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LONDON.
MABILLON. Jean, b. at St. Pierremont, in the diocese of Rheims, Nov. 23, 1632; d. in Paris, Dec. 27, 1707. In 1653 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur; and in 1664 he settled in the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés in Paris, as the assistant of D’Achery. His first independent work was his edition of the Opera omnia S. Bernardi, 1667, the first and also the model of the celebrated St. Maur editions of the Fathers; but his great life-work was his history of the Benedictine order. In 1668 appeared the first volume of his Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, which contained many striking proofs of his great critical talent. But just the cutting criticism which he exercised caused him trouble. He was accused by members of his own order, and had to defend himself before the chapter-general, in which, however, he succeeded completely. The ninth and last volume of the work appeared in 1701. In 1703 followed the first volume of his Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, of which he finished four volumes before he died. The fifth was completed by Massuet (1710); the sixth, by Martene (1739). His most celebrated work, however, is, perhaps, his De re diplomatica, libri vi., written against the founder of the Trappists, who himself before the chapter-general, in which, according to members of his own order, and had to defend himself before the chapter-general, in which, however, he succeeded completely. The ninth and last volume of the work appeared in 1701. In 1703 followed the first volume of his Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, of which he finished four volumes before he died. The fifth was completed by Massuet (1710); the sixth, by Martene (1739). His most celebrated work, however, is, perhaps, his De re diplomatica, libri vi., written against the foundation of the Trappists, who forbade his monks to read anything but the Bible and a few ascetical books, he wrote Traité des études monastiques (1691), in which he proved study and learning to be a necessary element of monastic life. Among his minor works are De lectu prima subtilissimo (1698), La mort christienne (1707), etc. Parts of his comprehensive correspondence have been published in his Ouvrages posthumes, and by Valery, Paris, 1846, 3 vols.

LIT.—The life of Mabillon has been written by RUMART (Paris, 1706); EMILE CHAVIN DE MALAN (Paris, 1843); HENRI JADART (Rheims, 1879); G. LAUBMANN.

MACARIANS. See Macarius (IV.).

MACARIUS is the name of several prominent characters in the ancient church. — I. Macarius the Elder, also called for the desert, or the Egyptian; b. about 300, in Upper Egypt; d. 381, in the desert of Scetis; grew up as a pupil of Antonius; was ordained priest in 340, and directed the monastic community of Scetis for half a century. He is commemorated in the Western Church on Jan. 15, in the Eastern on Jan. 19; and several monasteries in the Libyan Desert still bear his name. He left fifty homilies, which have been edited by J. G. Pritius, Leipzig, 1698, also some Apophthegmata and letters, edited by H. J. Fless, Cologne, 1830, while the Opera omnia was edited from his homilies. See BR. LINDNER: De Macario, Leipzig, 1846, and TH. FÜSSTER, In Jahrh. f. d. Theologie, 1873. — II. Macarius the Younger, or the Alexandrian, was a somewhat younger contemporary of the preceding, and stood at the head of five thousand monks in the Nitrian Desert. A tradition fixes the date of his death at Jan. 2; but he is commemorated on the same days as Macarius the Elder, with whom he is often confounded. A monastic rule (HOLSTENIUS: Cod. regul., I. 18) is ascribed to him, also a homily and some apophtegmata (Migne: Patr. Graec. xxiv.). — III. Macarius Magnus, probably identical with that Macarius (Bishop of Magnesia), who, at the Synod of the Oak (405), denounced the Bishop of Ephesus, the friend of Chrysostom. An apology of Christianity, directed against some Neo-Platonic adversary, discovered at Athens in 1687, and edited by C. Blondel (Paris, 1786), probably belongs to him. See L. DUCHESENE: De Macario Magneto et scriptis ejus, Paris, 1877. [IV. Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch in the seventh century; present at second council of Constantinople (868); was a Monothellete, and leader of a sect known as Macariani. See MONOTHELITIENS.] ZÖCKLER.

MACBRIDE, John David, D.C.L., F.S.A., eminent Orientalist; b. at Norfolk, Eng., 1788; d. at Oxford, Jan. 24, 1868. He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he took a fellowship. In 1813 he was appointed principal of Magdalen Hall, and Lord Almoner’s professor of Arabic in his university, and for the rest of his life retained these positions. He published anonymously, Diatessaron, or the History of our Lord Jesus Christ, compiled from the Four Gospels according to the Authorized Version, Oxford, 1887; Lectures explanatory of the Diatessaron, 1835, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1854; Lectures on the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, 1838; Lectures on the Epistles, 1838; also a work upon Mohammedanism. His Diatessaron was for some time a university textbook at Oxford.

MACCABEES, the name given in later times to the Asmoneans, a family of Jewish patriots who rose to celebrity in the reign of Antiochus (IV.) Epiphanes. It placed itself at the head of a popular revolt, which finally led, after terrible struggles, and many bloody vicissitudes of fortune, to a period of freedom and glory for Israel. The derivation of the name “Asmonean” is a matter of doubt. According to Josephus, it is to be looked for in a certain Asmoneus, who, he says, was an ancestor of the priest Mattathias. But it has such a singularly foreign appearance as to make it seem not improbable that it was a title of honor. [Professor Curtiss, in his brochure on The Name Machabe, advocates the meaning “extinguisher.”] The authorities for the history of the Asmoneans are, (1) the so-called “Books of the Maccabees,” which found their place in the Greek appendix of the Old Testament. The first book goes down to the death of Simon: the second does not extend to the death of Judas. (2) Josephus gives in his Antiquities (12-14) the most exten-
have regarded the introduction of foreign customs the "Oppressed" ( démôn), the "Poor" ( démôn), and the oppression. They liked to call themselves the morasses and ravines of the Lower Jordan, years he led the party with almost superhuman hand restrictions. These measures induced an open revolt, whose leader was the priest and the public murder of a royal official was the sign for the beginning of the revolt. Fleeing to the mountains, he, with the co-operation of his five heroic sons, organized war on a small scale. He boasted of having been related to the Maccabees. For the later period she perhaps drew her materials from family records, as she boasted of having been related to the Maccabees.

(3) Much valuable material is to be derived from the classic authors when we come to the close of the period.

The first principle in the politics of the Macedonian states of the East was the Hellenizing of the native populations. Antiochus IV. also followed it. Amongst all his subjects, the Israelites were the ones whose spirit and culture were the most bitterly antagonistic to Greek customs. But it was this very people, whom on account of their relations with foreign states, their wealth, and the importance of their geographical position, it was the most necessary for him to subject. It does not surprise us that some of the Jews should have regarded the introduction of foreign customs as something unavoidable, and offered no resistance. The zeal, however, of the strict advocates of the ancestral religion became intense under the oppression. They liked to call themselves the "Oppressed" ( démôn), the "Poor" ( démôn), and the "Fious" ( démôn). Indignant at this moral resistance, Antiochus finally inaugurated a religious persecution, which began with underhand restrictions. These measures induced an open revolt, whose leader was the priest and patriot Mattathias of Modin. His bold deed of the temple, which he re-dedicated with solemn festivity. Judas is said to have entered into relations with the Roman Senate. But the armies of Demetrius flooded the land, Jerusalem was taken, and Judas killed 161 B.C., leaving to his followers a name and example which counterbalanced many victories. He is the sole fanatic who stood up in the infinite blessing of the rescue and continuance of ancient Judaism, with its precious hopes, down to the time of the fulfilment.

The Asmonaeans did not despair. The astute Jonathan, fifth son of Mattathias, took the place of his heroic brother Judas, retreated to the morasses and ravines of the Lower Jordan, and carried on a destructive guerrilla warfare against the Syrians and Arabs. Demetrius, the nephew and legitimate heir of Antiochus IV., at this time occupied the throne. But a pretender (Alexander Bala) arose in the year 152 B.C., who gave himself out to be the son of Antiochus. This rivalry was favorable to the success of Jonathan's cause. Both parties sought his aid; and Demetrius not only restored the hostages he had taken from Jonathan, but withdrew most of the garrisons from the Jewish fortress, so that the latter became more and more of the temple, and without drawing the sword. Alexander, on the other hand, appointed him high priest; and the Jew, reaching out with both hands, united in his person the civil and spiritual power. At the death (150 B.C.) of Demetrius, Jonathan was master of Judea, and a powerful vassal of the kingdom of the Seleucidae. In 146 B.C. Demetrius the younger asserted his claims against the pretender. Jonathan defeated him, and secured the Philistine kingdom as the reward of the victory. Although Demetrius was afterwards successful, he preferred to have Jonathan for his friend, and granted to Judea immunities of much value. At a later period, a son of the pretender Alexander Bala arose against Demetrius II. Jonathan espoused his cause, but was, with Alexander himself, treacherously murdered. Schools were now erected at the side of the temple, and soon the pulpit became more prominent than the altar. Simon was advanced in years when he came into power. He was murdered 135 B.C. Respected by foreign nations, he was regarded by his own with affection. A noteworthy mark of his Alexander's ambitious minister, Tryphon, 143 B.C. Simon did not play as brilliant a part as either Judas or his successor Simon. He was a politician, and yet it was he who laid the foundation of the complete freedom of the Jews. One more son [the youngest] of Mattathias still remained, Simon,—a man tried in counsel and deed, and distinguished at once for prudence, mildness, and strength, and enjoying the full confidence of the people. He was the statesman of the house, as Jonathan was its diplomatist, and Judas its hero. In 142 B.C. he declared his nation independent, and united in his person the functions of high priest, prince, and military leader of the Jews. His rule marks an epoch in Jewish history. Priestly institutions had become the burden of the people. Schoolswere now erected at the side of the temple, and soon the pulpit became more prominent than the altar. Simon was advanced in years when he came into power. He was murdered 135 B.C. Respected by foreign nations, he was regarded by his own with affection. A noteworthy mark of his Alexander and devotion was embodied in a brazen tablet commemorating his virtues, and placed upon the wall of the temple. In 133 B.C. Simon struck off the first national Jewish money.

The further fortunes of the house of the Maccabees (Asmonaeans) has been given under the names of Simon's successors. It will be sufficient here to give a brief survey. John, or Hyrcanus I., Simon's son, was his immediate successor. With his death (107 B.C.) the glory of Israel descended to the house of the Maccabees advanced rapidly to its destruction. Hyrcanus, anticipating nothing good from his five sons, left his kingdom to his widow. Aristobulus I., however, pushed his way into power, but died (106 B.C.), after allowing his mother to perish of hunger, and throwing three of his brothers into prison. He was the first to assume the title of king. His widow Alexandra,
MACCABEES.

not yet weary of the new dignity, and worthy of it, offered her hand and her crown to one of her brothers-in-law, Alexander Janneus I., whose reign was longer than that of any other member of his family. He desired to shine, like his father, as a conqueror, without possessing his father's qualities. His power succeeded to power at his death (79 B.C.), and was followed, after a prudent and powerful reign, by her son Hyrcanus II. (70 B.C.). He united the offices of king and high priest, but was soon deprived of both by his brilliant and daring brother, Aristobulus II. Thenceforth the fortunes of the family were intimately associated with the ambitions and successes of the Herodian house. Its history was a series of tragedies. The land was deprived of the royal title by Pompey, 63 B.C. Aristobulus was murdered, and subsequently Hyrcanus II. (31 B.C.), in the eighteenth year of his age, and by the ambitious hand of Herod the Great, who had married his beautiful grand-daughter Mariamne. The same ambition put to death Mariamne's brother Aristobulus, in his eighteenth year (38 B.C.), in a midnight murder, to prevent the life of Mariamne herself, and consummated the bloody tragedy of the Maccabean house by the ghastly murder of his own two sons by Mariamne.—Alexander and Aristobulus. [See Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius, Hyrcanus.] Further facts the reader may consult the Histories of Israel of Ewald and Stanley, and especially Schurer: N. Tiche Zeitgesch., pp. 56-253, Leip., 1874; S. I. Curtiss: The Name Maccabees, Leip., 1876; F. de Sauloy: Histoire des Maccabees, Paris, 1889; Coxeter: Judas Maccaeius, London and New York, 1850.] Ed. Reuss.

MACCABEES, Books of. See Apocrypha.

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

MACCOVIUS (Makowsky), Johannes, Reformed theologian of Polish descent; b. at Lobzenic in 1596; d. at Padua, 1680; an elder brother of the preceding; left the Jesuits, and entered the order of the Cordeliers; was implicated in the political disturbances under John of Braganza, and became famous as a kind of walking encyclopedia, travelling from place to place, and holding disputations everywhere and about every thing. He wrote several works to show the perfect harmony between the doctrines of Augustine and those of the Church of Rome; several others, to show the perfect harmony between Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, etc. A complete list of the works of the two brothers Macedo is found in N. Antonio: Bibliotheca Hispana Nova, i.

MACEDONIA, the kingdom of Philip and Alexander the Great, comprised the middle part of the Balkan peninsula,—from Thessaly and Epirus to Illyria and Macedonia; from Thrace and the Aegean to the Adriatic. It was conquered by the Romans in 168 B.C., and divided into four provinces; but after the conquest of Greece, in 142 B.C., Macedonia appears as one single province besides Asia. Herod the Great united the Apocrypha of the Old Testament (Euth. xiv. 14, xvi. 10; 1 Macc. i. 1, vi. 2, viii. 5; 2 Macc. viii. 20). But it has acquired a much greater interest by being the first part of Europe which received Christianity. The Eusebian Apocrypha of the New Testament are Neapolis, Amphipolis, Apollonia, and Berea.

MACEDONIUS. When Bishop Alexander of Constantinople died, in 338, two candidates for his chair presented themselves,—Macedonius, an elderly man, and the young Paulus. The Athanasian party succeeded in carrying the election in favor of Paulus; but Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theodotus of Hieraules, induced the emperor to banish him. After the death of Constantine, however, he returned; but he was unable to maintain himself. Deposed by the synod of Constantinople in 338 or 339, he was banished to Mesopotamia by Constantius; and Eusebius himself made bishop of the metropolis. After his death, the rivalry between Macedonius and Paulus began anew; and Macedonius was consecrated bishop by the anti-Nicene party. The emperor sent his general, Hermogenes, to drive Paulus out of the city; but Hermogenes was killed by a fanatical mob. The emperor then came in person. Paulus was expelled, the refractory city was punished, and Macedonius was finally installed by force. Some years later on, however, Macedonius was once more compelled to retire before his rival on account of the general reaction which took place in favor of Athanasius; but shortly after the death of Constans, in 350, he returned, and succeeded in maintaining himself for about ten years. His position was difficult, however. The semi-Arians, whose leader he was, had gradually approached the Arians, and seemed willing to accept the Nicaean definition of the divinity of Christ; but exactly the same question arose with respect to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, separating the semi-Arians once more from the Nicaean, and drawing them nearer towards the Arians. At
MACHERUS. 1382

MACLAURIN.

a synod of Constantinople, in 380, his enemies actually succeeded in having him deposed, and he seems to have died shortly after. But his adherents in Constantinople and the adjacent dioceses were for a long time known under his name, as the “Macedonians,” and offered a stubborn opposition to the orthodox definition of the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

W. MöLLNER.

MACHERUS (a strong fortress in Perea, nine miles east of the northern end of the Dead Sea) was built by Alexander, the son of Hysenius I., and dismantled by Gabinius. It is not mentioned in the Bible; but Josephus (Ant. XVIII. 5, 2) points it out as the place in which the beheading of John the Baptist took place.

Archdeacon in Maynooth, 1814; b. early in the spring of 1789 (or March of Maronia in partibus. In 1829 he laid the foundation of the Killala Cathedral. In May, 1834, the death of the professor in that department, was unanimously elected his successor (1820). In 1835 he was appointed coadjutor bishop of Killala; but in July of that year he was elected archbishop of Tuam, metropolitan of the diocese covering territory bordering on Lake Nyanza. Bishop MacKenzie's death was premature; but his life was sufficiently long to enable him to develop a missionary enthusiasm and devotion which place him in the front rank of the foreign missionaries of the Anglican Church. See Dean Goodwin: Memoir of Bishop MacKenzie, Cambridge, 1864.

MACKENZIE, Charles Frederick, a devoted foreign missionary of the Anglican Church; b. in Portmore, Peshawar, April 16, 1829; d. Jan. 1, 1862, of fever, in Africa, on an island at the confluence of the Shire and Ruo Rivers. He graduated from the University of Cambridge, 1855, with distinction at Cambridge, and was made fellow of Caius College. Fired with missionary zeal, he went out in 1855, with Bishop Colenso, to Natal, as archdeacon of Pieter-Maritzburg. In 1859 he returned to England, to arouse an interest in African missions. He was subsequently sent out, under the Universities' Mission, to Africa, and was consecrated its first bishop Jan. 1, 1861, his diocese covering territory bordering on Lake Nyanza. Bishop MacKenzie's death was premature; but his life was sufficiently long to enable him to develop a missionary enthusiasm and devotion which place him in the front rank of the foreign missionaries of the Anglican Church. See Dean Goodwin: Memoir of Bishop MacKenzie, Cambridge, 1864.

MACKNIGHT, James, D.D., Scotch divine; b. at Irvine, Ayrshire, Sept. 17, 1721; d. at Edinburgh, Jan. 13, 1800. He was educated at Glasgow and Leyden; pastor at Maybole, Ayrshire, 1753-60; at Jedburgh, 1769-72, until his death. He prepared A Harmony of the Gospels, in which the natural order of each is preserved, with a Paraphrase and Notes, London, 1756, 2 vols, 7th ed., 1822, Latin trans. by A. F. Ruckersfelder, Brussels, 1772-73, 3 vols. (the notes are so copious, that the work amounts to a complete Life of Christ: it has long been a standard; The Truth of Gospel History, 1763 (a work upon the external and internal evidences of the Gospels); A New Literal Translation, from the Original Greek, of all the Apostolical Epistles, with a Commentary and Notes, 1795, 4 vols., several subsequent editions in varying number of volumes (the work has been very severely condemned for heretical teaching and defective scholarship, and, on the other hand, as highly praised for learning and ability). See his Life, by his son, prefixed to editions of the Epistles since 1806.

MACLAURIN, John, Scotch divine; b. at Glandenard, Argyshire, October, 1683; d. at Glasgow, Sept. 8, 1754. He was educated at Glasgow and Leyden, licensed to preach at Edinburgh, 1722. His Works were edited by W. H. Goold, Edinburgh, 1860, 2 vols. The most admired of his publications are An Essay on the Prophecies relating to the Messiah, with an Inquiry into Happi-
MACLEOD, Norman, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland, but even more widely known as the original editor of *Good Words*, and as the author of various standard works in popular literature; was b. at Campbeltown, Argyllshire, June 3, 1812; and d. in Glasgow, June 18, 1872. In his own Reminiscences of a Highland Parish will be found an animated account of the old Highland family — especially as represented by his grandfather, the patriarchal minister of Morven — from which he was proud to be descended, as well as graphic descriptions of the wild scenery, and free, out-of-door life, in the midst of which some of the happiest days of a happy boyhood were spent. It was, however, chiefly with the seaport town of Campbeltown and its seafaring associations, that the boy was familiar. On his singularly impressive and sympathetic nature all the circumstances of those early years appear to have exercised a lasting influence. Among the circumstances in question, his biographer attaches prominent importance to the character of his father and mother; the former, Dr. Norman Macleod (minister successively of Campbeltown, Campbeltown, and St. Columba, Glasgow), being "in many ways the prototype of Norman." Young Macleod never made any pretensions to scholarship; and at the University of Glasgow, which, after an irregular classical training, he entered in 1827, he shone more in the students' rooms. Of general literature, however, he appears to have read much in those days; his favorite author in poetry being Wordsworth. In 1831 he removed to the University of Edinburgh, that celebrated Dr. Thomas Chalmers, then professor of divinity in that university. Before receiving license, he spent three years in the family of a Yorkshire gentleman, Mr. Preston of Moreby, as tutor to his son; during most of the time residing at Weimar, or elsewhere in the continent of Europe. This first of many visits abroad seems to have had an important influence on the development of the character of the young man. "His views were widened, his opinions matured, his human sympathies vastly enlarged; and, while all that was of the essence of his early faith had become doubly precious, he had gained increased catholicity of sentiment, and a knowledge of the world" (Memoir, vol. i. p. 49). His first charge was London, in Ayrshire, a parish partly agricultural, but with a considerable weaving population. There he seems to have given himself up, with all the ardor of his nature and the enthusiasm of youth, to his parochial duties, especially among the working-classes of the population. It was, however, in the large and important parish of the Barony, Glasgow, embracing at that time eighty-seven thousand souls, to which (after thirteen years passed in Loudon, and in his second charge, Dalkeith) he was called in the year 1851, that though multiplied public engagements, as he often complained, prevented, with some success, Sunday services open exclusively to working-people in their working-clothes. Dr. Macleod's enormous parish duties did not prevent a man of so much energy, and of such varied powers, from engaging in literary work. It was in 1860 that he undertook the editorship of one of the ablest and most successful of the religious magazines of the day, — *Good Words*. About the same time, some of the more popular of his contributions to general literature were written; the greater number of them, indeed, originally appearing in *Good Words*. These works include *The Earnest Student*, *The Old Lieutenant and his Son*, *The Gold Thread*, *Character Sketches*, *The Starling*, *Eastward*, and *Peeps at the Far East*. One of the most exquisite pieces of religious fiction in the language is his *Wee Davie*, which belongs to this period. During the last ten or fifteen years of his life, Dr. Macleod took an active part in the general work of the church, including labors connected with some of the chief posts of honor to which Scottish churchmen are eligible. In 1815 he was one of a deputation to visit the Scottish churches in Canada. From 1864 to 1872 (the year of his death) he undertook the arduous duties of the foreign missions committee of the church; in this capacity paying also a visit to India as a deputy from the church, — an occasion, it may be added, on which he was received, both by Anglo-Indians and by the natives of India, with the utmost enthusiasm. He also, for many years, held the High Court appointments of Dean of the Thistle, Dean of the Chapel Royal, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen for Scotland. Nor were these empty honors; for personally he enjoyed in an eminent degree the favor and confidence of his sovereign. In the year 1869 he was raised by a unanimous vote to the presidency, or moderatorship as it is called, of the General Assembly, the Supreme Court of the Church of Scotland.


MACNEILE, Hugh, D.D., b. at Ballycastle near Belfast, county Antrim, Ireland, 1789; d. at Bournemouth, Eng., Jan. 26, 1879. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; studied law, but afterwards took orders in 1820; and from 1834 to 1868 was rector in Liverpool, where he acquired great popularity. In 1868 he was, on the recommendation of Mr. Disraeli, appointed Dean of Ripon; but in October, 1875, he resigned, on account of failing health. He was an eloquent man, noted for his vehement attacks upon the Roman-Catholic Church. His publications were mostly *Sermons and Lectures*, which passed through several editions, and controversial tracts upon Romanism. Unitarian from youth, he undertook the editorship of one of the ablest and most successful of the religious magazines of the day, — *Good Words*. About the same time, some of the more popular of his contributions to general literature were written; the greater number of them, indeed, originally appearing in *Good Words*. These works include *The Earnest Student*, *The Old Lieutenant and his Son*, *The Gold Thread*, *Character Sketches*, *The Starling*, *Eastward*, and *Peeps at the Far East*. One of the most exquisite pieces of religious fiction in the language is his *Wee Davie*, which belongs to this period. During the last ten or fifteen years of his life, Dr. Macleod took an active part in the general work of the church, including labors connected with some of the chief posts of honor to which Scottish churchmen are eligible. In 1815 he was one of a deputation to visit the Scottish churches in Canada. From 1864 to 1872 (the year of his death) he undertook the arduous duties of the foreign missions committee of the church; in this capacity paying also a visit to India as a deputy from the church, — an occasion, it may be added, on which he was received, both by Anglo-Indians and by the natives of India, with the utmost enthusiasm. He also, for many years, held the High Court appointments of Dean of the Thistle, Dean of the Chapel Royal, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen for Scotland. Nor were these empty honors; for personally he enjoyed in an eminent degree the favor and confidence of his sovereign. In the year 1869 he was raised by a unanimous vote to the presidency, or moderatorship as it is called, of the General Assembly, the Supreme Court of the Church of Scotland.


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

MADAGASCAR (an island off the eastern coast of Africa, eighteen hundred miles from the Cape of Good Hope) has been a distinguished scene of the success of modern missions among the heathens, and the steadfast perseverance of native Christians under violent and prolonged persecutions. The island is nine hundred miles long, and four hundred miles wide at its widest point. It was discovered, and made known to Europe, by Marco Polo, in the latter part of the thirteenth century. The natives, or Malayans, with an admixture of negro blood. They are a well-built race. The native religion consisted of the worship of a supreme God (whom they called "The Fragrant Prince"), idolatry, sacrifice, sorcery, and divination. Infanticide was practised till the arrival of the missionaries, and polygamy and slavery prevailed. Thousands of the population were shipped away by slave-dealers. The present population is estimated at two millions and a half.

Christian missions were established in Madagascar, in 1818, by the arrival of Messrs. Jones and Bevan, under appointment of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Bevan died soon after his arrival. In 1816 the first embassy of friendship had arrived on the island from England. Radama, who was king at the time of the missionaries' arrival, was an enlightened prince, and seconded their efforts in establishing schools. They invented an alphabet for the native language, and reduced it to writing. The London Society sent out two printing-presses; and a version of the New Testament was prepared, together with textbooks for the schools, a translation of the Pilgrim's Progress, and other books. The death of the king, in 1828, checked the progress of missionary extension. One of his wives was crowned in 1829, and with her coronation the sky changed for the Christian population. Hostile to Christian institutions, she gave notice to the missionaries to quit the land; and the last two left in 1836. From that time on, till 1857, violent persecutions were conducted against the Christians, who, with heroic faith and constancy, suffered death and all manner of violence, rather than deny Christ. The annals of these sufferings, and the perseverance of the Christians, form a most thrilling chapter in the history of modern missions. Many of the Christians were sold into slavery; others were stoned to death; others were paraded while kneeling in prayer; others—bound hand and foot, or chained together—thrown over a steep precipice looking down upon the sea upon the rocks; and still others imprisoned, or shackled with iron fetters, and condemned to wear an iron chain on their necks. They called "The Fragrant Prince," idolatry, sacrifice, sorcery, and divination. Infanticide was practised till the arrival of the missionaries, and polygamy and slavery prevailed. Thousands of the population were shipped away by slave-dealers. The present population is estimated at two millions and a half.

Christian missions were established in Madagascar, in 1818, by the arrival of Messrs. Jones and Bevan, under appointment of the London Missionary Society. Mr. Bevan died soon after his arrival. In 1816 the first embassy of friendship had arrived on the island from England. Radama, who was king at the time of the missionaries' arrival, was an enlightened prince, and seconded their efforts in establishing schools. They invented an alphabet for the native language, and reduced it to writing. The London Society sent out two printing-presses; and a version of the New Testament was prepared, together with textbooks for the schools, a translation of the Pilgrim's Progress, and other books. The death of the king, in 1828, checked the progress of missionary extension. One of his wives was crowned in 1829, and with her coronation the sky changed for the Christian population. Hostile to Christian institutions, she gave notice to the missionaries to quit the land; and the last two left in 1836. From that time on, till 1857, violent persecutions were conducted against the Christians, who, with heroic faith and constancy, suffered death and all manner of violence, rather than deny Christ. The annals of these sufferings, and the perseverance of the Christians, form a most thrilling chapter in the history of modern missions. Many of the Christians were sold into slavery; others were stoned to death; others were paraded while kneeling in prayer; others—bound hand and foot, or chained together—thrown over a steep precipice looking out upon the sea upon the rocks; and still others imprisoned, or shackled with iron fetters, and condemned to wear an iron chain on their necks. One of these chains which Mr. Ellis carried back with him to England weighed fifty-six pounds.

and had been carried by the unhappy sufferer for four years. Rasalama, the first of these martyrs, suffered Aug. 14, 1837. In the last persecution, in 1857, two hundred were executed. In spite of these persecutions, the number of the Christians increased; and now, since the first three centuries, has the truth of Tertullian's words been more signally verified, that blood is the seed of the church.

Radama II., the queen's successor, favored Christianity; and again the missionaries entered the country; and the Rev. Mr. Ellis again in 1861 visited it as the agent of the London Missionary Society. The sufferings of the Christians were now recognized, and their constancy commemorated in a number of martyrs' memorial churches. In 1858 there were 75 churches on the island, with 95 native and foreign pastors, and 4,574 communicants. The London Society in 1882 had 71,085 communicants connected with its missions. In 1887 the Friends established a mission, with which, in 1883, 3,200 members and 26,000 Christians were connected. The Rev. Mr. Ellis saw the Martyrs' Memorial Society (Norske Missions SelSkap zu Stavanger) also prosecute missionary work on the island, and in 1880 had 1,200 communicants. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel entered Madagascar in 1874, and has one bishop, Dr. Kestell-Cornish. Under the reign of Radama's successors, the missionaries have not only been recognized, but the work of extending the church has engaged the active sympathies of the government. The prime minister, on July 11, 1875, and other occasions, has presided at meetings held in the Martyrs' Memorial Church in Antananarivo, the capital, for the despatch of missionaries to the unevangelized portions of the island. A royal decree emancipating all slaves was issued June 20, 1877.


Madonna, an Italian term meaning "my lady," corresponding to "madam," but applied for excellence to the Virgin Mary and to her pictures and statues. See Mary.

Maffei, Francesco Scipione, b. at Verona, June 1, 1675; d. there Feb. 11, 1755. He was educated in the Jesuit college of Parma, devoted himself to literature, became a member of the Arcadian Society in Rome, made several campaigns in the Spanish war of succession, and settled finally in his native city, where he founded a literary society. He wrote against the Jansenists, Giansenismo nuovo dimostrato (Venice, 1722), and Storia teologica, etc. (Trent, 1742). His De teatri antichi e moderni (Verona, 1738) is a defence of the theatre as a moral institution. His collected works appeared in Venice, 1780, in 18 vols.

Maffei, Giovanni Pietro, b. at Bergamo, 1553; d. at Tivoli, 1605, their nearest. He was a Jesuit in 1585, lived most of his time in Genoa, and wrote, De vita et moribus S. Ignatii Loyola.
on these themes in 1789 and 1799. The volume was first issued 1801; the eighth edition appeared 1856, and it still is a standard. Archbishop Magee was a determined foe to Romanism and Unitarianism. See his Works with Memoir, London, 1842, 2 vols.

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

It must be noticed, that, during the first kings of the house of the Achaemenids, the Greeks often make a sharp distinction between Magians and Persians, identifying the former with the Medes, and the Persians with the Medes. Thus the reign of Pseudo-Smerdis is represented as an attempt of the Magians to substitute Median for Persian rule (Herodotus, III. 30, 62); and Herodotus expressly calls the Magians a Median tribe (1, 101; 107; 120; 128; 7, 18; 37), describing them as experts in astrology and omens. To this must be added that the Persians instituted a festival, the Magiphonia, in commemoration of the defeat and massacre of the magi, — a circumstance which could not possibly have occurred if magic had been an original Persian institution. It was, however, not an original Median institution either. In their home, the Medes adhered to the pure Zend religion of Zoroaster. Berosus even calls Zoroaster king of the Medes. The magi they adopted from Babylonia.

Still earlier than the Persians and Medes, the magi are found among the Chaldeans. They appear there as contemporaries of the Hebrew prophets, who describe them as the wise men and scholars of the Chaldeans, though with a smack of the soothsayer, the conjurer, the sorcerer, etc. (Isa. xlvii. 25; Jer. L 36; Dan. ii. 10, 11, 20, 21, 51). They were, indeed, so intimately connected with the Chaldeans that the names became interchangeable; a Chaldean meaning a magian or magician, just as a Canaanite meant a merchant. The name is, nevertheless, not of Chaldean origin. There is no Semitic root from which it could be derived. Nor does it seem to be of Aryan origin, though there are Sanscrit roots from which it might be derived without violence. Most probably, the name descended, together with the whole Chaldean institution, to the Christians from that Turanian people, the Accadians, whom we know as the first settlers in the Valley of the Euphrates. Originally an Accadian institution, magianism was successively introduced among the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians, and was finally completely incorporated with the Zend religion.

According to Xenophon (Cyrop., VIII. 1, 33),
it was Cyrus who first established magianism in Persia; and from that time the Persian priests were called magi, both in the cuneiform inscriptions and by the Greeks. As above mentioned, magianism met with some resistance in Persia during the first kings of the house of the Achaemenides; but gradually its spirit pervaded the whole religious life of the Persian people, and threw even the most prominent doctrines of the Zend religion into the shade. The influence which the Greeks exercised on the Persians after the death of Alexander was by no means unfavorable to the farther development of magianism. The Greek felt a natural aversion to the somewhat vain and completely shapeless abstractions of the old religion of light, and a natural affinity for the half-mystical, half-scientific artifices of magianism. While in the Persian Empire magianism reached its acme of power, — the king belonging to the order, and the senate being composed exclusively of magi,— it reached, at the same time, its greatest extension in the Greek-speaking world. The name “magian” there gradually became synonymous with sorcerer, sorcery, and a mild form of witchcraft. The word “magian” was, as for instance, in Matt. ii. 13, where the wise men from the East are represented as possessed of some prophetic insight derived from astrology, and enabling them to arrive in due time to do homage to the new-born Christ, just as they had done in former time to the new-born Pluto, but generally in a more odious sense, as, for instance, in Acts viii. 9, where Simon Magus is spoken of as “false prophet.”

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


MAHAN, Milo, D.D., b. at Suffolk, Nansemond County, Va., May 24, 1819; d. in Baltimore, Sept. 3, 1870. He was educated at St. Paul’s College, Flushing, L.I.; entered the Episcopal ministry, 1845; from 1851 to 1864 was professor of ecclesiastical history in the General Seminary of his denomination, New-York City. From the latter year till his death he was rector of St. Paul’s Church. Besides minor works, he published a Church History of the First Seven Centuries, New York, 1860; new edition, 1872. His Collected Works were edited, with Memoir, by Rev. J. H. Hopkins, Jun., New York, 1872-74, 3 volumes.
MAHANA'IM (see camp), a town named by Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2), allotted to the Levites (Josh. xiii. 29, 30, xxi. 38; 1 Chron. vi. 80), and situated in the territory of Gad, was near the River Jabbok. It was the residence of Ishboseth (2 Sam. ii. 8, 12), and the refuge of David on his flight before Absalom (xvii. 24, 27; 1 Kings ii. 8). The place has not yet been identified with certainty.

MAHOMET. See Mohammed.

MAI, Angelo, b. at Schilpario, in the province of Bergamo, March 7, 1782; d. at Albano, Sept. 9, 1864. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1799; studied at Naples and Rome, and was in 1813 appointed custos at the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Possessed of competent philological learning, extraordinary critical acumen, and great skill in paleography, more especially as a reader of palimpsests, he published, from manuscripts discovered in the library, a speech by Isocrates, and some fragments of a Gothic translation of the Epistles of Paul, several works of Philo Judæus, a book of Porphyrius, the Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, some letters of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, etc. The celebrity he attained in these publications led to his appointment as librarian at the Vatican, in which position he developed a still greater activity. In 1838 he was made a cardinal. The various works he edited were collected in the four following series: Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Rome, 1825-38, 10 vols.; Classicorum collectio, Rome, 1828-38, 10 vols.; Spicilegium Romanum, 1833-34, 8 vols.; Nova patria bibliotheca, 1844-71, 8 vols.; and an Appendix, Rome, 1879. [See B. Prina: Biografia del cardinale Angelo Mai, Bergamo, 1882.]

MAILLARD, Olivier, d. at Toulouse, June 13, 1502; belonged to the order of the Cordeliers; was professor of theology at the Sorbonne, court-preacher to Louis XI., confessor to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, published in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

MAIMBOURO, Louis, b. at Nancy in 1610; d. in Paris, Aug. 13, 1686. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1626, and was for some years preacher to Louis XL, confessors to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, both in French (Scrmotis, Lyons, 1498), and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

MAIMBOURO, Louis, b. at Nancy in 1610; d. in Paris, Aug. 13, 1686. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1626, and was for some years preacher to Louis XL, confessors to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, both in French (Scrmotis, Lyons, 1498), and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

MAIMBOURO, Louis, b. at Nancy in 1610; d. in Paris, Aug. 13, 1686. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1626, and was for some years preacher to Louis XL, confessors to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, both in French (Scrmotis, Lyons, 1498), and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

MAIMBURG, Louis, b. at Nancy in 1610; d. in Paris, Aug. 13, 1686. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1626, and was for some years preacher to Louis XL, confessors to Charles VIII., and enjoyed a great fame as a preacher. His sermons, both in French (Scrmotis, Lyons, 1498), and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

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

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

The works, however, which have immortalized his name throughout Judaism, are (1) his Commentary on the M.T., Lyons, 1486; and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

The works, however, which have immortalized his name throughout Judaism, are (1) his Commentary on the M.T., Lyons, 1486; and in Latin (Sermones dominicale, 1500; Sermones de sanctis, 1516, etc.), are a curious mixture of scurrility and sublimity. He also wrote La confession générale du frère Olivier Maillard, Lyons, 1526.

In the special introduction to the treatise Sanhedrin, he for the first time defined and formally laid down the Jewish creed: (1) That there is one God, a perfect being, creator and preserver of all things; (2) That he is the sole cause of all existing things, and consequently one, and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other; (3) He is not corporeal; (4) He is eternal; (5) That he alone is to be worshipped without any mediator; (6) That God had appointed other; (7) He is omniscient, always beholding the acts of men; (8) That the law and tradition were from God; (9) That the dead shall rise again. [This creed, which is found in the Jewish ritual, is repeated every morning by the orthodox Jew.]
His second great work was (II) his Mishneh-Thora, a gigantic work, also called Yad Hachazaka [i.e., "The Might Hand"], which he completed in 1180, and divided into fourteen books, subdivided again into eighty-two treatises, of which the work, written in very clear and easy Hebrew, consists; thus forming a cyclopedia comprising every department of biblical and Jewish literature. The first part speaks of the Jewish religion, the contents of which are also those of true philosophy. The second part speaks of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, with the intention to encourage the more intelligent to a more thorough investigation of the text of the Bible. But while, on the one hand, the Moreh Nebuchim contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science; and Judaism was soon divided into the Maimonidians and anti-Maimonidans. Anathemas and counter-anathemas were issued by both camps. In the midst of the conflict, which was begun by Samuel ben Ali at Bagdad, Maimonides died, in 1204, at the age of seventy. Whilst his adherents eulogized him by the saying, "From Moses to Moses no one has arisen like Moses," his opponents wrote on his tomb, "Here lies Moses, the anathematized heretic."

Maimuni's Mishna-commentary is to be found in all Mishna editions, and translated also into Latin by Surenhusius. The Mishneh-Thora was published by Justinian, Bishop of Nebiul Paris, 1520, and translated into German by R. Furstenthal, Krotoschin, 1838; the second, by Stern [Vienna, 1864]; in Arabic and French by John Buxtorf, Basle, 1629. The first part was especially devoted to the explanation of all sensuous expressions which are made use of in the Bible in regard to God. The second part speaks of the Jewish religion, the contents of which are also those of true philosophy. The third part speaks of the first vision of the prophet Ezekiel, with the intention to encourage the more intelligent to a more thorough investigation of the text of the Bible. But while, on the one hand, the Moreh Nebuchim contributed more than any other work to the progress of rational development in Judaism, it, on the other hand, also provoked a long and bitter strife between orthodoxy and science; and Judaism was soon divided into the Maimonidians and anti-Maimonidans. Anathemas and counter-anathemas were issued by both camps. In the midst of the conflict, which was begun by Samuel ben Ali at Bagdad, Maimonides died, in 1204, at the age of seventy. Whilst his adherents eulogized him by the saying, "From Moses to Moses no one has arisen like Moses," his opponents wrote on his tomb, "Here lies Moses, the anathematized heretic."

Maimuni's Mishna-commentary is to be found in all Mishna editions, and translated also into Latin by Surenhusius. The Mishneh-Thora was published by Justinian, Bishop of Nebiul Paris, 1520, and translated into German by R. Furstenthal, Krotoschin, 1838; the second, by Stern [Vienna, 1864]; in Arabic and French by John Buxtorf, Basle, 1829, 2 vols. See Sainte-Beuve : Portraits litteraires, vol. ii.
trine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses and Waldenses, 1832; The Dark Ages, 1844; Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England, 1849. He also prepared an (unpublished, though printed) index to all the books in the Lambeth Library printed prior to 1800.

MAJOR and the MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY. Georg Majer, b. at Nuremberg 1502, was appointed rector at Magdeburg 1526, pastor at Eisleben 1535, professor in Wittenberg 1536, pastor at Merseburg 1547, and superintendent at Eisenach 1551, whence he removed to Wittenberg 1556, where he died, Nov. 28, 1574. As one of the subscribers to the Leipzig Interim of December, 1548, he was suspected of having deviated from the straight line of orthodoxy with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith, and was vehemently attacked by Amsdorf in 1551. His first answer (Antwort auf des ehrwürdigen Herrn Amsdorf's Schrifft, 1552) was moderate and cautious. But in the course of the controversy extreme views developed, Major declaring good works necessary to salvation, while Amsdorf declared them detrimental to salvation. The Formula Concordiae occupies the happy middle between those extremes, defining good works as the necessary consequence of faith, but not as a necessary condition of justification. See Planck: Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, iv. 469–532. C. Beck.

MAJORINI PARS. See Donatists.

MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY. See Major.

MAKEMIE, Francis, the founder of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, b. near Rathmelton, Donegal County, Ireland (date unknown); d. in Accomac County, Va., in the summer of 1708. Licensed by the presbytery of Laggan in 1701, he went to Barbadoes in answer to an appeal from Capt. Johnson for a minister. He soon afterwards came to Maryland, and in 1708 organized the first Presbyterian church in the United States, at Snow Hill, on the narrow neck of land between the Chesapeake and the ocean. Makemie itinerated through Virginia and South Carolina. He married a Virginian lady of wealth. On a visit to England (1704) he succeeded in securing two ministers for the work in America,

John Hampton and George Macnich. While in London, he published A plain and loving Persuasion to the inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland for promoting towns and habitation. He was a member of the first American presbytery,—that of Philadelphia,—and its moderator in 1706. In 1707, while on a preaching tour, he was apprehended at Newtown, L.I., by Lord Cornbury, and thrown into prison for preaching without a proper license in the State of New York. He was subsequently acquitted, but obliged by the court to pay the expenses of his trial (eighty pounds). Mr. Makemie also published a Catechism (which is lost), and An Answer to George Keith's Libet on the Catechism printed at Makemie (Boston, 1692), two copies of which are preserved in Boston. See Webster: History of the Presbyterian Church in America, pp. 297–311; Sprague's Annals, vol. iii.; and Gillett: History of the Presbytery.

MAKOWSKY, Johann. See Maccovius.

MALACHI, the prophet who gives his name to the last book of the Minor Prophets and to the last book of the Old Testament. Some (e.g., Hengstenberg) deny that there ever was a prophet of this name, and for the following reasons: (1) The superscription gives no information respecting his antecedents; (2) the oldest Jewish tradition appears to know nothing about him; (3) the form of the name is peculiar. It means "my messenger," in reference to iii. 1. But such a nomenclature is unparalleled, since it is evident that it could not be given by men, but by God alone. Hengstenberg, therefore, considers the name as either ideal, or an official title. In answer it may be said, (1) Among the sixteen prophets whose writings are contained in the Old Testament, the fathers of only eight are known; of three only (Amos, Micah, and Nahum) is the birthplace given; while to only two (Habakkuk and Haggai) is the appellation "prophet" added; (2) and, finally, of two prophets (Malachi and Obadiah) we know nothing more than their names. The first argument, therefore, extremely weak. (2) In order to put much stress upon the second, we must first determine the time of Malachi's prophecy. This was, as Vitringa (Observa sacr., tom. ii. L. vi. pp. 331 sq.) has indubitably shown, during the second residence of Nehemiah in Jerusalem, i.e., about the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. The proof is derived from a comparison of Mal. ii. 8 with Neh. xiii. 15, 29; Mal. ii. 10 with Neh. xiii. 27–29; and Mal. iii. 7–12 with Neh. xiii. 10. Hence it appears that the very sins the prophet denounced were those Nehemiah legislated against. See art. Nehemiah. It cannot be maintained that Malachi came shortly after Nehemiah, for then his denunciations would be against extirpated sins; nor much time after, for then Malachi would not be included among the later prophets, but at the most among the Hagiographa. The conclusion is therefore to be drawn, that Malachi seconded Nehemiah (as Isaiah did Hezekiah, and Jeremiah Josiah), and began his prophetic activity when Nehemiah returned the second time. But the determination of the time answers the objection that Malachi is not mentioned in the early Jewish tradition, for the only document of that period is Neh. xiii.; and that is so short and supplementary in its character, that no mention would be expected. In the absence of authentic information, fancy had full play. The name was first seized upon; and the "messenger of God" became an angel. So the LXX. and many of the Fathers understand it: Jerome however, since the historical Malachi was personally unknown, while the word comes prominently out in iii. 1, others have considered it symbolical, and supposed that under this name another prophet

MAKrina, a saintly woman of the fourth Christian century, the sister of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa; belonged to a wealthy and distinguished family in Pontus and Cappadocia, but retired after the death of her father, together with her mother and a number of virgins, to an estate on the Iris in Pontus, where she founded a monastic institution, and spent the rest of her life in the severest ascetic practices. She is commemorated on July 19; her grandmother, the elder Makrina, on Jan. 14. Her life was written by her brother Gregory: De vita M., in Opp. ii. (Migne: Patrolog. Graec. iii.). See Acta Sanct., Jul., iv. 589. W. Mollten.
Jehovah callsemphatically "my messenger," but outward observance of the law. But in reality is, up to the final fulfilment of the promise, in reckoning. Israel's duty — this is his exhortation sermon is strenuous upon mere externals,— the rabbins and Christian theologians. But, since prophecy is a piece of history, there is no prophecy the name of whose author is not put in the forefront, for the real name must be known: therefore, if Ezra really wrote the Book of Malachi, he was in duty bound to sign it with his real name, since a symbolical signature is as good as none. (3) The name (Malachi) can be a contraction of (Malachiah), "servant of Jehovah;" the (Malachi), not a suffix, but (Malachi). In proof may be quoted the transcription of the LXX., Malachi, which shows that they considered the name a contraction of (Malachi).

Upon the contents and form of the book there remains little to say. The prophet takes in a glance past, present, and future. Starting with the past, he sets plainly before his hearers the love which led Jehovah to choose Jacob, while he rejected Esau. In contrast to this love from long ago, the prophet sets the present conduct of the people. People and priest have sinned, in that they have brought diseased offerings, treacherously reduced the temple revenues, and disgraced the divine name by mixed marriages. For these things comes the judgment, which is to be ushered in by a great, extraordinary messenger, whom Jehovah calls emphatically "my messenger," but who, in turn, is only the forerunner of a still greater one, the angel of the covenant, with whom Jehovah himself will appear, and who, as the counterpart of Moses, will reveal the new law to God's people. The prophet determines yet more closely the time of the coming of the forerunner, when he says that he is the prophet Elijah, who will come to convert young and old. Then comes the Lord to his temple, and the great and terrible day of judgment begins. But the judgment has two sides,— the destruction of the ungodly, and the elimination and purification of the righteous. In what this last prophet says of Elijah, he prophesies of the forerunner of God as revealed to his people, who is more than a prophet, in that his appointment, is a breaking of the day of Jehovah (Matt. xi. 9, 10).

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

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

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

Lit.— See the Commentaries by David Cyril (Boste, 1665), Samuel Boul (with the rabbinic comments, Boste, 1687), Sal. v. Tilly (Leyden, 1701), Vithinga (Leuwarden, 1712), J. C. Heidenstreich (with the Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel, Leipsic, 1731-46, 17 pts.), Vaxena (Leuwarden, 1769), C. F. Bahintz (Leipsic, 1769), Haselberth (Königsberg, 1836), Leipsic, 1838; 4th ed. by Steiner, 1881), Ubbrecht (Hamburg, 1846), Schego (1854), Rinken (R. C.) (Giessen, 1856), Kühler (Erlanden, 1885), Pressel (Gotha, 1870), Lange (1876).
to and from Rome, he visited Clairvaux, and it became a passionate desire with him to die there. Immediately after the close of the national synod, he consequently set out for Clairvaux; and, a few days after his arrival there, he expired in the arms of St. Bernard. The latter wrote his life, d'un missionnaire (Geneva, 1842), and made a great sensation. They soon still believed in the sect were poor and illiterate. Many, to avoid persecution, emigrated to Georgia, Asia. See Haxthausen {Studien über Russland, Hanover, 1847} and art. Malakanes, in BLUNT's Dictionary of Sects.

MALAKANES, a Russian sect which originated in the middle of the eighteenth century, and derived its name from Malako, "milk," the food they prescribed for health and strength. They are still believed in by many (see C. D. K. BARDE). They were chiefly at home in the province of Smolensk, and in the environs of Moscow. In 1791 they numbered 100,000 souls. The sect was proselyting activity among the natives. The discovery of the Spanish and Portuguese navigators. The largest of these islands are Sumatra (1,200 miles in length by 200 in breadth), Java (700 miles in length by 160 in breadth), Borneo (1,000 miles in length by 750 in breadth), Celebes, the Moluccas, and Philippine Islands. The population is composed of mixed races, some of whom are amongst the most degenerate specimens of the human family. Mohammedanism and Buddhism prevail side by side with the native religion, consisting of the worship of mountains and other works of nature, and magical arts. Many of the islands were originally under the dominion of Portugal, but passed, in the seventeenth century, over to the Dutch, who still hold them. The Dutch have encouraged proselyting activity among the natives. The Handelsmaatschappij, founded in 1802, declared it to be one of its first aims to plant the Reformed faith in the Dutch colonies. But marvellous were the measures pursued. Baptism was finally made, by some of the Dutch governors (as on Ceylon), the condition of holding even the most subordinate office, yes, of the protection of the laws. All were received who could prove that they knew the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. It has been successful in gathering 80,000 of the natives in 200 congregations. In Java, with its population of 18,000,000, there are only 4,000 Christians; and the island has been under the Dutch crown for more than two centuries and a half. In Borneo the Rhenish Society labors, among the Dyaks, and has 500 native Christians under its control. Its efforts were inaugurated by the blood of seven of its missionaries (four men and three women) in 1858. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel supports a mission among the Battas, which includes 5,000 native converts, and has fine prospects ahead. The American Board, in 1856, sent Messrs. Munson and Lyman on a tour of inquiry to this island, both of whom were murdered. See Yves: Six Months under the Malays, London, 1855; The Martyrs of Sumatra, a Memoir of Henry Lyman, New York, 1856; Cammond: Our Tropical Possessions in Malayan India, London, 1865; YAM
sensation: even Protestants came to hear his lectures. Days of Abelard, no professor had made such a success with the most extraordinary success. Since the late conception, then with respect to the doctrine of purgatory. On the first point he proved himself exclusively to the study of philosophy and to philosophical meditation. In the history of philosophy he stands as the most prominent disciple of Cartesianism: at some points he even carried farther the ideas of his master. He is the father of the so-called "Occasionalism." He adopted the absolute distinction which Cartesianism made between spirit and matter, soul and body. But the relation between these two opposites, which Cartesianism left unexplained, or only vaguely explained by postulating a perpetual divine mediation between them, Malebranche made the subject of his deepest meditation; and hence he restated his peculiar doctrine, that events taking place in the one sphere occasioned God to effect corresponding re-adjustments in the other, so that nothing could be truly understood unless "seen in God." The principal representation of his system is found in his first work, De la recherche de la verite (Paris, 1674); but further developments are found in his Conversations chretiennes et metaphysiques (1683). Traité de morale (1684), and especially in his Entretiens sur la Metaphysique et sur la Religion (1688). His De la nature et de la grace deprived him of the favor of Bossuet, and implicated him in a long and sometimes very bitter controversy with Arnauld. His doctrines were often said to incline towards Spinozism, but on this point he found a warm defender in Leibniz. His metaphysics have now only very little interest; but the noble piety of his works still makes impression, and the elegance of the representation still exercises its charm. His works were collected by Genoude and Lourdoine (Paris, 1837, 2 vols. in quarto); but the collection is not complete. See Blanpignon: Étude sur Malebranche, 1862; and Ollck Laprune: Philosophie de Malebranche, 1870, 2 vols.

MALMESEBURY, William of. See William of Malmsbury.

MALVENDA, Thomas, b. 1566; d. 1628; a Spaniard by birth, and member of the Dominican order; first attracted attention by his criticism of some points in the Annales ecclesiastici and the Martyrologium Romanum. Called to Rome, he was charged with a revision of the breviary, misal, and martyrology of his order, and of La Bigne's Bibliotheca Patrum, and also with writing the Annales ordinis fratum predicaturum, of which, however, he only finished four volumes folio, comprising the first thirty years of the history of the Dominican order. Sent to Spain in 1586, he drew up the Spanish Index librorum prohibitorum, and commenced a literal translation of the Bible, of which, however, only five volumes were completed, reaching Ezek. xvi. Among his other works: De viribus et poenis post mortem, 1605; De laudes beatarum virgium, 1607; Entretiens sur la Metaphysique et la Religion, 1688; See also: Maldonatus, Joannes; Maldonatus, John; Maldonatus, Giovanni; Maldonatus, Juan.
works (a complete list of which is found in Quetif and Echard: Scriptores ordinis praedicaturum, ii. 454) is a book, De Antichristo, a collection of all that has been said at various times about Antichrist.

C. SCHMIDT.

MAMACHI, Thomas Maria, b. in 1713; d. in 1792. He was a native of the Island of Scio, but was educated in Italy; entered the order of the Dominicans; was ordained a priest in 1736, and held various positions, as professor of theology, secretary to the Congregation of the Index, etc. In the first work he published (Epist. ad J. D. Mansium, Rome, 1748) he refuted Manai's computation of the date of the synod of Sardica and of the return of Athanasius to Alexandria. Of much greater importance are his Originum et antiquitatum christianorum libri XX. (Rome, 1749-55), written with steady reference to Bingham's Originis ecclesiasticae, and his De costumi dei primitivi Christiani (Rome, 1738). His participation, however, in the Febronian controversy (Ep. ad Justinum Febronium, Rome, 1776) showed that he was no match for Hontheim.

MAMERTUS. See Rogations.

MAMERTUS CLAUDIANUS. See CLAUDIANUS.

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

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

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

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

The philosophies of ancient and modern times have also been pretty well agreed that man is not simply the product of nature, but is a spiritual being. It is only since the middle of the last century (Lamettrie, Holbach, Helvetius, etc.) that materialistic philosophy has gained much of a following which degrades man to a level with the beast, or makes him a mere machine. But Linné (d. 1778) classified man at the side of the ape as the highest representative of the vertebrates, but at the same time pronounced him to have been "created with an impressed image after the divine image," and called him "the only one among the creatures blessed with a rational soul for the praise of God" (Systema Naturae, 6th ed., 1748). And Blumenbach (d. 1840), the real founder of anthropology as a department of natural science, never doubted that man was distinguished from all the other terrestrial creatures by his (1) upright person, (2) perfect hands, (3) protruding chin, and (4) articulate speech. On the other hand, the modern theories of natural descent and biological transmutation (from primordial cells, etc.), using certain results of the study of embryology, paleontology, the practices of breeding and selection of animals and plants, come to the conclusion that man is the result of a process of development; the ape being his immediate ancestor. This hypothesis of apish ancestry, which Lamarck (Philosophie zoologique, 1809), Lord Monboddo, etc., represented, has been bolstered up with facts by Darwin, Huxley, Lubbock, E. B. Tyler, Ernst Haeckel (Natur. Schopfungsgesch., 1868; Anthropogenie, 1874), Oscar Schmidt, Schaffhausen, etc. The facts these scientists have brought out have seemed to make the hypothesis plausible. However, they do not hold that man is a descendant of any of the families of apes now living, but of a family now extinct.

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

II. Unity of the Human Race. The human family has descended from a single pair (Gen. i. 27), and all men are of one blood (Acts xvii. 26). The traditions of many nations confirm these biblical statements. (See Lipschütz: De communi et simplici humani generis origine, Hamburg, 1864). It is true, however, on the other hand, that some primitive peoples, such as the autochthonous (the Greeks). This view, that there were more than one family from which the race descended, has been more recently revived, some holding to a co-Adamite theory (Paracelsus, Pos- man, etc.), others to the pre-Adamite (Zanini of Solcia, 1459, Isaac la Peyrre, 1656, Schelling, M'Caulanand, etc.). According to the first theory, others were created at the same time Adam was; according to the second, Adam was not the first man on the earth. Pichard, John Herschel, the Humbolds, Blumenbach (De generis humani varietate nativit, 1780), and others have asserted the possibility of the birth of all the human families from one pair. Since the Darwinian theory of development has gained currency, this view has received confirmation; and many of the best representatives of this school, if they do not hold that the race has descended from a single pair, affirm that the human family started at one common hearth (Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, etc.). The strict biblical view, that the human family is descended from a single pair, Adam and Eve, has the following considerations in its favor. (1) The different races of men do not lose their power of procreation by intermarriage. Blumenbach, Buffon (Études, iv. pp. 388 sq.), and many modern physiologists, such as Johann Müller, Rudolf Wagner, and Quadrages, have emphasized this fact in this connection. (2) They have many physiological features in common; the identity of vertebrate formation, length of pregnancy, temperature of the body, average length of years, etc. (3) The differences of color, configuration of the skull, etc., may largely be accounted for by climatic influences. (4) The present differences of language can also be accounted for by climatic influences. (5) The religious differences of different peoples do not militate with the theory of their original unity; on the contrary, religious traditions are found among peoples separated the most widely, which bespeak an original unity of religion and dwelling-place; and A. von Humboldt, Chevalier (Le Mexique ancien et moderne, 1883), Shields (The Final Philosophy, p. 184), and others derive the American races and their immediate ancestors, the cannibals of the Fiji Islands, the Kolhs of India, the negroes of Sierra Leone, etc., have pointed conclusively the truth of this assumption, which used to be frequently denied.

III. Antiquity of the Human Race. The usual system of biblical chronology makes out the period from Adam to Christ to cover 4,000 years (Ussher and Ideler, 4,004; Calvisius, 4,530; Kepler and Peutinger, 4,984, etc.). Such a short period seems to be inconsistent with the alleged unity of the race. However, the developing effects of sin must not be left out of account in determining this. The most ancient literatures are in the chronological tables of the Old Testament to make any calculation based upon them of questionable accuracy. There is at any rate some truth in the words of Chalmers, that "the sacred writings do not put the antiquity of the globe and those of Le Hir and De Sacy," "Il n'y a pas de chronologie biblique." It is quite possible that the...
lists of the patriarchs in Gen. v. and xii. are incomplete. The Bible, in fact, seems to allow for a longer duration of the human race by several thousands of years than the usually accepted chronology makes out.

The records of Egyptian history seem to make an extension of the chronology necessary. Even if Egypt's first sovereign, Menes, did not live 4000 B.C., as many Egyptologists affirm, and if he lived, as Lipsius says, 3590 B.C. or, as Bunson, 3900 B.C., or Wilkinson, 2700 B.C., it would be difficult to harmonize the chronology of Egypt with the usually accepted biblical chronology. Every new discovery of monuments in Egypt only goes to confirm Manetho's statement of thirty royal Egyptian dynasties, beginning with Menes.

Of much less value in this connection are the arguments based upon geological calculations. There is as yet no reliable geological chronometer. It is true that the remains of man have been found in caves with the remains of mammoths, the cave-bear, etc., and must have lived at the close of the ice age. It is during this great geological deluge: but when this period began and when it ended, remains still a matter of uncertainty. In general, we may, with Quatrefages, reasonably conjecture that he persecuted the adherents of the Jehovah-worship. He was buried in "the garden of his own house" (2 Kings xxi.18), and not among the kings. There is an undeniable difference between the accounts in Kings and Chronicles respecting his reign, in that the former does not relate his conversion; but then Manasseh and Amon are treated in Kings as briefly as possible; and, besides, it may be that the writer there did not regard Manasseh's conversion as more than half-hearted. Tradition puts the martyrdom of Isaiah in the first half of this reign. On the basis of the expression, "Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another" (2 Kings xxi.18), it has been reasonably conjectured that he persecuted the adherents, and particularly the prophets, of the true religion. Apocrypha found a Prayer "Manasseh, supposed to have been uttered by him in Babylon (see art. Apocrypha, p. 102). Upon

the cuneiform inscriptions Manasseh appears as a tributary vassal of Esarhaddon and Asurbanipal. Compare art. Manasseh, by Rüetschi, in Herzog, vol. ix. 20x-205.

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

MANSIESE, Tribe of. See Tribes of Israel.

MANCESEANS. See Manczeans.

MANDEVILLE, Bernard de, b. at Dort in 1670; d. in London, Jan. 21, 1733. He studied medicine in Holland, and practiced as a physician in London. In 1706 he published The Fable of the Bees, a poem in which he tries to show that all human progress and happiness depend upon fraud and crime, while virtue necessarily leads to barbarism and misery. The poem attracted attention; and he reprinted it several times, accompanied by long notes and discourses, in which he openly attacked the morals of Christianity from the standpoint of deism. He also wrote Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness, and An Inquiry into the Origin of Honor, and the Usefulness of Faculties of the Human Soul.

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

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

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

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

MANI. See Manichæism.
MANICHÆISM. Mani (Greek, Μάνις, or Μανιχαῖς; Latin, Manes, or Manichæus), the founder of Manichæism, descended from a distinguished Persian family which had emigrated from Ecbatana in Bactria, and settled at Ctesiphon in Babylonia; and was b. in Mârdâna, on the upper part of the Cûthâ canal, in 215 A.D. At the time of his birth, his father, Fâtâk, retired from public life, and joined the Mughthâlahs, or Baptizers, a religious sect which flourished in the province of Mesene, on the Lower Tigris, near the Arabian frontier, and may be considered the true ancestors of the Mandaeans. There young Mani was educated until his thirteenth year; at which time he separated from the sect, and adopted that scheme of asceticism which he afterwards prescribed for the Perfect among his own followers, and which he seems to have borrowed from his father. The next eleven years he spent in travelling, elaborating the theoretical part of his system, which, indeed, is nothing but a dialectical combination of elements derived from the various religious systems with which he came in contact. The materials he used he borrowed, but in any other sense of the word he does not seem to have had any precursors. The stories commonly accepted by the Occidental tradition, of Scythianus and Terbinthus as his predecessors, are simple misunderstandings of the real facts of his own life, hugely deformed with legendary embellishments. When he was twenty-four years old, his system was completed, and four years later on, at the coronation of King Sapor I. (March 20, 242), he first presented himself to the people of Persia as the founder of a new religion. He claimed to be a messenger from the true God. "What Buddha was to India, Zoroaster to Persia, Jesus to the lands of the West, I am to the country of Babylonia." The moment of his appearance was well chosen. Multitudes of people had gathered together, and the solemnity of the occasion heightened the general sentiment. But his success was small. The favor of the king he did not win, and for many years he lived and labored outside of the Persian dominion. His missionary tours were directed to the countries north and east of Persia: the Christian countries to the west he hardly visited. When speaking to Christians, he may have proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Christ (John xiv. 16), and, like Christ, he surrounded himself with twelve apostles; but otherwise he was so far from recognizing Jesus as a messenger from the true God, that, on the contrary, according to Mohammedan sources (see Flügel: Mani, p. 100), he declared him to be a devil. The religion he founded was not originally intended to defeat Christianity, but simply to supersede the old religion of Persia, the religion of Zoroaster. When he finally returned to Persia, he found not a few adherents; and even the brother of King Sapor I. was converted. But the Sasanides needed the support of the Persian priests, and any connection with the new religion was consequently a delicate affair. Nevertheless, in a personal meeting between King Sapor and Mani, the former is said to have been so deeply impressed by the latter, that he not only gave his adherents full religious liberty, but even promised to embrace the new religion himself. The cordial relation, however, does not seem to have been of long duration. Mani was once more compelled to go into exile; and though he again returned, and enjoyed the full favor of Sapor's successor, Hormisdas I., the priest party, now roused to fury while fighting for their very existence, proved too powerful when King Bahram I. ascended the throne. In 276 Mani was seized and crucified; and his corpse was flayed, stuffed with hay, and nailed to that gate of the city which afterwards bore his name.

As above hinted, Manichaeism was by no means the mere deviation of a Christian sect. It was an independent religion in exactly the same sense as Mohammedanism; and, during the whole course of its history, Christianity has had no more dangerous enemy to encounter. Its theoretical part, its metaphysics, was chiefly derived from the old Parseism; its practical part, its morals, chiefly from the neighboring Buddhism. From Christianity it took only some few loose ideas; but the whole method of combining all those materials, and fusing them into one coherent system, it borrowed from Gnosticism. Indeed, Manichaeism may most properly be designated as a Gnostic system, as the most complete system of Gnosticism. It did not, like Christianity, present itself as the product of a particular personality, but as a person within a person, the heart from sin; but, like Gnosticism, it simply proposed to gratify man's craving for knowledge by explaining the very problem of his existence.

The fundamental principle of this explanation is in Manichaeism dualistic, and the dualism is carried out with rigorous consistency. The world began from an accidental mixing of two absolutely contrasting elements,—one radically good, and one radically bad,— but both eternal, and both evincing the same formal character, at once spiritual and material. The good element, the light, is God; and strictly speaking it cannot be said that Manichaeism taught two gods. The bad element, the darkness, is in Manichaeism dualistic, and the dualism is the mere deviation of a Christian sect.
of the whole drama. What follows — the course of the universe, the history of the human race, the life of the individual soul, etc. — is nothing but a consistent evolution of this first encounter, often painted with a glow of fancy, a power of pathos, a subtlety of vision, which make it easy to understand how Manichæism could strike the imagination of Augustine, and keep its hold on him for several years, though at last it failed utterly in satisfying the deeper wants of his mind.

The dualistic principle which governs the whole metaphysics of Manichæism is no less apparent in its morals. The Perfect were enjoined to abstain from any thing in which the elements of darkness were considered to be predominant. The prohibitions were generally arranged under three heads (tria sigmacula), — the sigmaculum oris, which forbade to tell a lie, to utter a falsehood, to eat meat, to drink wine, etc.; the sigmaculum manus, which forbade to kill, to steal, to engage in any kind of manufacture, etc.; and the sigmaculum sinus, which forbade all kinds of sensual enjoyment, marriage, etc. The members of the Hearers, the second and lower class of Manichæans, were much easier. Still they forbade not only to kill, lie, steal, etc., but also to plant a tree, to build a house, to engage in any kind of manufacturing industry, etc. Nevertheless, the Hearer were allowed to enjoy meat and wine, to live in marriage and have children, to carry on trade, and hold public offices, they could live in society without attracting any special attention. A curious feature in Manichæan life was the relation between the two classes, — the extreme veneration with which the Hearers looked up to the Perfect. They considered them as immaterial beings, and not only supported and defended them, but handed them their food in a kneeling position. Common to both classes were the fasts and the prayers, the two principal features of Manichæan worship. Seven days in each month were fast-days, kept in honor of the sun and the moon. Four prayers were said every day, — at noon, in the afternoon before sunset, in the evening after twilight, and the first night-watch. When preparing for prayer, the Manichæan washed himself, standing erect, with running water: he then turned towards the sun or the moon, or, if neither of the great heavenly bodies were visible, towards the north, as the abode of the King of Light, and, prostrating himself on the ground, he said the prescribed prayer. The text, however, of those prayers, preserved in Arabic, shows that the Manichæans did not worship the sun and the moon, but simply addressed them as the symbols and visible representatives of the Great Light. The most splendid Manichæan festival was the so-called Bema (βίβα), "the pulpit," celebrated on the anniversary of the crucifixion of Mani. In his honor a pulpit was raised on five steps in the midst of the temple, and adorned with flowers; but it remained unoccupied. In other respects the whole Manichæan worship was very simple. The man who prays is the true temple of God, they said. They had no priests, properly speaking, though within the class of the Perfect there was a minor group of select persons, whom Augustine designates as bishops, presbyters, and magistrates. The final result of life on earth, the goal of all Manichæan morals proposed to lead, was somewhat dim. It seems that Mani in this point followed very closely in the track of the old Parsism. The Perfect was immediately transferred to paradise; the Hearer was put into a kind of purgatory; and the non-Manichæan was surrendered to Satan.

In spite of the severe persecution which King Bahram I. instituted against the Manichæans after the death of their leader, they spread rapidly in all directions. It is uncertain whether Mani himself ever visited India; but he wrote an epistle to the Indians, and, at the close of the third century, there was a Manichæan settlement on the coast of Malabar, which became the centre of a considerable missionary activity. It is probable that the old Thomas-Christians of India were Manichæans; and it is a significant fact with respect to the spread of Manichæism towards the East, that, in the first half of the tenth century, there lived near the frontier of China a powerful Turkish tribe, which professed Manichæism, and, by their threats of revenge, induced the prince of Samarcand to desist from the persecutions which he had raised against the Manichæans in that region. At the same period, however, their number is said to have been small in Bagdad, and only a little larger in the surrounding country. On its way towards the West, Manichæism first penetrated into Syria and Palestine, where it was encountered and vehemently attacked by Bishop Titus of Bostra. Nevertheless, according to Eutychius, most of the Egyptian metropolitans, bishops, and monks, were Manichæans at the time when Timotheus was Patriarch of Alexandria; and in Northern Africa, the so-called Africa proconsularis, Manichæism founded one of its most flourishing establishments. Tolerated, like all other religions, during the reign of Constantine, it was afterwards treated as a heresy, and very severe edicts were issued against its adherents. But Augustine's writings bear witness to its power and extension. In Italy it succeeded in getting a foothold, even in the city of Rome. Leo the Great (Serm. 41 de quadragesima. Ep. 21a Turribulum Abest ne expouamur), gave anxiety on account of its progress, and asked for the support of the civil authorities in order to extirpate it. In Spain it was connected with Priscillianism; in Southern France, with the movement of the Cathari (the Manichæans were themselves at one time called Catharites); and in the Eastern Empire, with the Paulicians and the Bogomilics.

Sources. — Mani was himself a prolific writer. Besides seven large doctrinal works (one in Persian, and six in Syriac), he wrote a number of circular letters (seventy-six), but nothing has come down to us except the titles and some stray quotations. Sources of second rank, however, are numerous, both Eastern (Arabic and Persian) and Western (Greek and Latin). — Of Eastern sources the most important is the Arabic Abūnāyman, a literary history by AbûNa'dîm, finished in 988, of which the chapter on Mani has been edited by Gustav Flügel, Leipzig, 1892, text, German translation, and commentary. Very important is also the work on religious and philosophical sects, by Abûl Fâth (d. 1153), edited by William Cure-
ton, London, 1842, and translated into German by Th. Haarbrücker, Halle, 1851. Furthermore, some shorter notices in various Arabic chronicles, by Al-Biruni (1000), edited by E. Sachau, Leipzig, 1873; and Eutychius Patricides, Patriarch of Alexandria, 916; and by Barbebleus, 1286, both the latter edited by Pococke, Oxford, 1828. Of special interest for the biography of Mani are the Persian works by Firdausi (edited by Jul. Mohl, Paris, 1866; v. pp. 472-475) and Minchond (translated by De Saey, in Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse, Paris, 1793, p. 294). — Of Western sources the most important is the so-called Acta Archelai, a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Syriac report of a dispute between Bishop Archelaus of Casar in Mesopotamia, and Mani, printed by Gallandi, in Bibl. Patrum, iii., and by Routh, in Reliquiae Sacrae, v. Very important are also the books which Augustin wrote against the Manichaeans: Contra epistolam Manichaeos quam vacant fundamenti, Contra Fossatum, Contra Fortunatum, Contra Arnimocatum. De actis cum Felice, Contra Secundinum; De natura boni; De duplas animis, De utilitate credentis; De Moribus Manichaeorum; De Heresibus, xlv. Among the Greek writers on heresy the most important with respect to Mani are Epiphanius (60), Theodoret (260), Photius (179), etc.


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

MANNA. When the Israelites, in the second month after the exodus from Egypt, arrived at the Desert of Sin, starving, and grumbling at Moses under the name of manna, and extracted from the ash-tree in Sicily and in Southern Italy.

MANNING, James, D.D., b. in Elizabeth-town, N.J., Oct. 22, 1798; d. at Providence, R.I., July 24, 1871. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey, Princeton, Sept. 29, 1785; went to Rhode Island in July, 1783, and started "a seminary of polite literature subject to the government of the Baptist." It was chartered (1784) as the Rhode Island College, and was first located at Warren; but in 1779 it was removed to Providence. Dr. Manning, besides being president of the college, was pastor of the Baptist Church of Warren and Providence successively, and in both capacities rendered efficient service. During the Revolutionary War the college was closed, and the building used for military purposes. In 1786 Dr. Manning sat in Congress. His death was due to a stroke of apoplexy while engaged in prayer. For an appreciative sketch of this prominent Baptist minister and able college professor, see Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal, edited by Dr. H. M. MacCracken, pp. 608-614.

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

MANSEL, Henry Longueville, Dean of St. Paul's; b. Oct. 6, 1800, at Cogsgrove, Northamptonsire, Eng., where his father was rector in the Church of England; d. in London, July 13, 1871. He was educated at Oxford University, where he afterwards became fellow and tutor. In 1855 he was appointed reader in moral and mental philosophy in Magdalen College. In 1858 he was appointed Waynflete professor of moral and mental philosophy, and in 1867 regius professor of ecclesiastical history at Oxford. In the Church of England he became Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, afterwards Dean of St. Paul's, London.

Manse was an eminent logician, and won the disputed distinction both as a teacher and an author in the department of logic. From this field he passed into that of metaphysics, attracted thereto in the interest of apologetic theology. That he commanded a large degree of attention in this region also admits of no doubt, though he did not make an impression as a metaphysician equal to that he had made as a logician. His transition was by the pathway of psychology, to which he uniformly and consistently assigned an essential place. His Prolegomena Logico, in Inquiri into the Psychological Character of Logical Processes (1851; 2d ed., 1880), gives a clear and valuable discussion of the relation of psychological distinctions to logic and ethics. His most noted effort in the department of metaphysics was the Bampton Lectures of 1858, preached in Oxford, and published under the title of The Limits of Religious Thought. His object in these lectures is to interpret and apply Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy of the Conditioned as a metaphysical theory, affording a powerful apologetic in theology. In manse it is maintained that the whole body of universal metaphysical theory on metaphysical grounds it is shown to be impossible to attain a knowledge of the absolute and infinite. All arguments against theological doc-
trines, on the ground of mystery, are thus demonstrated to be futile; and theology is unassailable as matter of faith, not matter of knowledge. There was nothing new in this, except the novel use of the special lines of argument pursued by Hamilton. The value of the defence of mystery in religious belief was generally recognized, as also of the assault upon the arrogance of a self-sufficient rationalism. But the defence of dogmatic theology was not inspiring, and failed to command general approval. To lower theology to the level where such defence could prove valuable was to give it an appearance of insignificance, and assign to it feebleness of practical, real, which made the defence too costly. The historic significance of the combined effort of Hamilton and Mansel became apparent in the readiness with which the doctrine of ignorance was accepted by the sensational school of thinkers, who desired to make all knowledge depend on sensation, and were specially disturbed by the affirmation of transcendental Being. To relegate the Infinite to the region of the unknown and unknowable was to the sensationalist a deliverance, to the thought of Bishop Mansel a stimulus from the theological camp; hence the majority of theologians were the reverse of grateful for the proffered apologetic. Theology was not so little a matter of rationalized thought that it could be defended by being excluded from the sphere of the rational and a divorce being proclaimed between reason and faith; consequently the marked sensation produced by publication of The Limits of Religious Thought passed away, and was succeeded by a general conviction that the limits of religious thought were not beyond the sphere of the rational and absolute. But assaults against these are hopeless. Are not arguments for them equally so?

The metaphysical argument borrowed from Hamilton was this: the unconditioned is independent of all relation. To think is to condition; therefore the unconditioned cannot be the object of thought. On this ground, Mansel maintained that the whole circle of revealed truth concerning the Deity was beyond the range of logical tests, as incapable of being included within the forms of thought. Creation as a beginning in time; the attributes of God, such as holiness and justice, implying personality,— all these incommensurate with which the doctrine of ignorance was accepted and assignto it feebleness of practical result, — Letters, Lectures, and Reviews, 1873. He wrote also Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, ed. by Lightfoot, 1875; and the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, or the Speaker's Commentary, but died before it was finished.

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

MANTON, Thomas, D.D., a nonconformist; b. at Lawrence Lydiard, Somersetshire, 1820; d. in London, Oct. 15, 1877. He was educated at Oxford; admitted to deacon's orders by Bishop Hall, and never took priest's, because "it was his judgment that he was properly ordained to the ministerial office." He was first settled at Stoke Newington, near London; then in London, at Covent Garden. During the Commonwealth he was one of Cromwell's chaplains; made the prayer at Cromwell's installation, June 26, 1657; was one of the "tryers," i.e., examiners of candidates for the ministry; and preached frequently before Parliament. He welcomed Charles II. in 1660, was chosen a royal chaplain, refused the deanship of Rochester, took part in the Savoy Conference, but in 1662 was deprived of his living by the Act of Uniformity. He then preached in his own rooms, and suffered arrest in consequence. Dr. Manton was one of the ablest Puritan preachers and theologians, and is still read. Archbishop Usher called him a "voluminous preacher," i.e., one who could reduce volumes of divinity into small compass. But he was voluminous in the modern sense. Among his admired productions are CXC. Sermons on the CXXIX. Psalm, London, 1861, 8th ed., with Life of the author, 1841, 3 vols:
MANUEL.

Expositions of James (1651), Jute (1658), The Lord's Prayer (1684), and The 53rd Chapter of Isaiah (1708). His Works were first printed in a collected edition, 1681-1701, 8 vols. folio, reprinted edition by Rev. J. C. Ryle, 1870-73, 22 vols.

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

MARCOPOLO. See China-Bible-Text.

MAORI. See New Zealand

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

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

MARANATHA, an Aramaic expression meaning "Our Lord cometh," used by Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, in warning that the approaching advent of Christ would see the cursing of those who rejected the gospel. It is, indeed, a precursor of the so-called Berleburg Bible.

MARBURG, Conference of. Luther and Zwingli opened the battle with the Pope almost at the same moment, but independently of each other. From the very beginning, the German and the Swiss Reformation followed different tracks, and from 1524 a clash between the two movements became unavoidable. The point at issue was the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. A series of controversial pamphlets were exchanged between the Reformers. Others also participated in the contest, and the breach in the Protestant camp became a glaring fact. In the evangelistic world this state of affairs caused much anxiety; and landgrave Philipp of Hesse was especially active in order to bring about a reconciliation. In the spring of 1529 he first broached the idea of a conference between the leaders of the two parties, to Melanchthon on the one side, and Ecolampadius on the other; and both received it favorably. Zwingli also declared himself willing to accept the proposition. But Luther was from the very first disinclined. Nevertheless, when in September he had reached Marburg, Basel, Zürich, and Strassburg, Luther accepted it; and Sept. 30 he arrived at Marburg, together with Melanchthon, Jonas, Cruciger, Myconius from Goth, Menius from Eisenach, and others. The day before, the Swiss had arrived,—Zwingli and Ulrich Funk from Zürich, Ecolampadius and Rudolf Frey from Basel, Butzer,
Hedio, and Jacob Sturm from Strassburg. On Saturday, Oct. 2, arrived the South-Germans,—Osiander from Nuremberg, Brenz from Swabian Hall, Agricola from Augsburg, and others,—and the conference began. It lasted for three days. Luther was the spokesman of the Germans; Zwingli and Ecielampadius spoke in behalf of the Swiss. But no agreement was arrived at; though Zwingli declared, with tears in his eyes, that there were none with whom he should like better to make common cause than the men of Wittenberg. Luther was hard and unfielding: "You are of another spirit than we," he said. Fifteen articles of agreement were drawn up, however, and subscribed to by all present. But they refer only to the general principles of Protestantism in their opposition to Romanism, not to the special point in question. Afterward, these Marburg Articles were made the basis of the Confessio Augustana.

LIT. — Rich sources of information concerning this notable event are found in the works of Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander, etc. See L. J. K. Schenck: Marburgische christliche Geschicchte (Halle, 1880); A. Erichson: Das Marburger Religionsgespräch (Berlin, 1871); and when, in 1643, the king appointed the two reprinted in the Nichol's series, 1865.

MARBURY, Edward, a minister of the Church of England, and rector in London; sequestered during the Rebellion; d. about 1655. He wrote two admirable commentaries,—one on Obadiah (London, 1669), and the other on Habakkuk (1650); the two reprinted in the Nichol's series, 1865.

MARCA, Petrus de, b. at Gant, Beam, Jan. 24, 1401; d. in Paris, June 29, 1652. He studied law at Toulouse, and was in 1621 appointed president of the Parliament of Pau. In 1639 he was called to Paris as counsellor of state. On the instance of Richelieu he wrote De concordia sacerdotii et imperii, seu de libertatis ecclesiae quioticum, an exposition of the position of the Gallican Church (1641). But the book was put on the Index; and when, in 1648, the king appointed him bishop of Conisians, the Pope withheld the confirmation until he recanted (1651). In 1652 he was made archbishop of Toulouse, and in 1661 archbishop of Paris. Among his other works are, De Eucharistia (1624), De Constantinopolitana Patriarcha (1830), Histoire de Bearn (1640), Dissertationes posthumae (edited by De Faget, Paris, 1689), and Opuscules (edited by Baluze, Paris, 1688). Both De Faget and Baluze have written biographies of him in their editions. MEYER.

MARCELLIANS and MARCELLINISTS, two heretical sects from the latter part of the second century, of which the first consisted of the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra (which article see); and the second, of the adherents of Marcellinus, a pupil of Carpocrates, whose system of Gnosticism she taught with much success in Rome while Anicetus was bishop. See ORIGEN: Contra Cel. sum, v.

MARCELLINUS, Bishop of Rome from June 30, 298, to Oct. 25, 304. The latter date, however, is uncertain. See LIPSIUS: Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe, Kiel, 1869. The Liber Pontificalis states, that, during the persecution, Marcellinus became a thurificatus; i.e., a Christian who offered incense on an idol's altar in order to escape persecution; and there is no reason for doubting the fact. Even Roman-Catholic writers accept it, though probably on account of the moral of the story, — that the Pope can be judged by no man (prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam). His martyrdom, however, seems to be a fiction, and the acts of the synod of Sinnessa (Mansi: Collection of Councils, i. 1550) are a later fabrication. See PAPERBROCH: Acta Sanctorum, in Propyl. Maij, viii. ADOLF HARNACK.

MARCELLUS is the name of two popes.—Marcellus I. is left entirely out by Eusebius and Jerome, but succeeded Marcellinus (according to the Catul. Liberianus) after a vacancy of seven years.

Lipius, however, in his Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe (Kiel, 1869), fixes his reign with great probability from May 24, 307, to Jan. 15, 308. His martyrdom (Acta Sanct., i.) seems to be a fiction; but it is a fact (De Rossi: Roman Martyrology, ii. 90) that Maximinus banished him from the city, not because he was a Christian, but on account of the furious riots, which, between 306 and 308, took place within the Christian congregation. Marcellus II. was elected pope in April 308; ascended the throne under great expectations, but died May 1, same year. See POLIDORUS: De vita, et moribus M. i., 1744. ADOLF HARNACK.

MARCELLUS is the name of five martyrs recorded by the martyrologies, besides Marcellus I., Bishop of Rome.—I. One Marcellus was during the persecution of Antoninus Philosophus, about 140, sunk into the ground to the waist, and left to die in that position at Chalons-sur-Saone, because he refused to participate in an entertainment given by the prefect Priscus. He expired after the lapse of three days, and is commemorated on Sept. 4. Whether or not there is any historical fact at the bottom of this legend cannot be made out. See GREGORY OF TOURS: Liber de gloria martyrum, c. 58; and RINHART: Acta primo- rum martyrum, c. 56. II. Marcellus, captain of the Trojan legion, was beheaded at Tingis in 270, on the order of Aurelianus Agricola, prefect of Mauritanus, because he refused to participate in the heathen festivals and sacrifices. He is commemorated on Oct. 30. See RUINART: l.c., p. 302. III. Marcellus who suffered martyrdom at Argenton in Gaul, during the reign of Aurelian (270–275), was born in Rome, and educated a Christian. When the persecution broke out in the metropolis, he fled to Argenton: but there he attracted the attention of the prefect Heraclius, by miraculously curing a cripple, a deaf man, and a mute; and, as he openly confessed himself a Christian, he was ordered by the prefect to be whipped, roasted, burnt alive, etc. The tortures, however, took no effect upon him; and he was finally beheaded. He is commemorated on June 29. See GREGORY OF TOURS: l.c., chap. 62. The legend seems, however, to be a mere fiction. See GÖRRES, in Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie, 1880, iv. 449–494.—IV. Marcellus, Bishop of Apomea in Syria, fell, during the reign of Theodosius the Great (379–395), a victim to the fanaticalism of the Pagans, which, however, he himself had roused by
Marcion, Bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, appeared as a zealous adherent of the homoeousian doctrine at the synods of Nicaea (325), where he met Athanasius, Tyre and Jerusalem (335), but fell, by his work De suffectione Domini Christi, written against the Arians, under the suspicion of Sabellianism, and was deposed, by the Council of Constantinople, 336. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote against him, Contra Marcellum and De eclesiastica theologia; and the copious quotations in the books of Eusebius give a tolerably clear idea of his peculiar theology. After the death of Constantine the Great, he was to resume his see. Nevertheless, he was again deposed, probably at the same time as Bishop Paulus of Constantinople, and sought refuge in the West. Bishop Julius of Rome recognized him as orthodox, and in the synods of Aries, 343, and Milan (355). Even his relation with Athanasius was disturbed by his Sabellianism, though the confession which the Marcellians of Ancyra sent to Athanasius was by him accepted as satisfactory. See Eugenii legatio ad Athanasium, in Montfaucon: Nova Coll. Veterum Patrum, ii.; Mansi: Coll. Conc., iii.; and Retzberg: Marcelliana. After his death, with Athanasius, he is said to have lived in retirement; and, according to Euphranius, he died two years before the publication of Ad. Hær, that is, in 373 or 374. See Zahn: Marcellus von Ancyra, Gotth., 1867. W. MüLLER.

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

Marcion and his School played, in thesecond half of the second century, and came to Rome between 140 and 150. His severe asceticism made a deep impression there, and at first his relation to the congregation was very friendly. But it changed after he made the acquaintance of Cerdo, a Syrian Gnostic, whose doctrines he adopted and further developed. In Cerdo's system he found the speculative foundation for his own dualistic conceptions, and the speculative arguments for his personal hatred of Judaism. After the time of Valentine, he began to expound his system in Rome. His idea was not simply to gather around himself, as other Gnostic teachers had done, a circle of such as were perfect,—perfect in knowledge, and perfect in asceticism. On the contrary, he proposed to form the whole Church by eliminating from her doctrines all those elements which were due to Judaism, and had crept stealthily into Christianity by way of tradition. His success may be estimated from the number and violence of his adversaries. Justin wrote against him, also Rhodon, Theophilius of Antioch, Philippus, and others; and Irenæus intended to devote a separate work to the refutation of his doctrines. Marcionite bishops and presbyters are often mentioned. Euphranius says that Marcion had adherents in Rome and Italy, in Egypt and Pontus, in Arabia and Syria, in Cyprus and in the Thebaid; and Theodoret tells us, that, in Syria alone, he had converted more than one thousand Marcionists (Ep. 118). [Waddington found in Syriathe ruins of a Marcionite temple. See No. 2518 in his Inscript. gr. et lat., Paris, 1871.] It was, however, not so much the speculative part of the system which fascinated people: on the contrary, the history of the sect shows that to have become its ruin. But the practical part of the system, its ethics, impressed even men like Tertullian. The complete separation from the 61w (see Gnosticism, p. 879), and the complete absorption in the love of God, was the principle of that ethics. Not only the theatre and the circus were abhorred; but every thing ornamental, even the elegance of refined social forms, was despised. Flesh and wine were forbidden. Marriage was rejected, and martyrdom was looked upon as the crown of human life. Under Constantine the Great the persecutions against the sect began, and they were continued under his successors. But the final disappearance of the sect was not due to those persecutions, but to internal dissensions on speculative reasons.

As the common gnostical, allegorical interpretation did not suffice to bring the Marcionite system in harmony with the New Testament, Marcion formed a canon of his own, consisting of the Pauline Letters (though in an altered form), and of one Gospel, most closely resembling that of Luke. The relation between this Gospel of Marcion and the four canonical Gospels has in the present century been the subject of very minute investigations. Down to the time of Semler,biblical critics generally contented themselves with the statements of the Fathers; but he, the true precursor of the Tubingen school, always
anxious to find the traces of Judaism in the ancient Church, thought, that, in the Gospel of Marcus Aurelius, he had found a reminiscence of that original Christianity which Judaism had tried to destroy; Eichhorn and others further developed the hypothesis; but its true scientific basis it did not obtain until Hahn undertook to restore the text of Marcion's Gospel from the notices of Tertullian and Epiphanius, Das Evangelium Marcions, Königsberg, 1823. Hahn, however, came to the conclusion, that, in their relation to the primitive Gospel from which both the Gospel of Luke and that of Marcion must be considered as derivations, it is Marcion, and not Luke, who has made arbitrary changes from dogmatical reasons. Otherwise, F. C. Baur: Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanon. Evangel., Tübingen, 1847. He returned to the hypothesis of Semler, and even went so far as to try to separate the original Pauline elements in the Gospel of Luke from the later Judaizing additions. This gave rise to further hypotheses.

See Hilgenfeld: Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangel. Justins, der element. Homilien, und Marcions, Halle, 1850; and Volkmann: Das Evangel. M., Text. und Kritik, Leipzig, 1852. The principal work on the subject is that of Montfaucon, in his Palæogr. Gr., p. 323; and a dissertation of the same writer is published in the Acta. Sand., M. 5, p. 367. The works of Melito of Sardis (Eusebius: Hist. eccl., IV. 23) and of the works of the apologists; and the authentic report of the persecution in Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, i. c., V. 1), which show that during the persecutions in general the government, which, on the contrary, seems to have taken pains to enforce the laws of Hadrian and Trajan.

of Theodosius (408–460), was a pupil of Chrysostom, and a contemporary of Isidore of Pelusium, Nilius, and Theodoret, and wrote forty treatises on asceticism. There are also mentioned a monk of the name Marcus, from the ninth century (the reign of Leo VI.), and a Briton, Marcus Eremita, or Anachoreta, from the tenth century. Nevertheless, the supposition of Bellarmin, that the nine treatises which have come down to us under the name of Marcus Eremita do not belong to the celebrated saint from the fourth century, but to some obscure monk from the ninth century, is entirely unwarranted; both internal and external evidences speak against it. Photius (Bibl. Cod., 200, p. 102 ed. Bekker, p. 667 ed. Migne) mentions nine treatises identical with those we possess. In the seventh century, Maximus Confessor gives nine treatises identical with those we possess. In the ideas and views of the nine treatises, and the general resemblance between the treatises is identical with the Marcus Eremita of Sozomen and Palladius, or whether, with Nicephorus, a distinction should be made between an elder and a younger Marcus. See Gallandi: Prolegom.; Du Pin: Nouv. Bibl., i. 8; Oudin, l. c., i. 902; Chélier: Auteurs eccles., xvi. 800; Cavy: Script. eccles., i. 572; Tillmont, l. c., viii. and x.; Ficker, in Zeitsschr. f. hist. Theologie, 1866, i. 402.

The nine treatises are, On the Spiritual Law, Useful to such as embrace an Ascetic Life; On Jus tionum by Faith, and not by Good Works; On the Penitence necessary to All; On Baptism; On the Subjugation of Anger and Lust; On Enthusiasm and Ecstasy; On General Moral Questions; A Dialogue between the Soul and the Spirit; and, On the Relation between Christ and Melchisedec with Reference to Heb. vii. 3. They were published in Latin and Greek by Fronto Ducseus, in Auct. Patr. (Paris, 1624, i. 571), but more completely by Gallandi (l. c., viii.) and Migne (tom. 65). By the authors must be considered as contemporaries. But it may be questioned whether the author of the treatises is identical with the Marcus Eremita of Sozomen and Palladius, or whether, with Nicephorus, a distinction should be made between an elder and a younger Marcus. See Gallandi: Prolegom.; Du Pin: Nouv. Bibl., iii. 8; Oudin, l. c., i. 902; Chélier: Auteurs eccles., xvi. 800; Cavy: Script. eccles., i. 572; Tillmont, l. c., viii. and x.; Ficker, in Zeitsschr. f. hist. Theologie, 1866, i. 402.

The nine treatises are, On the Spiritual Law, Useful to such as embrace an Ascetic Life; On Jus
as the colleague of Schleiermacher, in the pulpit of Trinity Church, until his death. His principal writings during this period were his History of the German Reformation (Geisch. d. deutschen Reformations, 2 vols., Berlin, 1816, and 4 vols., Berlin, 1831-34), extending to the year 1555, and characterized by a thorough acquaintance with the contests, and occasioned not a little bitterness. Two of his pupils and friends, Matthies and Vatke, edited a part of his theological lectures in 4 vols., Berlin, 1847-49 (vol. i., Moral: ii., Dogmatik; iii., Symbolik; iv., Dogmengeschichte). A sketch of Marheineke's life was prefixed to vol. i.

MARINUS (the Greek form of the Hebrew Miriam) was the daughter of Alexander, and the wife of Herod the Great, to whom she bore two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, and two daughters, Cozur de Jesus, and some other mystical treatises. In a fit of jealousy her husband had her put to death. See art. Herod.

MARIANA, Juan, b. at Talavera, in the diocese of Toledo, 1587; d. at Toledo, 1624, and returned to Spain in 1574. He was a prolific writer, and several of his books produced a sensation. His De Regre et Regia Institutione was written at the instance of Garcia de Loyesa, the tutor of Philip III., and was published at Toledo 1589. It contains the famous proposition, that a king, when he tries to overthrow the Church, may be justly killed when he cannot be deposed; and, in harmony with this maxim, Clement was openly condemned Photius; and as he was bishop of Caere when he was elected bishop of Rome, and such a man as the pope, he was nothing but a tool in his hands. See art. Clement.

MARIE A LA COQUE, b. at Lauthecourt, in the diocese of Autun, July 22, 1647; d. Oct. 17, 1690. She entered the order of the Salesian nuns, as novice, Aug. 27, 1671; took the vow Nov. 6, 1672; and attained great celebrity by the visions she pretended to have, and the miracles which were ascribed to her. She wrote La devotion au cceur de Jesus, and some other mystical treatises. Her life was written by J. Joseph Lanquet, Paris, 1729, and by Daras, Paris, 1875. Her memory has chiefly been kept up by the four songs, Ver-vert, in the Oeuvres de M. Gresset, Amsterdam, 1748, i. 9-45.

MARINUS is the name of two popes. — Marinus I. (882-884) was the son of a presbyte, Palmombo, and a native of Gaul. Before his accession he was three times sent to Constantinople as papal legate,— in 866 by Nicholas I., in 869 by Adrian II., and in 870 by John VIII.; and every time his errand was the controversy with Photius. His first official act after his accession was to condemn Photius; and as he was bishop of Caere when he was elected bishop of Rome, and such a removal from one see to another was canonically illegal, Photius answered by protesting against the validity of his election. On account of the great similarity between the two names Marinus and Marinus, they have often been confounded; and Marinus I. is, indeed, in the papal catalogues, recorded under the name Martinus II. His letters are found in Bouquet: Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, ix. 198. The sources of his life are given by Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. p. 269; Watterich: Pontif. Rom. Vita, i. p. 29; and Jaffé: Regesta Pontif. Rom., p. 292. — Marinus II. (942-946) owed his elevation to Alberic, "the prince and senator of all the Romans," and was nothing but a tool in his hands. The same confusion with the name has taken place with him as with Marinus I. See Watterich: i. c., i. p. 54.
MARIOLATRY. See Mary.

MARIUS OF AVENTICUM descended from a noble family of Autun, and was in 574 elected Bishop of Avenches, in the present canton of Vaud, Switzerland. He afterwards removed the see from Avenches to Lausanne, and d. there Dec. 31, 593. He composed a Chronicle of Prosper Aquitanius from 455 to 581, published in the Collections of Dumeschez and Dom Bouquet, but best by Rickly, in Mémoires et documens publiés par la société d'histoire de la Suisse Romande, xiii. The principal source of his life is the Carth. Lgus. and the Hist. Comm. Aventic., by his friend Bishop Bucichy of Marius v. Aventicum, Leipzig, 1875. E. F. GELFKE.

MARIUS MERCATOR, an ecclesiastical writer of the fifth century, who played an important part in the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies. He is mentioned only by Augustine, (Ep. 183; Quaest. ad Dulcit., 3) and Passidius (Indic. Libr. Augustini 4), and very little is known of his personal life: thus it is doubtful whether he was a priest, or a monk, or a layman. His spiritual character and dogmatical views, his style, his acquaintance with African affairs, seem to indicate that he was a native of North Africa. In 418 he must have lived in Rome. There he became acquainted with the chief representatives of Pelagianism, and wrote a book against them, which he sent to Augustine for examination. Augustine was, by his acquaintance with African affairs, seems to indicate that he was a native of North Africa. In 418 he must have lived in Rome. There he became acquainted with the chief representatives of Pelagianism, and wrote a book against them, which he sent to Augustine for examination. After this, he went to Constantinople, where he spent a part of his life, as it would seem, in some kind of an official position; perhaps as the agent of Celestine I. (422-432) and Sixtus III. (432-440). He spoke with authority; and his sole object was to defend his companions against the principal source of his life is the Carth. Lgus. and the Hist. Comm. Aventic., by his friend Bishop Bucichy of Marius v. Aventicum, Leipzig, 1875. E. F. GELFKE.

MARK, one of the four evangelists, whose name has passed over to the peculiar fable of an Isidorus Mercator. A collected edition of them was first published by J. Garnier, Paris, 1678, 2 vols. folio, and then by Baluze, Paris, 1684. The latter is the best, and has been reprinted in Gallandi, Bibl. Patrum., viii.; while Migne has adopted the former in his Patrol. Latin, 48. WAGENMANN.

MARK and Peter was a very intimate one. Papias (Euseb. 3, 39), who leans upon the presbyter John as his authority, informs us that he was Peter's interpreter. He says, "Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote down accurately what he remembered; . . . for he neither heard the Lord himself, nor followed him, but at a later time he followed Peter" (Mákos μνημειατης Πέτρος γράφον-, δοκειμένους, ἄριστος εργαστήρ. . . . ἀντι γορ ἕπος τοῦ κυρίου ὅτε παρακολούθησαν αὐτῷ, ἅπερον ἐν πάτρῳ). A later tradition, that he resided with Peter in Rome, is less reliable, as it is open to the
suspicion of being founded on the interpretation of Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13) as Rome (Euseb., 2.15; Jerome: Catal., 5). Further traditions state, that, after Peter's death, he went to Alexandria, established a congregation, became its first bishop, and suffered a martyr's death.

II. THE GOSPEL. — The early church placed the second Gospel of the canon in a very intimate relation to Peter, as it did the Gospel of Luke to Paul. Papias relates that Mark wrote down the things he heard from Peter, but did not observe any definite arrangement (οἱ μὲν πάντες τὰς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀκούσας λέξεις τῷ Πάπια τῷ φίλῳ του Παύλου). Justin (c. Tryph., 106) calls the Gospel the "Reminiscences of Peter" (τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου); and Tertullian (c. Marc., 4, 5) says it is "called Mark because he edited the Gospel of Peter" (evangelium Petri). Ireneus (Hist., iii. 1) adds, that Mark wrote it after the death (kímes) of Peter and Paul; and at the time of Eusebius (iii. 15) the opinion was universal, that Peter sustained a close relation to the Gospel; while Jerome says (Catal., 8, etc.) that the "Gospel was composed, Peter narrating, and Mark writing." Against this universal testimony, the influence of Peter upon the second Gospel, no tenable objection can be urged. Some (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin) have argued, from the notice of Papias, that there was an original document by Mark, which contained aphoristic utterances of Peter. But this theory goes upon the arbitrary supposition that Papias, in the words οὗ τὰς λέξεις ("did not follow a definite arrangement") meant a haphazard collection of sayings; but this cannot be made out to be his meaning. Another theory was set on foot by Grafe, Delitzsch, [Davidson], and others, and looks for its confirmation to the contents (by far the largest portion of which is contained in Matthew and Luke) and to the arrangement of the contents; the compiler using Matthew and Luke alternately (Mark i. 1–20, comp. Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 21 sqq., comp. Luke iv. 31–vi. 17; Mark iii. 28–35, comp. Matt. xiv. 34–xv. 28, Luke viii. 11–x. 16). Another argument is, that the Gospel shows its secondary origin by the proasic reflections and additions which the author inserts in his narrative (comp. viii. 3, xii. 13, etc.). But this theory likewise lacks all sound foundation. The arguments are defective. The first thing to be brought against it is the wide belief of the early church (Melito, Ireneus, Origen, Jerome, etc.) that the Gospels were arranged according to the date of their composition, Luke consequently following Mark. It cannot be shown that Mark had any partisan purpose in writing his Gospel; and, in the absence of this, no reasons can be given why he should have passed by the infancy of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, the raising of the widow of Nain's son, the great discourse against the Pharisees, and other narratives, if he was a mere compiler from Matthew and Luke. Again: the theory is made most improbable by the circumstance that Mark does not contain any of the characteristic peculiarities or excellences of Matthew and Luke.

No: the picturesque freshness and vividness of detail, especially in the sections which are peculiar to this Gospel, betray the hand of an original author. He preserves striking Hebrew expressions (iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 11–34), adds numerous details (i. 20; iv. 38 sqq.; vii. 2, 5, 6, 17; viii. 14; xiv. 3, 5, etc.), and represents Christ's rebukes of his disciples as sharper than the other Gospels (iv. 30; vi. 22; viii. 17 sqq., etc.). But the main point is, that the sections which Matthew and Luke have in common, Mark has; whereas sections which are peculiar to them he has not. This circumstance would rather prove Mark to be the original from which the last two synoptists drew, than vice versa.

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

The purpose of the Gospel of Mark is best expressed in its first words, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It brings out the divine glory of the person of Christ, its divine individuality and sublimity, with which incomparable and superhuman he impressed an astonished world. The discourses of our Lord are not ignored, but it is the daily deeds of healing and power which the second Gospel emphasizes. A school of critics, denying this purely historical aim, cite viii. 1, etc., as indicative of partisan purpose. Baur affirms his purpose was to preserve a position of studied neutrality between the Judaizing and Gentile types of Christianity. Hilgenfeld held that it leaned towards Petrinism; Volkmar, towards Paulinism, etc. Most strange! These critics come, with their fixed theories of apostolic Christianity, to the Bible, and there pick out the arguments for their positions. There is only one possible conclusion: If Mark serves neither the Gentile nor the Judaizing type of Christianity, and shows no polemical leaning to either, it follows that he was not led to write by any partisan purpose.

The Gospel was written for Gentile Christians, more especially for Roman readers, as is evident from the absence of appeals to the Old Testament, except in chap. i. 28 (being of very doubtful authenticity), and of those passages which would be of more especial interest to Jewish readers. The genealogies, passages referring to Christ's being sent to Israel, the continued efficacy of the law, etc., are all wanting. On the other hand, explanatory observations are added,
which were unnecessary for Jewish readers (vii. 3, 4, 34; xii. 42; xv. 42). Christ brought the gospel (i. 15), whose destination is a universal one; and the temple itself was to be a house of prayer for all the nations (xi. 17).

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

The place of composition was, according to the authorities of the 4th century, Ireneus, Eusebius, and Jerome, the city of Rome; and there is no good ground for disputing them. On the other hand, this view is favored by the explanation of Greek by Roman expressions (ii. 4; v. 9, 15, 23; vi. 27-29; vii. 4, 5; xii. 14, 42; xiv. 5; xv. 13, 30, 44), and is held by Gieseler, Tholuck, Schweller, Hilgenfeld, Meyer, etc. The isolated notice of Chrysostom (Hom. I., in Math.), that it was written in Alexandria, is unsupported by any of the Alexandrian Fathers.

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

The genuineness of Mark has been left unquestioned, except xvi. 9-20. This passage seems to be more than suspicious. Not that the style is so different from the rest of the Gospel, as some have urged, but because the passage is wanting in the Sinaic and Vatican manuscripts, because Eusebius, Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, and others say the Gospel closed with the words δι' οὗ εὐθύς εἰπὲν ("for they were afraid," verse 8), and the repetition of the first verse, which is found in the eighth. The passage, however, is very old; for Ireneus refers to it (iii. 10, 6). Perhaps the original conclusion of the Gospel was lost; perhaps it remained unfinished. [The genuineness is denied by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort (in their Greek text), also by Fritzsche, Ewald, Reuss, Meyer, Archbishop Thomson, Riddle, but affirmed by Mill, Hug, Scholz, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, Burgon, Scriven, and Morison.]
MARNIX.
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MARNIX, Philipp van (Sieur de St. Aldegonde), b. at Brussels in 1538; d. at Leyden, Dec. 15, 1588; one of the most prominent leaders of the Dutch rising in the sixteenth century. He was very deeply imbued with the political elements of Calvinism. After returning home in 1560, he lived for several years in domestic retirement, until the whirlwind of events carried him to the front. He drew up the so-called "compromise," by which the Dutch noblemen bound themselves to resist to the last the introduction of the Inquisition. After the occurrence of the iconoclastic riots at Antwerp, in August, 1566, he published Van de beelden afgeporten en de Nederlanden (1586), and Vraie narration et apologie des choses passées aux Pays-Bas (1587). But it was not with the pen alone he served the cause he had espoused. Valenciennes was heavily pressed by the Spaniards, and Marnix and Brederode undertook to re-enforce it. But they were defeated at Austravel, March 13, 1567. Marnix escaped first to Breda, then to Germany; but all his property was confiscated, Aug. 17, 1568. He entered the service of the elector-palatine, Friedrich III., and for several years he was deeply engaged in theological affairs. Meanwhile he had made the acquaintance of William of Orange. An intimate friendship sprang up between the two men; and in 1569 Marnix composed the famous William's Lay, which contributed more than any thing else to concentrate the sympathy of the Dutch on William the Silent. Between 1572 and 1585 falls the great political and diplomatical period of Marnix's life. He headed the embassy which (1580) went to France to offer the crown of the Netherlands to the Duke of Anjou. The latter mission was successful; and Marnix drew up the Acte de de'cheancede Philippe II. de sa seigneurie des Pays-Bas: see also his Rapport fait au prince d'Orange et aux États Généraux. But the foolish attempt of the duke (Jan. 15–17, 1583) to break the compact, and establish himself at Antwerp by a coup d'état, threw suspicion even on Marnix himself, as burgomaster of Antwerp, he surrendered the city to Alexander of Parma (Aug. 17, 1585), after a siege of nearly two years, he fella victim to calumny. He retired to his estate at Westsonburg, near Vlissingen, and lived for several years in deep retirement. As a kind of reparation, the states-general charged him in 1596 with the translation of the Bible; and he moved the following year to Leyden. But he succeeded only in finishing the translation of Genesis before death overtook him. His principal theological work is De Biencorps der etige roomachte keerke, a satire on the Church of Rome, her organization, her doctrines, her practices, inspired, no doubt, by the Epistola obscuro rum viorum, and often very striking and pointed. It was published in 1569, often reprinted, and translated into many foreign languages. His stand-point was that of strict Calvinism. It was very much due to his influence that at the synods of Antwerp (Aug. 20, 1568), the Wittenberg concordia was rejected; and in the same spirit he was active at the synods of Wesel (1588) and Emden (1571). A Traité du sacrement de la sainte cène du Seigneur, which was published after his death (Leyden, 1589), is very precise and definite in fixing the stand-point from which it is written; and so are his Réponse apologétique (1598), Onderzoekende ende grondelijke wederlegging der Geest drijvende Leere (1593), Tableau des différents de la religion (1801), etc. A complete edition of his works does not exist. A selection has been published by Edgar Quinet: Œuvres de P. van M., Brussels, 1857–90, 8 vols. His theological writings have been published by J. J. van Toorenbergen, St. Gravenhage, 1871. Many of his letters are found in the Werken der Mamix reeniging. LIT.—His life was written by PRINS, Leyden, 1782; W. BROEKS, Amsterdam, 1883; EDGAR QUINET, Brussels, 1854; TH. JUSTE, Brussels, 1859; J. VAN HARE, Harlem, 1854 (popular); VOLKMAN, Harlem, 1873 (popular); ALBERT-DING-K THANYM, Harlem, 1878 (ultramontane). 

MOTLEY: Dutch Republic. THEODOR SCHOTT.

MARONITES is the name of a Syrian tribe, which, within the Christian Church, forms a peculiar, half-independent community; or, to speak more correctly, a sect. Members of this sect live scattered all over Syria; larger congregations are gathered in Aleppo, Damascus, and the Island of Cyprus; but the proper home of the community is the Lebanon region, from Tripoli in the north, to Tyre and the Lake of Genesareth in the south. Especially the districts of Kefrawan near Beirut, and Bshere near Tripoli, are inhabited exclusively by Maronites; while in other places Maronites, Jacobites, Druses, etc., live interspersed between each other. The total number of the Maronite inhabitants of Lebanon hardly exceeds two hundred thousand; at all events, the estimate of the Notizia statistica delle Missioni cattoliche (Rome, 1843), five hundred thousand, is much too high. They pursue agriculture and cattle-breeding: the cultivation of the silk-worm is also very flourishing among them. They speak Arabic, and have done so for centuries; but they are of Syrian descent. The liturgy employed in their divine service is in Syrian, though only a very few of them understand that language: the readings from the Gospels, however, are in Arabic. They like to consider themselves a distinct nation; and they have, indeed, always succeeded in vindicating for themselves a certain measure of political independence. They are governed by sheiks, elected from among their own nobility; and to the Ottoman sultan, who appoints a Christian pacha over them, they only pay a variable tribute. At the head of their church (the Ecclesia Maronitarum) stands a patriarch, who is elected by themselves, and wears the title of "Patriarch of Antioch and all the East." He resides during summer in the monastery Kamnöbn, at Lebanon, and during
winter at Bkerke; and he is always named either Butrus (Petrus), or Bélus (Paulius). But he retained a fabrication from the Pope; for from the latter part of the twelfth century there has existed a certain relation between the see of Rome and the Maronites.

Name. — On the Orontes, between Hamath and Emessa, there lay an old monastery dedicated to St. Mark. The Maronites claim it as the origin of their name; and they are always named either as Maron (clericus), or as Maronites (clerici Maroniti). In the eighth century, in the writings of John of Damascus, it occurs, and with the monk and presbyter of whom Chrysostom speaks so highly (Ep., 30); both must have lived about 400. But the great age and the celebrity of the monastery make it more probable that it took its name from some saint much older; for instance, from Marc, who converted Babylon, and died, at the age of eighty-one, in the monastery Deir Mar Márt, near Seleucia, on the Tigris. From whomsoever it may have taken its name, it is from the monastery that the Maronites themselves derive their name; and it needs only to be mentioned passingly that some scholars derive it from Maronea, a village thirty miles east of Antioch; and others from Johannes Maron, about whom see below. But it must be noticed that the name did not occur until the eighth century, in the writings of John of Damascus, and that it is used there to designate a heretical sect. Exactly in the same manner it occurs later on in the writings of the Christian authors in Egypt (who wrote in Arabic), — Eutychius (Ibn Battir), from the beginning of the tenth century), Benassalus (Ibn eT-Assal, from the thirteenth century), and others. See Renaudot: Hist. Patriarch. Alex., Paris, 1713.

The First Patriarch. — Johannes Maron, whom the Maronites acknowledge as their first patriarch, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, and was educated in Antioch and the monastery of St. Mark. Later on he studied in Constantinople, became monk in St. Maron, was ordained priest, and wrote against the heretics. Having acquired a great reputation among the Syrians, he was introduced to the papal legate in Antioch, and by him appointed bishop of Butrus in 676. He then converted all the Monophysites and Monothelites in the Lebanon region to the Roman faith, or with the monk and presbyter of whom Chrysostom speaks so highly (Ep., 30): both must have lived about 400. But the great age and the celebrity of the monastery make it more probable that it took its name from some saint much older; for instance, from Márt, who converted Babylon, and died, at the age of eighty-one, in the monastery Deir Mar Márt, near Seleucia, on the Tigris. From whomsoever it may have taken its name, it is from the monastery that the Maronites themselves derive their name; and it needs only to be mentioned passingly that some scholars derive it from Maronea, a village thirty miles east of Antioch; and others from Johannes Maron, about whom see below. But it must be noticed that the name did not occur until the eighth century, in the writings of John of Damascus, and that it is used there to designate a heretical sect. Exactly in the same manner it occurs later on in the writings of the Christian authors in Egypt (who wrote in Arabic), — Eutychius (Ibn Battir), from the beginning of the tenth century), Benassalus (Ibn eT-Assal, from the thirteenth century), and others. See Renaudot: Hist. Patriarch. Alex., Paris, 1713.

The First Patriarch. — Johannes Maron, whom the Maronites acknowledge as their first patriarch, was born at Sirum, near Antioch, and was educated in Antioch and the monastery of St. Maron. Later on he studied in Constantinople, became monk in St. Maron, was ordained priest, and wrote against the heretics. Having acquired a great reputation among the Syrians, he was introduced to the papal legate in Antioch, and by him appointed bishop of Butrus in 676. He then converted all the Monophysites and Monothelites in the Lebanon region to the Roman faith, or ordained priests and bishops, and gave the Maronites their political and military constitution. When Theophanes, patriarch of Antioch, died, in the second year of the reign of Justinian II., he happened, we are told, to be present in the city, and was unanimously elected patriarch. We are furthermore told that he journeyed to Rome, and was consecrated by Pope Honorius. But Honorius lived nearly a century before that time; and, as no one else but the biographer of Maro knows anything about a patriarch of Antioch of that name, the whole story of his patriarchate seems to be a fabrication. But Renaudot even goes so far as to deny the very existence of Maron; but there is no reason to doubt that he really was elected bishop of Lebanon, and exercised great influence there in steady opposition to the Greeks, though it is apparent that his biography, derived from a

so-called Arabic chronicle of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and first published in a Latin translation by Quaresmianus (De matutino tempore sacerdotis, i. 37), and then in the original text by Assemani (Bibl. Or., i. 496), is much mixed up with legendary matter, and the product of some Maronite, converted to Romanism, and anxious to establish an early and intimate connection between Rome and his co-religionists. It was repaired generally very jealous of their orthodoxy, and employs every means at their disposal in order to slur over the fact — related by William of Tyre in his History of the Crusades, and accepted by Jacob of Vitry, Baronius, Rosmini, and all the church historians — that they were a heretical sect, Monothelites and Monophysites, until they, in 1182, joined the Church of Rome under the influence of the crusaders, through whom frequent communications took place with the papal see. Their principal defenders were Abraham Echellensis (Chronicon orientale, Paris, 1651), Faustus Nairon (De origine Maronitarum, Rome, 1679, and Euphrosyne fili, Rome, 1694), I. S. Assemani (Bibl. Orient., Rome, 1719), and Nicolas Murad (Notice historique sur l'origine de la nation Maronite, Paris, 1844).

Relation to Rome. — The great conversion to Romanism in 1182 was not complete. An anti-Roman re-action soon set in, and was punished by a papal interdict, from which the country was absolved only in 1191. The union was never complete, and was broken off in 1244. The Maronites took great pains to maintain the union. A national council was held in 1506, in the monastery of Kannobin; and P. Girolamo Dandini, a Jesuit, appeared at the council as papal legate, charged with the revision of all the Maronite scriptures. According to his report (Missione apostolica al Patriarca e Maroniti del Monte Libano, Cesena, 1656; translated into French, and accompanied with notes, by Richard Simon: Voyage du mont Liban, Paris, 1685), the council resulted in a complete submission to the Roman see, and an almost complete agreement with the Roman traditions. The exceptions were not a few, however, nor were they unimportant. The Maronites retained the celebration of the Lord's Supper under both kinds, the Syrian liturgy, the marriage of the priests, their own fast-days, their own saints, etc. A new council was held in 1736 in the monastery of Mary, at Luweiza, in the district of Kesrewan. The celebrated Maronite scholar, J. S. Assemani, was sent from Rome as papal legate; and the great object was to enforce among the Maronites the canons of the Council of Trent. Assemani partly succeeded. The Roman Catholic and the Gregorian Calendar were introduced; the Tridentine exposition of the doctrine of transubstantiation was established; the marriage of the clergy was confined to the lower degrees; the name of the Pope was introduced in the prayers, and the mass, etc. The acts of the council were published in Arabic, from the printing-press of the monastery of Mar Hanna, on Lebanon, 1788; and large extracts from those acts have been given by Schnurrer; in his two programmes: De ecclesia Maronitica, Tubingen, 1810-11. See also Nouveaux memoires des missions de la compagnie de Jesus dans le levant, Paris, 1745, viii. and S. E. Assemani: Bibl. Medec., Florence, 1742, p. 118. In 1884 Gregory XIII.
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MARRIAGE is that union of a male and of a female human being, without which there could be no family, no parental care, no developed political communities, no general society of mankind. For this reason, from the earliest times, marriage has been considered a sacred institution, to be regulated by laws and customs, and to be respected by all.

The Bible teaches that marriage is a union of one man and one woman, as is evident from the passages in Genesis, Deuteronomy, and the New Testament. For example, in Genesis 2:24, God says, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife; and they two shall be one flesh." This passage our Lord has sanctioned, "For this cause man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they two shall become one flesh." This closeseness of the tie to the parents. Another still to be drawn from calling the union "one flesh," is, that neither of the parties can be united at the same time to another person; so that polygamy is condemned by the very nature of marriage. And, still further, the expression "shall cleave" (adhere, or be devoted to) denotes a moral and spiritual union; which implies that they are also bound together in an exclusive sexual fellowship. The permanence also of the union is implied in this closeness.

The apostle Paul, by his parallel comparing the husband and wife with Christ and his church, confesses the highest possible honor on marriage, and shows the closeness of the union: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." "Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies" (Eph. v. 25, 28).

Polygamy is not only contrary to the earliest idea of marriage, but both the laws of nature and the experience of the world condemn it. As far as statistics reach, the sexes, at the marriageable age, maintain, on the whole, an equality, or a near approach to equality, as far as men being born, and more females surviving the perils of early and middle life. In the higher races polygamy is almost unknown: elsewhere it cannot be indulged in to any great extent, unless men are killed off in war, while women are spared; or unless the rich and powerful have many wives, and the poorer classes of men lead lives of profligacy. Polygamy, again, makes men sensual, and fills the wives of the same man with jealousy and hatred towards each other. The idea of the family cannot be realized in the harem; and its inmates are often as much slaves, being first acquired by war or money.

Yet polygamy, although contrary to the idea of marriage as set forth in Gen. ii. 24, was in the world at an early date. Lamach, the son of Enoch, had two wives (Gen. iv. 19), which seems like a record of the first known bigamy; after which polygamy may have soon sprung up. We find it in the family of Abraham: both his grandchildren, Esau and Jacob, had a plurality of wives,—the first, three; the other, four, of whom two may be called, like Hagar, concubines being given by Leah and Rachel to Jacob, as Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham, to be a substitute for herself. From this it may be conjectured that bigamy depended at first on the original wife's consent. Afterwards it became more common among the men of power and wealth. And yet Nabal had one wife only (1 Sam. xxiv.); and the same is true of the prophets, where we have any notices of their family relations. Moses also may have lost his first wife when he married the Cushite woman (Num. xii. 1); compare Knobel in loco. In the last chapter of Proverbs, only one husband and one wife are thought of. No law forbade polygamy, but it faded out of manners without the aid of legislation. All the peoples in the west, of a higher civilization, discarded it, or never had it; and no direct prohibition of it is to be found in the Christian Scriptures.

Marriage, unless begun at too early an age, is shown by modern statistics to be decidedly a healthier, as it is a more moral, condition than that of remaining single.

M. Michel Chevalier

[...]

founded the Collegium Maronitarum in Rome, and from that institution issued a number of celebrated scholars,—Georgius Amira, Gabriel Sinai, Abraham Echellelouis, the Assemblen, and others. Meanwhile the people itself, at home on Lebanon, remained in a semi-barbarous state. Two printing-presses were established among them,—at Baalbek in 1790, and at Kedesh in 1802; but they awakened no interest in reading. For a long period the Maronites maintained a kind of supremacy over the Druses; but after 1840 their power became greatly weakened, feuds arose between them and the Druses, by which the country was often fearfully desolated. It was an attack by the Maronites on a Druse village, which in 1860 gave the first occasion to the frightful massacre of the Christians by the Druses throughout Syria, especially in Damascus.


E. ROEDIGER.

MAROT, Clément, the poet; b. at Cahors about 1497; d. at Turin in 1544; led an adventurous life at the courts of Francis I., Marguerite of Valois, and Renata of Este; staid for some time at Geneva in friendly intercourse with Calvin, having been compelled to flee from Paris, suspected of inclining towards the Reformation; and settled finally in Turin. In 1538 he began, with the aid of the learned Vatable, to translate the Psalms into French verses; and his undertaking succeeded so well, that it became fashionable, even at the court, to sing them. The first edition dates from 1541, and contains only thirty psalms; but the second, of 1548, with a preface by Calvin, contains the whole. This was the first real attempt to render the Psalms into a living language. A second translation was made by the learned Frédéric Marot, in 1549, and a third by the learned Bellidor, in 1551. The first translation was well received, and was in demand; but the second and third were neglected, because they were not so well adapted to the taste of the time. The first translation was issued under the patronage of the learned Vatable, and was printed at Neuchâtel, in 1548; and the second, of 1551, was printed at Geneva, in 1551. The third translation was printed at Paris, in 1552.


C. SCHMIDT.
remarks, that if we compare the deaths of celi-
bates, married persons, widowers, and widows, in
their sum total, it is found that there is in France
an exceptionally great mortality in the class of
persons of either sex, married under the age of
twenty; but that, in all succeeding periods of life,
the death-rates of the married fall below those of
the unmarried. In the French census of 1861 the
deaths of celibates for a hundred persons under
the age of twenty and sixty, but, of married persons
between the same ages, they are 4.02 per cent of
males and 4.40 of females. An increase of mar-
rriage in our country, says M. Lagoyt, cited by
M. Cadet (Marriage, p. 18), would have for its effect,
not only a greater fecundity of legitimate births,
but also a greater mean duration of life.

The question here comes up, What persons are
forbidden in the Scriptures, or upon ethical
grounds, to form marriage unions with one an-
other? It must be remembered in primitive
times, that the children of the same family,
and others nearest of kin to one another, needed
to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained be-
tween them, in order that the family might not
become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find
laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under
heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-
castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans
branded it in their language. Even a parent and
an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle
and a sister's daughter. Two of these prohibitions
were set as an example to the Jews at the time of
Nehemiah (Ezra x. 41, 42). The early Christians
also wished to guard against marriages between
very near relatives; and the parties to such a union, or the man, at least,
were visited with penalties such as deportatio. In the
Hebrew Scriptures three of the curses to be ut-
tered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-20) relate
to incestuous marriages; Compare for unlawful
or incestuous marriages Lev. xvii. 6-17, and, for
incestuous intercourse, Lev. xx. 11-21. In a num-
ber of cases, death is made the penalty.

Another reason has been assigned for prohib-
iting marriage between cousins; namely, that such
relationships have been discovered in primal-
times, that the children of the same family,
and others nearest of kin to one another, needed
to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained be-
tween them, in order that the family might not
become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find
laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under
heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-
castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans
branded it in their language. Even a parent and
an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle
and a sister's daughter. Two of these prohibitions
were set as an example to the Jews at the time of
Nehemiah (Ezra x. 41, 42). The early Christians
also wished to guard against marriages between
very near relatives; and the parties to such a union, or the man, at least,
were visited with penalties such as deportatio. In the
Hebrew Scriptures three of the curses to be ut-
tered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-20) relate
to incestuous marriages; Compare for unlawful
or incestuous marriages Lev. xvii. 6-17, and, for
incestuous intercourse, Lev. xx. 11-21. In a num-
ber of cases, death is made the penalty.

Another reason has been assigned for prohib-
iting marriage between cousins; namely, that such
relationships have been discovered in primal-
times, that the children of the same family,
and others nearest of kin to one another, needed
to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained be-
tween them, in order that the family might not
become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find
laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under
heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-
castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans
branded it in their language. Even a parent and
an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle
and a sister's daughter. Two of these prohibitions
were set as an example to the Jews at the time of
Nehemiah (Ezra x. 41, 42). The early Christians
also wished to guard against marriages between
very near relatives; and the parties to such a union, or the man, at least,
were visited with penalties such as deportatio. In the
Hebrew Scriptures three of the curses to be ut-
tered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-20) relate
to incestuous marriages; Compare for unlawful
or incestuous marriages Lev. xvii. 6-17, and, for
incestuous intercourse, Lev. xx. 11-21. In a num-
ber of cases, death is made the penalty.

Another reason has been assigned for prohib-
iting marriage between cousins; namely, that such
relationships have been discovered in primal-
times, that the children of the same family,
and others nearest of kin to one another, needed
to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained be-
tween them, in order that the family might not
become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find
laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under
heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-
castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans
branded it in their language. Even a parent and
an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle
and a sister's daughter. Two of these prohibitions
were set as an example to the Jews at the time of
Nehemiah (Ezra x. 41, 42). The early Christians
also wished to guard against marriages between
very near relatives; and the parties to such a union, or the man, at least,
were visited with penalties such as deportatio. In the
Hebrew Scriptures three of the curses to be ut-
tered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-20) relate
to incestuous marriages; Compare for unlawful
or incestuous marriages Lev. xvii. 6-17, and, for
incestuous intercourse, Lev. xx. 11-21. In a num-
ber of cases, death is made the penalty.

Another reason has been assigned for prohib-
iting marriage between cousins; namely, that such
relationships have been discovered in primal-
times, that the children of the same family,
and others nearest of kin to one another, needed
to have the utmost sexual reserve maintained be-
tween them, in order that the family might not
become a hot-bed of vice. Everywhere we find
laws prohibiting marriages of near relatives under
heavy penalties. The word incestus (that is, in-
castus, unchaste, impure) shows how the Romans
branded it in their language. Even a parent and
an adopted child could not marry, nor an uncle
and a sister's daughter. Two of these prohibitions
were set as an example to the Jews at the time of
Nehemiah (Ezra x. 41, 42). The early Christians
also wished to guard against marriages between
very near relatives; and the parties to such a union, or the man, at least,
were visited with penalties such as deportatio. In the
Hebrew Scriptures three of the curses to be ut-
tered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-20) relate
to incestuous marriages; Compare for unlawful
or incestuous marriages Lev. xvii. 6-17, and, for
incestuous intercourse, Lev. xx. 11-21. In a num-
ber of cases, death is made the penalty.
seems to look upon marriage as a state of life inferior to celibacy. But whether the words, "we are not defiled with women," and "for they were virgins," denote absolute chastity in the monastic sense, or absolute purity in the moral sense, and especially freedom from defilements accompanying idolatry, it is not altogether easy to decide. (Comp. Diisterdieck and De Wette in loco.)

Want of purity in thought, speech, and action, was the great vice of heathenism, and is especially denounced in a number of places in the New Testament; and, at the time when Christianity was spreading, an ascetic doctrine invaded the western parts of the civilized world, the leading idea of which was that victory over bodily desires was the principal attainment for man. In reference to marriage, Tertullian could say that second marriage is nothing but a species of fornication (stupri). Thus a state of virginity began to be regarded as one of superior sanctity; and when Origen did is well known. At the Council of Nice, opinions were thrown out that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should refrain from sexual communion with their wives. The good judgment of an Egyptian bishop, who was himself unmarried, prevented this rule from being enacted. Ere long, however, the law became stricter, so as to require priests and deacons in the western church, if unmarried, not to marry, and, if married, to live apart from their wives. The eastern church allowed ordination in inferior ranks of the clergy without requiring such separation; but a married bishop was obliged to leave his wife when raised to this dignity. It took a long time for such laws to prevail in the western church, until Gregory VII., partly out of policy, in order to draw a broader line between the lay and the clerical members of the church, threatened excommunication against such laymen as should be present at masses celebrated by married presbyters. An unmarried clergy, thus secured, greatly aided the unity and ascendency of that order amid all the evils which the rule of celibacy brought about.

The most important points connected with Christian marriage in the medieval church are the including of it among the sacraments, and the power which the celebration of marriage with religious rites gave to the priests, of determining who could or could not marry according to Scripture and ecclesiastical canons. Upon the power of deciding questions touching the lawfulness of marriage depended the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops, so far as it reached, over legitimacy, succession to inheritances, and the validity of testaments,—an immense power, which could be used to increase the amount of property held by dead hands. Another control which the medi eval church exerted in time to marriage was that of deciding what impediments ought to prevent its being celebrated. Of these impediments there were various sorts; some from degrees of consanguinity or of affinity; others from special causes, such as fraud, precontract, clerical orders; others from the religion of one of the parties. In process of time, after the rise of Protestantism, when members of the Catholic Church and Protestants lived near one another, the question of mixed marriages arose, which has been a very troublesome one in some parts of Christendom; and still later began the strife between states and the church especially the Catholic Church, growing out of the permission of civil marriage, as it is called. Each of these subjects—the early impediments to marriage in the Catholic Church (existing in part, also, in Protestant countries to a small extent), mixed marriages, and civil marriages in the civil law—will call for some explanation.

1. The Impediments which early law in the western church, or canon law, sanctioned, may be divided into such as rendered marriage null, unless the party injured chose to have the marriage continue, and such as, on public grounds, without taking the wishes of the parties law account, absolutely dissolved it. (a) To the first kind belong force, fraud, error in regard to personal identity or in regard to freedom, antenuptial derangement of mind, crime or pregnancy, concealment of certain matters from the pastor, and seduction (which, however, might be included under force). By free consent all these impediments might cease to be binding, and the marriage thus be without a taint. (b) There were public impediments involving a sentence of nullity: such as marriage of a minor, or with a person not marrying, parties being a heretic, Jew, or heathen. If the party causing the impediment becomes a Catholic, the difficulty then ceases. (c) A marriage opposing existing obligations, such as a marriage already existing, or a previous vow of chastity. (d) Previous crime, as adultery between the parties, or marriage with a murdered person's wife or husband by the murderer. But a penance could remove this obstacle. (e) Blood-relationship, affinity, and even spiritual affinity, as that of a godfather or godmother. This impediment started from the prohibitory rules of Roman law, and perhaps of Levitical law, until it grew into a prodigious and annoying system, both in the Latin and Greek churches, from the prohibition against first cousins' intermarriage (which was the second degree), onward, until a remedy, in part, was found in the lucrative practice of dispensation. The cause may have been, in part, the feeling that such an alliance was something like incest, and in part from the supposed discovery (which Gregory the Great gives as a reason), that marriages between such near relatives are not prolific (601 B.C.). Things went on until sixth cousins, or persons in the seventh degree of relationship, could not marry. But Innocent III. brought about a change in the law at the Fourth Lateran Council, so that the prohibition should not thenceforth exceed the fourth degree of consanguinity and affinity; that is, the relation of fourth cousins. Yet a marriage between third and fifth cousins came into use. Affinity extended as far in prohibiting marriage as consanguinity, and this was very much abridged in its power. The same is true of the relation created between godfathers and god mothers and their kindred. Dispensations were pretty freely granted. The third canon of the Council of Trent on the sacrament of matrimony is as follows, rendered into English: "If any one shall say that only those degrees of consanguinity and affinity which are expressed in Lev. xviii. 6 sq. can prevent the contracting of marriage, or separate it when contracted, or that the church cannot give a dispensation in regard to some of them,
or enact that others besides shall not prevent and separate [marriage], let him be anathema." There is silent reference here to the marriage of Henry VIII. with his deceased brother's wife, which was declared unlawful by some during the controversy on that marriage and his divorce.

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

The reason of the evidently was, that they had felt what they considered tyranny from the Church of England, or eschewed it as not a true church. In process of time, ministers of the gospel, of any denomination, were allowed to solemnize marriages; and registry laws required that they should have the proper certification. In Europe, civil marriage has been subjected to much opposition, especially on the ground that the religious nature of marriage is not properly provided for by laws which render marriage by a minister of religion unnecessary. There are different ways of uniting civil marriage with religious forms. One is to begin with the civil marriage, which is essential, while the religious celebrations are left to the individual's own choice. This is the civil law of Germany since Feb. 6, 1875, accorded them; but in the eighteenth century the feeling on this point became freer or laxer, and at present mixed marriages form, in a few countries, an appreciable percentage of the annual marriages. It is readily understood that the Catholic Church is very averse to hold at all on the question of guaranties, but considerations of policy have called forth a certain degree of concession in some Protestant countries from the Catholic Church. The treatment of such marriage — as Walter, a Catholic writer, describes it in his Kirchenrecht (seventh edition, § 318, 1839) — is that, among the Churches of policy have been introduced in more recent times: By a law of Benedict XIV., a mixed marriage not celebrated according to the rules of the Catholic Church, and thus canonically regarded as a state of concubinage, although it were not entered into in the form prescribed by the Council of Trent, but in a form having legal validity in the place in question — could be regarded as a really and fully valid marriage. This concession, however, was limited at first to the Netherlands, and, by a brief of Pius VIII., to the western part of the Prussian monarchy. These concessions related only to the form of marriage. "But," adds Walter, "in some places, in order to avoid greater evil, even although the necessary guaranties are not given, the Catholic pastor may be present, and may enroll in the church book the declaration that is made. He must refrain, however, from all prayers and solemnities whereby he could have the appearance of approving such a union begun against the requirements of the church."

And for proof our author cites a brief of Pius VIII. to Prussian bishops in 1830, and of Gregory XVI. to Bavarian bishops in 1832 (Kirchenrecht, § 318, page 634 of seventh edition).

III. Civil Marriages. — These are marriages entered into according to a form, or in a way, prescribed by the State, and have a validity which is independent of any ecclesiastical solemnization. Such marriages arose out of the unwillingness of dissenting sects in Protestant countries to have the marriages of their members celebrated by ministers of the Established churches, or, per-
MARRIAGE AMONG THE HEBREWS. From the beginning, fathers selected for and gave their daughters in marriage, and finally to abolish polygamy (Exod. xxi. 8 sq.; Lev. xx. 17). Besides the customary presents given to the bride and her relations (Gen. xxvi. 33), a price was stipulated, which was to be paid to the father of the maiden (Gen. xxxvi. 15, xxxvii. 12; 1 Sam. xviii. 28, 25; Exod. xxii. 17). This price could be paid either in money (Deut. xxii. 29), or by services rendered (Gen. xxix. 20; Josh. xv. 16; 1 Sam. xvii. 25, xviii. 28). A dowry was very seldom given to the bride. The Mosaic law introduced no changes into these usages. It contains no rules as to the marriage contract. Only from incidental notices we learn that, in older times, the marriage contract was made between the parents orally, perhaps in the presence of witnesses (Ruth iv. 11), or by sworn promises (Mal. ii. 14). Only in the post-exile period do we meet with written marriage contracts (Tob. vii. 14), concerning which more minute rules and regulations were laid down in the Talmudic treatise Ketuboth.

Polygamy was allowed among the ancient Hebrews (Gen. iv. 19; 1 Chron. ii. 18), which at a very early period seems to have been customary with kings (2 Sam. v. 13, xii. 8; 1 Kings xi. 3; 2 Chron. xi. 21, xiii. 21; Joseph., Antt., XVII. 1, 3, and prominent persons (Judg. viii. 30). Although the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy, and only restricted it in the case of kings (Deut. xvii. 17), yet its many enactments tended to discourage, and finally to abolish, polygamy (Exod. xxvii. 6 sq.; Lev. xv. 18). By degrees, monogamy gained a strong foothold in the people, especially through the powerful influence of its religion; and marriage was finally regarded as a sacred covenant made before God (Prov. ii. 17; Mal. ii. 14; Hos. ii. 20). Hence marriage is very often used by the prophets as a true emblem of the relation between Jehovah and Israel. This religious conception of monogamic marriage became more and more prevalent in Israel; its basis being the divine institution of marriage, especially monogamic marriage, at the creation of man (Gen. i. 27 sq.; ii. 18 sq. 24; note especially the expression in ver. 24, unto "his wife," and the addition of the Septuagint, made in the interest of monogamy, "they twain," which is also retained in Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Ephes. v. 31). To regulate marriage,— partly in accordance with ancient usages, and partly with the spirit pervading the law of Moses,— degrees were prescribed within which a man was permitted to marry. Out of aversion to consanguinity and the evil consequences resulting from it on the one hand, and in opposition to the then existing Canaanitish and Egyptian usage on the other hand, marriages between a certain number of near relatives were forbidden (comp. Lev. xix. 17 sq., xx. 11 sq.; Joseph., Antt., III. 12, 1). He that trespassed against it was to be burnt (Lev. xix. 14). Yet these laws were not always strictly kept (2 Sam. xiii. 13 sq.; Ezek. xxii. 10 sq.); and how little the magnates cared for it we see from the example of the Herodians (Joseph., Antt., XVII. 1, 3, 1, XVIII. 6, 1, 4; comp. Matt. xiv. 4; Mark vi. 17 sq.). Ancient usage, however, favored marriages among more distant relatives (Gen. xxiv 4, 48), and in the case of the inheritance of daughters the law provided that they should only marry in their own tribe (Num. xxxvi. 6 sq.); and made it incumbent upon the brother of a deceased husband who died childless to marry his widow (Gen. xxxiv.,; Deut. xxv. 5 sq; Ruth iv. 1 sq.; Matt. xxii. 24 sq.). The priests, especially the high priest, were not allowed to marry a divorced or profane woman, nor a whore (Lev. xxii. 7); and, whilst the priest could marry the widow of a priest (Ezek. xiv. 29), the high priest was even prohibited from the latter. Only maidens were allowed to the high priests. Out of theocratico-religious reasons, the marriage of an Israelite with a foreigner from one of the accursed seven Canaanitish nations was forbidden (Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3; Josh. xii. 12), but this command was not always heeded (Judg. iii. 6, xiv. 1; 1 Kings xi. 1 sq.). Marriages with foreign men and women were permitted (Lev. xxiv. 10; 1 Chron. ii. 34 sq.), since they could acquire the Jewish civil right. After the exile, however, mixed marriages, in consequence of the sad experiences which the people had made as touching their faith, were interdicted, and the more rigorous view became prevalent (Ezek. xvi. 1 sq.); and how little the magnates cared for it we see from the example of the Herodians (Joseph., Antt., XVII. 1, 3, 1, XVIII. 6, 1, 4; comp. Matt. xiv. 4; Mark vi. 17 sq.). Ancient usage, however, favored marriages among more distant relatives (Gen. xxiv 4, 48), and in the case of the inheritance of daughters the law provided that they should only marry in their own tribe (Num. xxxvi. 6 sq.); and made it incumbent upon the brother of a deceased husband who died childless to marry his widow (Gen. xxxiv.,; Deut. xxv. 5 sq; Ruth iv. 1 sq.; Matt. xxii. 24 sq.). The priests, especially the high priest, were not allowed to marry a divorced or profane woman, nor a whore (Lev. xxii. 7); and, whilst the priest could marry the widow of a priest (Ezek. xiv. 29), the high priest was even prohibited from the latter. Only maidens were allowed to the high priests. Out of theocratico-religious reasons, the marriage of an Israelite with a foreigner from one of the accursed seven Canaanitish nations was forbidden (Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3; Josh. xii. 12), but this command was not always heeded (Judg. iii. 6, xiv. 1; 1 Kings xi. 1 sq.). Marriages with foreign men and women were permitted (Lev. xxiv. 10; 1 Chron. ii. 34 sq.), since they could acquire the Jewish civil right. After the exile, however, mixed marriages, in consequence of the sad experiences which the people had made as touching their faith, were interdicted, and the more rigorous view became prevalent (Ezek. xvi. 1 sq.).
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MARRIOTT, Wharton Booth, b. 1825; d. at Eton College, December, 1871. He was graduated at Oxford; fellow of Exeter College; from 1850 till death, assistant master of Eton College. He wrote a work of great learning upon church vestments (Vestitaria Anglicanum, London, 1857); and contributed extensively to Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, and to Smith and Cheetam, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. MARROW CONTROVERSY, so called because it was occasioned by the republication of Edward Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity. This author was an English High Calvinist of the seventeenth century.

the bridal chamber: and after coition it was ascertained whether the bride had preserved her maiden purity; if she had not, she was stoned (Deut. xxii. 13 sq.).

Modern Jews celebrate marriages in the following manner. A silk or velvet canopy, about three or four yards square, supported by four long poles, is held by four men out of doors on the day of the wedding. Under this canopy the bridegroom is led by his male friends, preceded by a band of music, and welcomed by the joyous spectators with the exclamation, Baruch Habad! i.e., "Blessed is he that cometh!" The bride, with her face veiled, is then brought to him by her female friends, and led three times round the bridegroom, thereby fulfilling the command, "The woman shall compass the man" (Jer. xxxi. 22); when she takes his hand round once amid the congratulations of the by-standers, and then places her at his right hand, both standing with their faces to the south, and their backs to the north. The rabbi then covers the bridal pair with the talifh, or fringe of the robe, which he has on. Joining the hands, he says, "Who hath created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine." If a man seduced a maid, he had to marry her, or, in case her father refused to give her unto him, the seducer had to pay money according to the dowry of virgins (Exod. xxii. 16 sq.). In spite of all these strict injunctions, the prophets spoke often against this sin (Jer. vii. 9, xxiii. 10; Hos. iv. 2; Mal. iii. 5); and at the time of Jesus immorality was very great in Israel (Rom. ii. 22); but it was especially propagated through the lascivious, sensual Syro-Phoenician cult, and with it found its way into Israel (Num. xxv. 1 sq.; 1 Kings xiv. 24. xv. 12, xxii. 46; 2 Kings xxiii. 7; Hos iv. 13 sq.).

Divorce. — The Mosaic law does not institute divorce, but, as in other matters, recognizes and regulates the prevailing patriarchal practice. The ground on which the law allows a divorce is termed errath dhabar, any "shameful thing" (Deut. xxiv. 1). Whatever this croath dhabar meant was much discussed at the time of Jesus in the schools of Shammai and Hillel; and according to Hillel only the burning of food in cooking was a sufficient reason for putting away a wife. The husband had to give his divorced wife a bill of divorce (Isa. i. 28; Jer. xxxix. 1, 2; Matt. xix. 3, 4), thus enabling her to marry again. Without such a bill, she was regarded as belonging still to her former husband. A husband who had divorced his wife could not remarry her, even if her second husband had died, or had divorced her (Deut. xxiv. 2 sq.); otherwise the husband was in duty bound to provide his wife with food and raiment, and to fulfil the duty of marriage (Exod. xxvi. 10), but was released from the latter duty during the time of her menstruation (Lev. xviii. 16, xxvii. 14; Ezek. xviii. 6, xxii. 10).

Adultery. — Although connection with an unmarried woman was not regarded as adultery so long as polygamy existed, yet at a very early period connection with a betrothed or married woman was looked upon as so sinful that both the guilty parties were stoned (Deut. xxii. 20 sq.; John viii. 5, 7) or burned (Gen. xxxvii. 24; Lev. xxi. 9). The verdict of four legal witnesses that an old woman fords adultery (Exod. xx. 14) proves that the ancient law of Israel regarded the marriage relation as something sacred. When a man violated a woman in the field, where she could not get help, the seducer only was killed. When a husband suspected his wife of adultery, he had to bring her unto the priest, who subjected her to the ordeal of the waters of jealousy (Num. v. 12 sq.). If a man seduced a maid, he had to marry her, or, in case her father refused to give her unto him, the seducer had to pay money according to the dowry of virgins (Exod. xxii. 16 sq.). In spite of all these strict injunctions, the prophets spoke often against this sin (Jer. vii. 9, xxiii. 10; Hos. iv. 2; Mal. iii. 5); and at the time of Jesus immorality was very great in Israel (Rom. ii. 22); but it was especially propagated through the lascivious, sensual Syro-Phoenician cult, and with it found its way into Israel (Num. xxv. 1 sq.; 1 Kings xiv. 24. xv. 12, xxii. 46; 2 Kings xxiii. 7; Hos iv. 13 sq.).
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MARRIOTT, Wharton Booth, b. 1825; d. at Eton College, December, 1871. He was graduated at Oxford; fellow of Exeter College; from 1850 till death, assistant master of Eton College. He wrote a work of great learning upon church vestments (Vestitaria Anglicanum, London, 1857); and contributed extensively to Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, and to Smith and Cheetam, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. MARROW CONTROVERSY, so called because it was occasioned by the republication of Edward Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity. This author was an English High Calvinist of the seventeenth century.
century, noted for spirituality and learning; and his book was originally issued in 1644. It consists of religious dialogues of an original and sprightly kind, discusses the doctrine of the atonement, and guides the reader safely between the Scylla and Charybdis of Antinomian error and Neoplatonic heresy (see arts.). A copy of it was brought into Scotland by an English Puritan soldier, and devoured by Thomas Bot- tont (see art.), who was much pleased with it, and spoke of it to several; and so it was republished in 1718, with a complimentary preface by Rev. James Hog of Carnock. The book displeased the Neoplatonists very much, and they were the leading men in the Church of Scotland. One of their number, principal Haddow of St. Andrews, assailed it in his opening sermon at the synod of Fife, April, 1719; and a "committee for preserving the purity of doctrine" was chosen at the Assembly that year, whose business really was to discredit the book. This was attempted by garbled extracts. In their report in 1720 the committee condemned the book as Antinomian, and the Assembly approved. Then the friends of the book rallied to its defense; twelve men, who were called "the Representers," formally called the attention of the Assembly to the anomaly that it had condemned, because taught in the book, propositions which were couched in Scripture language, and others which were expressly taught in their symbolical books. The Neoplatonists, however, carried the day; and in the Assembly of 1722 the twelve Representers were solemnly rebuked; and subsequently every effort was made by the Neoplatonists to prevent the settlement of ministers holding the Marrow doctrines. No action was taken against the Representers, and the book was re-introduced in the church courts. But the irritation lasted, and ultimately led to the formation of the Secession Church. See Hether- ington: History of the Church of Scotland, chap. ix., American edition, pp. 343, 344-347.

MARSAY, Charles Hector de St. George, Mar- quis de, b. in Paris, 1688; d. at Ambleben, near Wolfenbüttel, 1746. His parents belonged to the Freimuthige uncichristliche Disburse, otler Zeumiss. He himself began his career as a lieutenant in an Anglo-Hanoverian regiment, serving in the Spanish War of Succession; but in 1711 he retired to meditation. From 1735 to 1742 he lived in the Schwarzenau in the countship of Wittgenstein, and devoted his life to asceticism and religious faith, and early emigrated to Germany. His parents belonged to the Reformed faith, and his birth was pronounced by the Neonomians and subsequently every effort was made by the Neonomians to prevent the settlement of ministers holding the Marrow doctrines. No action was taken against the Representers, and the book was re-introduced in the church courts. But the irritation lasted, and ultimately led to the formation of the Secession Church. See Hetherington: History of the Church of Scotland, chap. ix., American edition, pp. 343, 344-347.

MARSAY, Herbert, D.D., Bishop of Peter- ough; b. Dec. 10, 1757, at Faversham, Kent; d. at Peterborough, May 1, 1839. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and took a fellowship in 1780. In 1782 he became Lady Margaret professor of divinity at his alma mater; bishop of Llandaff 1818; transferred to Peter- ough 1819. He was a vigorous opponent of Calvinism and Roman Catholicism. While professor, he substituted English for Latin in the delivery of his lectures on the Marrow doctrines. No action was taken against the Representers, and the book was re-introduced in the church courts. But the irritation lasted, and ultimately led to the formation of the Secession Church. See Hetherington: History of the Church of Scotland, chap. ix., American edition, pp. 343, 344-347.
was an active man, and a judicious adviser in all ecclesiastical affairs. He preached before Parliament, the Lord-Mayor, and the Assembly, more frequently than many others combined. He was the most influential member of the Westminster Assembly in ecclesiastical affairs. He represented the English Parliament in 1644, and in 1647 attended the commissioners of Parliament at the treaty of Uxbridge. He was one of the Committee of Accommodation in 1645; attended the commissioners sent to the king at Newcastle for the accommodation of peace in 1646; attended the commissioners at the treaty of the Isle of Wight in 1647. He was a moderate and judicious Presbyterian under Cromwell's administration, and as an acknowledged chief was appointed one of the committee to draw up a catalogue of fundamental articles as a basis of toleration, to be presented to the House of Commons in 1654, and became one of the Tryers. He died in November, 1655; and his remains were interred in Westminster Abbey, but were shamefully dug up at the Restoration.

Large numbers of his sermons on special occasions were published. The following are published notwithstanding the faults in method and style characteristic of the times, are models of eloquence and fervor. Among these we will mention, A Peace-Offering to God, Sept. 7, 1641; Reformation and Desolation, Dec. 22, 1641; Meroz cursed, Feb. 28, 1641 (2); Song of Moses the Servant of God, and the Song of the Lamb, June 15, 1643; Sacred Panegyrics, 1644; Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants, 1644; Right Understanding of the Times, Dec. 30, 1646; Unity of the Saints with Christ the Head, April, 1652. The only systematic work he published was A Defence of Infant Baptism against John Tombes, London, 1644, 4to, pp. 256.

C. A. BRIGGS.

MARSHMAN, Joshua, one of the first Baptist missionaries and most distinguished missionaries to India; b. at Westbury Leigh, Wiltshire, Eng., April 20, 1790; d. in Serampore, India, Dec. 5, 1857. He had a scanty education, but early developed an insatiable thirst for reading. He was sent to the loom, and continued till his twenty-sixth year a weaver (his father's occupation). In 1794, having previously been married to Miss Hannah Shepherd, he took charge of a school in Bristol, where he found time to acquire a knowledge of the classic, Hebrew, and Syriac languages. Under Dr. Ryland's influence, he joined the Baptist Church, and in 1799, with Mr. Ward and two others, sailed for India. Not being permitted to disembark at Calcutta, they landed (Oct. 13) at Serampore, then under the Danish flag, but destined, by their labors and those of William Carey, to become the most conspicuous spiritual centre in the country. Here for nearly forty years he continued to labor in the pulpit and the school, and through the press, for the moral and intellectual elevation of the natives.

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

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

Dr. Marshman stood in close relations with Lords Hastings, Bentinck, and other governors-general of India, whose sympathies and protection he secured for Serampore and its enterprises. Brown University conferred upon him in 1831, as it had previously done on Carey, the degree of D.D. One of his daughters, the wife of Gen. Havelock, died in 1882. See J. C. Marshman: Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, 2 vols., London, 1859; and art. INDIA.

MARSIlius PATAVINUS, b. at Padua between 1270 and 1280; studied canon law and philosophy in his native city; and was rector of the university of Paris in 1312, which presupposes that he had taken a degree, and delivered lectures there. The latter part of his life he spent in Germany, at the court of Lewis the Bavarian, and there he died, probably in 1342. While in Paris he witnessed the contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, and no doubt conversed with many, who, in that conflict between Church and State, sided with the king. When, then, in 1328, the contest broke out between John XXII. and Lewis the Bavarian, he himself appeared in the arena with his Defensor pacis, — a most audacious attack on the papal fabric, which just at that moment stood fire conspicuous in all its splendor and power. The work (which was first printed
MARTÈNE.

at Basel, 1522, then at Frankfurt, 1592, and afterwards often) consists of three books. The first book develops the idea of the State; the second, the idea of the Church; and the third sums up the whole exposition in the form of theses. The polemical centre of the work lies in the second book, which, by a series of trenchant arguments, undermines the whole foundation on which the papal power is built up. The priest, the author says, has no secular power, — no power to enforce obedience. The administration of the Word and the sacraments is his only business. All power is spiritual, all his influence moral. All priests, he further says, are essentially equal in power and dignity. The New Testament knows no difference between a presbyter and a bishop, and no difference between Peter and the other apostles. The sole head of the Church is Christ, and the highest representation of this Church is the Ecumenical Council. The work was by the author presented to Lewis the Bavarian, and exercised a decisive influence on his policy; but his policy was not successful. On the other hand, William Occam defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage; while William Occam defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage, in spite of her second marriage, in spite of her divorce; but for some reason or other — probably because the exarch dreamed of the establishment of an independent Italian empire, and hoped for the aid of the Pope — Marsilius stepped forward, opposing the Pope on occasion of the divorce of Margaretha of Tyrol from Johann Heinrich of Luxemburg, and her marriage with Lewis of Brandenburg, the son of the Emperor Lewis. He defended the emperor's right to dissolve her first marriage, while William Occam defended the legitimacy of her second marriage, in spite of her relation to her husband. Both treatises have been considered spurious, but without sufficient reason. See RIEZLER: Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Bayerns, 1874; and G. LECHLER: "De popemmit der v. Kurf." 1879.

MARTÈNE, Edmond, b at St. Jean de Lone, in the diocese of Dijon, Dec. 22, 1634; d. at St. Germain-des-Prés, in Paris, June 20, 1739. In 1672 he entered the order of the Benedictines at Rheims, but was soon after removed to St. Germain-des-Prés, where he enjoyed the friendship and advice of D'Achery and Mabillon, and which continued his headquarters, though at various times he resided at Marmontier and in the monastery of Montmartre in Paris. He was ordained in 1690, De antiquis monachorum ritibus (Lyons, 1690), and De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus (Rouen, 1700), were much appreciated; but it was especially as a collector and editor of old literary documents that he acquired his great reputation. 

Vetorum scriptorum et monumentorum collectio nova (Rouen, 1700), a continuation of D'Achery's Spicilegium, was his first work of the kind; but after a journey of several years through various parts of France, in company with Dom Ursium Durand, he published his great works, Thesaurus noae anecdotorum (Paris, 1717, 5 vols. fol.) and Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum amplissima collectio (Paris, 1724-33, 9 vols. fol.). He also continued Mabillon's Annales ordinis S. Ben. (tom. vi. 1177-1157, Paris, 1729). His edition of Martinus S. Greg. in Tuscania (R. See TASSIN: Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1750-65, 6 vols. ALBRECHT VOGEL.

MARTIANAY, Jean, b. at St. Sever-Cap, in Gascony, Dec. 30, 1647; d. at St. Germain-des-Prés, in Paris, June 6, 1717. He was the elder brother of the Benedictines in 1688. In the controversy with Pezron, which was brought to a sudden end by the peremptory order of the Archbishop of Paris, he wrote Défense du texte hébreu et de la chronologie de la Vulgate (Paris, 1689) and Continuation de la défense, etc. (Paris, 1693). His edition of Jerome (Paris, 1689-1706, 5 vols. fol.), of which the first volume attracted much attention, while the others proved a disappointment, implicated him in a very bitter controversy with Richard Simon (Lettres critiques, Basel, 1699) and Johannes Clericus (Questiones Hieronymianae, Amsterdam, 1700). A complete list of his works, most of which refer to the translation and exposition of the Bible, is found in TASSIN: Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1750-65, 6 vols. G. LAUBMANN.

MARTIN is the name of five popes. — Martin I. (946-955) was ordained, in the beginning of July, without having obtained the confirmation of his election from the emperor of Constantinople, Constans II.; and as he shortly after, at a synod of the Lateran, condemned not only monotheletism, but also the imperial edict which forbade all further discussion of the question, he was deposed by Pope Callixtus II., the successor of Martin I. On the other hand, the emperor ordained Olympius, the exarch of Ravenna, to send the Pope a captive to Constantinople. Olympius also entered Rome with an army; but for some reason or other — probably because the exarch dreamed of the establishment of an independent Italian empire, and hoped for the aid of the Pope — Martin I. remained free and unhurt. Olympius died soon after, however; and his successor, Theodore Calliopa, dragged the Pope from the Church of the Lateran, and sent him in chains to Constantinople. After an imprisonment of ninety-three days, he was summoned to Senlis, where he died, Sept. 16, same year. His letters are found in MANF : Con. Coll., x. pp. 790 and 1170; JAFFÉ: Regesta Pont. Rom., p. 161; BARONIUS: Annales, a. a. 849; his life, in MURATORI: Rec. Ital. Script., iii. para i. — Martin II. See Martinus I. Martinus II. See Martinus II. Martinus III. See Martinus III. Martinus IV. (Feb. 22, 1281-March 28, 1285). Simon de Brion, a native of Touraine, an occupant of various ecclesiastical positions, first in Rouen and afterwards in Tours, was in 1260 appointed Chancellor of France by Louis IX., and in 1261 made a cardinal by Urban IV. As papal legate he carried on the negotiations with Charles of Anjou, concerning his assumption of the crown of Sicily; and it was due to the influence of Charles, then king of Sicily, that the turbulent conclave after the death of Nicholas III. elected Cardinal Simon de Brion pope. In honor of St. Martin of Tours, he assumed the name of Martin IV. One of his first acts was to appoint King Charles "senator" of Rome; and, in order to support his claim on Greece, he put the Byzantine emperor, Michael Paleologus, under the ban, though he thereby brought all negotiations for a union between the eastern and western churches to a sudden end. But March 31, 1282, the Sicilian vesper took place. Charles not only lost his crown, but also his influence in Rome, where a "tribune" was elected in his stead; and it was only by the intercession of the Pope that the Pope escaped from the storm which overtook his ally. See his biographies in MURATORI.
MARTIN OF BRAGA.

Rer. Ital. Script., iii. pars i.; Duchesne: Histoire de tous les cardinaux français (Paris, 1890), and Histoire de chancelliers de France (Paris, 1890).—Martin V. (Nov. 11, 1417-Feb. 20, 1441). Oddo Colonna was made a cardinal by Innocent VII., and charged by Alexander V. with the investigation of Íñigo's appeal. After the deposition of John XXIII., Gregory XII., and Benedict XIII., by the Council of Constance, he was unanimously elected Pope, and crowned in the Cathedral of Constance, Nov. 21, 1417. The reform of the church in head and shoulders, which was the great task laid upon his shoulders, he very cunningly evaded,—by the appointment of a committee of working according to peculiar regulations, by confining the actually called and opened in Paris in 1423, it was dissolved in 1429, without doing anything. To the city of Rome, which he did not enter until September, 1420, he brought peace and order; and in his personal habits he was unpretentious and parsimonious. He was, however, not without talents and meagre wealth, and still less so in the way of using it. When he died, most of the great offices and benefices of the church were in the possession of his relatives. His bulls are found in Mansi: Con. Coll., xxviii. Biographies of him were written by Crocetto (Foligno, 1638), Cantelore (Rome, 1641), and in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. pars ii. See arts. Benedict XIII., John Hus, and Council of Constance. 

R. ZÖPFEL.

MARTIN OF TOURS or DUMIA (S. Martini Bracarensis sine Dumiensi). Of the life of this remarkable man, several notices have come down to us, scattered about in his own works and in those of Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc., v. 38: Mirac. Mart., i. 11), Venantius Fortunatus (Ad Martium Gallic.), and Isidore of Seville (De Veris III., 99, and Hist. Suecorum). He was born in Panonia about 510, became monk, acquired a great reputation for learning, visited Palestine, and, having fallen in with some Spanish pilgrims there, went in 561 as a missionary to northern Gaul. In 378 he was elected bishop of Tours; and though as a bishop he carried on with energy and dignity all the secular business of his office, he continued to live as a monk, and founded on the bank of the Loire the famous monastery of Marmontier. His influence extended far beyond the pale of his diocese, and was, indeed, felt throughout the whole country. He is the founder of monasticism in Gaul, and he contributed very much to the extinction of Paganism in the country. Thus he became the patron saint of France, also of Mayence and Würzburg; and the date of his death (Nov. 11) is celebrated not only in France, but also in Germany and the Scandinavian countries. See J. Chr. Fromman: De sancto Martiniano, Leipzig, 1720. He has left no literary monument: the Conventus (Flanders: Bibliotheca: Bibl. Paunonia about 510, became monk, acquired a great reputation for learning, visited Palestine, and, having fallen in with some Spanish pilgrims there, went in 561 as a missionary to northern Gaul. In 378 he was elected bishop of Tours; and though as a bishop he carried on with energy and dignity all the secular business of his office, he continued to live as a monk, and founded on the bank of the Loire the famous monastery of Marmontier. His influence extended far beyond the pale of his diocese, and was, indeed, felt throughout the whole country. He is the founder of monasticism in Gaul, and he contributed very much to the extinction of Paganism in the country. Thus he became the patron saint of France, also of Mayence and Würzburg; and the date of his death (Nov. 11) is celebrated not only in France, but also in Germany and the Scandinavian countries. See J. Chr. Fromman: De sancto Martiniano, Leipzig, 1720. He has left no literary monument: the Conventus (Flanders: Bibliotheca: Bibliotheca: the, was occasioned by a series of seven tracts, in which, with much wit, the prelacy of the English
Church was attacked. The tracts appeared between November, 1588, and July, 1590, under the manifest pseudonym of Martin Marprelate, Gentleman, and were printed secretly, and at the risk of life. Notwithstanding, or perhaps in consequence of, the mystery of their appearance, they obtained a wide circulation, and caused a storm of opposition. Their author was a vigorous defender of the extremest independency. Dr. Dexter ascribes their authorship to Henry Barrowe, and their publication to John Penry. See his Congregationalism as seen in its Literature, Lect. iii.

**MARTIN. Sarah, philanthropist, b. at Caister, near Great Yarmouth, June, 1791; d. at Great Yarmouth, Oct. 15, 1848.** By trade a dressmaker, and destitute of the refinement, social position, and education of Mrs. Frye, she yet was able, almost unassisted, to do a great work among the pauper and criminal classes of Yarmouth. As early as 1810 her interest was excited by the prisoners there; but it was not until 1819 that she ventured to visit them, finally giving up one evening per week to their assistance upon discharge, taught them, and also those in the workhouse. In 1826 she fell heir to ten pounds yearly, whereupon she gave up dressmaking, and devoted her whole opportunities for establishing a reputation as a scholar, and securing a position of ease and comfort. The words of his diary of Sept. 23, written as the vessel was passing out of sight of Europe, indicate well the measure of his consecration: “We are just to the south of all Europe, and I bid adieu to it forever, without a wish of ever revisiting it, and still less with a desire of taking up my rest in the strange land to which I am going. Ah, no: farewell, perishing world! To me to live shall be Christ,” etc.

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

Mr. Martyn’s work in India was accomplished at the military stations of Dinapore and Cawnapore, and within the space of less than four years and a half. In addition to his labors among the
soldiers and English residents, he preached to the natives, and prepared translations in the vernacular. Endowed with rare linguistic talents, and fully consecrated to his work, he speedily became fluent in the Hindustanee; and his preaching was so effective, that at the time his failing health obliged him to quit Cawnpore, he had as high as eight hundred in his audiences.

Mr. Martyn's most permanent influence was exerted through his translations. He had by Feb. 12, 1812, already completed a translation of a part of the Book of Common Prayer into the vernacular, which was soon followed by a Commentary on the Parables. In March, 1808, he took the supervision of a Persian version of the New Testament, which is said to be very idiomatic. At the urgent invitation of his friends, Mr. Martyn also undertook the supervision of a Persian version of the New Testament. In this task he was not so successful, and his version was referred back to him for revision. He lived to make it, but the effort cost him his life. Never strong, his health gave way, so that he had to return to Persia, recreation and the prosecution of the revision of the Persian Testament. Starting with alacrity in January, 1811, Mr. Martyn reached Shiraz, where he not only finished the Persian New Testament (Feb. 12, 1812), but made a Persian version of the Psalms, which he calls "a sweet employment that caused six weary moons, which waxed and waned since its commencement, to pass unnoticed." The learning of this faithful Christian translator, and his courage and skill in disputing with the Mohammedans, awkened a profound sensation in the city, and aroused the Muqjjuhid, or professor of Mohammedan law, to engage in a public dispute with him. The professor followed the discussion up with a tract in defence of Mohammedanism, to which Mr. Martyn replied in an equally spirited and more learned manner. Anxious to present a copy of the New Testament to the king of Persia, and fully consecrated to his work, he speedily placed itself at the head of Paganism, the mere profession of Christianity might expose a man to the dangers of torture, banishment, etc.; and those who underwent such sufferings willingly and unhesitatingly, without retracting, or conceal- ing, or prevaricating, were honored as "confessors." Both terms are of frequent occurrence in the writings of the early Fathers.

MARTYN, The Forty, a title in the martyrologies, referring to those forty soldiers at Sebaste in Armenia, who in 320, during the reign of Licinius, were placed, by the order of Lysias the commander, naked, on a pond covered with ice, and kept there during the whole night, because, as Christians, they would not sacrifice to the gods. Their corpses were then burnt, and the ashes strewn on the waters. Basil of Cesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Gaudentius of Brescia, and Ephraim of Syria often mention the event in their homilies. See Petrus de Natalibus: Catalogus Sanct., Lyons, 1508; Baronius: Martyrologium Romaneorum, Mayence, 1631; Ruinart: Acta Martyrum, Amsterdam, 1713; Görres: Licinius Christenverfolgung, 1875.


MARTYR and CONFESSOR. The Greek word μαρτυρίων (or μαρτυρία) denotes simply "a witness," and was the technical term in which the Jews engaged in the persecution of Christians, were placed, by the order of Lysias the commander, naked, on a pond covered with ice, and kept there during the whole night, because, as Christians, they would not sacrifice to the gods. Their corpses were then burnt, and the ashes strewn on the waters. Basil of Cesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Gaudentius of Brescia, and Ephraim of Syria often mention the event in their homilies. See Petrus de Natalibus: Catalogus Sanct., Lyons, 1508; Baronius: Martyrologium Romaneorum, Mayence, 1631; Ruinart: Acta Martyrum, Amsterdam, 1713; Görres: Licinius Christenverfolgung, 1875.

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

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

1. The mother of our Lord. She is not often spoken of in the Gospels; and the worship of the church, the more natural, not to say necessary, of such an enthusiasm. First, there was a Christian turning-point, however, in the development of Mariolatry, was the Nestorian controversy. It began with the question whether Mary could be the mother of God, or only the mother of Christ. Nestorius denied her any qualification (De monogam., viii.), that it was a virgin, about to marry once for all after her delivery, who gave birth to Christ in order that each title of sanctity might be fulfilled in her son "with closed womb." The prototype of this wonder they found in the eastern gate of the temple, which, according to Ezek. xlv. 1-3, should remain closed forever, because Jehovah once passed through it (Ambrose: De institut. Virginis, c. 8, No. 52; Ep. ad Siricius, Nos. 4, 5; Jerome: Ad. Pigidianus, ii. 4); and the miraculous process in the way explained by referring to the entrance of the risen Christ through the closed door into the room where the disciples were assembled (Gaudentius of Brescia: Sermo ix.; Gregory the Great: Hom. in Evang., ii. 26).

These views were embodied in a series of apocryphal narratives intended to supplement the meager information given by the Gospels concerning the infancy and youth of Christ. The most important of those narratives is the Protoevangelium Jacobi, printed in God. Apocryph., New Testament, by Thilo (i. 159) and by Fabricius (i. 68). But though, in the Roman-Catholic Church, this whole literature of legends was condemned by the decrees of Gelasius, many of its details, nevertheless, crept into the tradition of the church,—such as the names of Joachim and Anne, the education of Mary in the temple, the formal marriage between Joseph and Mary when Joseph was already ninety years old, etc.—and all traits which served to support the belief in the perpetual virginity of Mary were eagerly adopted. In spite, however, of all the glorification which was lavished on her character and history, at the end of the fourth century people were not yet prepared to worship her, or to pray to her. She was a saint, but she was not without her faults and weaknesses, and could not be worshiped as a deity.

With the development of the Gnostic doctrine of syzygies an evidence: the sect of the Collyridians is another. The real turning-point, however, in the development of Mariolatry, was the Nestorian controversy. It began with the question whether Mary could be called Θεοτόκος, "mother of God," or only Θεοτόκος, "mother of Christ." Nestorius denied her right to the title Θεοτόκος; but he was condemned by the synod of Ephesus, 431. And when the Fathers who had defended the "mother of God" left the assembly-room, they were accompanied through the illumined city to their stopping-place, with torchlights and incense-burning.

From that moment the worship of Mary may be considered as established, and it increased with...
every century. In one of his laws (Lib. I., Cod. tit. 27 de offic. drait. Afric., i. 1) Justinian prays for her to be the restoration of the Roman Empire. Nurses, the general, expected from her the designation of the right moment of making an attack (Evagrius: Hist. Eccl., iv. 24). In 608 Boniface IV. dedicated the Pantheon of Agrippina to Maria ad Martyres, and thus the Christian Olympus superseded the Pagan.

The iconoclastic controversies contributed still further to the spreading and consolidation of the worship of the Virgin. After the Council of Nicaea (787), images of her became very frequent in churches and houses, in the streets, and along roads. Candles were lighted, and incense was burnt in front of them. Real portraits of her also existed. The most celebrated was that painted by St. Luke. Spain and Italy possessed several painted by angels. Some of them were black, according to Canticles 1: 5: most of them wrought miracles. In the eleventh century, a continuous reading of Luke vii. and viii. will show that the evangelist is speaking of two entirely different persons. The woman who was health: Mary of Magdala (Luke vii.2) had seven demons. Our Lord delivered her, and the latter identification is the most mischievous. The former was unhappily confounded, not only with Mary of Bethany, sister of Lazarus, but also (indeed, well-nigh universally) with the penitent Magdalen, a town on the west side of the Lake of Galiilee, has been unhappily confounded, not only with Mary of Bethany, sister of Lazarus, but also (indeed, well-nigh universally) with the penitent fallen woman, who, in Simon’s house, anointed Christ’s feet (Luke vii.37, 38). Both identifications lack the least support. The former is disproved by the dissimilarity of the names of their respective towns no less than by the dissimilarity of their dispositions: for Mary of Bethany was quiet and deep, Mary of Magdala, passionate and fiery. The latter identification is the most mischievous. A continuous reading of Luke vii. and viii. will show that the evangelist is speaking of two entirely different persons. The woman who was a sinner was morally weak, though sound in health: Mary of Magdala (Luke vii. ii. 2) had seven demons. Our Lord delivered her, and...
secured her unavailing allegiance and constant attendance. She followed him from place to place; was at his crucifixion (John xix. 25) and burial (Mark xv. 47); prepared spices, and came on Easter morning, with other female friends, to embalm his body (Mark xvi. 1); told Peter and John of the empty tomb, lingered after they had gone, and was honored with the first appearance of the risen Lord (John xx. 1–18). Mary of Magdala is mentioned fourteen times in the New Testament (Matt. xxvii. 56, 61, xxviii. 1; Mark xv. 40, 47, xvi. 1, 9; Luke viii. 2, xxiv. 10; John xix. 25, xx. 1, 11, 16, 18). Cakl BUKGEK.

3. The sister of Lazarus and Martha; beloved by every Bible-reader for her devotion to Jesus, and earnest attention to his words. Besides the frequent mention in John xli., her name occurs only in John xii. 3, and Luke x. 38, 42.

4. The wife of Cleophas (John xix. 25).

5. The mother of John Mark (Acts xii. 12).

6. A Christian woman in Rome (Rom. xvi. 6).

MARY (TUDOR), Queen. See ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

MASON, Francis, missionary to Burmah; b. in York, Eng., April 2, 1799; d. in Rangoon, Burmah, March 3, 1874. In 1818 he emigrated to the United States, and, going at once to Missouri, worked at the shoemaker's trade until 1824, when he went to Massachusetts. At Canton in that State he was associated with the Baptist Church, studied at the Newton Theological Seminary, and in 1830 was despatched by the Baptist Missionary Union to Burmah. He became the successor of Dr. Boardman in the work among the Karens. He edited for many years The Morning Star, a monthly periodical in the native language, and published a number of books for the Karens, the first of which was the Sayings of the Elders. Among his English works are a Life of Kho-Thah-Byu, the Karen Apostle (Boston), Memoir of Mrs. H. M. Mason (New York, 1847), Burmah, Its People and Natural Productions (2d ed., Rangoon, 1860), and an autobiography, The Story of a Working Man's Life, with Sketches of Travel (New York, 1870). He received the degree of D.D. from Brown University.

MASON, John, b. at Dunnlow, Essex, 1708; d. at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, 1768, where he had been pastor since 1748. He is widely known (formerly much better than now) as the author of Self-Knowledge, a Treatise, London, 1754, very often reprinted in England and America; edited, with Life, by John Mason Good, London, 1811. It has been styled "the best manual of practical Christianity," but is "somewhat sparing of evangelical peculiarities."

MASON, John Mitchell, D.D., b. in New-York City, March 19, 1770; d. there Sunday, Dec. 26, 1826. He was graduated at Columbia College, New York, 1790; until 1801 studied theology with his father, a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, but in the latter year went, for further study, to Edinburgh. His father died the next year, and he returned home; was licensed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Pennsylvania, Oct. 18, 1792; supplied the pulpit of his father's church for some five months, when, being unwillingly aware of the necessity of the congregation, he became their pastor, April, 1793. He soon took a prominent place in his denomination, particularly by his earnest Letters on Frequent Communion (1799), directed against the Scotch custom of communing only once or twice a year. In 1801 he was sent to Great Britain and Ireland by the synod to procure additional ministers. But the manifest advantage of a departure from the plan of a foreign educated ministry led to the appointment, in 1802, of a committee of two, of which Dr. Mason was one, to draught a plan for a theological seminary. In 1804 they rendered their report, and Dr. Mason was unanimously appointed the professor. In 1806 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. In May, 1806, the plan was matured; and the seminary opened in November, with eight students. The Bible itself, in the original, rather than any body of divinity, was intended to be the text-book of the institution. The course extended over four years. Dr. Mason was "its life and soul," and "the inspiration of the institution." It had originated with him as early as 1796, and it was his darling project throughout life. "Dr. Mason's Seminary," as the institution was usually called, was the earliest American seminary. In 1807 he began the editorship of The Christian's Magazine, and wrote nearly the whole of each number. The contents were mainly polemical, directed against Bishop Hobart's claims for episcopacy. The Magazine was dedicated to the defence of Presbyterian doctrines and polity, but was only maintained a few years. In 1809 Rev. James M. Mathews was appointed assistant professor in the seminary, and served until 1818. On March 12, 1810, Dr. Mason called a meeting of his congregation, and announced his firm intention to resign. The reasons he assigned were the impossibility of his undertaking the outside duties among them, owing to the multiplicity of his outside duties, especially the seminary, and their unwillingness both to provide him an assistant and to build a new church. On May 25 the synod released him from his charge; but, with a part of the congregation, he began a new
ch. While they were seeking a temporary church home, they built the new church in Murray Street, which was finished in 1812, they were in the habit of meeting in the Cedar-street Presbyterian Church (Dr. Romeyn's), and thus led to unite at communion. This action was looked upon with great disfavor by some in the Associate Reformed Church, but the sober, judicious, and honest estimate was, in general, favorable. Dr. Mason defended his conduct before the synod in a speech of remarkable power, and later (in 1816) by his Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholic Principles. In 1811 he became provost of Columbia College, but resigned in 1816. He was one of the founders of the American Bible Society (1816), and its first secretary for foreign correspondence. In this year he sought recreation and health in Europe, and was gone until November, 1817. In 1821 he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn., but resigned in 1824, and returned to New-York City to end his days in retirement,—a mere wreck of once splendid powers. He suffered little bodily pain, and was able to the last to conduct family worship, but could not preach. In his ecclesiastical relations to the Presbyterian Church, and doubtless wearing himself out in devotion to her interests. As a teacher he was particularly successful in impressing the students with the necessity of familiarity with the word of God in the original, and in accustoming them to think for themselves. It is, however, as a preacher, that he is best remembered. He stood forth pre-eminent in America. On occasion, he rose to an extraordinary height, as in the two famous sermons, Messiah's Throne (preached in London, 1802, before the London Missionary Society) and Living Faith (in Edinburgh, the same year, before the Society for Relief of the Destitute). He preached extempore, out of a full mind and loving heart, with a great flow of apposite language. “Always master of his subject, and deeply interested in it, he was naturally led into expressions, tones, and gestures at once the most significant and the most becoming. His imagination was both powerful and vivid, but under the control of a sound judgment and good taste. He sought, not to please, but to save.” He possessed originality and power. Notwithstanding his denominational restrictions, and lack of means, he inaugurated a system of ministerial education which has since been extensively followed. He thus rid his denomination of dependences upon foreign-instructed ministers. But he also led his brethren to broader views in respect to communion and fellowship. He was associated with every good scheme; e.g., he was one of the earliest and ablest advocates of foreign missions and of the American Bible Society. Even in church architecture he showed his originality in designing a pulpit, which, although ridiculed when proposed, has been accepted substantially ever since. Besides the books already mentioned in the course of this article, a number of sermons, etc., were collected and published by his son, Rev. Ebenezer Mason, New York, 1849. His Life was written by his son-in-law, Rev. J. Van Vechten, New York, 1856.

MASON, Lowell, b. in Medfield, Mass., Jan. 8, 1792; d. in Orange, N.J., Aug. 11, 1872. He began to give public musical instruction in Savannah, Ga.; but in 1827 he removed to Boston, Mass., whence he ultimately went through all New England, bent upon exciting popular taste for music. By his instrumentality the Boston Academy of Music was established, and an enormous impetus given to musical education. His early (1828) became an advocate of what is called the Pestalozzian method of teaching music. In 1837 he visited Europe for purposes of study. But while he did much to increase the love for music by the organization of choirs, and also by fostering congregational singing, he did little to advance the art, or to raise the popular standard. His collections, from his first (Handel and Haydn Collection of Church Music, Boston, 1821) to his last (The Song Garden, 1860), number more than forty. In the line of church and Sunday-school music he did more than any one of his day. In 1855 the University of New York made him a “doctor in music,” the first degree of the kind given in the United States. His musical library has passed into the possession of Yale Seminary.

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

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

On the other hand, the apostles were far from discarding the idea of spiritual sacrifice from religion. This idea was included in the idea of the priesthood of all believers (Exod. xix. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9). In this sense the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 16, 18) calls the praise of the Lord, and doing good, sacrifices. And likewise Paul (Rom. xi. 1) calls the sanctification of the body, and the gift he had received from the Philippians...
(Phil. iv. 18), sacrifices, and compares the faith of the Philippianss to a sacrifice, and his life to a drink-offering (Phil. ii. 17).

The oldest church-fathers likewise saw in the Mosaic sacrificial ordinances only a temporary system, and regarded the sacrifices a lateral consecrated to God, faith, obedience, righteousness (Iren., iv. 17, 4), and prayer; and only the spiritual priesthood can offer them up acceptably to God.

It was in this sense that the idea of sacrifice was at first associated with the Lord's Supper. In the apostolic age the agape, or "love-feasts," were connected with the communion and to these, even after they were separated, the members of the congregation brought offerings of bread and wine, which were used, not only at the communion, but in the support of the clergy and for the relief of the poor. These gifts, which were called "oblations" (oblationes) and "sacrifices" (sacrificia), the Apostolic Constitutions in one instance distinguished the former as gifts, the latter as presents (25, 11) the bishop with a prayer of thanksgiving, and invocation for the blessing of the Holy Ghost. This prayer of thanksgiving (εὐχαρίστησις) was itself a sacrificial act (Iren. iv. 18, 3) and the difference between this offering and the Mass is at once apparent. Not the body and blood of Christ, but bread and wine as such, were offered; and the offering was not an atoning sacrifice, but a sacrifice of thanksgiving, made, not by the clergyman alone, but by the congregation. It was called a "bloodless sacrifice," not in distinction to the sacrifice of Calvary, but to the bloody sacrifices of the ancient world.

A new meaning was given to these offerings when the bishops and presbyters came to be clothed with the functions of a clerical priesthood, of which the Mosaic priesthood was the type. It was Cyprian who first advocated the priestly idea with full earnestness. He regarded priesthood and sacrifice as correlative notions, and treated the whole service of communion as an offering wherein not only oblations of wine and bread, but of Christ's body and blood, even to his sufferings, were made. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of an atoning sacrifice (θυσία τοῦ Ἱασώμοιο) in the Lord's Supper, and explains himself by saying, "We offer up the slain Christ in order to reconcile God to ourselves" (Cat. Myst., v. 8–10). Later on, eggards adds, that the consecrated elements were merely antitypes of the blood and body of Christ (20). Augustine saw in the Lord's Supper a memorial of an accomplished sacrifice (memoria peracti sacrificii). It is, notwithstanding, a most true (verissimum) sacrifice; and the elements are the body and Christ; not the glorified Christ, however, but his Church, in which many become one bread and one body, and again vow to remain in the communion of Christ's body. To eat of Christ's body and drink his blood is nothing more than to be in Christ (In Joann. tract. 24, 18), Augustine, therefore, used interchangeably the expressions, "to offer the bread and wine" and "to offer Christ's body and blood." The Eastern Church continued to hold to the sacrifice of Calvary as correlatives, and even Chrysostom makes the sacramental meaning more prominent than the sacrificial; while Theodoret declares the Lord's Supper to have only a commemorative significance. On the other hand, the Latin Church laid an increasing emphasis on the sacrificial notion. Gregory the Great (Hom. in Evang. 37, Dial. iv. 56) saw a victim (victimam) on the altar, through which the sufferings and death of Christ are repeated: Christ is now sacrificed (immolatus).

The effects of the communion were regarded as expiatory, but at first only for venial sins; for mortal sins were to be expiated by penance. But it conferred blessings in every relation of life. In the Gregorian Sacramentarium there are masses against drought and too much rain, storms, sickness, etc. Its effects were magical. According to Gregory, a prisoner's chains had been loosened as often as his wife prayed for his soul; and a ghostly appearance offered a shipwrecked sailor bread at the moment that a bishop who thought him drowned offered a mass for his soul (Hom. in Evang. 37, Dial. iv. 57). Masses were offered for the dead; and Augustine (Serm., 172, 2) hoped that God would deal with the bishops in a similar manner to that in which he dealt with his priests. Gregory, by his doctrine of purgatory, established a final warrant for this custom, and taught that the dead were helped out of purgatory by the prayers, and especially the masses, of the living. He even knew a monk who was so delivered by thirty masses (Dial. iv. 63); whence the so-called trigesima.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper, which in the early church was, for the most part, confined to the Lord's Day and the anniversaries of the martyrs, at a later period was repeated every day, and, after the time of Leo the Great (Ep. ix. 2, etc.), was repeated several times on the same day. In the eighth and ninth centuries, when the number of chapels was greatly increased, the priest often found himself without a congregation at the time of the celebration. Hence arose private masses, against which Theodulf of Orleans, in his Capitulary of 797 (c. 7), and the synod of Mainz (818, c. 43) and Paris (829, c. 49), protested, but which Wallrafred Strabo (d. 849) advocated. In this disjunction of the eucharistic celebration from the congregational communion was involved the idea of a priestly sacrifice; that is, an act independent of the sacrament. But this isolation of the sacrificial notion did not gain currency till the thirteenth century; Robert Pulley, (d. about 1180), in his Sentences, treating of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, and Peter Lombard (d. 1160) himself not going beyond the figurative significance. The latter says (Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 12, G.), that which is consecrated by the priest is a sacrifice (sacrificium et oblatio), because it is a memorial and representation of the true sacrifice on the cross (memoria et representatione veri sacrificii et sanctae immolations factae in cruce).

The beginning of the thirteenth century marks a new epoch in the history of the doctrine of the Eucharist. The doctrine of transubstantiation was fixed in 1215; and, in proportion as the sermon was neglected, the sacrificial functions of the priesthood were emphasized. Thomas of Aquinas said openly that the priest, like Christ, was the mediator between God and men, and that the consummation of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper did not lie in the participation of
believers, but in the consecration of the elements (perfectio hujus sacramenti non est in use fideiullum sed in consecratio materiæ, Summa iii. qu. 80, art. 12). The real founders of the doctrine of the Mass were Thomas, and Albert the Great. The former makes a sharp distinction for the first time between sacrifice and sacrament. The participation of the sacrament effects for the believer what the sufferings of Christ had accomplished for humanity as a whole, and consumes venial sins. The Mass, however, regarded as a sacrifice, is propitiatory, and removes even mortal sins. The benefits of the Mass are not confined to the participants, but extend ex opere operato to the absent, among whom the dead are included. Albert the Great said the Mass was not merely a representation, but a true immolation by the hands of the priest (Comm. in 4 Sent. dist. 13, art. 23).

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

II. The Tridentine Definition. — The Council of Trent gave the doctrine of the Mass its final form on Sept. 17, 1562, at its twenty-second sitting, and defined it as at once a sacrament which is received and a sacrifice which is offered. The keenest interpreter of this definition has been Bellarmine. He appealed for its confirmation (1) to Christ’s eternal priesthood (Heb. vii. 11), which implies that his sacrifice was to continue to all times; (2) to the prophecy of a pure sacrifice to be made amongst all peoples (Mal. i. 11); (3) to the meaning of “This do (facere) in remembrance of me,” as meaning sacrifice both in the Latin and Hebrew usage, etc. With such arguments he seeks to prove that in the Mass a real sacrifice is offered up.

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

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

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

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

Under the influence of the disciplina arcana, the didactic and sacramental portions of the service were distinguished, — the former part called the Missa catechumenorum; the latter, Missa fidei- lium. The service was closed by the deacon, with the word aple,o, or ite, missa est (ecclesia, “Depart, for service is dismissed”). A third period in the development is marked by a change of the earlier part of the service into a mere preparatory service.

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

The Mass falls into two main parts, the first being a preparatory celebration (introitus, graduale); the second, the sacramental (offertorium, canon missae), followed by the post-communion. Each of these five services is introduced by the words of the priest, “The Lord be with you,” and the response of the congregation, “And with thy spirit;” which proves that the early idea included the presence of a congregation. It was at the celebration of the offertorium, that, in the ancient church, the gifts were offered; and a relic of this practice still exists in the Ambrosian ritual of the church in Milan, where, on festival occasions, two old men and two matrons take up vessels of wine and bread to the ministering priest at the altar. It was also the custom to sing psalms while the gifts were being offered; but in the middle ages this practice was likewise abandoned, and a single verse of a psalm substituted, and five priestly prayers, which bear the name of the offertorium; and namely, the medistorial and propitiatory functions of the church, which believes that the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ are repeated every day.
which “I offer to thee for my innumerable sins, and for all around me who take it all for faithful Christians, both the living and the dead,” etc. The second is offered at the mixing of the water and wine. The third asks that the sacrifice being consummated may be well pleasing in God’s sight. In the fourth and fifth the priest asks the Sanctuary surrounding the altar, where, at the request of his superiors, he pronounced some funeral orations and eulogies. In 1796 he became head of the seminary of St. Magloire in Paris, the most distinguished school of the Oratory. In 1809 he preached the Lenten sermons in Paris and Versailles, before the king; and again he preached before the king, in 1701 and 1704. [Bourdoloue, on hearing him, is said to have remarked, “He must increase, but I must decrease.”] These sermons are his best; and one of them, on the small number of the elect [Le petit nombre des élus], is said to have struck terror in the distinguished auditory by its evangelical boldness and magnificent descriptions. Louis XIV. said to him, “I have heard more than one great orator in my chapel, and was very well satisfied with them; but, whenever I hear you, I am always dissatisfied with myself.” Massillon did not preach before Louis XIV. again, but at his death pronounced the funeral oration over him, [on which occasion one of the most impressive oratorical effects was made of which we have record. Looking over the vast audience, and then at the coffin, the preacher turned his face upwards, and, breaking the solemn silence, exclaimed, Dieu seul est grand, mes frères (“God only is great, my brethren”).] In 1717 Massillon was made bishop of Clermont, and preached in the following year before Louis XV. (then eight years old) ten sermons, known as Le petit carême, in which he urged upon the youthful sovereign and his court the obligations of morality and just government. In 1719 he was elected a member of the Academy, and two years afterwards was called upon to pronounce the funeral discourse of the Duchess Elizabeth Charlotte of Orleans, which is one of the best of six orations funèbres: From this time until his death he resided on his diocese; and was recognized as a model of Christian \[\ldots\]
ness and virtue. D'Alembert pronounced his eloquence in the French Academy. In his Essai sur l'élloquence de la Chaire, ascribes the decline of French public eloquence to the influence of Massillon. But this decline had begun before his time, and was due to the growing corruption of morals and taste. Massillon was the last great public orator of France; in some respects he stands higher than Bossuet. With him, in its full sense, eloquence was a virtue, an earnest effort to lead men to peace in God. He was more simple and sympathetic than the brilliant and courtsy Bossuet, and more sincere and warm-hearted than Bourdaloue (who was the more opulent of thought), and therefore more edifying than both. The purity and unadorned beauty of his style were unsurpassed. He was acquainted with the secret movements of the heart, and made his appeals to it. His memory was unreliable; but he committed his sermons, calling those the best which were memorized the most accurately.

LIT. — The first complete edition of Massillon's works appeared in 15 vols., Paris, 1745; and since then they have appeared often, in many forms. The best work on M. is Petit Careme's, Sermons et Morceaux choisis, Paris, 1833. For translations of his sermons see Dodgson: "Massillon's Sermons, with a Life by D'Alembert," London, 1839.

MASSINGBERD, Francis Charles, b. in Lincolnshire, 1800; d. at South Ormsby, Lincolnshire, December, 1872. He was graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, 1822; took orders in the Church of England, and became rector of South Ormsby 1825; in 1847 prebendary of Lincoln, and in 1862 chancellor of the cathedral. He distinguished himself by his efforts to revive the powers of convocation. He wrote, besides many pamphlets, History of the English Reformation, London, 1812, 3d ed., 1857; Law of the Church and State, 1837; Lectures on the Prayer-Book, 1864.

MASSORA. The first who undertook to collect and sift the manuscripts was Jacob ben-Chajim ibn-Adonia (cf. Ginsburg: Jacob ben-Chajim ibn-Adonja's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, London, 1867); and the result of his labors is found in the second Rabbinic Bible, published by Bomberg at Venice, 1524. This Massorah text must be regarded as the textus receptus.

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


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

Massuet, René, b. 1065, at St. Ouen in Normandy; d. in Paris, Jan. 11, 1710. He entered the congregation of St. Maur in 1692, and made his literary début in the controversy with the Jesuits concerning the edition of Augustine which the congregation had published. In 1698 he answered Langlois’ anonymous attacks by his Lettre à M. Langlois. In 1708 he settled at St. Germain-des-Prés in Paris, the principal centre of Benedictine learning; and in 1710 he published his edition of Irenæus, his chief work. After the death of Ruinart, he continued the Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, and published in 1713 the fifth volume. Five interesting letters from him to Berlh. Pez are found in J. G. Schellhorn’s Ameniitates Literariae, xii. 278–310. See Tassini: Hist. littér. de la congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1750–65. G. Laubmann.

Matamoros, Manuel, a devoted Spanish Protestant, whose imprisonment, personality, and early death aroused an interest in Holland, Switzerland, and Southern Germany, in the evangelization of Spain; b. Oct. 8, 1835, at Lepe in the Province of Huelva; d. at Lausanne, July 31, 1866. His father was a captain in the Spanish artillery, and at his wish he entered in 1850 the military school at Toledo. But, conceiving a dislike for a military life, he fled to Malaga, where his mother, then a widow, was residing. On a visit to Gibraltar he casually attended a service held by Francisco de Paula Ruet, who had been brought to a knowledge of the gospel by the sermons of Luigi de Sanctis in Turin, and had been banished from Spain for preaching the gospel in Barcelona. The sermon made an indelible impression upon his mind; and he bought a New Testament, which opened his eyes to the errors of the Roman Church. Through Ruet, Matamoros came into relations with a committee in Edinburgh, and, later, with one in Paris, which prosecuted the evangelization of Spain. He went, under commission of the latter, to Granada, Seville, and Barcelona (1860). At Granada he became acquainted with Alhama, a hat-maker, who had been converted through the instrumentality of an American tract, and was preaching the gospel. Thrown into prison, letters were found on him from Matamoros, Martin, Carrasco, and Gonzalez, all of whom were likewise thrown into prison. Matamoros laid there two years, awaiting trial, and contracted the disease (consumption) which caused his death. Through the influence of a deputation of the Evangelical Alliance he was released (May 28, 1866), and condemned to nine years’ labor in the galleys, which was afterwards changed to nine years of banishment. Matamoros then made a visit to England, where he was cordially welcomed, and afterwards went to Lausanne, where he attended the theological seminary. On a visit to Pau in Southern France, in the interest of his health, he established, through the liberality of an American lady, a Spanish school. Returning to Lausanne, he died just a few days before the end of his term of imprisonment, and two years before his country was opened to Protestant missions (1868). In his last days he exhibited an undiminished interest in the evangelization of Spain; and his rich spiritual experiences have been to this day an incentive to the Swiss to aid in that work. His name will not be forgotten.

F. Flückiger (Madrid).

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

Materialism, as its name indicates, is the theory which seeks to trace all things in nature to matter as its sole and ultimate source; or, in other words, the theory which professes to explain the universe in terms of matter. This definition may appear clear and precise. The thing defined is, however, essentially obscure and vague, owing to the number and diversity of the conceptions formed as to the nature of matter. Materialism never answers strictly to its name, because it always attributes to matter properties which have not been proved to belong to it. Instead of being a single system, which advances from stage to stage by a self-consistent development, it comprises a crowd of heterogeneous and discordant hypotheses. The ruder tribes of men are unable to conceive either of mere matter or of mere spirit; and hence their religious beliefs are, to a large extent, materialistic. Anti-religious materialism makes its appearance only when thought has become speculative and sceptical. Such materialism was propaga-
MATERIALISM.

Indestructible, which possess no merely qualitative differences, but vary quantitatively in form, magnitude, and density. The general neglect of physical science, and the general acceptance of Christianity, secured the rejection of materialism during the middle ages. In the period of transition from medieval to modern times it began to reappear. Gassendi gave it currency in France, and Hobbes in England. The so-called "materialism" of Coward, Dodwell, Hartley, and Priestley, denied the spirituality of the soul, but not the existence of God. La Mettrie and Von Holbach first advocated the atheistical materialism which has since become so common. This form of materialism has never had more advocates than at present. The causes of its prevalence are such as these,—the still operative influence of the thought of the eighteenth century, re-action from the excessive idealism of the transcendental philosophies, political and social disaffection, the spread of rationalism and of unbelief in the supernatural, the predominance of material interests, and the rapid progress of physics, chemistry, and especially of biology, with its wide engrossing attention, to the comparative neglect of mental and spiritual truth, and also largely engendering undue confidence in a particular class of hypotheses. The materialism of the present day claims to be distinctively scientific; and, of course, it largely incorporates, and freely applies, modern scientific theories. As to its primary principles or assumptions, however, it has no more title to be deemed scientific than the materialism of earlier times. In fact, contemporary materialism shows a manifest tendency to represent matter as essentially endowed with qualitative differences, and even with spontaneity, life, intelligence, "mind-stuff," "soul-organs," etc., which is surely a tendency, not towards science, but towards feticism.

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

Materialism claims to be the most rational and philosophical theory of the universe on the following grounds. First, that it best satisfies the legitimate demands of the reason for unity. It professes to be the only self-consistent and adequate system of monism,—the only philosophy which traces all things back in a satisfactory manner to a single ultimate substance as their cause. Theism, materialists hold, is a kind of dualism, because it refers some things to mind, and other things to matter, and maintains matter and mind to be distinct; and idealism they represent as erroneous, trying to account for general facts by such as are special, and failing to explain the physical world. Secondly, materialism claims to be the only theory which explains all things in a natural manner, or without having recourse to any arbitrary, any transcendental cause, any supernatural will. Thirdly, it claims to be a peculiarly intelligible explanation,—the only explanation which can be realized in imagination and conception, which the mind can picture or figure to itself. In opposition to these claims, however, it is urged that matter has not been shown to be one even in kind, as it has not yet been resolved into less than about sixty elements; that, if it could be reduced to a single homogeneous physical element, that element would not be one, since each of its parts would be as much a substance as the whole; that force has never been shown to be an effect of matter, while, if co-ordinate with matter, every atom must be dual, and, if the cause of matter, materialism must be abandoned; that it is the reverse of scientific to assume without proof that matter and force are eternal, and explain every thing; that it is a violation of the law of causality to account for the lower by the higher; that thought is seldom figurate or pictorial thought. Materialism involves the affirmation that matter is eternal, but it has as yet entirely failed to produce any good reasons for the opinion. The condition presents and elements of matter strongly favor the contrary view. The relationship of matter to force presents difficulties which materialism has likewise failed to overcome. Force cannot be accounted for by aggregation, or self-determination, of matter, and thus shown to be an effect; yet to represent it as co-ordinate with matter is to fall into the dualism which materialism professes to despise; and to suppose it the cause of matter involves the surrender of materialism. Life must be shown to be either a property or an effect of matter, before materialism is entitled to be accepted. It has certainly not been shown to be either the one or the other. The attempts of M. Pouchet, Dr. Bastian, etc., to prove experimentally the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, have utterly failed. Materialism finds it still more difficult to explain the relationship of matter to force presents difficulties which materialism has likewise failed to overcome. Molecular changes in the nervous and brain not only have not been shown ever to pass into mental states, but cannot even be conceived to do so. Such facts as the unity of consciousness, the consciousness of personal identity, self-consciousness, self-activity, and the moral sentiments, cannot be resolved into states of matter. The universe as a system of law and order presupposes a Supreme Intelligence. On these and other grounds it may be held that materialism is far from a satisfactory doctrine.

The mass of literature on materialism is enormous. F. A. Lange's Geschichtedcs Materialismus, E. Haeckel's Natural History of Creation and Anthropogeneic, and The Old and New Faith of Strack may also be named as English translations of German works devoted entirely or mainly to the advocacy of materialism.
H. SPENCER'S First Principles, HUXLEY's essay on The Physical Basis of Life, and TYNDALL'S Belfast Lecture, need only to be mentioned. In England, materialism has been combated by Beale, Birks, Carpenter, Elam, MacVicar, Martinou, Clerk-Maxwell, Mivart, Balfour Stewart, Hutchinson, Siringo, Stokes, Tait, Thomson, Duke of Argyll, etc.; in America, by Bowen, Bowne, Chadbourne, Cocker, Joseph Cook, Dawson, Fisher, Hickok, Hodge, Le Conte, McCosh, Porter, etc.; in France, by Caro, Janet, Pasteur, etc.; in Germany, by Fabri, J. H. Fichte, Harms, Hoffmann, Huber, Lotze, Bona Meyer, Schaller, Ulrici, Weiss, Wigand, Zöckler, etc. The chief works relating to particular periods of the history, and special points of the theory, of materialism, will be found indicated in notes v.-xix. on Lectures ii.-iv. of Antitheistical Theories, by the author of this article. R. FLINT (University of Edinburgh).

MATERNUS, Julius Firmicus, is, according to the signature of the only manuscript of the work still extant, the name of the author of the book, De errore profanarum religionum, dedicated to the sons of Constantine,—Constantius and Constans. According to xxviii. 6 and xxx. 9, the book must have been written after the expedition of Constantine to England, and before the defeat of Constantius at Singara; that is, between 343 and 348. Its purpose was to induce Constantius and Constans to adopt a policy of active suppression of Paganism: the apology is here transformed into polemic. The work is not complete: the leaves 1, 2, 7, and 8, of the manuscript, are missing. The plan of the composition, however, is perfectly clear. The manuscript, formerly in Minden, is now in the Vatican. It was first edited by M. Flacius, 1662, then by Münter, Copenhagen, 1826; reprinted in Miene (Patrol., xii.) by Bursian, Leipzig, 1856, and C. Halm, in Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat., ii. Of the author's personal life and character nothing is known: he is nowhere mentioned. According to Bursian's investigation, he is not identical with the Maternus who wrote the Libri de errore profanarum religionum. H. SPENCER'S First Principles, HUXLEY's essay on The Physical Basis of Life, and TYNDALL'S Belfast Lecture, need only to be mentioned. In England, materialism has been combated by Beale, Birks, Carpenter, Elam, MacVicar, Martinou, Clerk-Maxwell, Mivart, Balfour Stewart, Hutchinson, Siringo, Stokes, Tait, Thomson, Duke of Argyll, etc.; in America, by Bowen, Bowne, Chadbourne, Cocker, Joseph Cook, Dawson, Fisher, Hickok, Hodge, Le Conte, McCosh, Porter, etc.; in France, by Caro, Janet, Pasteur, etc.; in Germany, by Fabri, J. H. Fichte, Harms, Hoffmann, Huber, Lotze, Bona Meyer, Schaller, Ulrici, Weiss, Wigand, Zöckler, etc. The chief works relating to particular periods of the history, and special points of the theory, of materialism, will be found indicated in notes v.-xix. on Lectures ii.-iv. of Antitheistical Theories, by the author of this article. R. FLINT (University of Edinburgh).

MATERNUS, Julius Firmicus, is, according to the signature of the only manuscript of the work still extant, the name of the author of the book, De errore profanarum religionum, dedicated to the sons of Constantine,—Constantius and Constans. According to xxviii. 6 and xxx. 9, the book must have been written after the expedition of Constantine to England, and before the defeat of Constantius at Singara; that is, between 343 and 348. Its purpose was to induce Constantius and Constans to adopt a policy of active suppression of Paganism: the apology is here transformed into polemic. The work is not complete: the leaves 1, 2, 7, and 8, of the manuscript, are missing. The plan of the composition, however, is perfectly clear. The manuscript, formerly in Minden, is now in the Vatican. It was first edited by M. Flacius, 1662, then by Münter, Copenhagen, 1826; reprinted in Miene (Patrol., xii.) by Bursian, Leipzig, 1856, and C. Halm, in Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat., ii. Of the author's personal life and character nothing is known: he is nowhere mentioned. According to Bursian's investigation, he is not identical with the Maternus who wrote the Libri de errore profanarum religionum.

MATHER FAMILY, The. Richard Mather, the son of Thomas and Margaret; b. in 1596 at Lowton (Winwick), about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng.; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester,Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquainted with an Aspinwall family, by whose influence he was led to devote himself to the ministry, and went to Brasenose, Oxford, to prepare for the same. But the people at Toxteth were so unwilling to wait for him, that he left the university before taking his degrees, and late in 1618, when only twenty-two, preached his first sermon at Toxteth Park. The Bishop of Chester ordained him; and in September, 1624, he married Katherine, daughter of Edmond Holt of Winwick, about midway between Liverpool and Manchester, Eng. ; d. at Dorchester, April 22 (May 2), 1669. He was sent to the Winwick grammar-school, and at fifteen was chosen teacher of a school at Toxteth Park. Here he became acquaintance...
that he should have exercised an influence as vast as it mainly was salutary. In 1662 he married Maria, daughter of John Cotton, by whom he had three sons and seven daughters. His sons — Cotton, Nathaniel, and Samuel — graduated at Harvard in 1678, 1685, and 1690 respectively. Of these, Cotton, the eldest (22), 1663 (1663); d. Feb. 13 (23), 1728 (1729), — became the most renowned of the lineage; although, conceding his omnivorous scholarship and exceptional labors, it may be doubted whether he was even the peer of his father or grandfather in intellectual ability. He took his B.A. when less than fifteen years and six months old; taught for a time; overcame an impendence of speech which had threatened to interfere with his success in the family profession; acted as his father's assistant at the Second Church, Boston; and was ordained, as joint pastor with him, May 15 (23), 1686, — a place which he surrendered only at his death, at the age of sixty-five. During these nearly three and forty years he was indefatigable as a preacher, systematic and thorough as a pastor, eminent as a philosopher, and as a scholar, — at great personal risk no less than in study. In 1728 he published Magnalia Christi Americana, or The Ecclesiastical History of New England, with memoir, and translations of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin quotations, was printed in 2 vols. at Hartford, 1755.

HENRY M. DEXTER.

MATHEUSIUS, Johann, b. at Rochlitz, Saxony, June 24, 1504; d. at Joachimsthal in Bohemia, Oct. 8, 1565. He studied at Ingolstadt; came in Bavaria in contact with the Anabaptists; was converted by the study of Luther's writings; went in 1529 to Wittenberg; was in 1532 made rector of the school of that city. In 1535 he went to Wittenberg, where he lived in Luther's house; and was in 1541 appointed deacon at Joachimsthal, and in 1548 pastor. He published several volumes of sermons, one of which, containing seventeen sermons on Luther (delivered 1562–64) was published at Wittenberg, and often repeated, is of great interest, because they constitute the first complete and reliable biography of Luther. His Life was written by a descendant of his, J. B. Mathesius, Dresden, 1705. See G. Flitt: Die vier ersten Lutherbiographien, Erlangen, 1756.

MATTHEW, Theobald, the famous "Father Mathew," the Apostle of Temperance in Ireland; b. at Thomastown (five miles west of Cashel), Tipperary, Oct. 10, 1796; d. at Queenstown, Dec. 8, 1850. He studied for a year at Maynooth College (1806–08; was ordained 1814; entered the Capuchin convent at Kilkenny, but the same year went to the Capuchin convent at Cork; attained a wide popularity; was appointed a member of the Board of Direction of the House of Industry (workhouse), Cork. One of his fellow-governors was Dr. Thomas Martin, a Friend, and one of the pioneers in the total-abstinence cause. It was he who first impressed Father Mathew with the fearful curse drink entailed, and how it was the cause of the wretchedness the workhouse so strikingly exhibited; and he urged the priest to start a crusade against the evil, maintaining firmly that he was just the man to do it. On April 10, 1838, Father Mathew, who was then in his forty-eighth year, definitely committed himself to the work. His success was phenomenal. Twenty-five thousand signed the total-abstinence pledge inside of three months; and, by January of the next year, two hundred thousand persons, most of whom lived in Cork and its vicinity, had embraced the new gospel. Father Mathew extended his labors over all Ireland, visited Scotland and England (1842–43), and spent two years in America (1849–51), going as far west as St. Louis, everywhere making converts by the hundreds. Much of his success was due to the man, — his exhaustless flow of animal spirits, his humor and wit, his downright earnestness, his courage and high character. To
MATTHEW, Jacques, b. at Alt-Eckendorf, Alsace, May 31, 1791; d. at Strassburg, June 23, 1864. He studied at Göttingen and Paris, and was appointed professor of history in the college of Strassburg in 1819, and in the following year also professor of church history in the theological faculty. In 1832 he was called to Paris as inspector-general of the university, but returned in 1846 to Strassburg as professor of the philosophy of religion. Of his works the following have specific theological interest: Histoire critique du Gnosticisme, Paris, 1828, 2 vols.; Histoire universelle de l'Eglise Chrétienne, Paris, 1829-32, 3 vols.; Schelling et la philosophie de la nature, 1842; Histoire de la philosophie dans ses rapports avec la religion, 1867, 2 vols. La science en France aux temps de Fénélon, Paris, 1864.

MATTHILDA, Countess of Tuscany, b. 1046; d. in the monastery of Benedone de' Roncori, July 24, 1115; a daughter of Count Boniface of Tuscany and Beatrice of Lorraine; inherited, while still a mere child, very extensive possessions in Northern and Central Italy,—Tuscany, parts of Lombardy, Mantua, Parma, Reggio, Piacenza, Ferrara, Umbria, Spoleto, etc. Her parentage was German, and her ancestors were firm adherents of the German emperors; but the treacherous manner in which Henry III. treated her father induced him to throw himself into the opposite camp; and during the reigns of Nicholas II., Alexander II., and Paschal II., the Countess Mathilda was the mainstay of the Papacy. Specially intimate was her relation to Gregory VII., whom she sheltered more than once against the fury of Henry IV. She continued the war against the emperor, even after Gregory's death. She was twice married,—first to Godfrey of Lorraine, then to Duke Welf of Bavaria; but her first marriage seems never to have been completed; and from her second husband she was divorced. Her enormous wealth she bequeathed to the papal chair. It formed the first step of the so-called "Patrimonium Petri." See Trinitarian Brothers.

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

II. THE GOSPEL. — One of the oldest, least questioned, and most generally believed church traditions is, that Matthew was the author of a Gospel written in Hebrew. Papias (Euseb., H. E., 3, 30) sets down drunkenness was his enthusiastic, uninhibited character. In business matters he was plerone. A finest statue has been erected to his memory at Cork. Of the several lives of him, the best is by J. F. Maguire, London, 1863, people's ed., 1865. Protestant critical writers, Bleek, Ewald, Ritschl, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, and many others (see below) have advocated the theory that the Greek Gospel is the original one. But from an historical standpoint the view which the Greek Gospel was the original one. Some of the old scholars identified the Hebrew Matthew with the Gospel to the Hebrews often mentioned by Irenæus (Adv. Haer., i. 26, 2; iii. 11, 7), Jerome (c. Pelag., 2; Ad Matth., 12, 13), and also called the Hebrew Gospel (rō Ἱβρικόν), or the Gospel of the Ebionites, the
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Nazarenes, etc. But Origen (Tract. 8 in Matth., xix. 19), Eusebius (H. E., 3, 25), and Jerome (De vir. ill., 3; Ad Mich., 7, 6), who appeals to his own personal observation, distinctly deny it. The divergence in the testimonies seems to point us to a common original, from which the Hebrew Matthew and the other works were derived. And certainly there is no sufficient ground for regarding (with Schneckenburger, Schwengler, Baur) our present Gospel according to Matthew as a translation of this Gospel to the Hebrews; and Jerome, the translator of the latter, specially distinguishes it from our Matthew.

But what relation does our Greek Matthew hold to the original Hebrew Gospel of the apostle? We do not believe, with some, that the author of the original Hebrew Gospel (Matthew) translated it into our present Greek version, or revised it. An apostle who had been an eye-witness of the events would not be the author of the account as we now have it. Many of the discourses are placed out of the environment in which they were uttered. The discourses and miracles are given in groups, and in connection with notices of time such as an eye-witness would not have given (comp. vii. 1, 5, 14, 18, 28, 29; ix. 1, 9, 14, 18, 27, 32; or xii. 35, 46; xiii. 1, 36). Here belong also such concluding statements as “the end of the first book” (xxi. 1; xxi. 20); and, if he had written an account of the Lord's sayings, the narratives of events being inserted afterward. We cannot agree with this view, and hold that there is more to favor the opinion that the expression τὰ λόγια included narratives of events, than to favor the contrary opinion, limiting it to discourses. Papias denominated his own work an Exposition of the Lord's Discourses (λόγια κυρίου κυρίων), but the expression seems to include narratives of events. The very superscription, “The Lord's sayings” (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου), seems to favor our view. Just those quotations (ii. 6, 15, 23; viii. 17; xii. 18–20; xiii. 35, etc.) which are added by the writer himself are independent of the LXX.; while those (about thirty) which are taken from the discourses of Christ agree almost unanimously with the LXX. From this circumstance we draw the conclusion that the Hebrew writer used the Hebrew text of the Old Testament in his quotations, and the translator of our Greek Gospel took those quotations from the LXX.; whereas, when he added his own reflections, he went immediately to the Greek for his quotations, and translated into Greek.

The quotations from the Old Testament which have been used to confirm the theory of a Greek as well as a Hebrew original, seem to favor our view. Just those quotations (ii. 6, 15, 23; viii. 17; xii. 18–20; xiii. 35, etc.) which are added by the writer himself are independent of the LXX.; while those (about thirty) which are taken from the discourses of Christ agree almost unanimously with the LXX. From this circumstance we draw the conclusion that the Hebrew writer used the Hebrew text of the Old Testament in his quotations, and the translator of our Greek Gospel took those quotations from the LXX.; whereas, when he added his own reflections, he went immediately to the Greek for his quotations, and translated into Greek.

The view of the writer of this article is certainly not strengthened by the explanation to which he is forced of the quotations of Matthew from the Old Testament. There are three views historically possible in regard to our canonical Greek Matthew: (1) It is a close translation of a Hebrew original (by Matthew himself, or another), called by Papias τὰ λόγια, and referred to by many of the Fathers; (2) It is a free reproduction and enlargement (either by Matthew himself, — as Bengel, Guericke, Schott, Olshausen, Thiersch, Schaff, and Godet held, — or by another) of these same λόγια; (3) Papias made a mistake (as did the other Fathers who are in this case regarded as having followed him), and our canonical Greek Gospel is the original. This last view, held (in addition to the scholars above mentioned) by Keim, Alford, Elliott, Roberts (Discussions on the Gospels), Dr. J. A. Murphy, Reuss, Meyer, and others, seems to us to be a literal translation of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, but was derived from a Gospel which stood in very intimate relations to the Hebrew Matthew. Papias speaks of the τὰ λόγια (the Lord's discourses) which Matthew translated, and says he had good reasons for so doing. He moreover expressly says that the name of the translator was not ascertained; and later writers regarded him to be James, the Lord's brother, or John (Theophylact, Prolog. in Matth.).
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MATTHEW.

and unquestioned testimony in favor of a prior
Hebrew Matthew, the inherent probability that a
Gospel for the Jews would be written in their
own language, and the universal regard in which it
was held by the early Christian writers.

The date of the Gospel is put (on the ground of
xxvii. 8; xxviii. 15, etc.) down quite a time below
the ascension, yet (on the ground of v. 23; xxiii.
36; xiviv. 29, etc.) before the destruction of Jeru-
alem, and between 60 and 70 (Alford, Archbishop
Thudicum, Godef., 156; Schaff, Keim, 96; Lange,
67-69, etc.). Volkmar puts it down at 105-110;
and Guder, while assigning the Hebrew Gospel to
a date before the destruction of Jerusalem, assigns
the Greek Gospel to a date subsequent to that
event.

The Gospel, as Irenæus, Eusebius, and Jerome
observed long ago, was meant for Jewish Chris-
tians in Palestine. A knowledge of Jewish cus-
toms, topography, etc., is presupposed in the
readers (comp. Matt. xv. 1, 2, with Mark vii.
3 sqq., etc.); the method of reckoning time is Jew-
ish, etc. The aim of the Gospel was to be a com-
prehensive proof that Jesus was the promised
Messiah. He is represented as David's and Abra-
ham's son (i. 1; ix. 27, etc.), was born in Bethle-
hem, fled as the new-born king from Herod's wrath
(ii. 13-15), was brought up in Nazareth (ii. 23),
had John for his forerunner (iii. 3; xi. 10),
labor in Galilee (iv. 14 sqq.), heals the sick (viii.
17; xii. 17), speaks in parables (xiii. 1 sqq.),
enters in triumph into Jerusalem (xxi. 5-16), was
rejected by his people (xxi. 42), and forsaken by
him was held by the early Christian writers.

In the disposition of his matter he follows an
arrangement based upon the matter, giving the
discourses (v.-vii.) and parables (xiii.) in groups,
as also the miracles (viii., ix.). The Gospel is
divided into three main divisions: (1) The early
history of our Lord (i.-iv.); (2) His activity
in Galilee (v.-xviii.); (3) The continuance of this
history of England, but to the general church history of the time. It was con-
continued by William Richanger, a monk of the same
monastery, down to 1273. Its general title is
Historia anglica major, in contradistinction from
the Historia minor, an extract from the work, made
by the author himself. [Best edition of the first
by Luard, London, 1872-83, 7 vols.; of the
second, by Madden, 1868-69, 3 vols.; Eng. trans.
of both works in Bohn's Antiquarian Library,
5 vols.]

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

MATTHEW OF YORK, b. in Bristol, 1546; d.
at Cawood Castle, March 29, 1628. He was grad-
uated at Oxford, 1563; canon of Christ Church,
1570; prebendary of Sarum, and president of St.
John's College, 1572; dean of Durham, 1588;
bishop of Durham, 1595; archbishop of York,
1606. He was a man of much learning and great
eloquence; but his only printed production is
Concilia apologistica contra Capianum, Oxford, 1581
and 1685. In York Cathedral there are manu-
script notes of his upon all the ancient Fathers.

MATTHEW, Thomas. See English Bible
Versions (p. 733), and Rogers, John.

MATTHEIÆN. See Bockhold.

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

In 1564 a conference was held at Maulbronn between the Lutheran theologians of Württemberg and the Calvinist theologians of the Palatinate,—the so-called Colloquium M., for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation between the two parties. The occasion was the establishment of Calvinism in the Palatinate, and the issue of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563. The conference lasted from April 10 to April 15, but no result was arrived at. Both parties ascribed the cause of the failure to the publication of the Protocol. The Württemberg theologians published an Epitome Colloquii M., and the publication of the Protocol. The Wiirtemberg theologians answered with another Epitome (Heidelberg, 1565) and the publication of the Protocol. The Württemberg theologians published the Protocol without additions or omissions; and the controversy dragged on for several years. More effective was another conference, held, for the same purpose, at Maulbronn, Jan. 19, 1576. It resulted in the so-called Protocol, which afterwards became the basis of the Formula Concordiae.

MAUNDY THURSDAY, the day before Good Friday. Upon it the Lord's Supper was instituted. Skeat's note (slightly abridged) upon the word is as follows: "Maundy is Middle English maundee, a command, used with especial reference to the commandment, 'that ye love one another.' This Middle English maundee = Old French mande, that which is commanded; from Latin mandatum, a mandate, command. Spelman's guess, that maundy is from maund, a basket [i.e., of gifts, which it was the custom among Christians to present at this time, in allusion to Christ's great gift], is as false as it is readily believed." See his Etymologiae, 45, 5 vols, fol.; and of equal interest to medieval history are the contributions of the Congregation to universal history or the science of history. The science of diplomacy was founded by its members: De re diplomatica, 1681, by Dom Mabillon; Nouveau traité de diplomatique, 1750-65, 5 vols., by Dom Toussaint and Dom Tasch. They also founded the science of chronology: Art de vérifier les dates, 1750, 2 vols., commenced by Dantin, and finished by Clémenceau, afterwards recast by Clément. Of great interest to Greek archaeology is Montfaucon's Antiquités expliquées en figures, 1710, 19 vols. fol.; and of equal interest to medieval history are Consequently Dom Bénard, a monk of St. Vanne, who already previously had been charged with the reform of several other monasteries, received in 1618 authority from Louis XIII. to found a new congregation. It was formed under the patronage of St. Maur, and organized by Gregory XV., and in 1627 by Urban VIII. The first monastery which accepted the reform of Bénard was that of Blans-Manteaux in Paris; but others soon followed: only that of Cluny refused to join. In 1632 the Congregation numbered forty monasteries, for the following century of the eighteenth century, a hundred and eighty, which were divided into six provinces. The most celebrated of those monasteries was that of St. Germain-des-Prés, near Paris. It was the residence of the general, who held episcopal privileges, and contained an excellent library rich in manuscripts. The wise arrangements of the first general (Dom Tariffe) for the education and learned training of the monks, soon attracted the gifted youths, even of the most illustrious families; and during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Congregation produced a number of scholars whose labor was an honor to the church and a benefit to science. What the Congregation of St. Maur has done for history in general, and more especially for the history of France, can hardly be overrated. Such works as La religion des Gaulois (1727, 2 vols.), by Dom Martin, and Histoire des Gaules (1752, 2 vols.), by Dom de Brezillac, may be considered as antiquated; but the Histoire du Langueoc (1730-45, 5 vols. fol.), by Yssabette and Vic, the Histoire de la ville de Paris (1725, 5 vols.), by Félibien and Lobineau, the Histoire littéraire de la France (1738-83, 12 vols., after 1814 continued by the Académie des Inscriptions), etc., are invaluable contributions to the history of France, not to speak of the great collections of sources made by the Congregation: the Scriptores rerum gallicarum et franciarum of the eight first volumes by Dom Bouquet, ninth to eleventh by Dom Handig, twelfth and thirteenth by Dom Clément, fourteenth and fifteenth by Dom Brial, afterwards continued by the Académie des Inscriptions), the Spicilegium veterum Scriptorum, 1688-77, 10 vols., by D'Achery; the Vetus latina, 1675-85, 4 vols., by Mabillon; the Collectio nova veterum Scriptorium, 1700, by Martène; the Thesaurus novum Anecdotorum, 1717, 5 vols. fol., by Martène and Durand; the Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum Nova, 1739, 2 vols. fol., by Montfaucon, etc. Of no less importance are the contributions of the Congregation to universal history or the science of history. The Congregation of St. Maur succeeded in re-establishing order and discipline in the monastery of St. Vanne, near Verdun. Several other monasteries, among which those of Moyenmoutier and Senones, adopted the reform; and Clement VIII. confirmed the Congregation of St. Vanne, from which proceeded Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. In 1614 the convention of the French clergy expressed the wish that all the Benedictine monasteries of the country should join the Congregation of St. Vanne; but the chapter-general of the Congregation was afraid of so immense an extension, and proceeded in its stead the formation of another congregation.
the additions to Ducaenge's Glossarium by Dom Dantine and Dom Carpentier.

Principally, however, the labor of the Congregation was devoted to the church. The Benedictine editions of the Fathers (Latin and Greek), and of the great ecclesiastical writers of the middle ages, are still models of correctness of text, of acuteness, moderation, and circumspection of accompanying notes, commentaries, introductory essays, etc., and of typographical outfit. The first of the Latin Fathers whose works the Congregation undertook to edit, was, characteristically enough, Augustine. The work was begun in 1679, in the midst of the Jansenistic controversy, by Dom Delfau, and finished by Blampan and Courson, 1706, in 11 vols. fol. In 1779 appeared Cassiodorus, 2 vols. fol., by Garet; 1686-80, Ambrose, 2 vols. fol., by Du Frische and Le Nourri; 1693, Hilary of Poitiers, by Courstant; 1693-1706, Jerome, 5 vols. fol., by Martinay; 1726, Cyprian, begun by Baluze, who did not belong to the Congregation, but continued by Dom Martin. Of the Greek Fathers, the Epistle of Barnabas was published in 1645 by Ménard; Athanasius, 3 vols. fol., by Montfaucon, 1698; Ireneus, by Massuet, 1710; Chrysostom, 13 vols. fol., by Montfaucon, 1698; Cyril of Jerusalem, by Toulle, 1720; Basil the Great, by Garnier, 1721-30, 3 vols. fol.; Origen, by Charles and Vincent de la Rue, 1739-50, 4 vols. fol.; Justin and the other apologists, by Maran, 1724; Gregory of Nazianzen, 1728, by Maran and Clémence (interrupted by the Latin Fathers, etc.), etc. Of medieval writers, the Concordia Regulae, by Ménard, appeared in 1623; Lanfranc, 1648, and Guibert of Nogent, 1651, both by D'Achery; Robert Pulley and Peter of Poitiers, by Mathoud, 1665; St. Bernard, by Mabillon, 1677; Anselm of Canterbury, by Gerberton, 1705; Gregory the Great, 4 vols. fol., by Denis de Sainte-Marthe, 1705; Hildebert of Mans, by Beaugendre, 1708, etc. Directly bearing on church history were the new edition of Gallia Christiana, 15 vols., 1715-58, continued in 1856 by Hauréau, the first attempt of ecclesiastical geography, which met with the approbation of the Académie des Inscriptions. Dom Brial, the last member of the Congregation, died in 1833 as a prominent member of this new Congregation of St. Maur was also compelled to disperse. Many works begun were thus broken off; but some of them were, as above mentioned, taken up by the Académie des Inscriptions. Dom Brial, the last member of the Congregation, died in 1833 as a member of the Académie. In 1837 some friends of Lamennais bought the abbey of Solesmes; and suddenly fell upon the emperor, who lay sick in Innsbruck, but had to fly for his life across the Alps. By the mediation of King Ferdinand, the Convention of Passau was brought about Aug. 2, 1552, and full religious liberty was granted to the Protestants. After this exploit, Maurice completely regained the confidence of his co-religionists; but he had only a short time to avail himself of the great opportunities thereby offered him. In a miserable feud with the margrave of Brandenburg he was severely wounded, and died a few days after. His life was written by Langenn, Leipzig, 1842, 2 vols.

LIT. — Perz: Bibliotheca Benedicto-Mauriana, Vienna, 1710; Le Cerv: Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de S. M., 30—II

MAURICE, John Frederic Denison, b. in London, April 1, 1815, d. in London, April 1, 1872. He was the son of a Unitarian minister, and was brought up amidst corresponding theological influences. — A circum-
stance which should be kept in mind when we examine the character of this remarkable man. If a person be met midway on a mountain's side, it is important, if we would judge of his relative position, that we should ascertain whether he be coming up or going down. Mr. Maurice's was an ascending progress, and he rose from lower views of our Lord and Saviour to infinitely higher ones. He made a mark on the university in his own acknowledged it also appears that he formed the univer-
salism of themediaeval age — is a charac-
teristic performance, in which one sees the opin-
ions of former days expressed with a certain
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MAXENTIUS. See Constantine.

MAXIMILIAN II., emperor of Germany (1564-76), showed in his younger days a decided inclination toward the Reformation, was well acquainted with the writings of Luther and Melancthon, listened cold and silent to the remonstrances of his secretary and confessor, and chose his most intimate friends among the Protestant princes,—Friedrich of the Palatinate, and Philip of Hesse, his secretary and confessor,—and, when he went to Rome to lay the case before the Pope, he was imprisoned in the castle of San Angelo, and not released until he resigned his see.

Compelled to emigrate in 1792, he repaired to Rome, where he was received by Pius VI. as a saint and martyr; made archbishop in partibus Nicæa, bishop of Montefiascone, and cardinal 1784. At the instance of Pius VII., it is said, he wrote a humble letter to Napoleon, Aug. 22, 1804, which resulted in his reconciliation with the French Government. In 1806 he returned to Paris; and so absolutely did he devote himself to Napoleon, that he became an object of hatred to the legitimists and the ultra-
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career, and was appointed secretary to the Emperor Heraclius. But he afterwards gave up this position,—at what time and for what reason is not known,—and became a monk in the monastery of Chrysopolis, near Constantinople. When the Monothelite controversy broke out (633), he was in Alexandria; and when the Euchaetis was promulgated (638), he placed himself at the head of that movement which swept through the whole Northern Africa, and made that country the principal seat of the opposition, both to monophysitism and to monothelitism. He was supported by the imperial governor, Gregorius, or Georgius, who thought of making himself independent, and hoped to use the movement to his own advantage. After the death of Heraclius (641), Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, having been implicated in the intrigues of the empress widow Martina, sought refuge with Gregorius; and the latter arranged a disputation between him and Maximus. It took place at Carthage in July, 645; and its Acts, printed by Combefis, Migne, Mansi, etc., belong to the most remarkable monuments of Monothelite controversy. Maximus was completely vanquished: he recanted, and adopted the orthodox view of a double will corresponding to the double nature in Christ. In 646 the bishops of North Africa assembled in a synod, condemned Monothelitism, and induced Bishop Theodore of Tripoli to withdraw to the decision by the authority of his name. Maximus and Pyrrhus repaired to Rome, and the latter presented a formal recantation of his Monothelite doctrines to the Pope, who then recognized him as the legitimate patriarch of Constantinople. Thus a most formidable alliance stood arrayed against the Monothelites; but as Gregorius fell in a battle against the Saracens (647), and Pyrrhus made his peace with the Emperor Constans by recanting once more, the alliance collapsed without producing any effect. Meanwhile, Maximus remained in Rome, steadily active in his opposition to the Monothelites; and when, in 648, the emperor promulgated the Typos, forbidding all further discussion of the subject, Maximus induced Pope Martin to convene the synod of the Lateran, which (649) condemned, not only Monothelitism, but also the imperial Typos. The fate of Pope Martin is known: that of Maximus was not very different. Having been arrested in Rome, he was brought to Constantinople. The chronology is uncertain; but the process against him seems not to have been opened until 650. Twice he was placed before the imperial court; and as he remained stanch, and refused to accept the Typos, and enter into communion with the patriarch of Constantinople, he was both times banished. Of those proceedings a minute protocol has been printed by Combea, Migne, etc. Of his third and last appearance before the court (in 662) no protocol exists. But, in the mean time, the imperial policy had changed. There was no more question of negotiation or compromise. He was formally anathematized by a Monothelite synod. His tongue and right hand were cut off; he was whipped through the streets of Constantinople, and finally shut up in the castle of Shenami.
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no original propositions by Maximus; it is entirely borrowed from Scripture, the Fathers, and some profane authors. It was first published with a Latin translation by Konrad Gesner, Zürich, 1546. The Capita de caritate (a collection of four hundred sentences, mostly of ethical, but also of dogmatical and mystical contents, and all original) is generally printed as an appendix to the works of the bishop, and the history of the see down to the middle of the sixth century, our information is very fragmentary, and of a legendary character. St. Crescens, the pupil of Paul (2 Tim. iv. 10), is said to have been the first to preach Christianity in those regions. In 746 Boniface was appointed bishop of Mayence; in 747 he was elected primate of Germany, and made the metropolitan see of Germany,—a rank which it retained until 1803. From the tenth century the archbishops of Mayence were often chancellors of the realm; and from Christian I. (1157-80) the title of arch-chancellor of Germany became permanently connected with the see of Mayence. As the electoral dignity arose in the twelfth century, the archbishop of Mayence became one of its principal bearers: of the three ecclesiastical electors,—Mayence, Cologne, and Treves,—Mayence had the precedence. During the period of the Reformation the two archbishops—Albert II. (1514-45) and Sebastian (1545-55)—governed with great wisdom and moderation, and successfully resisted the spreading Protestantism without having recourse to violence. At the beginning of the present century the elector of Mayence ruled over about three hundred and twenty thousand souls, and had an annual income of about two million guldens. Ten suffragan sees belonged to his province,—Würtemberg, Speyer, Sarreburg, Colmar, Würzburg, Eichstätt, Paderborn, Hildesheim, Constance, and Augsburg,—and he was the primate of the German clergy. But all that splendor came to a sudden end. By the peace of Lunéville, 1801, the whole left bank of the Rhine, which was ceded to France by Austria, was established under the authority of the archbishop of Mechlin. The possessions of Mayence on the right bank of the Rhine were divided between Prussia, Hesse, etc. The electoral dignity, however, was not abolished. The last archbishop of Mayence, Friedrich Karl, died at Kassel 1864; but his coadjutor, Dalberg, succeeded him as primate of Germany, arch-chancellor of the realm, etc.: only the see was removed from Mayence to Regensburg. After the fall of Napoleon, the German territories ceded in 1806 were restored; and in 1829 the bishopric of Mayence was, by a papal bull, laid under the authority of the archbishop of Freiburg. See Werner: Der Dom zu Mainz, Mayence, 1827, 3 vols.; Schaab: Geschichte der Stadt Mainz, Mayence, 1844, 3 vols.

MAYER, Johann Friedrich, b. at Leipzig, Dec. 6, 1850; d. at Stettin, March 30, 1712. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was appointed superintendent of Leiningen 1673, of Grimm 1678, professor of theology at Wittenberg 1684, pastor of St. Jacob of Hamburg 1686, being at the same time professor in the university of Kiel, and superintendent-general of Pommerania, and professor in the university of Greifswald 1701. He had great gifts as a pulpit orator, but acquired a rather unenviable reputation as a polemic, especially in his controversy with the Pietists (Joh. Eichhorbe). He was indeed appropriately styled by S. B. Carpov "the hammer of heretics and pie-tists." The Lexikon d. hamburg. Schriftsteller, vol. 5, pp. 89-164, Hamburg, 1867, gives the titles of 581 writings of his. See J. Geppchen:
MAYER. 1444 M'ALL MISSION IN PARIS.

Johann Winckler und die hamburg. Kirche, Hamburg, 1861. CARL BERETHEAU.

MAYER, Lewis, D.D., minister of the German Reformed Church: b. at Lancaster, Penn., March 26, 1783; d. at York, Penn., Aug. 25, 1849. He was ordained, 1807, pastor at Shepherdstown, Va., until 1821, and at York until 1825, when he assumed the presidency of the theological seminary of his denomination, which was first established at Carlisle, Penn., but afterwards removed to York. He retired in 1833, and devoted his remaining years to a history of the German Reformed Church, of which only the first volume, carrying the story down to 1770, has been published (Philadelphia, 1850). To the volume is prefixed a Memoir by Rev. E. Heiner.

MAYHEW. I. Experience, in Martha's Vineyard, Mass., Jan. 27, 1673; d. there Nov. 29, 1758. He passed his days as a missionary among the Indians on Martha's Vineyard and adjoining islands; being familiar with their language from infancy, his direct ancestors being also Indian missionaries. In 1709 he finished a version of the Psalms and of John, for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He also published a work upon Indian Converts (1727), giving an account of thirty Indian ministers and some eight other pious Indians (reprinted 1729). In connection with a Discourse, he gave in 1720 a history of the Martha's Vineyard mission from 1694 to 1720. II. Jonathan, son of the preceding; b. in Martha's Vineyard, Mass., Oct. 5, 1720; d. in Boston, July 9, 1768. He was graduated at Harvard College 1744; entered the ministry, and in 1747 he was called to the West Church, Boston. But only two members came of the first council called to ordain him, owing to the suspicion of his heresy; and so a second, and selected council had to be assembled. Although settled with such difficulty, and long under the ban, he still maintained his connection with the West Church all his life. He was an ardent patriot, and vigorous opponent of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He was for thirty years a minister and some eight years a cardinal, and in 1642 he succeeded Richelieu as prime-minister of France; which position he continued holding to his death. Partly from religious indifference, and partly from political calculation, he showed great tolerance to the Huguenots. May 21, 1665, he solemnly renewed all edicta in their favor, and at times he showed considerable courage in resisting the fanaticism of the Roman-Catholic clergy. Turenne and Gassion retained their positions in the army; and Herworth, a Protestant banker, was made comptroller-general, in spite of a formal sentence of excommunication. The last great favor he showed the Reformed was the permission granted in 1659 to convoke the synod of London. Cheruel edited his letters, and wrote the history of his times, Paris, 1879 seq.

MAYNOOTH, County Kildare, Ireland, fifteen miles west-north-west from Dublin; seat of the Royal College of St. Patrick's, founded in 1795, by the Irish Parliament, for the education of Roman Catholic Churchmen. The college now receives an annual grant of £20,000. After the Union (1801) this grant was continued, and, in 1808, £13,000 voted for enlarging the buildings. In 1845 Sir Robert Peel proposed to increase the grant to £26,360, but make it part of the yearly budget, and vote £30,000 for building purposes. After vigorous opposition, the bill passed. By the Irish Church Act, July 29, 1860, the college ceased after 1871; and, as a compensation, £372,581 was appropriated for the college support. Besides this, the Dunboyne estates in County Meath yield £460 per annum. The institution has a full faculty in the arts and theology, together with president, vice-president, and four deans. MAZARIN, Jules, Cardinal, b. at Piscina in Southern Italy, July 14, 1602; d. at Vincennes, March 10, 1661. He first studied law, then held a command as captain in the papal army, and finally entered the service of the church. As secretary to Cardinal Sacccheti, he came to France in 1629. His diplomatical abilities was immediately recognized; and his partiality to French interests was so pronounced, that in 1639 he was naturalized as a French citizen, and entered the service of the king. In 1640 he was made a cardinal, and in 1642 he succeeded Richelieu as prime-minister of France; which position he continued holding to his death. Partly from religious indifference, and partly from political calculation, he showed great tolerance to the Huguenots. May 21, 1665, he solemnly renewed all edicta in their favor, and at times he showed considerable courage in resisting the fanaticism of the Roman-Catholic clergy. Turenne and Gassion retained their positions in the army; and Herworth, a Protestant banker, was made comptroller-general, in spite of a formal sentence of excommunication. The last great favor he showed the Reformed was the permission granted in 1659 to convoke the synod of London. Cheruel edited his letters, and wrote the history of his times, Paris, 1879 seq.

MAYSOON. II. Mission in Paris. Rev. R. W. M'All was a Congregational minister in Hadleigh, Lancashire. In August, 1871, he went with his wife to Paris, for the first time, intending merely to make a four-days' visit. They distributed tracts, and were especially impressed by their reception in Belleville, the artisan district of Paris. They saw an opening for effective religious work. After much consultation, and study, not only of localities, but of the French language...
McCAUL, Alexander, D.D., Hebraist; b. in 1798; d. Nov. 13, 1863. He was educated at King's College, London; served as missionary for the Society for the Conversion of the Jews; and in 1845 was appointed professor of divinity in his alma mater, and prebendary of St. Paul's. He wrote a number of valuable books upon Hebrew and Jewish topics, among which may be mentioned, The Old Paths, or a Comparison of the Religion of Moses and the Prophets, London, 1837, new edition, 1868; Lectures on the Prophecies, proving the Divine Origin of Christianity, 1846; The Messiahship of Jesus, 2 vols., the two last as the Warburton Lectures for 1837-39 and 1840 respectively.

McAULEY, Catharine E., b. in Gormanstown Castle, near Dublin, Sept. 29, 1787; d. in Dublin, Nov. 18, 1841. She was born in the Roman-Catholic faith, but, having had the misfortune to lose both her parents while yet a child, was brought up without religious instruction. She was adopted by Mr. Callahan, and inherited his large fortune. She professed Romanism, and devoted herself and her property to the service of the poor. In 1827 she and a few other ladies purchased a house in Baggot Street, Dublin, and opened a home (“House of Mercy”) for the destitute and forlorn, and a free school for Roman-Catholic children. These ladies soon determined upon a regular organization, under the name of Presentation nuns, and Dec. 18, 1831, the new Order of Mercy was founded. (See art.) Of this order Miss McAuley was mother-superior until her death. See Life of Catharine McAuley, New York, 1848.

McCHEYNE, Robert Murray, Scottish pastor and evangelist; b. at Edinburgh, May 21, 1818; d. at Dundee, March 25, 1843; educated first at the high school, and then at the university of his native city, in both of which he distinguished himself by gaining honors in his classes; his poetic faculty being even thus early recognized by Professor John Wilson, the celebrated “Christopher North,” who awarded him the prize for a poem on The Covenanters. He studied theology at the Divinity Hall of the University of Edinburgh, under Drs. Chalmers and Welsh, having been first quickened into earnest religious life through the effect produced upon him by the death of a beloved brother, and the reading of The sum of Saving Knowledge, which is generally appended to the Westminster Confession of Faith. Among his fellow-students and intimate friends at this time, and during his life, were Alexander Somerville (whose name has recently come into prominence for his evangelistic labors in Australia and the Continent of Europe), Horatius Bonar the well-known hymnist, and Andrew Bonar, afterwards his biographer. He was licensed to preach the gospel by the Established Church presbytery of Annan on July 1, 1835, and began his ministerial labors at Larbert, near Falkirk, on Nov. 7 of the same year. After nearly two years of work in this rural sphere, he was (Nov. 24, 1836) ordained to the pastorate of St. Peter's Church, Dundee, which he continued to hold until his death.

Toward the close of 1838 his health began to fail, and he was induced, along with Drs. Black and Keith, with his friend Andrew Bonar, to undertake a mission of inquiry among the Jews in Palestine and on the Continent, of which an interesting account was published, forming one of the earliest of those works on the Holy Land which have been such a feature of the biblical literature of recent years. He returned to Dundee to find his church in the midst of a great revival, under the ministry of William Burns, afterwards celebrated as a missionary to China, who had been supplying his pulpit in his absence. This religious interest continued unabated till the close of his career, and many hundreds of souls were thereby brought to the knowledge of the truth. He paid this visit to Ireland, and went frequently from place to place in Scotland, having “a growing feeling that the Lord was calling him to evangelistic more than to pastoral labors.” In the controversy known as “The Ten Years' Conflict” he took very decided ground on the non-intrusion side; but, before the disruption, he had gone to the region where controversies are at an end; for, having caught typhus-fever in the discharge of his pastoral labors, he died at the early age of twenty-nine years and ten months. But, useful as his personal ministry had been, it was through his death that he rose to his highest and widest influence; for his Memoir and Remains, prepared by his friend Andrew Bonar, has had a most extensive circulation, and has been richly blessed both to pastors and Christian people generally. In 1856 the book was prepared and sixteenth English edition. This fact shows how extensive has been the circulation in Great Britain; and that in America has probably been nearly as great. It has become an established classic of the closet, and especially of the pastor's closet. The sermons are not remarkable for genius, originality, or intellectual grasp; but they are full of “unction,” and have in a very large degree the fervor of earnestness and the glow of
McCLINTOCK, John, D.D., LL.D., joint founder of McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, was a travelling preacher in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church the same year; from 1836 to 1846 he was professor in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. (which in 1834 had passed under the Methodist influence), in the mathematics, but after 1840 in classics. In 1846 he commenced, in conjunction with Professor G. R. Crooks, a series of elementary books upon Latin and Greek, which applied the method of imitation and repetition so successfully used in teaching modern languages. The series has been very widely used. From 1848 to 1856 Dr. McClintock was editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review. In 1857 he went to Europe as delegate to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, and also to the Berlin meeting of the Evangelical Alliance. From 1857 to 1860 he was pastor of St. Paul's Church, New-York City; from 1860 to 1864 pastor of the American Chapel, Paris, and corresponding editor of the Methodist Advocate established in Paris. In 1862 he was recalled to St. Paul's; but ill health compelled his resignation after a year. In 1867 he accepted the responsible position of president of the newly organized Drew Theological Seminary at Madison, N.J. (See art.) Dr. McClintock was generally recognized as the best scholar in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and also as one of her foremost pulpits orators. He industriously cultivated his natural powers, and left behind him many proofs of his labor. Personally he was very attractive, a man of liberal views, and genial and amiable spirit.

His publications include, besides the series already mentioned, an Analysis of Watson's Theological Institutes, New York, 1842, prefixed to the American edition of Watson since 1850; a translation, in connection with Professor C. E. Blumenau, of Neander's Life of Christ, New York, 1847; Sketches of Eminent Methodist Ministers, New York and Cincinnati, 1852; Temporal Power of the Pope., New York, 1855; edition of D. S. Scott's translation of Felix Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, New York, 1865; a translation of Count De Gasparin's Uprising of a Great People, London, 1861, expressly designed to help on the Union Cause in England. Since his death there have been issued a volume of his sermons, phonographically reported, entitled Living Words, New York, 1871, 2d edition, same year, and his Lectures on Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology, Cincinnati, 1873. These volumes represent only a portion of his activity. He wrote for different periodicals, and interested himself in various enterprises, and by one great work he laid the church under heavy debt. As early as 1838, in connection with Dr. Strong, he began the collection of material for a Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, which should be much more complete than any existing. With unusual industry he labored on, assuming alone the cost of systematic, historical, and practical theology. It was not until 1867 that the first volume appeared (Harper & Brothers, N.Y.). He lived to superintend the publication also of the second
McClure, Alexander Wilson, D.D., b. in Boston, May 8, 1808; d. at Cannonsburgh, Penn., Sept. 20, 1865. He was graduated at Amherst College 1827, and at Andover Seminary 1830; and was Congregational pastor successively at Malden, Mass. (1830-41); at Augusta, Fla. (1841-44), and Malden again (1845-52). In 1852 he was installed over the First Reformed Dutch Church of Jersey City, but became corresponding secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union 1855. He held the position until 1858, residing, from 1855 to 1858, in Rome, Italy, as chaplain of the Union. During his closing years, from 1850, he was a great sufferer. His scholarship was profound, and his writings were genial and popular. He edited The Christian Observer, 1844-47, and wrote many valuable articles in other periodicals. His books comprise Four Lectures on Ultra-Unsatisfism, Boston; Lives of the Chief Fathers of New-England, 2 vols.; and particularly that painstaking and valuable historical work, — The Translators and the English Version of the Holy Bible, New York, 1853, the materials for which were "drawn from the best sources in Great Britain and America, and with the utmost care for many years, to secure accuracy and fulness."

McCrie, Thomas, D.D., Scottish preacher and author. He was in November, 1772 (exact date unknown, but baptized Nov. 22); d. at Edinburgh, Aug. 5, 1835. He was educated at the school of his native town. He entered the university of Edinburgh when he was about sixteen years of age, and completed his curriculum in 1791. In the autumn of the same year he went to Brechin, where he acted as assistant in a private academy, and also opened a day-school in connection with the Anti-burgher congregation of the town. Here he resided for three years, except during the few weeks which were annually required for attendance at the theological seminary of the General Associate, or Anti-burgher denomination at Whitburn, which was then presided over by the Rev. Alexander Bruce. He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Kelso in 1795, and ordained to the pastorate of the Potter-row Church, Edinburgh, May 26, 1798. Here he remained for ten years; when, owing to differences about the province of the civil magistrate in religious matters, a schism occurred in the Anti-burgher denomination, and McCrie, with other four ministers, separated from the General Associate Synod, by which they were afterwards deposed. They formed themselves into a new denomination, called "The Constitutional Presbytery," which was, at a later date, merged in the Synod of Original Seceders; and McCrie, followed by the larger part of his flock, removed to another place of worship, in which he continued to minister until his death. The controversies in which he was engaged led him to investigate the early history and constitution of the Church of Scotland; and in the years 1802-06 he contributed to The Christian Instructor a series of papers, chiefly biographical, bearing on these topics. These, however, were but unconscious preparations for the great work — the Life of John Knox, the Scottish Reformer — by which his name will be perpetuated. This work (begun in 1807, and published in 1811; enlarged edition in 1813), not only placed McCrie in the front rank of the authors of his day, but also produced a great change of popular sentiment in regard to Knox. It was distinguished by original, painstaking research, independence of judgment, judicial fairness of mind, and singular clearness of style; and its effect on the general estimate of Knox among men was not unlike that produced, in the succeeding generation, in reference to Cromwell, by the publication of Carlyle's monograph. It was received with the greatest favor by critics; its author was honored by the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1813; and there is reason to believe that the impulse given by it to the study of the history of the Scottish Reformation, and the principles involved in the subsequent conflicts of the Scottish Church, did much to bring about that movement which resulted in the disruption of 1843. In 1817 McCrie reviewed the delineation of the Covenanters, by the author of Waerley, in Old Mortality, in a series of articles; and the effect of these was so great, that Scott felt it needful to reply to them under cover of an article in The Quarterly Review. McCrie continued through life to prosecute his historical studies; and the results of these were given to the world in his Life of Andrew Melville (1819, 2 vols.), History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy (1827), and his History of the Reformation in Spain (1829). These, together with an excellent memoir by his son, were republished in 1837, and along with them a volume of posthumous Sermons, a series of Lectures on the Book of Esther, and a collection of Miscellaneous Writings, including some valuable pamphlets, which he had given to the press. — Thomas, jun., D.D., LL.D., son of the biographer of John Knox; b. at Edinburgh, 1798; d. 1875. He was educated in his native city; succeeded his father in the pastorate of the Original Secession church in that city in 1856 to the professorship of systematic theology in the English Presbyterian College at London. Besides the memoir of his father (1840), he wrote Sketches of Scottish Church History (1840), a Life of Sir Andrew Agnew, Annals of English Presbyterianism from the Earliest Period to the Present Time (1872), Story of the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Disruption (1875), The Early Years of John Calvin (1880), and edited a new translation of The Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, with Historical Introduction and Notes (1849). He was also editor of The British and Foreign Evangelical Review from 1862 to 1870. — Thomas, jun., D.D., LL.D., son of the biographer of John Knox; b. at Edinburgh, 1798; d. 1875. He was educated in his native city; succeeded his father in the pastorate of the Original Secession church in that city in 1856 to the professorship of systematic theology in the English Presbyterian College at London. Besides the memoir of his father (1840), he wrote Sketches of Scottish Church History (1840), a Life of Sir Andrew Agnew, Annals of English Presbyterianism from the Earliest Period to the Present Time (1872), Story of the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Disruption (1875), The Early Years of John Calvin (1880), and edited a new translation of The Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, with Historical Introduction and Notes (1849). He was also editor of The British and Foreign Evangelical Review from 1862 to 1870. — W. M. Taylor.
December, 1804; declined calls to other charges and to theological professorates, but finally became pastor of the Central Church, Philadelphia, June 3, 1823, and, from 1846 till his death, pastor of the Spring-Garden Church in the same city. “Few men have ever been connected with the American Presbyterian Church who have rendered it such manifold and varied services as Dr. John McDowell. He was a man of excellent common sense, had great executive ability; but his crowning attribute was earnest and devoted piety.” He wrote his name ineffaceably upon the records of Elizabethtown. Eleven hundred and forty-four persons joined his church during his memorable ministry of twenty-eight years. From 1825 till 1836 he was permanent clerk of the General Assembly. In the disruption he sided with the Old-School branch and was stated clerk of the Assembly from 1836 till 1840. He wrote A System of Theology, 1825, 2 vols.— William Anderson, brother of John; b. in Lankin- ing, N.J., May 15, 1799; d. there Sept. 17, 1861. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey 1809; entered the Presbyterian ministry; was pastor at Bound Brook, N.J., 1813-14; Mor- rison, N.J., 1814-18; Trenton, N.J., 1818-25; moderator of the General Assembly, 1833; secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, 1885-80. See W. B. Speague: Memoirs of John and W. A. McDowell, New York, 1864.

McILVAIN, Charles Pettit, D.D., D.G.L. (Como., D.C.L.(Lambton), D.D.(Ayr)). B. in Burlington, N.J., June 18, 1799; d. at Florence, Italy, March 14, 1873; of the MacIlvaines of Ayrshire; ancestor removed to the neighborhood of Bristol, Penn., about 1700; baptized about 1815; entered the Princeton 1831; ordained deacon, July 4, 1820, by Bishop White; ordained presbyter, March 24, 1821; bishop Kemp; consecrated bishop, Nov. 1, 1832, by Bishops White, Griawold, and Meade; minister of Christ Church, Georgetown, D.C., 1820-25; chaplain to the Senate, United States, 1822 and 1824; chaplain West Point Military Academy, 1825-27; pastor St. Ann’s Church, Brooklyn, L.I., 1827-32; bishop of the diocese of Ohio, 1832-73.

Works.—Evidences of Christianity (lectures delivered at University of New York, 1831, edited in England by Olinthus Gregory); Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches, Philadelphia, 1841; A Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese on the Righteousness by Faith; Sermon at the Consecration of Bishop Polk, 1889; Sermon at the Consecration of Bishop Lee, 1841; On Episcopacy; Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, 1841; On the Chief Dangers of these Times (twenty-two sermons); The Truth and Life, 1854; The True Temple or Holy Catholic Church, 1860; Preaching Christ Crucified; A Charge to his Clergy, 1863. Sources of further information. Memo- rials of McIlvaine, by Canon Carus, Winchester, Eng. (Whittaker, New York, 1882); Memorial Address to the Diocese, by Bishop Bedell (Diocesan Journal of Ohio, 1873); Address by Bishop Huntington (Diocesan Journal of Central New York, 1873); Memorial, a Series of Papers (Standard of the Cross, Cleveland, O., 1892).

Bishop McIlvaine in personal presence was tall, of a commanding figure, with dignified action. His eyes were particularly bright and keen, habitually full of tenderness, but capable, when occasion arose, of expressing scorn and pity for whatever seemed to him base and unworthy.

Bishop McIlvaine was no less distinguished for worthy traits of natural character than for the form and features of his manhood. His dignity of presence found an answering dignity in manner, thought, and mode of speech. Many people who did not know him well supposed him to be distant and haughty. He was indeed reserved until satisfied that his complacency would not be upset; but when his confidence was won, not only did all signs of reserve disappear, but a confiding amiability took its place, which his intimate associates remember with great delight.

He was never weak, never impassive; always honest, fair, and firm; generous, except when a sacrifice of truth was demanded; a man of pure unblemished character, finely strung nervous temperament; possessing a peculiar sense of honor; sustained by manly pride; profoundly humble, devoutly spiritually minded; a saint, but in every sense a man.

Bishop Huntington said of him, “Inheriting Scotch blood, his mental constitution bore the marks of that ancestry in his theological genius, and his taste and ability in dogmatics, as well as in his strong personal will. Gifted with a quick and capacious understanding, moving always with the dignified and graceful mien of a noble person, and lifted into universal respect by his ardent piety, it might not be fanciful to trace in him some characteristics of his national descent, —something of the evangelicalunction of Leigh- ton, of the sanctity of Erskine, of the directness of Rutherford, and even the courage of Knox.”

As a Theologian. — Bishop McIlvaine was an Evangelical, of the school illumined in this country in the Episcopal Church by the lives and teaching of Milnor, Meade, Bedell, Johns, Tyng, May, Sparrow, and Eastburn. Being a logician, and brought up in a school (Princeton) where dogmas were placed in the crucible of human reason, it was almost of necessity that his religious views should be tinctured with Calvinism; for the system of John Calvin is the result of the severest logic.

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

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

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

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

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

“"We reached England in the darkest days of the Trent affair. Constant efforts were needed to explain and vindicate our cause, to correct misapprehensions, conciliate prejudices, strengthen faithfulness, and all among the highest people, as well as the most intelligent and educated. "I thank God, who gave me courage and strength."

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

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

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

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

As a Preacher. — His great power in the pulpit was in the manifestation of the gospel. His main topics were, redemption, — the efficacy of it, the completeness of it. How he rang the changes on that chime! — ever varied, ever the same; the melodies many, the harmony one; the one thought, Jesus Christ and him crucified. The range which it covered was as large as every spiritual need, and every doctrine to his preaching very like that of St. Paul. He was thoroughly imbued with the principles of it, the efficacy of it, the completeness of it.

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

McVICKAR, John, b. in New-York City, Aug. 10, 1787; d. there (in Roylimgdale) Oct. 28, 1868. He was graduated at Columbia College 1804; entered the Episcopal ministry 1811; was professor of moral philosophy, rhetoric, and belles-lettres 1817-57, and of natural and revealed religion 1857-64, and afterwards professor emeritus, and chaplain at Governor's Island. He wrote, besides other works, pamphlets, and articles, A Domestic Narrative of the Life of Samuel Bard, D.D., 1822; Memoir of Edmund Dorr Griffin, 1831; Early Years of Bishop Hobart, 1834; and Professional Years of Bishop Hobart, 1855. The Memoir of Dr. McVickar by his son, W. A. McVickar, D.D., New York, 1871.

MCWORTHOR, Alexander, D.D., b. in Newcastle County, Del., July 15, 1734; d. in Newark, N.J., July 20, 1807. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey 1756; studied theology under William Tennent; became pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church of New-York, 1777. In 1784 he was sent by the synod of New York and Philadelphia to North Carolina on a mission, and in 1775 he was sent by Congress to western North Carolina to induce the Indians there to take up the Revolutionists' cause. In 1778 he became chaplain of Knox's Artillery Brigade. In 1779 he went to Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, N.C., to be pastor there, and also president of Queen's Museum College, afterwards Liberty Hall. But Cornwallis took the town. Dr. McWhorter lost his library; and in 1781 he returned to Newark, where he was re-installed. He took a prominent part in forming the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. For thirty-five years he was a trustee of the College of New Jersey, and collected large sums for it after its buildings were burned (1802). He published several volumes of sermons.

MEADE, William, D.D., third bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia; b. Nov. 11, 1789, in Clarke County, Va.; d. in Richmond, March 14, 1882. He was the son of Richard K. Meade, a favorite aide-de-camp of Gen. Washington's in the Revolutionary War. He entered Princeton College in 1806. It was during his last year in college that his religious views and experience assumed a decided character, and he formed the purpose of entering the ministry of the Episcopal Church. Out of a class of forty he was assigned, on his graduation, the valedictory. As there were no theological seminaries at that time, he prepared for the ministry under Rev. Walter Addison of Maryland, and was ordained by Bishop Madison, Feb. 24, 1811. His first charge was Christ Church, Alexandria, where Gen. Washington had frequently attended divine
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MEANS OF GRACE are the instrumentalities which God has ordained for our use to secure spiritual enlightenment and edification. In the narrower sense they are three,—the Word of God (preached and read), the sacraments (the Lord's Supper and baptism), and prayer (Westm. Short. Cat., q. 88). The Augsburg Confession makes special mention of only two: “By the Word and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given,” etc. (art. 5). The Protestant Church agrees in holding that the efficacy of these means depends upon the faith of the individual (even in the case of infant baptism) and the sanctity of service. Here, by the character of his preaching, he attracted members of Congress from Washington, only seven miles distant, among whom were John Randolph and James Milnor, afterwards rector of St. George's, New York. With John Randolph he had a correspondence on the subject of personal religion, which has been published. He was now zealously and successfully engaged in the revival of the Episcopal Church in Virginia, which had been left by the Revolution in the most discouraging state. He had much to do with the election of Richard C. Moore, D.D., of New York, as bishop. My. 1834 he was elected bishop of Pennsylvania by a majority of one clerical vote, but from some technicality the election was not confirmed. In 1829 he was elected assistant bishop to Bishop Moore, with forty-five foreign missionaries. In 1829 he was elected bishop of Pennsylvania by a majority of one clerical vote, but from some technicality the election was not confirmed. In 1829 he was elected assistant bishop to Bishop Moore, with the right of succession. In 1841, he became bishop, and continued one clerical vote, but from some technicality the election was not confirmed. In 1829 he was elected assistant bishop to Bishop Moore, with the right of succession. In 1841, he became bishop, and continued until his death, March 14, 1862.

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

On March 13, 1834, he was elected a member of Congress from Washington, and on Sabbath, according to Josephus (Life, § 54), now before noon, when the synagogue service was over. It is every way probable that the Jews ate very little meat, bread and fruits constituting with them, as with the modern Orientalists, the principal diet. Primitively the Jews sat (i.e., probably squatted on the ground) at meals; but contact with other nations, especially with the Babylonians, refined their idea of life; and hence Amos (eighth century B.C.), inveighing against the luxury which enervated the upper classes, speaks of those “ that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches.” The New Testament notices show that the custom of reclining at meals, at least where there were guests, had become national. This fact is brought out most prominently in John xii. 23 (“There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved”), xxii. 20 referring to the same fact (the disciple who “leaned back on his breast”). The published monument records. This institution has sent out about seven hundred and fifty ministers of personal religion, which has been published. The Augsburg Confession makes special mention of only two: “By the Word and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given,” etc. (art. 5). The Protestant Church agrees in holding that the efficacy of these means depends upon the faith of the individual (even in the case of infant baptism) and the sanctity of personal religion, which has been published.
MEASURES. See Weights and Measures.

MEAT, MEAT OFFERINGS. The word "meat" in the Authorized Version means food in general; what we now call "meat." A "meat-offering" was an "unbloody offering," consisting of a cake made of flour and oil. The law respecting its preparation and use is found in Lev. xxii. 14–23. In the case of public sacrifices a meat-offering was enjoined as a part of the necessity of the use of the sacraments than the Reformed communions, but not upon the reading and preaching of the Word and the use of prayer, except in family prayer. For further details see Baptism, Lord's Supper, etc., and the theologies of Hodge (iii. 466 sqq.), Van Oosterzee (lii. 730 sqq.), and Dorner.

MEASURES. MEDARDUS. St., b. in 465; d. in 545; was
spreading Christianity among the Pagans. He is commemorated by the Roman-Catholic Church on June 8. He is the patron of haymaking. His life was written in verse and in prose by Fortunatus, and in prose by Radbodus. See Acta Sanctorum, Juni ii.

MEDE, Joseph, B.D., b. at Berden, in Essex, 1586; d. as a fellow of Christ College, at Cambridge, Oct. 1, 1638. He was reader of the Greek lecture on Sir Walter May's foundation, and eminently for learning and piety. He is best known by his Clavis Apocalypistica, Cambridge, 1627; English translation by R. More, The Key of the Revelation, London, 1643; new translation by B. Cooper, London, 1833. The work is highly esteemed: indeed, he was considered "as a man on June 8. He is the patron of haymaking. His enumeration of the sons of Japhet. The same writer (1.101) divides the Medes into six yavea, — Boscoa, Madai, Media, Elam, on the west the Zagrus Mountains, — cf. Strabo, etc. — Berosus, Ugaritica, "Apiot," the "Medes" so often mentioned in the Bible, in the Achiemenidan inscriptions, and in Greek writers. Herodotus (VII. 62) even tells us that the Medes (and this must refer to the ruling element of the population) called themselves "apan. The same writer (I. 101) divides the Medes into the Medes and Medo-Elamitae, "Aramaizait, Avgonoi, Mays. The last was probably an order or class, rather than a tribe, and to this class the priests appear to have belonged.

Languages. — These were, at least, two in number. The Aryan language of the dominant race is preserved to us in many proper names. The language of the original subjugated inhabitants is, with little question, that in which the second middle column of the tri-lingual Achiemenidan inscriptions is composed. This non-Aryan language is akin to that of the inscriptions of Susa, but not identical. It has been variously called "Scythic," "Elamitic," "Medic," "Proto-Medic," and "Medo-Elamitic;" the last being probably the most exact designation.

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

History. — The early history of Media is obscure. We do not know when the Aryan invasion took place, and authorities are much divided as to the date when the land became a political unit. The statement of Diodorus Siculus (II. 1), in regard to Pharnos, King of the Medes (c. B.C. 1280), is quite as untrustworthy as his mention of Ninus, king of Assyria, the conqueror of Media. We know nothing authentic of the ninth century B.C. Then we have in the Assyrian records scattered notices of Media, by Shalmaneser II. (probably; he says, not "Madai," but "Amadal;" see Schnader, Die Keilschriften und Geschichtsforschung, 1878, pp. 173 ff.), who reigned B.C. 858-829, by Shamash-Rammainas (823-819), and by Ramman-Nirari (810-781). At
length we find Tiglath Pileser II. (B.C. 745–727) conquering and annexing to the Assyrian Empire at least part of Media. Sargon (B.C. 722–705) transported captives to the cities of Media (cf. 2 Kings xxvii. 7). Similar reports come from Senacherib (B.C. 705–681) and Esarhaddon (681–668). Media does not appear as a single consolidated power until the reign of Assurbanipal (B.C. 688–686); and this, joined with the plural expression “all the kings of the Medes” (Jer. xxv. 25; cf. li. 11, 28), seems to indicate that the petty chiefs of the country were not until then united under one headship. Herodotus’ statements, therefore (I. 90 ff.), in regard to King Deioces (B.C. 705–686) and the hundred and twenty-eight years of Median dominion over Upper Asia, can hardly be credited. Phraortes (B.C. 655–633), Kyaxares (633–593), and Astyages (593–550), are the only Median kings whose reign is fully established by Persian and Greek authorities. (On “Darines the Mede,” see DARIUS.)

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


MEDIATOR, MEDIATION. Mediation is the work of reconciling persons who are at variance. But, in order to reconcile them, there must be satisfaction for sin, a veritable atonement. Peace could come in no other way. There was only one being who could make satisfaction, and be the mediator,—the daysman who could lay his hand upon both the parties. The Scriptures plainly lay down the qualifications for the work. The mediator must be a sinless man, and at the same time a divine person; for “the blood of no mere creature could take away sin.” Jesus Christ possessed all the qualifications, and therefore he is the mediator (I Tim. ii. 5). Mediation was effected by him in his dual personality, as the God-man; but his mediatorial work is usually and properly exhibited under the heads of his prophetic, sacerdotal, and kingly offices. "We need a Saviour who is a prophet to instruct us, a priest to atone and to make intercession for us, and a king to rule over and protect us. See HODGE: Systematic Theology, pt. iii. chap. iv. (vol. ii. pp. 455–461); arts. Atonement, Christology, Intercession, Jesus Christ, Three Offices of, etc.

MEDICINE OF THE HEBREWS. The sources from which our knowledge of the medicine of the Jews is derived are two; viz., the Bible and the Talmud. Unfortunately the descriptions of diseases contained in the Bible are so vague that to arrange from them a system of medicine is largely a matter of conjecture; the Jewish idea of pathology and etiology being very vague, and a very clearness let us divide our subject into two parts: 1st. What we can learn from biblical accounts of medicine; 2d. What the Talmud has to teach us of Hebrew medicine. The first shows its origin from Egypt and the influence of Assyrian ideas, while the second is imbued with the wisdom of the Greeks.

I. HEBREW MEDICINE, both in the old and the New Testament, was a matter belonging principally to the priestly class; the priests caring both for private and public health. The latter was natural, since all disease was regarded as sent by Jehovah, mostly in punishment of sin; for the Jews had no knowledge of those changes in the tissues of the body which constitute disease. God called himself “the physician” of his people (Exod. xv. 26); and so the assumption of the office of physician by the priest was eminently proper. There were some physicians, however, who were not priests.

Among diseases threatened for disobedience were the plague, boils, fever, sterility, jaundice, ulcers, itch, insanity, blindness, and leprosy. The following maladies are mentioned in the Bible. (1) Fever and ague (Lev. xxvi. 16). (2) Dysentery (Acts xxviii. 8), with, probably, prolapsus ani, as in Jehoram’s case (2 Chron. xxi. 15, 16). (3) Inflammation of the eyes, due to heat, night dews, sea breeze, flying sand, injuries, etc., which was often followed by blindness (Lev. xix. 14; Deut. xviii. 18; Matt. xii. 22, etc.); while congenital blindness is spoken of, in the case of the man whom our Lord healed, who had been blind from his mother’s womb (John ix. 1). (4) Diseases of the liver. (5) Hypochondria. (6) Hysteria. (7) Rheumatism and gout, for the cure of which many resorted to the Pool of Bethesda (John v. 2–3). (8) Consumption, a general term including hectic, typhoid, and other fevers (Lev. xxvi. 17; Deut. xxviii. 22, etc.). (9) Phthisis (?), indicated by leanness (Isa. x. 18); these last two being punishments for the misuse of the corporeal blessings of God. (10) Atrophy of muscles, “withered hand,” being due either to rheumatism, plugging up of the main artery of the limb, or paralysis of the principal nerve, etc. (Matt. xii. 10; 1 Kings xiii. 4–6, etc.). (11) FEVERS in general (Matt. viii. 14, etc.). (12) Pestilence (Deut. xxiv. 13). (13) Oriental pest, the so-called “bubonic pest,” a disease propagated through a miasma, a form of typhus-fever of the Nile lands, raging specially in warm, damp, thickly-peopled deltas, characterized by swellings in the groins, armpits, knee-joints, and neck, with petechial spots on the body; often fatal before the end of second day,
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though most die between the third and sixth day, before appearance of boils; it has prodromal symptoms, is accompanied with fever and delirium, and very fatal (Lev. xxvii. 25; Deut. xxviii. 21, 27, 60, etc.). The "emeros" spoken of in 1 Sam. v. 6, etc., are thought by some to be the plague, by others, the bites of a poisonous insect (Solypa fatalis), hemorrhoids, or dysentery. (14) Boils (2 Kings xx. 7, etc.). (15) Sunstroke (2 Kings iv. 19, etc.). (16) Gonorhhea (Lev. xv. 2). (17) Metorrhagia, or uterine hemorrhage (Lev. xii. 3); see under medicine. (18) Swelling (Gen. xx. 18, etc.). (19) Aes' foot disease, either oedema, or gout (2 Chron. xvi. 12). (20) Elephanthis? (Job ii. 7). (21) Dropsy (Luke xiv. 2). (22) Cancer (2 Tim. ii. 17). (23) Worms, may have been phthisis, or lice (2 Macc. ix. 5-8). (24) Erysipelas, see art.). (25) Other varieties of skin diseases, as the itch, which rendered its victim unfit for the priesthood (Deut. xxviii. 27). (26) Apoplexy, as in the case of Nabat (1 Sam. xxi. 11, etc.). (27) Lethargy (Gen. ii. 21; 1 Sam. xxviii. 12). (28) Paralysis, palsy (Matt. iv. 24; Acts ii. 2). (29) "Possession of devils" (Matt. iv. 24, etc.). (30) Melancholia, madness (Deut. xxviii. 28, etc.), David's case (1 Sam. xxxi. 15), supposed by some not to have been assumed, but a passing mental delusion in regard to identity, of which there have been similar cases placed on record. (31) Nervous exhaustion is supposed to have been the trouble of the leprosy (1 Tim. v. 23): this was the usual treatment in those days. (32) Miscarriage from "a little wine" (1 Tim. v. 23) was the usual treatment in those days. (33) Poisoning by arrows (Job i. 7). (34) Poisoning by arrows (Job i. 7). (35) Poisoning by arrows (Job i. 7). (36) Poisoning by arrows (Job i. 7).

II. Talmudic Medicine. — Consequent upon the successive destructions of Jerusalem, and the carrying-away of the people into captivity, the rabbis were brought in contact with the medical thought of other people: hence their ideas were modified, and we find in the Talmudic medicine the influence of the Greek school. The medical part of the Talmud may be called a collection of minutes of the meetings of the medical rabbis, when they discussed their art, and of their writings (see art. "Talmud").

Of anatomy they knew the essential parts, but of course had no knowledge of histology. They recognized the beginning of the spinal cord at the Foramen magnum, at the base of the skull, and its ending in the Cauda equina, near the end of the spinal column. They thought that the medulla con- sisted of two coats; that the lungs were enclosed in two membranes, and the fat about the kidneys in its own skin. In the first century A.D., one rabbi dissected the body of a prostitute, and said that he found two hundred and fifty-two bones (two hundred is the correct number). As to physiology, they experimented in taking out the spleen, and said that the operation was not fatal. They distinguished between albumen and seminal fluid, saying, that, by boiling, the first coagulated, and the second liquefied.

Surgery. — They considered dislocation of the femur, contusion of the skull, perforation of the lungs, esophagus, small intestines, stomach, and gall bladder, injuries of the spine, pia mater, and traumas, and fractures of the ribs, as fatal, unless surgical help was at hand. They not only knew the effects of mouth and nose were sent as punishment for past sins. They also recognized stone in the bladder. Bleeding was done by the bar- bers, as it is in the East to-day.

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

Obstetrics. — Pregnancy was said by the Talmud to last from 270 to 273 days (now reckoned at from 280 to 300 days), and to be unrecognized before the fourth month. It was thought that an eight-months child could not live — a popular idea at the present time, but false. Caesarean section, turning, eversion, and abortion, are operations known of, and prohibited. Of monstrosities were known; the latter supposed to be caused by intercourse of a demon or animal with a woman, or a man with an animal. By the sixth week they thought that the genitals, mouth, nose, and eyes were formed from the center of the body. By the seventh week, the upper and lower extremities; by the third month, or third and a half, the first hair. Out of the male element the bones, sinews, brain, and white of the eye were produced; while from the female element came the skin, flesh, hair, black of the eye, etc.; but God gave the soul. Menstruation in children was known, although it is of rare occurrence.

Therapeutics. — Besides certain drugs, magic was employed. Any thing that a patient specially craved to eat he was given. Other dietetic rules were, before the fortieth year, eat more, after that, drink more; after meals, eat salt; after wine, take water; not too much working, walking, sleeping, loving, or drinking; regular stool; frequent baths, anointings, and washings. They gave onions for worms, wine and pepper against vomiting, a drop of cold water into the eye in the morning, quinines; was appointed preacher in his native place, superintendent of Naumburg in 1536, of Bruns-}
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MEDER, Nikolaus, b. at Hof, in Voigtland, 1502; d. at Bernburg, Aug. 24, 1551. He studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg, and established a school at Egger, but caused pregnancies and abortions because he taught his pupils Luther's doctrines; was appointed preacher in his native place, but had to leave because his preaching was too sharp; lived several years in Wittenberg as chaplain to the wife of the landlord; by the seventh month, the upper and lower extremities; by the third month, or third and a half, the first hair. Out of the male element the bones, sinews, brain, and white of the eye were produced; while from the female element came the skin, flesh, hair, black of the eye, etc.; but God gave the soul. Menstruation in children was known, although it is of rare occurrence.

Therapeutics. — Besides certain drugs, magic was employed. Any thing that a patient specially craved to eat he was given. Other dietetic rules were, before the fortieth year, eat more, after that, drink more; after meals, eat salt; after wine, take water; not too much working, walking, sleeping, loving, or drinking; regular stool; frequent baths, anointings, and washings. They gave onions for worms, wine and pepper against vomiting, a drop of cold water into the eye in the morning, quinines; was appointed preacher in his native place, superintendent of Naumburg in 1536, of Bruns-
1649 to his death he was pastor of the Dutch Church in New Amsterdam (New York). His zeal led him into intercourse with Lutherans and Independents. His valuable *Short Account of the Mohawk Indians, their Country, Language, Figure, Costume, Religion, and Government*, written originally in Dutch, and published in Holland without his consent (1651), will be found translated in *Hist. Coll. State of New York*, vol. iii.

**MEGIDDO** (see *Megiddo*), a city of Manasseh, yet situated within the borders of Issachar. Before the conquest it was a royal city of Canaan (Josh. xii. 21).

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

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

**MEKHITARISTS, The**, form one of the noblest congregations of the Roman-Catholic Church, and have developed a literary activity which may fairly be compared to that of the Congregation of St. Maur. They received their name from the founder of the order, Mekhitar, b. at Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia, Feb. 7, 1760; d. in Venice, April 27, 1749. In his fourteenth year he entered the monastery of the Holy Cross near his native place, and afterwards he studied the Scriptures and the Fathers in the monastery of Edshmiazin, the residence of the Armenian patriarch, and the seat of Armenian learning. He had heard, however, of Europe and Rome, and he longed to go there. In 1685 he actually set out on the voyage. At Aleppo, where he stayed for some time, he became acquainted with the Jesuit missionary Antoine Beauvilliers. But in Cyprus he was overtaken by a violent fever, which compelled him to give up the undertaking, and return to Sebaste. In 1690 he was ordained priest; and the great object to which he had decided to devote his life — the moral and religious education of his countrymen, and the reconciliation of the Armenian and the Roman-Catholic church — he immediately began to labor for by gathering pupils, and training missionaries. In 1700 he went to Constantinople; and his learning, as well as his great gifts as a preacher, soon secured for him a considerable influence among his countrymen. But, when it was discovered that he was making propaganda for a union between the Armenian and the Roman-Catholic church, persecutions began, and he was compelled to seek refuge with the French ambassador. Morea, at that time in the possession of the republic of Venice, was pointed out to him as the place best suited for such a missionary establishment as he intended to found; and in 1705 he settled at Modon, under the protection of the republic. In 1706 the monastery, church, and school were built, and filled with Armenian youths. In 1712 the order he established was confirmed by Pope Clement XI. But shortly after Morea was conquered by the Turks, and the whole establishment had to be removed with great loss to Venice in 1715. The city council, however, presented the order with the Island of San Lazaro; and, before Mekhitar died, not only were a monastery and a church erected there, but a school and a printing-press were in active operation, and the whole establishment was in the most flourishing condition. Besides a number of hymns which date back to his early youth, but which are still used in the Armenian Church, Mekhitar published an Armenian grammar and dictionary, commentaries on several books of the Bible, a text-book in religion for children, and a complete translation of the Bible. His pupils followed his method with decided success. The Mekhitarists have put themselves in possession of most civilized languages; and while, on the one side, they publish translations into Armenian of European literature, and make their countrymen acquainted with the ideas and methods of modern civilization, on the other side, also publish critical editions of the old Armenian literature, whereby they have made known to the world many classical works which exist only in Armenian translations, such as the works of Ephraem Syrus, the *De providentia* of Philo, the Chronicle of Eusebius, etc. In material respect the order has also prospered. It has received great donations; and the mother institution of San Lazaro has been able to establish branches in every place in Europe where Armenians are settled, especially in Vienna.


**MELANCHTHON, Philipp**, the eminent co-laborer of Luther in the German Reformation; b. at Bréten in Basse, March 7, 1497; d. in Tubingen, April 19, 1560. His original name was Schwarzerd ("black earth"), which, after the custom of the times, and on the advice of his great-uncle Reuchlin, the famous scholar and humanist, he exchanged for its Greek equivalent, Melanchthon. After the year 1531, the Reformer wrote his name Melanthion (*Corpus Reform.*, i. p. xxxi), with a view, probably, to facilitate the pronunciation. In 1597 he entered the Latin school at Pforzheim, the residence of his grandmother, where he came into close contact with Reuchlin. In 1599 he passed to the university of Heidelberg, where he gave himself up assiduously to private studies, and in 1511 took the bachelor's degree. Being refused the following year the degree of master, on account of his youth, and in spite of his attainments, he went to the university of Tubingen, where he devoted himself, not only to the study of philosophy and the humanistic culture (*humaniora*), but to law, astronomy, and medicine. In 1514 he took the master's degree, and began the study of theology. He continued at Tubingen, put forth editions of Terence (1519) and his Greek grammar (1518), and was engaged as proof-reader for a time in the printing-establishment of Anshelm. He also wrote the preface of the *Epistles clavorum virorum* (1614).
Melanchthon, the atvice of Reuchlin, refused calls to Ingolstadt and Leipzig, but accepted the invitation to the chair of Greek in the university of Wittenberg, for which Reuchlin had recommended him. Arriving in Wittenberg Aug. 25, 1518, he delivered his inaugural on the necessity of a change in the course of academic studies (De corrigendis adolescenti studiiis), in which it is apparent that he hoped to effect a reformation within the Church through the instrumentality of literary culture. But the influence of Luther led him to a deeper study of the Scriptures; and the religious discussion at Leipzig in 1519—at which he says he was an "idle spectator" (otiosus spectator), but really aided Luther—contributed to interest him more profoundly in theological questions, and to strengthen the friendship between Luther and himself. A letter to Ecolampadius, which was published, incited Eck against him. In his reply to Eck (Defensio adv. Eoctianam inculpationem), he emphasized the authority of Scripture. His theological attainments were acknowledged by the gift of the degree of bachelor of theology. The dean of the university of Erfurt conferred on him this degree; but he refused it, urging that it ought to be sought in a reverential spirit, and conferred with great care (Corpus Reform., iv. p. 811). In 1520 he was married to Catharine Krapp, a daughter of the mayor of Wittenberg. In 1521 he was approached by the papal legate Campegius, urging him to renounce the Reformed doctrines. Melanchthon, who was then only a minor, was invited to prepare a plan of instruction for the Church's schools, and was commissioned to prepare a statement of the Lutheran teachings (Summa doctrinae Lutheri). In 1522 he was advanced to a theological professorship, and continued in Wittenberg during the remainder of his life, in spite of calls to Nurnberg, Tubingen (1534), to France, etc. In 1527 he took part in the visitation of the churches and schools, and was commissioned to prepare a plan of instructions for the visitors to the clergy. This work (Unterricht der Visitanten an die Pfarrherrn, 1528) was cordially approved by Luther, who, however, inserted some "nails and lances against the papal hierarchy, as Melanchthon was too mild" (Luther's Briefe, De Wette, iii. No. 906). The year 1529 is important, both in the history of the Reformation and the life of Melanchthon, on account of the Diet of Spire and the conference at Marburg. Melanchthon was present at both, counselling, at Spires, against any condemnation of the Swiss Reformers before giving them an opportunity to be heard, but at Marburg, where he took little part, willing to break off fraternal relations with the Swiss.

The year 1530 forms an epoch in the history of the Reformation. It was the year of the Diet of Augsburg, and the composition of the Augsburg Confession (Confessio Augustana). See art. Augsburg Confession. Melanchthon was commissioned by the elector to prepare a statement of the articles in dispute between the emperor and the Protestants. He developed in its stead an apology of the Protestant faith, by proving it to be in agreement with the Scriptures and with the writings of the early Fathers. Luther, who remained at Coburg, approved the document as sent by Melanchthon. This first confession of Protestantism is indebted to Melanchthon for its peaceful and irenic tone, and its clear and simple terminology. It followed the stricter doctrines of Luther, as is apparent from Art. X., — which concerns the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and in regard to which Melanchthon himself wrote (June 26, 1530), “The article concerning the Lord's Supper follows the views of Luther” (juxta sententiam Lutheri, Corpus Reform., ii. 142), as also from the change which Melanchthon himself made in this article in 1540 (the so-called Augs. code Ward upon him); but he refused it, urging that it ought to be sought in a reverential spirit, and conferred with great care (Corpus Reform., iv. p. 811). In 1552 he was married to Catharine Krapp, a daughter of the mayor of Wittenberg. In 1521 he stood forth as the champion of Luther, in a tract signed Dylmus Faenustinus, declaring that he had not renounced true Christianity, but had only denounced the abuses of the Pope and the Church. In this same year (December, 1521) Melanchthon published the first system of theology of the Reformation, under the title, Loci communes rerum theologicarum, seu Hypotyposeos theologicae. His next years were occupied largely with the German translation of the Bible (in which he was associated with Luther), and in the publication of commentaries. In 1524 he took a journey to Southern Germany in the interests of his health, and was approached by the papal legate Campegius, urging him to renounce the Reformed doctrines. Melanchthon, who was then only a minor, was invited to prepare a plan of instruction for the Lutheran churches, and was commissioned to prepare a plan of instructions for the visitors to the clergy. This work (Unterricht der Visitanten an die Pfarrherrn, 1528) was cordially approved by Luther, who, however, inserted some "nails and lances against the papal hierarchy, as Melanchthon was too mild" (Luther's Briefe, De Wette, iii. No. 906). The year 1530 is important, both in the history of the Reformation and the life of Melanchthon, on account of the Diet of Spiers and the conference at Marburg. Melanchthon was present at both, counselling, at Spires, against any condemnation of the Swiss Reformers before giving them an opportunity to be heard, but at Marburg, where he took little part, willing to break off fraternal relations with the Swiss.

For several years after the Diet of Augsburg, Melanchthon performed his academic duties in comparative retirement. The most important theological work of this period was his Commentary on Rom., 1534 (Corpus Reform., ii. p. 862). He fully approved of the Form of Concord sent to him by Bucer, and met with him by appointment at Cassel, 1534, to discuss the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He departed, in consequence of this discussion and previous studies, farther and farther from the views of Luther, and distinctly calls himself, at Cassel, a representative of other views (Corpus Reform., ii. p. 862). At a later period, Luther suspected him of leanings to the Zwinglian theory, but added that he would, in spite of this, "share his heart with Melanchthon." He was accused (1536) by Cordatus, preacher in Niemcek, of affirming good works to be an indispensable condition of justification; and in 1538, in the second great edition of his Loci, he had departed farther from the Augustinian views, and emphasized his so-called Synergism. But, in a letter to Luther and his other colleagues, he says, “I never have wished to teach, nor have I taught, any thing about this controversy (good works) than that which you in common teach.” (Corpus Reform., iii. 150). These discussions and differences imibited his stay in Wittenberg during the years 1536 to 1538;
so that he compares himself to Prometheus bound to Cannabis (Corpus Reform., iii. p. 906). About this time occurred the notorious case of the double marriage of Philip of Hesse. Melanchthon, as well as Luther (see Luther), regarded this an exceptional case, was present at the marriage, and urged Philip to keep the matter a secret. When it was made public, and Melanchthon was informed of it, he was so overcome with regret, and pangs of conscience, that he sickened unto death, and was only delivered by the heroic courage of Luther in prayer, and the influence of his powerful will. In October, 1540, he was present at the religious conference in Worms, and determined to be less sparing of the Papists than he had been in 1530 at Augsburg. The conference was afterwards adjourned to Regensburg (1541), and was followed by the Regensburg Interim. In 1548 he came into conflict with Luther by the definition in the statement prepared by Bucer and himself for the Reformation party in Cologne. Luther spoke out his feelings of disapprobation from the pulpit, and even went so far as to say that Melanchthon ought to be banished from Wittenberg. Luther's tract against the Swiss Reformers (Kurze Bedenken, etc.) of the year 1544 contains no disparaging references to Melanchthon. The relations, however, between these Reformers henceforth took the old freedom and confidence. But Luther's death (Feb. 18, 1546) overwhelmed Melanchthon; and in his memorial address before the university (Feb. 22), while hearty references to their friendship are lacking, he dilates at length upon Luther's great services to the Church, and counte with Isaiah, John the Baptist, Paul, and Augustine, among the elect witnesses and leaders of the kingdom of God on earth. The last eventful and also sorrowful period of his life began with the Interim and Adiaphoristic controversies in 1547. In the case of the Augsburg Interim, and especially of the Leipzig Interim, Melanchthon admitted that many Roman-Catholic customs belonged to the adiaphora, that is, were matters indifferent in their nature, and came into conflict with Flacius and other Lutheran divines. He continued, however, now that Luther was dead, to be the "theological leader of the German Reformation" (Nitzsch), but not the undisputed leader; for Flacius Ilyricus, at the head of a more strict school of Lutheran theology and practice, accused him of erroneous teaching. He was also brought into conflict (after 1548), about the doctrine of justification, with Andreas Osiander, who had denounced the forensic view. These attacks, from which personal abuse was not wanting, wore upon his sensitive mind; but he bore them with great patience, and wrote letters conceived not only a new spirit to his opponent but also to his friend Peucer, his son-in-law, and most others, hold that he, in the later period of his life, regarded the participation of Christ's body and blood as a figurative expression for the union with Christ. He undoubtedly gave up, after 1544, the idea of a physical union of the body and bread (physica conjunctio corporis et panis), and quotes approvingly the words of Macarius, that they who partake of the bread "eat spiritually the flesh of the Lord" (καρπος και λαβειν, Corp. Reform., ix. 1046). Above all, he made prominent the union with Christ and the mystical body; but he always seems to represent this as mediated by a carnal impartation by Christ of himself. But, in considering his views of the Lord's Supper, we must not forget his bias for union, and how far he was willing to go in the modification of his views in order to promote it. A few days before his death he wrote down his reasons for not fearing death. On the left hand of that paper were the words, "Thou shalt be delivered from sins, and be freed from the academy and fury of theologians;" on the right, "Thou shalt go to the light, see God, look upon his Son, learn those wonderful mysteries which thou hast not been able to understand in this life," etc. He contracted a severe cold on a journey to Leipzig, which brought an intermittent fever. His last hours were spent in prayer, and listening to passages of Scripture, especially Ps. xxiv.-xxvi., Isa. liii., John i., xvii., and Rom. v. Especially significant did the words seem to him, "His own received him; as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God" (John i. 11, 12). When Peucer asked him whether there was any thing else he wanted, he replied, "Nothing but heaven." His body was laid at the side of Luther, in the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg. In estimating Melanchthon's influence we naturally think, first of all, of his share in developing the interests of the Protestant Church. As the colleague of Luther, he was especially called to confirm and carry on the work of the Reformation
upon the basis which Luther had laid. Providence joined these two men, so opposite in their natures, together in one great work, because they complemented each other. It required the heroism and creative power of a Luther to break with the ruling church. Melanchthon himself was led by “faith into labor, and bold and military nature.” He shrank from public activity, and would have preferred to confine himself to an academic and literary career. Without Luther, as Nietzsche has said, he would have “become and remained a second Erasmus”; although his deeper religious nature would have given him a more vital interest in the Reformation. He is continually longing for the retirement of a literary life, exclaiming, as early as 1529, “Oh, happy they who abstain from public affairs!” (Corp. Reform., i. 106). But it was essential that he should aid in the public work of the Reformation, and bring into use these very literary talents. If Luther scattered the sparks among the masses, it remained for Melanchthon by his logical and systematic writings, comparing the Protestant faith with the Catholic, to scatter the sparks among the cultured and learned, for the cause of the Reformation. Melanchthon’s moderation and conservative tendency were, in general, as necessary, in their place, to the success of the German Reformation, as were Luther’s heroism of faith, and bold and military nature. Only Luther could have written the Ninety-Five Theses, the book addressed to the nobles of the German nation, etc., and have made the bold confession before the emperor at Worms; but Melanchthon had to write the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Loci Communes. These two men fully understood their own capabilities and the talents of each other. In 1520 Melanchthon writes (Corp. Reform., i. 160), “I will rather die than be born from Luther.” Luther he compares to Elijah (Corp. Reform., i. 448), and calls him “the man full of the Holy Ghost” (Corp. Reform., i. 282). In spite of the coldness which grew up between them in the last years of Luther’s life, Melanchthon exclaims at Luther’s death “the horseman and chariot of Israel who ruled the Church in this last age of the world” (Corp. Reform., vi. 59). On the other hand, Luther wrote of Melanchthon, in the Preface to Melanchthon’s Commentary on the Colossians (1529), “I was bound to fight with rabble and devils, for which reason my books are very belligerent. I am the rough pioneer, who must break road; but Master Philip comes along softly and gently, sows and waters heartily, since God has richly endowed him with gifts.” A year before his death, Luther, in the Preface to his own works, praises Melanchthon’s Loci above them, and calls him an instrument of God who had accomplished the very best in the department of theology, to the great rage of the Devil (Henze: D. Verhältniss Luthers u. Melanchthons, 1880). In the last years of his life, although Luther was opposed to Melanchthon’s views on the Lord’s Supper and other questions, he controlled his feelings, and never said any thing harsh against him. In their relations it cannot be denied that Luther was the more magnanimous, never once uttering a suspicion against Melanchthon’s personal character; while Melanchthon did express now and then a want of confidence in Luther’s. The latter, however, is to be explained by the fact that Melanchthon was the weaker nature, and at times felt the dominating personality of Luther to press like a yoke.

It is Melanchthon’s moderation, conscientious prudence, and love of peace, which merit our respect for him as a Reformer. Nothing is easier than to be dazzled by the lightning and thunder of Luther’s strong mind and personality. Melanchthon’s moderation and caution were often, during his lifetime and after his death, explained as fear, and want of courage and character. But, if there is much to make such a view plausible, we must remember that he was always thinking more of the welfare of the Church than of his own. Nor did he lack in personal fortitude; and it is related how, a few years before his death, he dashed into a crowd of noisy students with a drawn dagger, in order to restore peace. In fact, it required no little courage to practise a cool moderation when all was in haste, especially in view of the calumnies of the Catholic party. But his courage was not only princes, but also a large number of the cultured and learned, for the cause of Christ and God himself. For that reason, I am a bare spectator. If we fall, Christ will likewise fall; and, if he fall, I would rather fall with Christ than stand with the emperor.”

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

The literary talents and learning of Melanchthon were very great. His works betray an excellent gift of observation, a healthy though not always profound judgment, fine aesthetic tastes, and a happy memory. To these gifts he added an assiduous eagerness to get knowledge, and facility in the use of his language... His style was marked by clearness, vivacity, and a simple
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elegance. In Latin he was a master, and even in Greek he expressed himself with more elegance than in German. Melanchthon exercised as great an influence upon the culture of the time through his academic activity as by his writings. His lectures were attended by throngs of hearers. Heerbrand says there were two thousand, and, among these, princes, counts, barons, etc. He was fitly called the Praeceptor Germaniae ("teacher of Germany").

As a theologian, Melanchthon appears not only as the theological co-reformer, but as the leader of the German Reformation. He wrote the first Protestant work of systematic theology. Melanchthon's was not an original, creative mind, but predominantly receptive. In his Loci he sought to give the theological and religious results of the Reformation, and pursued the dialectic rather than speculative method, making accurate definitions, clear divisions, etc. It was also his aim to make prominent the practical truths of the gospel in opposition to the theoretical and speculative. It was as the author of the Loci that his influence continued for five years after his death. In the first edition of the Loci (1521) he follows closely the Epistle to the Romans in his delineation of the fundamental doctrines of sin and grace. Twelve years intervened between the first edition of the Loci and its revision by its author in 1533. The first German translation was made by Spalatin (1522), and a second (1538) and third by Justus Jonas. He insists upon his doctrinal agreement with Luther, and does, in fact, agree with him in making all prominent the doctrine of salvation by faith in Christ. But the Melanchthonian system modified, and in some points developed, Luther's system. It had a wide influence in the department of homiletics, and has been regarded as the author, in the Protestant Church, of the methodical style of preaching which follows a subject. He himself keeps entirely aloof from all mere dogmatizing or rhetoric in the Annotationes in Evangelium Mathaei (1558), and his German sermons prepared for George of Anhalt. He never preached from the pulpit, never having been ordained; and his Latin sermons (postilla) were prepared for the Hungarian students at Wittenberg, who did not understand German. [By his De Rhetorica (1519) and De Officiis Concinatoris (1385), he exerted a profound influence upon the writers on rhetoric who followed him. See art. Homiletics.]

In the department of philology and pedagogy Melanchthon's influence was also very great. He has been called Praeceptor Germaniae. He laid great stress upon classical studies, and, by urging the study of the classic languages and models, became the founder of the learned schools of Germany. He advocated the close and necessary conjunction of the school and the church; the school being a nursery, or forecourt, of the church. He was, in fact, the most active representative of the union of the evangelical church and the new culture. [He put forth editions of many classic authors, and published Greek and Latin grammars, which held their places in German schools for two centuries.]

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

The opinions of Melanchthon's character and work have undergone radical changes since his death. One would deem it incredible, if it were not well authenticated, that, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, Leonard Hutter, in a public discussion at Wittenberg at which Melanchthon's authority was appealed to, tore down a picture of the Reformer, which was hanging on the wall, and in the sight of the audience trampled it under foot. For more than a hundred years after that, few voices spoke a word in his favor. In 1760 the anniversary of Melanchthon's death was for the first time celebrated, and from that time a different view began to gain currency. In 1800 the 300th anniversary of Melanchthon's death was observed with much enthusiasm all over Germany; and, in spite of his weaknesses, he will continue to be honored for his positive and not inconsiderable contributions to the Reformation.


MELCHIADÉS, or Miltiades, Pope (July 2, 318-4 Jan. 16th and children), was an African by birth, and buried in the burying place of Callisti. The edict of toleration by Galerius, the occupation of Rome by Constantine, and the edict of toleration by Constantine and Licinius, fall in his time. A letter from Constantine to him, written in Gaul in 313, is found in Eusebius: Hist. Eccl. x. 15, 18. The decrees ascribed to him by the Liber Pontif., and Gratian are spurious.

MELCHITES, in contradistinction to Monophysites, denoted the orthodox Christians living in those provinces of the Roman Empire which were conquered by the Arabs. The name, derived from ἦδος ("king"), referred to their allegiance to the Pope, and that their positions were treated with much more severity by the Arabs than were the Monophysites.

MELCHIZEDEK, the priest of the Most High God, and king of righteousness, is mentioned in Gen. xiv. 17-20, Ps. ex. 4, Heb. vii. 14. He met Abraham after his victory over the kings, and offered him bread and wine, and blessed him. Receiving a tithe of the spoil from Abraham, he returned again into retirement, a true representative of the higher world of peace. We shall consider here his city, his God, and his priesthood.

The Salem of which Melchizedek was king (Gen. xiv. 18) has been identified with a city called Salem, or Salumias, which Jerome states was close by Scythopolis. He further states that Melchizedek's palace was shown there (Ep. ad Ecgr.). Whithby, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek, Alford, Ewald, and others have adopted this view, and refer to Salim (John iii. 29). It is better to identify it with Jerusalem. In Ps. lixxvi. 2, where the word occurs again as the designation of a place, it stands for Jerusalem. Its meaning, peaceful, made it an appropriate name for the city. The analogy between the names Melchizedek and Adonizek, the king of Jebus (the old name of Jerusalem) in the time of Joshua (Josh. x. 1), also favors this view. Abraham would naturally have taken the road by the city in returning to Hebron. The Targunis, Josephus, Jerome, at first (Quart. in Gen.), and most of modern critics, adopt this view.

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

Melchizedek was a priest not merely by virtue of his being the head of a family, but as being a prince; all princes, according to the ancient Phoenician custom, exercising the functions of the priesthood. In him as its representative, the older and purer Canaanitish religion offered the hand to the representative of the new Hebrew religion, and acknowledged his own and his people's salvation in the God of Abraham, who recognized him as a priest, and could not resist themselves. This foreigner, Melchizedek, subsequently became the ideal priest in the eyes of Israel (Ps. ex. 4); and the Epistle to the Hebrews finds in Christ his true antitype. Origen and Didymus regarded Melchizedek as an angel, because the Hebrews represent him as without pedigree. Hierakas regarded him as an incarnation of the Holy Spirit, and the sect of
the Melchizedekites as the incarnation of a power superior to Christ (App. ad Tert. de prescrip., c. 53; Epiph., Her., 35). Another opinion held by the Targums, the most of the rabbins, Jerome, Luther, Melanchthon, [Hugh Broughton, Selden, Lightfoot, Jackson], is that he was Shem, who seems, according to the chroniclers, to have survived Abraham's entrance into Canaan a hundred and twenty-five years. Others have advocated the view that he was Ham, or Japhet, or even Enoch. (Comp. Deyling: Observat. ii. p. 71 sqq.) Our best point of departure for ascertaining the person of Melchizedek is the name of Adonizek. The latter was a Jebusite (Josch. x. 5, 6), and we may conclude that the former was so likewise. [See H. Broughton: Treatise of Melchizedek, 1591; Gaillard: Melchisedecus Christianus, etc., 1898; Borgius: Hist. Crit. Melchisedecit, 1708; Jackson: On the Creed (book ix. § 2, ch. vi.-xi.); and the Commentaries on Gen. xiv. 18-20, and Hebrews vii.] F. W. Schultz.

MELDIENIUS, Rupertus, is the name of the author of the Patresnesis voicae, pro pace Ecclesia, and legem pacis. The book, which, though superior to Christ (App. ad Tert. de prascrip., c. 53), has been preserved by Epiphanius, or at least to unite all the anti-Arians into one camp. But, before the emissaries of the synod reached Antioch, Lucifer of Calaris had consecrated Paulinus bishop; and, as he was recognized by Athanasius and by Rome, the schism became fully established. Under Julian, Meletius returned to his see; and the great personal reputation he enjoyed, as well as his intimate connection with Basil and the two Gregories, gave to his party a paramount importance. A reconciliation did not therefore, which appeared improbable,

MELETIAN SCHISM. See next two articles.

MELETIUS OF ANTIoch and the Meletian Schism. In 368, Bishop Eudoxius of Antioch removed to Constantinople, as the successor of the deposed Macedonius, Meletius (who had previously been bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, but in 367 died in retirement at Beroea in Syria) was elected bishop of Antioch on the supposition that he belonged to the Arian party. This proved a mistake, however. A sermon which he delivered shortly after his election, and which has been preserved by Epiphanius (Her. 73, 29), revealed to the congregation, that, though he was not an adherent of Athanasius in the strict sense of the word, he was decidedly antagonistic to Arianism. The discovery caused great commotion. Meletius was banished by the emperor; but Eudoxius, a full-blooded Arian, was appointed bishop. Nevertheless, a large portion of the congregation, holding the same views as Meletius, remained true to him; and thus the church of Antioch became split into three parties, the Eustathians, who, under the leadership of the desec Paulinus, lived in a quiet and retired manner, accused of Sabellianism by the two other parties, but acknowledged by Athanasius as the true church; the Arians, who enjoyed the support of the court; and the Meletians, who formed a rapidly growing middle party between those two extremes. A synod of Alexandria, presided over by Athanasius, undertook in 382 to bring order into the disturbed affairs of the church of Antioch, or at least to unite all the anti-Arians into one camp. But, before the emissaries of the synod reached Antioch, Lucifer of Calaris had consecrated Paulinus bishop; and, as he was recognized by Athanasius and by Rome, the schism became fully established. Under Julian, Meletius returned to his see; and the great personal reputation he enjoyed, as well as his intimate connection with Basil and the two Gregories, gave to his party a paramount importance. A reconciliation did not therefore, which appeared improbable,

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

MELETIUS OF LYCOPOLIS and the Meletian Schism in Egypt. During the persecution of Diocletian it came to an open breach between
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, and Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, a city in the province of Thebais. They held different views with respect to the re-admission of the lapsi. According to the penitential writing of Peter, which the Greek Church has incorporated with the Epitola Canonicoe, and which is found in Routh, Relig. Sacr., iv. 23, he recommended mildness and forbearance; while Meletius protested that no lapsus could be re-admitted until after full penance; that an ecclesiastic who had fallen should be degraded, etc. To this difference of views may be added a feeling of jealousy; the Bishop of Alexandria having at that period begun to exercise a kind of authority over the rest of the Egyptian Church, which was vehemently opposed by the other Egyptian bishops, especially by Meletius. The dissension broke out while the two bishops were still in prison; and when Meletius, after his release, undertook to ordain presbyters and deacons outside of his own diocese, the bishops whose jurisdiction was violated were in prison, and everywhere tried to enforce his views with respect to the lapsi, Peter felt utterly provoked, cancelled all his ordinations, and even deposed him from his see. The Council of Nicea, 325, intervened. In its famous sixth canon it formally acknowledged and established the supremacy of the Bishop of Alexandria over the Egyptian Church, thereby laying the foundation of the future patriarchate of Alexandria. But in other respects it treated Meletius and his adherents, the Meletians (or, as they called themselves, the "Church of the Martyrs"), with great mildness. His ordinations were recognized, and he himself was continued in office, though under certain restrictions. After this, every thing went on smoothly and quietly until Athanasius became bishop of Alexandria. He regretted the mildness which the Council of Nicea had shown, and employed much harsher measures, the consequence of which was, that the Meletians formally broke off from the church, and formed an independent community of their own. In the following contest between Athanasius on the one side, and the Eusebians and Arians on the other, the latter were always supported by the Meletians; and it took a whole century before the schism was thoroughly healed.

**MELITA.**

**MELITO.**

Melita was the site of the shipwreck of the vessel which was conveying St. Paul as a prisoner to Rome (Acts xxvii.-xxviii. 10). Two islands have had advocates as the ancient spot. — Meleda in the Adriatic; and Malta, sixty miles south of Sicily, in the Mediterranean. It is now generally agreed that the latter was the Melita on which Paul was cast. This is made almost certain by the description the Acts gives of the seas which washed up on the island, the harborage of a grain-ship, and the direction Paul took, by way of Putoecili, on leaving the island, to get to Rome. The subject is thoroughly and interestingly treated by Capt. Smith, in *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, and Dean Howson, in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. "Life of St. Paul," and the *International Revision Commentary on the Acts*-New York, 1882.

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

**MELITO OF SARDES** (Sardis), the only bishop of that place mentioned in the literary monuments of the first three centuries, flourished in the middle of the second century, and acquired great fame by his activity in the church and in literature. Of his numerous works, only fragmentary writing of Peter, which the Greek Church has incorporated with the Epitola Canonicoe, and which is found in Routh, *Relig. Sacr.*, iv. 23, there is ascribed to him another apology, of which a Syrian translation was discovered by Tattam in a monastery in the Nitrian desert, and edited by Cureton, in *Spicil. Sacr.*, and by Pitra-Renan, in *Spicil. S. L.,* it. and iii. There is yet another apology, of which a Syrian translation was discovered by Tattam in a monastery in the Nitrian desert, and edited by Cureton, in *Spicil. Sacr.*, it. and iii. It probably belongs to the latter part of the eleventh century. A sect of Melitonians is probably a later fiction. [For an excellent study of Melito and his writings, see Harnack: *Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristl. Lit.*, Bd i. (Leipzig, 1882), pp. 240-278.]

**MELVILLE, Andrew.**

Andrew, b. at Baldovy, near Montrose, Aug. 1, 1545; d. at Sedan in 1572. He was a "sickly, tender boy." After preliminary training in Latin, Greek, and French, at Montrose, he entered St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, in 1559; and when he left St. Andrews for the Univer-
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University of Paris, in the autumn of 1564, he was called to defend the polity and liberties of the church. Despite the confession of 1581, the Privy Council revived the episcopacy, and laid the liberties of the country at the king's feet. But in 1588, after twenty months' absence, Melville returned with the exiled nobles. Weary of tyranny, their countrymen flocked to their standard, Arran fled, and the king received them into favor. Melville was made a commissioner to the church courts. As he would persevere in opposing episcopacy, and attacking Melville, having fallen into poverty, addressed Melville, who turned a deaf ear to him; but Melville generously supported him several months, as he himself was afterwards aided, when a prisoner in the Tower of London, by Adamson's nephew and Jameson Patrick Simpson. In June, 1592, Melville's labors were crowned with success; Parliament having consented to pass an act ratifying the assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and kirk sessions of the church, and declaring them, with their jurisdiction and discipline, as agreed to by the king, and embodied in the act, to be, in all time coming, "most just, good, and model." This settlement is still the charter of the church of Scotland's liberties.

Contrary to his promise, James persisted in restoring the popish nobles, and put the ministers on their defense, and when called to defend the polity and liberties of the church. Despite the confession of 1581, the privy council revived the regulations recognizing episcopacy, framed at Leith in 1573; and Lennox, one of the king's unworthy favorites, got Montgomery presented to the archbishopric of Glasgow. High-handed procedure by the court was boldly met by the church, and Montgomery was excommunicated. The privy council proclaimed the excommunication null and void, ordered those who refused to pay him the episcopal rents to be imprisoned and laid Glasgow College under a temporary interdict. In his opening sermon before a special meeting of the assembly, Melville inveighed against those who had introduced "the blude gullie of absolute power into the country, and who sought to erect a new popedom in the person of the prince." A remonstrance was drawn up, which he and others presented to the king. In February, 1584, he was summoned before the Privy Council for seditious and treasonable preaching. Conscious of his innocences, and furnished with ample proof, he appeared, and gave account of his sermon. On the council resolving to proceed with the trial, he maintained that he ought to be tried in the first instance by the church courts. As he would neither yield to entreaties nor threats, he was found guilty of declining the judgment of the council, and was sentenced to imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle, and further punishment at the king's pleasure; but he escaped to England.

As the court wished to make James absolute by bringing every cause before the Privy Council, it was necessary to curb the church courts; and accordingly, in 1584, Parliament overthrew presbytery, and laid the liberties of the country at the king's feet. But in 1588, after twenty months' absence, Melville returned with the exiled nobles. Weary of tyranny, their countrymen flocked to their standard, Arran fled, and the king received them into favor. Melville was made a commissioner to the church courts. As he would persevere in opposing episcopacy, and attacking Melville, having fallen into poverty, addressed Melville, who turned a deaf ear to him; but Melville generously supported him several months, as he himself was afterwards aided, when a prisoner in the Tower of London, by Adamson's nephew and Jameson Patrick Simpson. In June, 1592, Melville's labors were crowned with success; Parliament having consented to pass an act ratifying the assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and kirk sessions of the church, and declaring them, with their jurisdiction and discipline, as agreed to by the king, and embodied in the act, to be, in all time coming, "most just, good, and model." This settlement is still the charter of the church of Scotland's liberties.

Contrary to his promise, James persisted in restoring the popish nobles, and put the ministers on their defense, and when called to defend the polity and liberties of the church. Despite the confession of 1581, the privy council revived the regulations recognizing episcopacy, framed at Leith in 1573; and Lennox, one of the king's unworthy favorites, got Montgomery presented to the archbishopric of Glasgow. High-handed procedure by the court was boldly met by the church, and Montgomery was excommunicated. The privy council proclaimed the excommunication null and void, ordered those who refused to pay him the episcopal rents to be imprisoned and laid Glasgow College under a temporary interdict. In his opening sermon before a special meeting of the assembly, Melville inveighed against those who had introduced "the blude gullie of absolute power into the country, and who sought to erect a new popedom in the person of the prince." A remonstrance was drawn up, which he and others presented to the king. In February, 1584, he was summoned before the Privy Council for seditious and treasonable preaching. Conscious of his innocences, and furnished with ample proof, he appeared, and gave account of his sermon. On the council resolving to proceed with the trial, he maintained that he ought to be tried in the first instance by the church courts. As he would neither yield to entreaties nor threats, he was found guilty of declining the judgment of the council, and was sentenced to imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle, and further punishment at the king's pleasure; but he escaped to England.

As the court wished to make James absolute by bringing every cause before the Privy Council, it was necessary to curb the church courts; and accordingly, in 1584, Parliament overthrew presbytery, and laid the liberties of the country at the king's feet. But in 1588, after twenty months' absence, Melville returned with the exiled nobles. Weary of tyranny, their countrymen flocked to their standard, Arran fled, and the king received them into favor. Melville was made a commissioner to the church courts. As he would persevere in opposing episcopacy, and attacking Melville, having fallen into poverty, addressed Melville, who turned a deaf ear to him; but Melville generously supported him several months, as he himself was afterwards aided, when a prisoner in the Tower of London, by Adamson's nephew and Jameson Patrick Simpson. In June, 1592, Melville's labors were crowned with success; Parliament having consented to pass an act ratifying the assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and kirk sessions of the church, and declaring them, with their jurisdiction and discipline, as agreed to by the king, and embodied in the act, to be, in all time coming, "most just, good, and model." This settlement is still the charter of the church of Scotland's liberties.

Contrary to his promise, James persisted in restoring the popish nobles, and put the ministers on their defense, and when called to defend the polity and liberties of the church. Despite the confession of 1581, the privy council revived the regulations recognizing episcopacy, framed at Leith in 1573; and Lennox, one of the king's unworthy favorites, got Montgomery presented to the archbishopric of Glasgow. High-handed procedure by the court was boldly met by the church, and Montgomery was excommunicated. The privy council proclaimed the excommunication null and void, ordered those who refused to pay him the episcopal rents to be imprisoned and laid Glasgow College under a temporary interdict. In his opening sermon before a special meeting of the assembly, Melville inveighed against those who had introduced "the blude gullie of absolute power into the country, and who sought to erect a new popedom in the person of the prince." A remonstrance was drawn up, which he and others presented to the king. In February, 1584, he was summoned before the Privy Council for seditious and treasonable preaching. Conscious of his innocences, and furnished with ample proof, he appeared, and gave account of his sermon. On the council resolving to proceed with the trial, he maintained that he ought to be tried in the first instance by the church courts. As he would neither yield to entreaties nor threats, he was found guilty of declining the judgment of the council, and was sentenced to imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle, and further punishment at the king's pleasure; but he escaped to England.
church affairs was "the needle which drew in the episcopal thread." In 1597 Melville was deprived of the rectorship of St. Andrew's University, after holding it seven years. To get rid of his opposition in the university, all doctors teaching theology or philosophy, not being pastors, were forbidden to sit in sessions, presbyteries, synods, or the assembly, under pain of deprivation and rebellion. Prelacy was soon declared the third estate of the realm; and, when the assembly met, the king would not allow it to proceed until Melville retired; and ultimately he was forced to quit the town. James protested that he did not intend to restore bishops, but only wished some of the wisest ministers, as commissioners of the Kirk, to have a place in the Privy Council and Parliament to judge in their own affairs. To this the assembly by a small majority agreed. The king would not permit Melville to sit in the assembly of 1600, and, by acceding to many caustions, he induced the members to comply with his plan. When the Scotch Parliament restored the bishops to their ancient privileges, in 1606, Melville, who was sent by St. Andrew's presbytery, protested. As the bishops had as yet no spiritual power, Melville and other seven ministers were summoned to London, nominally to confer with the king on church affairs, really to deprive their brethren of their aid and council in opposing the changes contemplated. The English nobles were astonished at Melville's talents and courage. On a highly ritualistic service which he had been made to perform on the king's birthday, he wrote a Latin epigram, which one of the court spies, set to watch him, conveyed to the king. For this Melville was tried by the English Privy Council on the 30th of November, and, though he had given out no copy, was found guilty of sedition and high treason. In April he was sent to the Tower, where for ten months he was treated with great severity. Pen, ink, and paper were taken from him; and none saw him save the person who brought his food. But his spirit was free and unbroken, and he covered the walls of his cell with verses beautifully engraved with the tongue of his shoe-buckle. By means of packed assemblies and bribery, prelacy was established with Tilenus the professorship of divinity. There were eagerness to have Melville as professor of divinity in St. Mary's College. The contest in which he took such a prominent part, not only affected the government of the church, but also the cause of civil and religious liberty. "Scotland," says his nephew James, "never received a greater benefit at the hands of God than this man." If it, says Dr. McRie, "the love of pure religion, rational liberty, and polite letters, forms the basis of national virtue and happiness, I know no individual, after her Reformer, from whom Scotland has received greater benefits, and to whom she owes a deeper debt of gratitude and respect, than Andrew Melville. He was full of spirit, vigorous and chivalrous, quick-tempered but kindly, of great and varied learning, but more of a scholar than a popular orator. His chief work was in the universities and church courts, rather than in the pulpit; and that, perhaps, was the reason why, with all his influence among his brethren, he never gained such sway over the nobles and people as Knox and Henderson attained. The hard measure meted out to him by King James was one of the greatest blots on his reign.

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

D. HAY FLEMING (of St. Andrews).

MEMPHIS. See Noph.

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

"Dict. Soc. p. s. a. v."

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

MENAHEM (comforter), king of Israel for ten years, 771-760 b.c., usual chronology, or 769-759 according to Ewald (2 Kings xi. 14-30). He came to the throne by the murder of Shallum, who was king for only one month. Under Menahem, Israel's affairs became desperate, as Hoses (in chaps. iv.-xiv.), Isaiah (x. 10, xi. 1-10) abundantly prove. It was then that the first invasion of Assyrians took place. Pul (Tiglath-pileser) the invader was, however, bought off by 1,000 talents of silver (about $1,642,000). With this biblical statement tallies the Assyrian inscriptions which speak of Menahem (or, as they call him, Minhimmi Samirinai) as tributary to Tiglath-pileser. Menahem's reign opened with an act of awful cruelty,— the massacre of the
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MENANDER, one of the oldest Gnostics, was, according to Justin (Apolog., i. 26), born at Capparatais, a village in Samaria, and taught in Antioch. According to Euting, Stuttg., 1867, he was a pupil of Simon Magus, and the teacher of Saturninus, Satuvitus, and Basildes, thus forming the transition from the Oriental to the Hellenistic Gnosticism. G. UHLBORN.

MENAEANS (properly Mandaeans), or CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN, are an Eastern religious sect, who appear to reject some New-Testament features, tainted, however, with Jewish, and even Parsie, elements. They derive their name from Mandā ("gnosis"; hence Mandayē, "gnostics"). But the Mandā is not the "gnosis" in the abstract, but is a kind of a personified and hypostatized male son, which as the Mandā d'hayyē, or "spirit of life," represents the Mandean mediator and saviour. In public they call themselves Subbōt, i.e., "Baptists," and allow themselves to be regarded as emanations of Mandā. They are mentioned in the Koran. They reside about the cities of Wāsīt and Bābār, and in Chūzistān (the ancient Susiana), on the eastern shore of the Tigris. On account of their veneration of John the Baptist, they were also called "Christians of St. John." The first knowledge of these Christians of St. John was brought to Europe by the Carmelite missionary, Ignatius a Jesu, of the seventeenth century, then by the Maronite Abraham Ecchel, and, in another place it is said that Hibi alone is his son, Sit'il his grandson, and Anūs his great-grandson. Hibi, the most important among them, is almost equally venerated with the Mandā de-Chayē, receives the same names, and is often confounded with him. If Mandā is the Christ, Hibi is the Jesus Christ, of the Mandaeans, whom the Mandaeans, their Christ, after whom they called themselves "Mendaeans." The "second life" attempted to usurp the place of the "first life," and was on that account exiled from the pure ether into the world of light, being separated from it by the Hephexey mayē, i.e., "water-canal." But the "spirit of life" remains with the "first life," or rather the Mandā rabbā, whose "beloved son," he is styled, also "good shepherd," "high priest," "word of life.") He revealed himself, however, to humanity in his three sons, who are also called his brothers, — Hibi, Siti, and Anūs (Abel, Seth, and Enoch). In another place it is said that Hibi alone is his son, Siti his grandson, and Anūs his great-grandson. Hibi, the most important among them, is almost equally venerated with the Mandā de-Chayē, receives the same names, and is often confounded with him. If Mandā is the Christ, Hibi is the Jesus Christ, of the Mandaeans. Among the Uthre ("angels") who emanated from the "second life," is the Hayyē ṭūdēyē ("the third life"), the first and most prominent of the Uthre, often also called Abūtēr, i.e., "father of the Uthre," or "the Ancient," or the hidden one, "the watchman." He sits at the limit of the world of light, where the door leads to the middle and lower regions, and, in a scale which he holds in his hand, he weighs the deeds of the departed as they appear before him to be admitted. Under him there was at the beginning an immense void, and at the bottom of it the troubled, black water, mayē s'yəvä. As he looked down, and saw his image reflected in it, arose Ptähē, who is also called Gabriel, the son of Abatūr, who retains in part the nature of the dark water from which he proceeded. He receives from his father the mission to build the earth and to create man. This he does, according to some, alone; according to others, with the aid of demons. When he created Adam and Eve, he found himself unable to give them an upright posture, be-
cause the spirit was not in him. Hibil, Sitil, and Anus then interfered, and obtained from Mānā rabbā the spirit, and infused it into man, that he might not worship P'tākhī as his creator. Hībi Zīdē then instructs Adam and Eve concerning the “great mountain of flesh,” and commands the first men, “Take unto yourselves wives, and fill the earth; but after cohabitation wash and cleanse yourselves” (i. 14, 3 sq.). P'tākhī is then exiled from the world of light by his father Abatur, because he had lost his power over the first man, and consigned to a place below, where he is to remain until the day of judgment. He will then be raised up by Hībi Zīva, be baptized, made king of the Uthērē, and will be worshipped.

The nether world consists of four entrances into hell, and three hells. Each of the entrances is governed by a king and queen. Then only comes the real kingdom of darkness, divided into three stories, governed by three old single kings,—Sāūm, “the warrior,” grandson of darkness; Gīt, “the Greek,” king of blood; and Rūb, “the reddest,” and mightiest of all, the Sāūm rabbā d'ēsērâ, i.e., the “great mountain of flesh,” and “first-born of darkness.” In the entrances to hell there is yet dirty, slurry water: in the real hell there is none; and Rūb’s kingdom consists only of ashes, dust, and vacancy. In hell and its entrance, there is no longer any brilliancy in fire, but only a consuming power. Hībi Zīva, or Mandā d'ayyē, sustained by the power of Mānā rabbā, descended into it, unravelled the mysteries of the lower regions, took all power from their kings, and closed the door of the different worlds. By subterfuge he brought out Rūchā, daughter of Kin, the queen of darkness, and prevented her return to the nether world. Rūchā is the mother of Ur, i.e., fire, or destroyer, the worst of all devils. When, in his zeal, Ur sought to storm the world of lights, Hībi Zīdē threw him into the black waters, bound, and surrounded with seven iron and seven golden walls. While P'tākhī was occupied in the creation of the world and of man, Rūchā bore first seven, then twelve, and again five, sons to Ur. These twelve sons were by P'tākhī transplanted into the heavens. The first seven are the seven planets, one for each of the seven heavens; the twelve became the signs of the zodiac; the remaining five have not yet been interpreted. The sun, as the greatest of the planets, stands in the central or fourth heaven. The planets are intended to be serviceable to man, but only seek to injure him, and are the source of all evil and wrong upon earth. The seven planets have their Matūrādū, or stations, where they return always, after accomplishing their course in the heavens. They, like the earth, and another world situated in its neighborhood, to the north, rest on anvils which Hībi Zīdē placed on the belly of Ur. The heaven of the Mendaeans consider as built of the purest, clearest water, but so solid that even diamond will not cut it. On this water the planets and other stars are sailing; they are of themselves dark, being evil demons, but are illuminated by brilliant lights carried by the angels. The sun, as the central sun, and the seven heavens as far as the polar star, around which, as the central sun, all the other stars are revolving. Towards it, as to their Kōbā, the Mendaeans turn their face at prayer. The earth they regard as a circle, inclining somewhat to the south, and surrounded on the three sides by the sea. On the north is a great mountain of turquoise, whose top causes the sky to appear blue. On the other side of that mountain is the world of the blessed, a kind of lower paradise, where the Egyptians reside who did not perish at the Red Sea. They are regarded as the ancestors of the Mendaeans, since Pharaoh had been high priest and king of the Mendaeans. Both worlds are surrounded by the Yamā rabbā d'sēfē, i.e., the outer sea.

Man consists of three parts,—the body, or payrâ; the animal soul, or rūkā; and the heavenly soul, or n'semātē.

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

Ethics.—Ethical sentences from the Sīdrā d’Yāhīyā were useful to us to see through the Hierarchy. — There are three different degrees in the priesthood among the Mendaeans: (1)
MENDEAEANS.

MENDICANT ORDERS.

S'kandô, or deacon, to which office he is ordained at the age of nineteen: having served for one year as deacon, he becomes (2) Tarmidô, or priest, presbyter, by the ordination performed through a bishop, with the assistance of two priests. The highest degree is that of (3) Ganziora, i.e., "treasurer," corresponding to our "bishop." Besides these three degrees, there is yet another ecclesiastical dignity similar to that of patriarch or pope, that of the Rish ammâ, who is both the civil and ecclesiastical authority. Women are also allowed to become members of the clergy: they must be virgins at their entrance into the diocese. In order to be raised to the dignity of Tarmidô, they must at once marry a priest of that order, or of a higher. In no case the woman can have a higher title than her husband. The official dress of the priests is pure white. During divine service they wear on the right fore-arm the ttigu, or crown. On the little finger of the right hand the priests wear a gilt, and the bishops a golden, seal-ring, bearing the inscription, sîm jâdar zîwâ, i.e., the name of Yâdîr Zîwâ, i.e., the victorious Hibîl Zîwâ: in the left hand they carry an olive-brancli. They must always be barefooted in exercising their functions. Rites. — The most important of all religious ceremonies is the masba'ta, or baptism, by which they receive children into the communion of God. A second baptism is performed on sundry occasions, and a third during the five days of the festival of baptism. Besides baptism, they have also a Pêkhô, i.e., a kind of Lord's Supper. To assure an entrance into the upper world in case of a sudden death, the bishop reads betimes, for such an event, the masakta, a kind of mass for the departed.

Churches, or mas'c'tenâ, are only for the use of the priests and their assistants; the laymen remaining in the entry. The churches are so small that only a few persons can stand in them. They are built in the vicinity of a flowing water, to be used for baptism. When a church is dedicated, the priests offer up a dove.

Sacred Seasons. — Besides Sunday, they celebrate, (1) The Naurûz rabba, or New-Year's Day, at the change of the Babylonian year; (2) Dehûdâ A'tînâ, or Ascension Day, in commemoration of the return of Hibîl Zîwâ into his realm of light; (3) Marwânâ, in honor of the Egyptians who perished in the Red Sea; (4) Panîshâ, i.e., the five days of baptism, during which time all Mendaeans, male and female, must bathe themselves three times every day in the river, and must wear purely white dresses; (5) Dehûdâ d'âdîmânâ, in honor of one of the three hundred and sixty Uâhrâs; and (6) Kâmshê zahîdâ, or the last day of the year. Besides, they have some m'kûlât, or fast-days.

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

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

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

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

Origin and Home of Mendaeism. — Mendaeism originated in Babylonia, and is descended from the religion of the ancient Babylonians. They are not descendants of the disciples of John the Baptist, though they often speak in their writings of John and of the Jordan. Manichaeism is nearest akin with Mendaeism.


MÉNDELSOHN, Moses, b. at Dessau, Sept. 6, 1729; d. Jan. 4, 1786; descended from a poor Jewish family, and studied the Bible, the Talmud, Maimonides, and afterwards modern languages and literatures, under great privations. In 1750 he became tutor in the family of a rich Jewish manufacturer in Berlin, and in 1754 bookkeeper in the firm. From about the same time date his intimate acquaintance with Lessing, Nicolai, Abbé, etc., and the beginning of his long and varied literary activity. His Phadon, oder Geschichte der Seele (1767), and Morgenstunden (1787), lectures on the existence of God and immortality, procured for him a great name as a philosopher, and were translated into several foreign languages. But his ideas as well as his method are now utterly antiquated. More interest have his controversies with Lavater, who wanted to convert him to Christianity, but completely failed, and with Jacobi, who had accused Lessing of Spinozism. Of lasting merit were his efforts for the elevation, mental and moral, of his co-religionists in Germany, and especially in Berlin. The most complete edition of his works is that by his grandson, Leipzig, 1849-45, 7 vols.

HIS LIFE was written by Samuels, London, 1822, and by Kayserling, Berlin, 1832; and his German writings upon philosophy, aesthetics, and apologetics, were edited by Brusch, Leipzig, 1880, 2 vols.

MENDICANT ORDERS, or BEGGING FRIARS, is the general designation of those monastic orders, which, at least for a time, took their vow of poverty in earnest, and actually lead the life which their alms they received. They were four,—the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, and Augustinian Hermits; but the history of those four orders and their branches shows how soon their poverty became a mere deception, and their beggary a base means of amassing wealth.
MENNIUS was appointed patriarch of Constantinople in 536 by the Emperor Justinian, instead of the Monophysite Antimus, and was the first Eastern patriarch who was consecrated by a Roman pope. But this cordial relation proved fatal to the patriarch. When the Three-Chapter controversy broke out, he sided with the emperor, and the Pope consequently deposed him. Mennas submitted, however, and died shortly after, 582.

MENNO SIMONS. b. at Witmarsum, a village in Friesland, 1492; d. at Oldeslohe in Holstein, Jan. 13, 1599. The dates often met with in German works on the subject (1505-161), and those often met with in Dutch works (1496-1561), are—Uitgang en bekeering van Menno Simons. In 1515 or 1516 Menno was ordained pastor and priest, appointed vicar or sub-pastor at Pingsum, near Witmarsum. He entertained, even at that time, grave doubts with respect to the dogma of transubstantiation; but for a time he tried to drive them away as temptations of the devil. He finally sought refuge with the Bible, which he had hitherto shunned as a dangerous seducer; and the effect of his study was, that he very soon acquired the fame of being an evangelical preacher. In 1581 he was removed as pastor to Witmarsum. In that year the burning at the stake of Sicke Freerkens, for holding Anabaptist views, made a great sensation, and led Menno into investigations which resulted in the firm conviction that neither the New Testament nor the writings of Luther, Butzer, and Bullinger, gave sufficient evidence of the validity of infant baptism. Many were led by his preaching to leave the Roman-Catholic Church; he himself, however, still remained in his office as priest; and when, in 1584, Jan Matthijssoon's book, Van der wreke, was spread over all Friesland, Menno wrote against it, — Bewijs uit de H. Schriften dat J. C. is de rechte beloofde David, etc. Nevertheless, in 1535 a swarm of fanatic Anabaptists forcibly took possession of the monastery Blencamp, and it came to a bloody encounter with the Frisian governor, in which most of the enthusiasts, and among them Menno's own brother, were killed. Jan. 12, 1536, Menno resigned his office, left the Roman-Catholic Church, and began to preach secretly to the brethren who gathered around him, though not so secretly that the Inquisition did not notice it.

In August, 1536, delegates from various Anabaptist congregations assembled at Bockholt in Westphalia. All parties present agreed with respect to the questions of infant baptism, the Lord's Supper, the incarnation of Christ, free-will and grace, etc.; but great dissension prevailed concerning the questions of marriage and the kingdom of heaven. Those from Münster and Batenburg defended polygamy; while the Melchiorites and Obbentites condemned it as adultery, and even
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MENNONITES.

demanded divorce if one of the married couple did not belong to the brethren. Again: the Obbenites tried to resist the general fermentation, and sent six or eight representatives to Menno to induce him to assume the office of "elder" among them. After much hesitation he consented; and he became a blessing to the brethren. Pious and conscientious himself, he demanded the strictest morals in the congregations; and with powerful hand he kept down any outbreak of enthusiasm or fanaticism. From 1537 to 1541 he resided in Groningen; but, when a price was put on his head, he removed first to Amsterdam, then to various places in North Holland, and finally settled at Emden in East Friesland, in 1543, whither he had been invited by John a Lasco in order to hold a public disputation with him on the various Anabaptist issues.

Menno was not an original genius. His doctrinal system was completely borrowed from the brethren. But he was eminently clear (the charge of obscurity is entirely due to the circumstance), and with powerful hand he kept down any outbreak of enthusiasm or fanaticism. From 1537 to 1541 he resided in Groningen; but, when a price was put on his head, he removed first to Amsterdam, then to various places in North Holland, and finally settled at Emden in East Friesland, in 1543, whither he had been invited by John a Lasco in order to hold a public disputation with him on the various Anabaptist issues.

MENNONITES is the name of those evangelical Christians, who with respect to constitution, discipline, baptism, oath, military service, etc., agree with Menno Simons, after whom they are named. In the Netherland they are now called "Doopsgezinde." But the views the Mennonites hold originated in Switzerland. At present they have congregations in Germany, France, Switzerland, Russia, and North America.
The German Mennonites live in Alsace (especially in the Vogesen)—thirteen congregations in the Bavarian Palatinate; eleven in Baden; in Wurttemberg, Bavaria, Hesse, Nassau; in Neuwied, Crefeld, Cleve, Goehr, and Emmerich in the valley of the Lower Rhine; three congregations in East Friesland; seventeen in Lithuania; six in Poland hene in Galicia; in Hamburg, Danzig, Elbing, and Königsberg. See Alfr. MiCHELS: Les anabaptistes dans les Vosges; HUNZINGER: Religioes, Kirchen-, und Schulwesen der Mennoniten in Baden, 1830; GRÜNEISEN: Mennoniten in Wurttemberg, 1847; WINTER: Geschichte der bairischen Widerläufer, 1849; WOLNY: Die Widerläufer in Mährren, 1856. — The French Mennonites have congregations in Nancy, Toul, and Franche-Comté. — The Russian Mennonites, numbering about 20,000 souls, and settled in about 50 colonies in the circles of Choritz, Molotshna, Mariapol, and Samara, are all of German descent. On the invitation of Catherine the Great, they emigrated to Russia, mostly from Lithuania, and founded a number of flourishing agricultural colonies, especially in the Crimea. But an edict of June 4, 1871, bereft them of their exemption from military service, giving them, however, a term of ten years to abstain from the ministry; and in 1873 no less than thirty families emigrated to the United States, followed in the next years by a considerably larger number. See D. von SCHLATTER: Reisen nach dem südlichen Russland; and A. PETZHOLDT: Reise im westl. und südl. Russland. — The American Mennonites number about 200,000 souls, of whom 150,000 are settled in the United States, and 25,000 in Canada. Driven away by the persecutions in Switzerland and the devastation of the Palatinate, and allured by the promise of perfect religious freedom which William Penn held out to them, the Mennonites very early began to emigrate to America. They founded their first settlement at Germantown, near Philadelphia, in 1683. In America they retained the distinction between Obere and Untere Mennonites. The latter, by far the largest division, is generally named under the name of Old Mennonites, and is characterized by its being the first to adopt the ban, and, as a consequence, it has been in America the one division which has not been able to preserve its perfect separation from the State Church. They dropped the name of "Mennonites," and have called themselves simply Doopsgenoten. After the cessation of persecution, in 1831, they were not only not tolerated, but even protected by the State; and in 1872 they were formally recognized. They generally chose their preachers among their learned men,—physicians and lawyers; but in 1739 they founded at Amsterdam a theological seminary, which in 1811 was considerably extended, and is now in a flourishing condition. About 1760, their number was 160,000: but at the beginning of the present century it had decreased to 30,000. At present there are 127 congregations, consisting of 47,000 members, and settled principally in the provinces of North Holland and Friesland. See TUCKERS. — The most interesting specimen of this kind is the German Mennonites, numbering about 400 in the independent congregation, and no other relation than that of simple brotherhood existed between the various congregations, great differences could not fail to arise. It was in the Netherlands, as in Switzerland, the question of the ban which produced the first and the most radical split. At the convention of Wissarn (1554), one fraction of the brotherhood adopted the ban in its most rigorous form, declaring, that, according to Matt. xviii. 17 and 1 Cor. v. 11, excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis vom Ölwei, 1627; that of Jan Cents, 1630; and that of Adrian Cornelizason, 1632) once more united the whole party; and they retained the name of "Mennonites," at least in name. They adopted a sort of "gezinden," which was to use the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Allatius: De libris Grocorum, 83-86. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis vom Ölwei, 1627; that of Jan Cents, 1630; and that of Adrian Cornelizason, 1632) once more united the whole party; and they retained the name of "Mennonites," at least in name. They adopted a sort of "gezinden," which was to use the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Allatius: De libris Grocorum, 83-86. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis vom Ölwei, 1627; that of Jan Cents, 1630; and that of Adrian Cornelizason, 1632) once more united the whole party; and they retained the name of "Mennonites," at least in name. They adopted a sort of "gezinden," which was to use the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Allatius: De libris Grocorum, 83-86. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis vom Ölwei, 1627; that of Jan Cents, 1630; and that of Adrian Cornelizason, 1632) once more united the whole party; and they retained the name of "Mennonites," at least in name. They adopted a sort of "gezinden," which was to use the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Allatius: De libris Grocorum, 83-86. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis vom Ölwei, 1627; that of Jan Cents, 1630; and that of Adrian Cornelizason, 1632) once more united the whole party; and they retained the name of "Mennonites," at least in name. They adopted a sort of "gezinden," which was to use the Latin Church, and contains a complete list of all the festivals celebrated throughout the year in honor of the saints and martyrs, together with short notices of the life and death of the person celebrated, etc. See the art. Menaion, and Allatius: De libris Grocorum, 83-86. The most interesting specimens of this kind are the Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication dissolved every relation of human life, even that between husband and wife and that between parents and children; while another fraction, called Waterlanders, from their location in the province of North Holland, held that excommunication affected no other relation but that to the church. The rigorous party was again divided into Vlamingen and Frisians: the Vlamingen, into Old Vlamingen and Contrahuishakers; and the Frisians, into Hard and Soft Frisians. But the necessity of drawing up confessions (the Concept of Cologne, 1561; that of thirty-three articles printed in the Book of Martyrs, 1617; the Bekennnis von...
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Darmstadt, July 28, 1679), who, like the father,
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After the closing, however, of the university of
concordat of Vienna (1448), an arrangement was
made by which the months were divided, and the
uneven reserved for the Pope. At present, the
right, though not altogether extinguished, exists
only in certain countries and under certain modi-
fications. MEIJER.
MENTZER, Balthasar, b. at Allendorf in Hesse,
Feb. 27, 1565; d. at Marburg, Jan. 6, 1627. He
was appointed professor of theology at Marburg
in 1596, but removed to Giessen in 1605, as he
was vehemently opposed to the landgrave's plan
of establishing the Reformed Church in Hesse.
After the closing, however, of the university of
Giessen, in 1625, he returned to Marburg. He
was an ardent champion of Lutheran orthodoxy,
and sustained numerous controversies in its be-
half with the Roman Catholics and the Reformed.
His Opus Theologicum Latina were collected in two
volumes (Francfort, 1669) by his son, BALTHASAR
MENTZER (b. at Giessen, May 14, 1614; d. at
Darmstadt, July 28, 1792), who, like the father,
was a stanch Lutheran, and professor of theology
at Marburg.
MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY, a school of
philosophy and theology which took its rise, about
the year 1836, in Marshall College and in the
Theological Seminary of the German Reformed
Church, at that time located at Mercersburg,
Pennsylvania. This title was derived from the
name of the village, and first applied by oppo-
nents, as indicating a novel and somewhat doubt-
ful system of speculation in American Protestant-
ism. It grew out of the contact between the
modern evangelical theology of Germany and
Anglo-American church life, and quickened the
German Reformed Church to new activity. That
church was just then awaking from a state of
comparative stagnation, and passing from the
German to the English language. In this un-
avoidable process of transition, she was in danger
of losing her historical identity, and dissolving
into other denominations. The Mercersburg
system saved her historical church life, but trans-
formed and adapted it to the condition and voca-
tion of a new country. It produced considerable
fermentation and controversy, which affected also
the Lutheran and other neighboring churches,
but is now a matter of history, though its fruits
remain. The movement has three phases. The
first was philosophical (from 1836 to 1843); the
second was theological, and turned chiefly on
the church question (1843-58); the third was
liturgical (from 1858 to 1866). The liturgical
movement began at the synod of Norristown, in
1847; but the liturgy was not published till 1858.
The man who gave the initial impulse to this
school of thought was the Rev. F. A. Rauch,
Ph.D., first president of Marshall College (founded,
in 1835), a pupil of the distinguished theologian
Dr. Daub, in Heidelberg, and a ripe scholar of
varied culture. He came to this country as a
political refugee. Well acquainted with German
and Scotch systems of philosophy, and recognizing
the deficiencies of both, he conceived the purpose of uniting the best qualities of both
in an advanced system, which he proposed to
call "Anglo-German philosophy." His method
of thought was internal and organic, in distinction
from the external and mechanical method. It
was internal, in that he reflected upon a subject
from its principle to its mode of action and con-
sequences, and regarded the parts of a whole as
being a unity by the operation of an immanent
law, not as held together by forces outside of
itself; and organic, because the living individual
furnished the governing idea, or type, for inquiry
in psychology, in ethics, in religion, and in all
other branches of knowledge. For example,
imagination, memory, and will are not related like
the parts of a mechanism, but are the members
or organs of a living unit, being vitally connected,
like the eye and the ear, the heart and the limbs,
of the human body. Rauch's plans were frus-
trated by his premature death, but the seed-
thoughts sown by him yielded a rich harvest.
With Rauch, the Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin,
called from the Theological Seminary of the
Presbyterian Church at Allegheny, to the Theo-
logical Seminary of the Reformed Church, became
associated in the spring of 1840. Somewhat pre-
bared by his own independent studies for a transi-
tion into the bosom of a German church, he soon
learned to appreciate the genius and the genetic
method of Rauch. His new vocation led him to
study more fully the Heidelberg Catechism, and
the history of the Continental Reformation, and
modern German philosophy and theology. Rauch
died in April, 1841. Nevin became the second
president of Marshall College. Two years later
the Reformed Church called Dr. Philip Schaff,
by birth a Swiss, from the University of Berlin,
where he had just begun to lecture, to the chair
of church history and exegesis in Mercersburg.
Arriving in the summer of 1844, young and
enthusiastic, he entered with freedom into the
theological life then pulsating in the Mercers-
burg institutions, and gave fresh impulse to its
growth by the publication of his Dissertation on
the Principle of Protestantism (1845). Rauch,
Nevin, and Schaff were alike conversant with
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philosophy and theology; but Rauch excelled chiefly in the former, and Nevin in the latter; while Schaff was by predilection a church historian, filled with love for the past, and hope for the future,— an advocate of progressive development. Complementing each other reciprocally, these three scholars developed the ideas of Mercersburg theology in different ways. Dr. Nevin discussed the questions concerning the church and the sacraments. Turning to Cyprian and the Nicene age, he represented the contrast between the church idea then extant and the sect system of our century, but aimed chiefly to show that the Oxford Tractarian theory of repristination was historically untenable, and would lead logically to the whole system of the Papacy, which in some respects was an improvement on Nicene and ante-Nicene Christianity. On the nature of the sacraments he reproduced the anti-Zwinglian and anti-Lutheran conception of John Calvin, which he held to be the true and approved doctrine of his first book, Principles of Protestantism, vindicated the doctrine of the Reformation on the basis of historical development, in decided opposition to Romanism and Puseyism on the one hand, and also to rationalism and sectarianism on the other. Their attitude towards opinions then current provoked the charge of Romanizing tendencies against the Mercersburg school; yet, at the very time, Nevin was dealing heavy blows against Rome in his articles on Brownson's Quarterly Review; and Schaff, in his treatise, What is Church History? justified and defended the epoch of the Reformation as the legitimate result of the preceding ages, and the main current of modern Christianity. The Mercersburg school was also charged with transcendentalism and mysticism, but all these charges have gradually subsided. Among the expounders and defendants of the school must be mentioned Drs. Wolf (d. 1872), Harbaugh (d. 1867), Higbee, Gerhart, Apple, Gast, and many other graduates of the college and seminary of Mercersburg. The chief opponents within the German Reformed Church were Dr. Berg, then in Philadelphia, and afterwards Dr. Bomberger, who headed the anti-liturgical movement since 1858. A regular heresy trial was held at the synod of York in 1845, and again at two subsequent synods; but in each case the Mercersburg professors were acquitted by an almost unanimous vote.

We shall state in brief compass, not in the historical, but in logical order, the points of doctrine which were at issue in these controversies.

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

2. The doctrine concerning the nature of the Church. Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, is the second Adam, the head of a regenerate human race. Born in him and of him, by the Holy Spirit, believers are his members. He, glorified in heaven, and they, though still in the flesh on earth, together constitute one mystical body, a spiritual organism. This is the Christian Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Of supernatural origin, invested with divine authority, possessing spiritual powers adequate to the fulfillment of its mission, instinct with heavenly life, and destined to overcome her enemies, she is the communion in which men may obtain salvation and eternal life. The Church, extending through all ages, and destined to embrace all nations, is ever identical with herself, having one Lord, one faith, one baptism; yet as she is not an aggregation of individuals, but a vital whole, she is organized, and she perpetuates her spiritual organization, agreeably to the laws of human life. Her history resembles the history of an individual man. The Church begins her life in infancy: she passes, by growth, through the period of childhood and youth, and by successive stages develops toward the strength and maturity of manhood. Different phases of the fulness of her spiritual life, including doctrine and morals, cultus and ecclesiastical polity, appear at different epochs in her wonderful history. Hence no statements of doctrine formulated in any past age need be final, and no form of organization can be fixed and unchangeable. But the Church modifies doctrinal formulas according to her progress in the knowledge of Christian truth, and adjusts her organization to the advanced status of her life and to her altered connections with the world. On this principle, Mercersburg could recognize propriety and wisdom in the papal hierarchy of medieval Romanism, and yet affirm the necessity of the Reformation, and vindicate the validity of the anti-hierarchical organizations of the Protestant churches.

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

3. An elevated conception of the Church involved a corresponding estimate of the spiritual dignity of the ministry. Christ perpetuates his mediatorial office by an order of chosen men, who, by laying-on of hands, are duly invested with divine authority to speak in his name, to dispense the sacraments, and to bear rule as undershepherds over the flock. At the same time, Mercersburg always taught the general priesthood of the
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tality and the equality of ministers, and therefore had no sympathy with the Anglican High-Church movement, which rests on the theory of an external episcopal succession, and a sacerdotal view of the ministry. The constitution and polity of the Reformed Church are essentially Presbyterian.

4. The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, being of divine appointment, are not empty forms, but the significant signs and seals of God's covenant with us. They are means of grace which become efficacious by faith alone. By baptism, the subject is received into the covenant. The Lord's Supper is the commemoration of the once crucified but now glorified Christ, and the communion of his body and blood, wherein, by the impartation of his own divine-human fulness, he nourishes his people unto everlasting life. The contrary opinion, which then largely prevailed in the American churches, that baptism is only the empty symbol of forgiveness and of the new birth, and the Lord's Supper merely a celebration of the crucifixion of Christ, was sharply criticised. This positive view respecting grace, which looked for its development were repelled by it, was nothing more than a strong re-assertion (so Dr. Nevin persistently claimed, and demonstrated by historical proofs against Dr. Hodge) of the doctrine advanced and elaborated by John Calvin, and embodied in all the later Reformed confessions, including that of Westminster.

5. Such views of the church of the ministry, and the sacraments, involved the principle of liturgical worship. Mercersburg found fault with the common style of extemporaneous public prayer, and advocated a revival of the liturgical church-service of the Reformation period, but so modified and reproduced as to be adapted to the existing wants of Protestant congregations. The result of this phase of Mercersburg activity was, "A Liturgy; or, Order of Christian Worship," prepared by a committee (Schaff, Nevin, Harbaugh, Gerhart, Apple, Steiner, and others), and published in Philadelphia, 1858; a book of common prayer, which was subsequently revised, and issued in 1866, entitled An Order of Worship for the Reformed Church. Both, however, are merely optional, and not intended to supersede free prayer. A new German hymn-book was also prepared, by Dr. Schaff, in 1850, and is now generally used in the German congregations of the Reformed Church.

6. Mercersburg laid special stress on educational religion, particularly on the diligent instruction of the baptized youth. By Christian teaching all children and youth were to be led to Christ in the exercise of a living faith. To this end, family training, the teaching of the catechism, and the faithful preaching of the gospel, were adequate means. Hence the opposition to the "anxious bench" and the spurious revival system, which for a time had widely spread in the German Reformed and Lutheran churches, contrary to their genius and history. These prominent features are all logically connected with the primordial truth that the Word made flesh, Jesus Christ, is the sum and substance of Christianity. The form and content of doctrine asserted in each case is determined by its internal relation to this fundamental principle.

The whole movement was christological, and in close sympathy with the positive evangelical theology of Protestant Germany, though necessarily modified by American surroundings and wants. In 1858 Marshall College was removed to Lancaster, Penn., and united with Franklin College. The theological seminary followed in 1871. The appellative Mercersburg, therefore, no longer signifies any local relation. The name has been employed in this article to denote that christological type of thought which originated and was developed at Mercersburg. At the present time, the peculiar characteristics of the Mercersburg school are no longer equally distinctive, because similar christological tendencies have since sprung up, and taken root in other denominations: hence former issues have been superseded. Instead of antagonism at nearly all points, there is now some degree of living sympathy between the different branches of American Protestantism and schools of evangelical theology. Within the German Reformed Church itself the two parties which for years were divided on doctrine and worship have been brought into closer sympathy, and at nearly all points, there is now some degree of living sympathy between the different branches of American Protestantism and schools of evangelical theology. Within the German Reformed Church itself the two parties which for years were divided on doctrine and worship have been brought into closer sympathy, and at nearly all points, there is now some degree of living sympathy between the different branches of American Protestantism and schools of evangelical theology.
LADY OF MERCY, a religious order founded in Dublin by Miss Catharine McAuley (see art.), Dec. 13, 1842. The first house was founded by the archbishop of Dublin, Jan. 23, 1844; but subsequently the rule of St. Augustine, with some necessary modifications, was chosen, approved by Gregory XVI. in 1835, and formally confirmed by him in 1840. The order has spread very rapidly, and is now found in all parts of the British domains and of the United States. The first house upon the American Continent was opened at St. John's, Newfoundland, 1842, and, in the United States, at Pittsburg, Penn., 1843. The Sisters of Mercy devote themselves to the suffering and the tempted among women. They are divided into choir-sisters and lay-sisters. The latter are occupied with the duties in the house; the former, with those connected with their more active work. The former also elect the superior for the order in each diocese, for there is no general superior over the entire order. Those who would enter either class undergo a postulancy of six months, assume the white veil, and then, after a novitiate of two years, are received. The irrevocable vows are of poverty, chastity, obedience, and service to the poor, sick, and ignorant.

The habit of the order is a black robe with long loose sleeves, a white coif, and a white or black veil. In the streets a bonnet of black crepe is worn, instead of the coif and veil. See Ceremonial for Reception and Profession of the Sisters of Mercy, Baltimore, and Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy, New York, 1851, sqq., 3 vols.

MERCY-SEAT, the golden lid of the ark. See ARK OF THE COVENANT.

MERIBAH (quarrel), the name of two places (Exod. xvii. 7; Num. xx. 13), upon the wandering of the Israelites, where Moses, on command of God, drew water out of a rock (1) Meribah, with the alternative name Massah (temptation), was in Rephidim, the last station before the Sinai Desert. The monks of St. Catherine put it in the Wady Leja, at the base of Sinai, on the other side from the convent; but the location is improbable. Against it is the monastic and Bedouin eagerness to put as many holy places as possible to their credit. The improbable location is at the base of Sinai, and yet not in the Wilderness of Sinai, and the perennial supply of water at Sinai. Wilson and Warren place it in Wady Feiran, near Mount Serbal; Holland, in the pass at Wadiyeh, at the eastern end of Wady es-Sheikh. (2) Meribah, near Kadesh, in the Wilderness of Zin. From Ezekiel's mention of it (xlvi. 18), it has been conjectured that the water still flowed in his day. See KADESH. It was at this Meribah that Moses disobeyed God by striking the rock, instead of speaking to it, and received the heart-breaking intimation, that, in consequence, he would not be allowed to lead the Israelites into the promised land, as he had expected (Num. xx. 12).

W. PRESSIEL.

MERITUM DE CONDIQNO, DE CONGRUO.

This distinction in the conception of the merit of good works, as first made by Thomas Aquinas (II. 1, Qu. 114, arts 4 and 6), is, in his system, a compromise between the stronger Augustinian leaning, which personally ruled and distinguished him, and the Pelagian inclination in the Catholic Church towards emphasizing good works. He taught, (1) that no one but Christ can gain grace for any one else by the "merit of condignity," i.e., real merit; (2) that no one can gain such grace by the "merit of congruity," since God meets the wish of man for the salvation of others. Duns Scotus goes even farther in this Pelagian direction, and asserts that man can prepare himself to receive this grace. But Protestants reject altogether this teaching, on the ground that it tends to lessen the mediatorial character of Christ, and leads tender consciences to doubt of all their works, and to seek ever for more. [See K. R. HAGENBACH: History of Christian Doctrine, ii. 308-311; HODGE: Systematic Theology, iii. 231-245.]

MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, Jean Henri, b. at Eaux-Vives on Lake Leman, Switzerland, Aug. 16, 1794; d. at Geneva, Oct. 21, 1872. He studied theology at the university of Geneva; but the deepest and most decisive religious impressions he received from Robert Haldane and the religious revival which he produced in Geneva in the second decade of the present century. It was not without some hesitation that he subscribed to the famous edict of May 3, 1817, issued by the Venerable Association of Pastors, a thoroughly rationalistic body, and forbidding the preachers to discuss any debatable doctrine in the pulpit, such as hereditary sin, predestination and grace, etc. But some explanations induced him to take a lighter view of the edict; and July 3, 1817, he was ordained. It was at that time his idea to devote himself to literature in general, and he was much occupied with translations of Ariosto and Schiller; but his visit to Eisenach in October, 1817, during the celebration of the third centennial festival in commemoration of the Reformation, made it one of the great objects of his life to write the history of the religious reforms of the sixteenth century. After a short stay in Berlin, where he acquired the friendship of Neander, he was appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation in Hamburg, 1818, and court-preacher in Brussels, 1824. In both places he exercised great influence; but in Hamburg he experienced some difficulties from the side of the consistory, and in Brussels, from the society of the clergy and the revolution of 1830. Meanwhile the Evangelical Society had been formed in Geneva; and, in order to provide the church of Geneva with evangelical pastors, the society had founded an independent theological school. From that school Merle accepted a call as professor of church history; and in that position he remained for the rest of his life, preaching alternately with Gaussen and Gall, and in the Chapelle de l'Oratoire. The formation, however, of the Evangelical Society, and the foundation of the new theological school, could not help arousing the jealousy of the state church; and the Venerable Association of Pastors forbade Merle the pulpit. One of Merle's most cherished ideas was the union of all true Christians, and consequently he actually dreaded a separation from the state establishment. But, on the other hand, he could not allow any external authority to interfere with his office as a preacher of the gospel; and in 1838 an independent congregation was formed at the Oratoire, which, by joining the Bourg, de Faur in 1849, became the foundation of the Église Evangélique in Geneva. In the same
year he published the first volume of his great work, *Histoire de la Réformation*, of which the thirteenth and last volume appeared after his death. The work consists of two divisions,—the Reformation at the time of Luther (English translation, many editions), and the Reformation at the time of Calvin (English translation, 1865–79, 8 vols.); the two great characters forming the respective centres of the two groups of Reformers. Its success was marvellous, especially in the English-speaking countries Great Britain and America, but also in France and Germany. It was translated both into English and German, and edition followed upon edition. Among his other works are *Le Protecteur*, 1848, an apology of Oliver Cromwell; *Trois Siecles de l'ultime prédiction de la capture de Babylone*. Bel is here mentioned, a famous Babylonian deity, son of Ea, god of speech, sermons, etc. [See REMUSAT: *Mélanges de littérature et philosophie*; and ROBERT BAIRD: *D'Aubigné et ses écrits*, New York, 1846.]

**MERODACH** (Heb., מְרוֹדָאָךְ; Babylon, Marduk, Maruduk; origin and meaning of name uncertain), a famous Babylonian deity, son of Ea, god of the planet Jupiter; a valiant warrior, agent and god during the later Babylonian Empire, the special guardian of Babylon itself; is named (Jer. 1.2) as overthrown at "the time of Merodach; but the latter was himself called Ilu, bel ("lord"); and it is on other grounds certain that, before the end of the Babylonian rule, the distinction observed in more ancient times between him and the mighty god Bel (see Baal), who belonged to the superior triad, was the king named by Tiglath Pileser II. is the same person, though this is quite possible. But if "Baladan," the name of the father of Merodach-Baladan according to 2 Kings xx. 12 and Isa. xxv. 1, is abbreviated, as is not unlikely, for Marudachus Baldanes as ruling in Babylon for six months just before Tsiglath Pileser, B.C. 721, the time of the embassy to Hezekiah. In all probability, the object of it was really to pave the way for an alliance of the Assyrians to the northern kingdom of Israel). The name Mardukabalidinna occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions as follows: (1) Among the kings who paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser II. at Babylon, B.C. 721. He is there called "son of Jar-Ele, dwelling on the sea;" his stronghold is "Dur-Jakin," lying evidently in "Bit-Jakin;" and "Bit-Jakin" ("house of Jakin") is the land bordering on the Persian Gulf, in extreme Southern Babylonia (cf. *Bit-Chumri*, "House of Omri," applied by the Assyrians to the northern kingdom of Israel). "Son of Jakin" means, probably "of Jakin's dynasty." (Cf. "Son of Omri," applied by Shalmaneser II. to Jehu.) (3) As "King of Kar-Duniash" (Babylonia in the narrow sense), defeated and put to flight by Sennacherib, B.C. 704. (4) As again conqueror by the same monarch in Bit-Jakin, B.C. 700. (5) On contract-tablets we find mention of the ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and (Schrader: *Keilinschriften u. Geschichtsforschung*, p. 585; cf. Boeckh, in *Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.,* vol., p. 19) twentieth year of the reign of Mardukabalidinna. Pioeney's Canon gives for the reign of Mardukabalidinna in Babylon twelve years,—B.C. 721–710; and Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb., *Chron.,* I, 5), probably on the authority of Berosus, names Marudachus Baldanes as ruling in Babylon for six months just before Tsiglath Pileser, B.C. 721.

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

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

See SARGON, SENNACHERIB.

**ME-ROM**, Waters of (waters of the high place), a lake in Northern Palestine, the site of Joshua's crushing defeat of Jabin's confederacy (Josh. x. 5, 7, identified with Lake Samachonites of Josephus, and Lake Huleh of the Arabs, eleven miles north of the Lake of Galilee. It is triangular in shape, six miles long by four and a half wide, but only eleven feet deep.

**MERSWIN, Rulman.** See RULMAN MERSW-
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MESOPOTAMIA (Μεσοπόταμια, i.e., ἴ μέση τῶν ποταμῶν τοῦ τῆς Ἐφραίμου καὶ τοῦ Τίγρεως — Attian. Alex., 7, 7; cf. Tacit. Annal., 6, 37) is the name given by the Greeks to the country bounded on the east and west by the Tigris and the Euphrates. The Taurus range was generally regarded as separating it from Armenia on the north: the Median wall and the Euphrates-Tigris canali-system usually stood for its southern limit. It was rarely held to include Babylonia, both Upper and Lower. The Old Testament assigns this general region to Aram, and calls it Σύριος ἢ Δαμασκίς, “Aram of the two rivers.”

In the time of the Judges we hear of “Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia” (Deut. xxi. 10, xx. 19, etc.). The northern part of the district is mountainous (Num. xiii. 7), with fruitful valleys attractive to settlers, and was populous from early times. Toward the south the land was dry and barren, except along the river-beds, crossed by caravan-tracks, but otherwise abandoned to wild beasts (Ammian. Marc., 18, 7; Xen. Anab., 1, 5, 1 ff.) and to Arabian robber-bands, whose presence there caused it sometimes to be considered part of Arabia (Dio Cass., 68, 31).

Among the chief cities of Mesopotamia were Haran (Carrae), Edessa, Nisibis, and Tul-Barsip (later Kar-Salmanassar), capital of the important principality of Bit-Adini (Dio Cass., 68, 3). Mesopotamia was not a political unit, and its history is involved in that of the great peoples which bordered upon it. The ancestors of the Hebrew people settled there (Gen. xi. 10 ff., xii. 5; Josh. xiv. 2 ff.; Acts vii. 2), after leaving Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. xxiv. 10; Deut. xxiii. 5, etc.). D'K 334, Psilam-Aram, “Plain of Aram” (Gen. xxv. 20, 18, 18, etc.) is the name of part of the same district. (See Psilam-Aram.) The LXX. translate these names by Μεσοπόταμια, Μεσόσιων, Συρία, or πεδίου Μεσοσιων. The later Arabic name Al-Djeziya, “Aram of the two rivers,” is from an Arabic compound made with the name of a river, a water-source, a valley, or, in the case of this name, a name of a country.

The northern part of the district is mountainous; its southern limit. It was rarely held to include Babylonia, both Upper and Lower. The Old Testament assigns this general region to Aram, and calls it Σύριος ἢ Δαμασκίς, “Aram of the two rivers.”

In the time of the Judges we hear of “Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia” (Deut. xxi. 10, xx. 19, etc.). The northern part of the district is mountainous (Num. xiii. 7), with fruitful valleys attractive to settlers, and was populous from early times. Toward the south the land was dry and barren, except along the river-beds, crossed by caravan-tracks, but otherwise abandoned to wild beasts (Ammian. Marc., 18, 7; Xen. Anab., 1, 5, 1 ff.) and to Arabian robber-bands, whose presence there caused it sometimes to be considered part of Arabia (Dio Cass., 68, 31).

Among the chief cities of Mesopotamia were Haran (Carrae), Edessa, Nisibis, and Tul-Barsip (later Kar-Salmanassar), capital of the important principality of Bit-Adini (Dio Cass., 68, 3). Mesopotamia was not a political unit, and its history is involved in that of the great peoples which bordered upon it. The ancestors of the Hebrew people settled there (Gen. xi. 10 ff., xii. 5; Josh. xiv. 2 ff.; Acts vii. 2), after leaving Ur of the Chaldees (see Ur); and, even after Abraham had entered Canaan, a connection with the country. Merob and Sahak fled into Greek Armenia; but the persecution was only of short duration, and both were able to return. See Merob and Sahak.

The northern part of the district is mountainous; its southern limit. It was rarely held to include Babylonia, both Upper and Lower. The Old Testament assigns this general region to Aram, and calls it Σύριος ἢ Δαμασκίς, “Aram of the two rivers.”

In the time of the Judges we hear of “Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia” (Dio Cass., 68, 31), as an oppressor of Israel (Judg. iii. 8, 10). In David's time the king of the Syrian Zobah had vassals in Mesopotamia (2 Sam. x. 16, cf. v. 18). From the Assyrian inscriptions it appears that the land was divided among petty chiefs, whom the Assyrians by degrees subdued; Shalmaneser II. (B.C. 858-823) establishing at length a permanent control over the greater part of the territory. The district then belonged successively to the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians; falling later under the dominion, first of the Seleucidae, then — after being long the battle-ground of Parthian, Armenian, and Roman armies — of the Romans. Its incorporation into the Roman Empire was due to Trajan, and, more completely, to Caracalla at this time. The main divisions were recognized — Osrhoë in the West, Edessa as its capital; Mygdonia in the East (Polyb., 5, 51), with Nisibis as the chief city. The Arabs conquered Mesopotamia A.D. 637-641.


MESROB, or MASHTOZ, b. in the middle of the fourth century, at the village of Haçezgaz in the Armenian province of Taron; d. at Warsashapat, Feb. 18, 441. He was educated by the catholicoi, Nerses the Great, and instructed in Greek, Persian, and Syriac. After the death of Nerses, he came to the court of King Vrashapuh as his secretary; but, after the lapse of seven years, he retired, dissatisfied with a merely worldly life, first to a monastery, and afterwards into the desert. The great fame of the catholicoi, Sahak the Great, allured him back into the world; and then began his great missionary and literary labors. The Bible was known in Armenia only in the Syriac translation, which the common people did not understand; and the Armenian language could be written only by means of Greek characters, which were altogether repulsive to the nature of the representing it. After many troubles, he finally succeeded in producing an alphabet of thirty-six letters, which proved admirably fitted for the Armenian language; then he translated the Bible into Armenian in connection with Sahak; and finally he laid the broad foundation of the whole Armenian literature by a number of translations from Greek and Syriac, performed by disciples whom he had sent to Edessa, Constantinople, Athens, and Alexandria. For a short time after the death of King Vrashapuh, he was disturbed in his beneficent activity. The Persian kings decided to govern their Armenian provinces by Persian governors, and those strangers determined to introduce the Persian fire-worship in the country. Merob and Sahak fled into Greek Armenia; but the persecution was only of short duration, and both were able to return. See Merob and Sahak.

MESSALIANS. — I. Messalians, or Massalians, a word of Syriac derivation, and denoting "praying people," was the name of a non-Christian religious party which flourished in Asia Minor in the middle of the fourth century. According to Epiphanius, they originated among the Hellenists. They accepted a plurality of gods; though they recognized only one God, the Omnipotent, as worthy of being worshipped. They held frequent prayer-meetings, with illuminations and singing. In some respects they resembled the Coelecines and the Hypsistarians; in others, they seem simply to be a popular form of Persian dualism. They were never numerous, but they were persecuted by the Christian authorities. See Epiphanius: Hær., 80; Cyril of Alexandria: De Adoratione, iii.; Ullmann: De Hypsistariis.— II. Messalians, or Massalians, a word of Syriac derivation, and denoting "praying people," was the name of a non-Christian religious party which flourished in Asia Minor in the middle of the fourth century. According to Epiphanius, they originated among the Hellenists. They accepted a plurality of gods; though they recognized only one God, the Omnipotent, as worthy of being worshipped. They held frequent prayer-meetings, with illuminations and singing. In some respects they resembled the Coelecines and the Hypsistarians; in others, they seem simply to be a popular form of Persian dualism. They were never numerous, but they were persecuted by the Christian authorities. See Epiphanius: Hær., 80; Cyril of Alexandria: De Adoratione, iii.; Ullmann: De Hypsistariis. — II. Entirely without connection with this non-Christian party, there existed in Syria, in the latter part of the fourth century, under the name of Massalians, a Christian sect, which, however, soon obtained other names, Euchites, after their principal of prayer; or, Deram, after their habit of dancing; or Adelphians, Lampe, 11478.
Messiah, Messianic Prophecy. — According to the teaching of the Old Testament, the consummation of the plan of salvation was, on the one hand, to be brought about by the personal advent of Jehovah in his glory. He appears, amidst the jubilation of the whole creation, to establish his kingdom on the earth (Ps. xcvii. 10 sqq., xcviii. 6 sqq.), and reveals himself to his people as the Redeemer from bondage and the Good Shepherd (Isa. xxxxx. 4 sqq., xl. 10 sqq., lii. 12; Ezek. xxxiv. 11 sqq., etc.). Jehovah himself takes up his dwelling on Zion, ruling all nations as his king (Zech. xiv. 10), fills the new temple with his glory (Ezek. xiii. 2, 7), shines as the eternal light over the divine city (Isa. ix. 2, 10), etc. So patent was this future indwelling of God in his church to be, that no ark of the covenant would be any longer necessary (Jer. iii. 16). While on the one hand, the representations are thus most distinct, that Jehovah will dwell among his people in the era of salvation, they are, on the other, equally distinct, that the kingdom of God will be restored by a member of the house of David. Both of these representations are put side by side in Ezek. xxxiv., where Jehovah himself is portrayed as the shepherd (ver. 11), and as, at the same time, raising up a shepherd, even his servant, David (ver. 23). In verse 24 both delineations are merged in the description, “I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them.” This member of the house of David is the promised Messiah.

The Hebrew word “Messiah” (יְשֵׁעָה), translated in the LXX, Ἰουσαῦ ("Christ"), designates in the Old Testament, in the first instance, every person anointed with the holy oil, as the high priest, and especially the king. From the latter use, its application passed over (Ps. ii. 2; Dan. ix. 25) to Him who was to represent and introduce the consummation of the kingdom of God. The Targum of Onkelos adds the title at Gen. xli. 10, Num. xxxiv. 17; and the Targum of Jonathan, at Hos. iii. 5, and many other places. The term “Messiah” is twice used in the New Testament (John i. 42, iv. 25); and its Greek equivalent, “Christ,” almost always with the article in the Gospels, without it in the Pauline and Petrine Epistles. The promise of the Messiah was connected with the family of David, but it presupposes and was built upon the hope of salvation which Revelation from the very beginning had excited. It is with this expectation that we must therefore here begin our beggary. The demon, they taught, with which every human being is born, can be expelled or subdued only by intense prayer: baptism and the Eucharist are of no account. But, in the enthusiasm of intense prayer, the soul is raised above all passions andcreated in the true image of God to live above all mere restrictions. Condemned by one council after the other, and persecuted both in Syria and Asia Minor, they are still heard of in the sixth and seventh century. [See the exhaustive article, “Euchites,” by G. Salmon, in Smith and Wace: Dictionary of Christian Biography.]

The promise of the Messiah was connected with the family of David, but it presupposes and was built upon the hope of salvation which Revelation from the very beginning had excited. It is with this expectation that we must therefore here beggary. The demon, they taught, with which every human being is born, can be expelled or subdued only by intense prayer: baptism and the Eucharist are of no account. But, in the enthusiasm of intense prayer, the soul is raised above all passions and created in the true image of God to live above all mere restrictions. Condemned by one council after the other, and persecuted both in Syria and Asia Minor, they are still heard of in the sixth and seventh century. [See the exhaustive article, “Euchites,” by G. Salmon, in Smith and Wace: Dictionary of Christian Biography.]

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

A third period of Messianic prophecy begins with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Baal, in the synonymy of the star of Jacob (Num. xxiv. 17 sqq.), referred by the ancient Jews to the Messiah, evidently points to a glorious rule and ruler issuing from Israel. The passage in Deuteronomy (xviii. 15–19) does not refer, as it used to be explained, to a single individual prophet, Christ, but to the office of the prophetic ministry. However, its place in the Messianic predictions, as showing that prophetic as well as regal functions were necessary to the consummation of God's kingdom on earth. [Stephen, in his address before the Sanhedrin, quotes this passage from Deuteronomy, and finds in it a prophecy of the Messiah, — Acts vii. 37.] The point of departure for the more definite concentration of the Messianic expectation on a person is 2 Sam. vii., where Jehovah promises to establish David's dynasty forever, and to make his seed his son. This son was not the whole house of David, but one of David's descendants (1 Chron. xi. 16). By this passage (2 Sam. vii.) two things were fixed, — that the Messiah was to be a king, and a son of David. David's house can be humbled, but not permanently (1 Kings xi. 39). In David's last song (2 Sam. xxiii.) predicates are affirmed of David's royal personage in each particular on his own person, but to the ideal kingdom he represented (compare Ps. xxi. 5, 7, lxi. 7). In Ps. lii., lv., lxiii., cx., a royal personage is de-
picted, to whom neither David nor Solomon corresponds, but only He of whom they were types.

There are two schools of interpretation with regard to these psalms. The one, represented by Calvin, holds, that, in the first instance, they refer to a king of Israel, but that the ideal predicates affirmed of him refer to the Christ. The other school holds that the Psalms had before him the ideal theocratic king, and so spoke directly of Christ. This last view cannot be set aside by the objection that the Psalmist could not sing of a future king; for he does sing of a future glory of the holy city (Ps. lxxxvii.), and the future advent of Jehovah to establish his kingdom (Ps. cxvii.-cxviii.). This view seems to be decidedly the more natural in Ps. ii., lxxii., cx. These psalms depict the Messiah as a victorious prince, ruling over the world, and relieving the suffering (Ps. lxxii.). This king is also a priest (Ps. cxvii.), a designation it was impossible to give to David or Solomon; and it is only after the order of Melchizedek that it was to be "after the order of Melchizedek." This shows that it was to be something outside of, and not occasion any surprise that the prophets, at the time of the deterioration of the Davidic dynasty, should have pointed more distinctly to the future; for this was the very function of the prophets,— to testify to the indestructible truth of the divine promise. Pursuing first the line of the predictions concerning Christ's person, we discover that he is to be endowed with a superhuman dignity. He is of divine origin (Mic. v. 2), and endowed with divine power (Mic. v. 4). To this passage in Micah corresponds Isa. iv. 2, if this is to be referred to the Messiah, as the Targum assumes. Isa. vii. 14 refers to the birth of "Immanuel;" and again, prophetically conceded that it refers to the Messiah from its connection with ix. 5 sqq., where the divine nature of the Messiah is affirmed. In xi. 1 sqq. the divine in him seems to be described as only the result of the Divine Spirit's resting upon him. In Jer. xxiii., xxxii., xxxiii. 14-20, we have other prophecies of the Messiah; but, in the first, the expression "the Lord our righteousness" (xxxiii. 6) does not necessarily contain the affirmation of the divinity of the Messiah; for it does not say he is divine, but is "called" so. In Jer. xxx. 21, however, the Messiah is described as a ruler, and in a peculiar relation to Jehovah, such as no man can hold to him. In Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, the expression "Branch" is used as a proper name of the Messiah. In Mal. iii. 1 we have a prophecy of a "messenger," whom the Lord would send to prepare the way for the "messenger of the covenant," or angel of the covenant. This latter, who does not otherwise appear in the Old Testament, is Jehovah. The angel of the covenant may be the angel of the wilderness, but it is more plausible to refer it to the Messiah. Finally, in Daniel, we come to the close of the Messianic prediction of the Old Testament. In vii. 13 sq. the vision of the four beasts is concluded with a vision of the "Son of man coming with the clouds to the Ancient of days." According to some interpreters, the Son of man referred to the theocratic people, as the four beasts referred to world-kings; but this is very improbable: and, as far back as we can trace the exegetical tradition, it was referred to the Messiah. So here, likewise, the "branch" is a divine as well as a human being; for only God can use the clouds as his chariot (Ps. civ. 3). If we follow the usual interpretation, the Messiah is not again referred to in the heavenly creatures of Daniel; but who is he whose voice is heard on the bank of the Ulai (viii. 15-17), who appears in majesty at the Tigris (x. 5 sqq.), and swears by him that liveth forever (xii. 6 sqq.)? That is the best view which sees here the angel of Jehovah (Michaelis, etc.). If this be so, his identity with the Son of man of vii. 13 (not with Daniel, as Hengstenberg urged) is easily made out. It is to be noticed that the Apocalypse (i. 13-15) gets its description of the appearance of the glorified Christ from Dan. x. 5 sqq.

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

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

The second characteristic of the Messiah of the Old Testament is that he suffers, and by his suffering and death atones for the sins of the people. The destruction of sin he will accomplish by the exercise of righteous judgment (Isa. xi. 9) and the spread of the knowledge of Jehovah through the land. At the side of passages of this kind are others, in which prophecy points to a servant of Jehovah who suffers in the people's stead, to an act of atonement upon which the dawn of the period of salvation depends. The Messiah is to be a priest. The sufferings of the Messiah bring about a recognition of the God who saves among those who theretofore have not known him. This idea is brought out very distinctly in Ps. cxii., which as Loretz remarks, is the most original prophecy of the Messiah, in which no circumstance is found to correspond to it (not even 1 Sam. xxiii. 25 sqq.), nor to Jeremia, who would hardly have associated the establishment of the kingdom of God among the heathen with his deliverance. The meal of thanksgiving and sac-
without overthrowing the old position, that only phal books of the Old Testament has been re-sacrifice (Ps. xxii. 26) is identical with the prophesied meal of the Messianic period (Isa. xxv. 6 sqq.), which God prepares on Zion. For all pious of the patriarchs of Israel are sinful themselves, for this reason cannot roll away the curse from the people (Isa. xliii. 27, etc.), and do well if they save themselves (Ezek. xiv. 14 sqq.). The people needs a more perfect mediator. This is the servant of Jehovah. The fundamental conception of the servant of God in Isa. xl sqq., it is true, is the people of Israel (xlii. 8 sqq., xlv. 1 sqq.; comp. Jer. xxx. 10), in which the prophets are included. It is not the prophetic order by itself, for the prophets were not a corporation; and the description of blind and dumb dogs (iv. 10) is not applicable to them. But when this servant of Jehovah is described as the light of the Gentiles (xlii. 1-7), the one who shall lead the people back to the Holy Land (xlii. 1-6, etc.), it is not to be denied that the description refers to an ideal person, and not to the servants of God (Israel) as an aggregate. This must be affirmed very positively with regard to lii. 13-11. The people itself has the consciousness of guilt (lix. 16, lxxiv. 5), and cannot atone for its sins (lix. 16). The prophecy points to one who suffers not for his own sins, but gives up his life for the sins of others. He is rejected of men, but honored of God, and by him lifted out of the grave into glory. This servant of God is the son of David, as is plain from lv. 3 sqq., which refer back to the promise of David. In Zechariah it is plainly taught that the Messiah is to be priest, making atonement for his people (lii.), and is crowned with the double crown, uniting the royal and priestly functions (vi. 9-15). He is to suffer death; and, when he is pierced, as though Jehovah himself were pierced (xii. 10-13).

3. The Apocrypha.—The question whether the Messianic hope had died out in this period is not to be answered by the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament. For this reason we shall not be surprised to find the notion of a personal Messiah wanting in Philo's system. That "more divine than human revelation" of which he speaks, follows the description of the Shechinah of the wilderness, not the Messiah; and this is not the result of his preference for the Pentateuch over the prophetical books, for the Alexandrine version of the Pentateuch contains the term "Messiah." He does not mention an objective act of atonement, nor a restoration of David's throne; and the victorious conqueror of the heathen (Num. xxiv. 7) he explains away as the unperturbed courage and robust physical strength of the Jews.

In spite of what has been said, the Messianic hope which flamed forth under the Herods had not died out in this period. It was still held as a scholastic opinion, as is proved from the LXX., which probably understood Gen. xlix. 10 in a Messianic sense, and Num. xxiv. 7, 17, when he whose kingdom is greater than that of Agag cannot be any one else than the Messiah. The same may be said of Isa. ix. 5, where they seem to have identified the Messiah with the august presence of the Lord's presence. The earliest Targums prove the same thing as the LXX. (see below). The Messianic hope was also fostered in those narrow and pious circles (Essenic circles, Hilgenfeld) from which the Jewish apocalyptic literature sprang after the Maccabean period. To this literature we now turn.

4. The Hebrew Apocalyptic Literature.—The Book of Enoch, whose composition is put by the latest authorities in the year 110 B.C., substitutes for the seventy weeks of Daniel seventy periods in which heathen rulers shall govern. At the completion of these two books, it is true of all the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. The Book of Baruch, which the writer attempted to set in the key of the old prophets, speaks of the glory of Jerusalem and the return of the people (lv. 21 sqq.), but has no word about the Messiah. The same is the case with Tobit, which refers to the four kings of the Gentiles (xiii. 8-18, xiv. 5-7), but not to the Messiah. The First Book of Maccabees breathes, more than any of the other Apocrypha, the theocratic spirit of the Old Testament; but here, too, there is no trace of a Messianic expectation. The Messianic hope had not died out among the pious of the people back to the Holy Land (xliii. 1-6, etc.), and do well if they saved themselves (Ezek. xiv. 14 sqq.). The people needs a more perfect mediator. This is the servant of Jehovah. The fundamental conception of the servant of God in Isa. xl sqq., it is true, is the people of Israel (xlii. 8 sqq., xlv. 1 sqq.; comp. Jer. xxx. 10), in which the prophets are included. It is not the prophetic order by itself, for the prophets were not a corporation; and the description of blind and dumb dogs (iv. 10) is not applicable to them. But when this servant of Jehovah is described as the light of the Gentiles (xlii. 1-7), the one who shall lead the people back to the Holy Land (xlii. 1-6, etc.), it is not to be denied that the description refers to an ideal person, and not to the servants of God (Israel) as an aggregate. This must be affirmed very positively with regard to lii. 13-11. The people itself has the consciousness of guilt (lix. 16, lxxiv. 5), and cannot atone for its sins (lix. 16). The prophecy points to one who suffers not for his own sins, but gives up his life for the sins of others. He is rejected of men, but honored of God, and by him lifted out of the grave into glory. This servant of God is the son of David, as is plain from lv. 3 sqq., which refer back to the promise of David. In Zechariah it is plainly taught that the Messiah is to be priest, making atonement for his people (lii.), and is crowned with the double crown, uniting the royal and priestly functions (vi. 9-15). He is to suffer death; and, when he is pierced, as though Jehovah himself were pierced (xii. 10-13).
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whom all the beasts of the earth, and fowls of the heavens (the heathen nations), shall acknowledge. The name of the Messiah occurs most frequently in chaps. xxxvii.-lxxi (which Hilgenfeld declares to have been written after Christ's birth), and was given before the world's creation (xviii. 3). When he appears (xvi. 4 sqq.), he will cast out all the rest of the earth, and establish righteousness. It is the universal avowal of the Mosaic law, and not the consummation of the Davidic authority, which is brought forward to the conclusion of Hilgenfeld, that it is of post-Christian origin.

The Book of Daniel was much studied in Alexandria; and the apocalyptic thoughts it started were embodied in the Sibyl, a heathen voice announcing the glory of Judaism, and its triumph over heathenism. The oldest document ascribed to the Sibyl is the prophecy in the third of the Sibylline books, which Hilgenfeld puts in the year 140 B.C. This prophecy announces the Messiah; but the God of Israel is the great king, and he rules through prophets. It is the universal away of the Mosaic law, and not the consummation of the Davidsic authority, which is brought out. Virgil's description of the return of the golden age is very properly regarded as having drawn from this document. The Sibyl regards the fourth kingdom of Daniel as the Roman Empire; and in proportion as the Roman oppression was increased did the expectation become more intense, that the approach of the Messiah was near. These Sibylline books aided in spreading that general expectation which we find so prevalent in the heathen world, that a new period of the world's history was about to daw and which Suetonius (Ve. i.pas., 4) refers to as an old and firm opinion. The Fourth Book of Ezra is the last of the Hebrew apocalyptic writings. The most recent criticism again refers its origin to a date before Christ, although we still prefer to place it about 100 A.D. The teachings concerning the Messiah include much that is peculiar to the Talmud. It represents the fourth world-power as the Roman Empire. The Messiah will come to bring the eagle (the Roman Empire) to judgment, and to cast it into the fire (xi. 37 sqq.), and, on the other hand, to bless the people of God until the day of the last judgment (xii. 33). In chap. xiii. the advent and work of the Messiah are more fully described. His face is as a consuming fire. The nations will give up their wars when he speaks. His reign, however, is limited to four hundred years, when he and all men living shall die, but, after seven days, rise again. The Highest will then reveal himself, and establish righteousness.

5. Culmination of the Messianic Expectation. — The expectation of the Messiah culminated in the Herodian period. This result was caused by the restlessness of the people under the dominion of Idumean and Roman rulers; and the people looked forward with great longing to the coming of the Son of David, which from henceforth is a title of the Messiah in the New Testament (Matt. ix. 27, etc.) and the Targums. The best authority on the subject, as it was held at this time, is the New Testament; after it, Josephus, who however, is very cautious in his utterances. The New Testament represents one of the essential features of the time to be the waiting for the Messiah (Luke i. 18, ii. 25), who should deliver Israel from its enemies, and redeem it from its sins (Luke i. 74-77). He was to establish righteousness, but only through suffering and conflict rise to his glory (Luke ii. 34; John i. 29). Very different was the Messianic hope of the Pharisees. They expected the kingdom of God to come with outward circumstance (Luke xvii. 20), and to be a political power. Their ideas were visibly embodied in Judas the Galilean, and the faction of the Zealots.

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

The destruction of Jerusalem was by no means the grave of the Messianic hopes: on the contrary, from that event dates the reception of this belief as a Jewish article of faith; and Bar Chochba was able once more to gather the people about him, under the delusion that he was the Messiah, and to lead them into a death-struggle. Rabbi Akiba acknowledged his Messianic claims; but Hillel II., in the time of Constantine the Great (Gnaetz: Gesch. d. Juden., iv. 386), said, "There is no Messiah for Israel; for Israel had its Messiah long ago, in the days of Hezekiah." To which Rabbi Joseph replied, "May God forgive Hillel!" It was firmly believed that the Messiah would come, which Suetonius (Vespas., 4) refers to as an old and firm opinion. The Fourth Book of Ezra is the last of the Hebrew apocalyptic writings. The most recent criticism again refers its origin to a date before Christ, although we still prefer to place it about 100 A.D. The teachings concerning the Messiah include much that is peculiar to the Talmud. It represents the fourth world-power as the Roman Empire. The Messiah will come to bring the eagle (the Roman Empire) to judgment, and to cast it into the fire (xi. 37 sqq.), and, on the other hand, to bless the people of God until the day of the last judgment (xii. 33). In chap. xiii. the advent and work of the Messiah are more fully described. His face is as a consuming fire. The nations will give up their wars when he speaks. His reign, however, is limited to four hundred years, when he and all men living shall die, but, after seven days, rise again. The Highest will then reveal himself, and establish righteousness.

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

The Messiah was to appear suddenly (Bab. Sanh., 97): "Three things come unexpectedly,—the Messiah, that which is found, and a scorpion.", but whether in Nisan (the month of the deliverance from Egypt) or Tisri (Ps. lxxx. 14) was a matter of dispute. Signs would precede his coming. R. Johanan says (Bab. Sanh., 95), "The Son of David will not come, except in that generation when all are either undeserving of punishment (Isa. lix. 21), or all are guilty (Isa. lx. 16)." R. Acha asserts, that, if Israel was in a state of penitence only for a single day, the Son of David would at once come; and he bases the assertion on Ps. xcv. 7. R. Levi says, that, if Israel observed only a single day according to the rules, the Messiah would immediately come. It was believed that the Messiah would appear at a time of great moral depravity (see especially Mishna Sofo, ix. 16), unchastity, drunkenness, harlotry, etc.

As to the person of this Messiah, it cannot be questioned that the most current view amongst the Jews was that which Trypho—after declaring the doctrines of the divinity and eternal pre-existence of Christ to be absurd—indicates in the Dialogue of Justin Martyr (c. 40): "We all expect that Christ will be a man born of men." Not even in the oldest Targums can the doctrine of the superhuman dignity of the Messiah be found; and in the Targum of Jonathan at Isa. vii. 14, Mic. v. 2, there is no trace of a reference to his birth from a virgin; and the explanation of Isa. ix. 5 is ambiguous. But the notion of the Messiah's superhuman nature was not altogether wanting, as is proved by a reference to some of the Midrashim, especially Bereschith robeh, edited, according to Zunz, in the sixth century. The latter identifies the first act, which was deemed of permanent validity, in modern life. In the Targum of Jonathan, in its paraphrase of Isa. lii. 5, says, "By his teaching, peace will be granted.

The teaching spoken of must refer to a revision of the Mosaic law, which was deemed of permanent validity, stretching even to the future world (Pesikta s.). In regard to the fate of the Gentile nations, some taught full citizenship would be offered to them; others, that not even the privileges of the proselyte would be granted.
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MESTREZAT, Jean, b. at Geneva in 1592; d.
in Paris, May 2, 1657; studied at Saumur, and
was pastor of Charenton. He was a learned
theologian, an excellent preacher, and one of the
main supports of the French Reformed Church.
In the second half of the seventeenth century, very active in its
synods, in its disputations with the Jesuits, and
in its negotiations with the court. He published
several collections of sermons, of which the most
remarkable is the Exposition de l'épître aux He-
breux, Geneva, 1655, 3 vols. Of his numerous
polemical writings, his treatise, De la Communion
du J. C. au Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, Sedan, 1624,
was translated into German 1824, English 1831,
and Italian 1888 See André: Essai sur les œuvres
de J. M. Strassburg, 1847.

C. SCHMIDT.

METALS IN THE BIBLE. The use of bronze and iron was so old among the Hebrews, that
they, like other ancient peoples, dated it back to the very beginning of history. (Compare Gen.
iv. 22.) Abraham was rich in gold and silver, and the treasures of David and Solomon were
famous (1 Chron. xxil. 14, xxiv. 4; 1 Kings ix.
26, x. 27; 2 Chron. viii. 18). Palestine itself,
however, is not rich in metal-bearing strata, but
the neighbour countries are; and, since the author
of the Book of Job shows a considerable knowl-
edge of mining, he may very well have acquired it
from personal experience. According to Strabo,
gold and silver were dug in the land of the Na-
batanians, and according to Eusebius, at Gebel el-Sersa
in the Seir Mountains, and along the boundary-
line between Egypt and Nubia; but the principal
places from which it was derived were Ophir
(1 Kings ix. 26, 27, 11, 12, 22, 24; 2 Chron.
vii. 17, 18, ix. 10), Uphaz (Jer. x. 9; Dan. x.
6), Havilah (Gen. ii. 11, 12, x. 29), Sheba (Kings
x. 2, 10; 2 Chron. ix. 9; Ps. lixii. 15; Isa. l. 8;
Ezek. xxxvii.), and Parvaim (2 Chron. iii. 6),—
places, which, according to Sprenger (Die alte
Geographie Arabiens) and Soetheber (Das Goldland
Oph, Berlin, 1880), were situated in Jemm, on the
south-western coast of Arabia. Copper and iron
were found at Punon, between Zfar and Petra,
the region in which Moses raised the brass ser-
pent (Num. xxi. 9, xxxiii. 42), and still more
plentifully in the peninsula of Sinai, where the
Wady Mehehâr was specially famous. According
to its rock-inscriptions, the Egyptian king Suefna,
the husband of Cleopatra, used the riches of the mines there fifteen hundred years before the time
of Moses. Noticeable were the copper-works of
Lebanon, of which traces are still visible, and the
iron-works east of the Jordan, midway between
the Lake of Genesareth and the Dead Sea, which
Abraham Pascha once more put into order (1856-39).
Most of the metal, however, used by the Hebrews,
was brought to them by the Phoenicians.

Gold generally occurs more or less mixed with
silver, and silver more or less mixed with some
baser metal; but the Hebrews understood the
various processes of purification; and gold from
Ophir was specially valued on account of its
purity (Job xxvii. 10; Ps. xiv. 9; Isa. xiii. 12).
Before the exile, neither gold nor silver was
coined into money, though both were used in the
payment of tributes (2 Kings xii. 18, xiv. 14;
xxv. 14, xxvii. 33) and of taxes (Exod. xxxv. 3,
xxxv. 5; 1 Kings x. 16; 2 Chron. ix. 14). Gold
and silver were mostly used for ornaments, such
as bracelets (Gen. xxiv. 22), chains (Gen. xii. 42),
tables (Exod. xxxv. 22), and necklaces (Exod.
xxxvii. 22), or for embroidery (Exod. xxxix. 3;
2 Sam. 1. 24) and decoration. Especially was
silver lavishly used in the outfit of the temple,
for the sockets of the torches (1 Kings x. 19,
xxiv. 24), for the hooks of the pillars (Exod.
xxxviii. 10, 19), for the bowls and chargers (Num.
xxii. 18), the trumpets (Num. x. 2), the candle-
sticks, and tables (1 Chron. xxviii. 15, etc.).
Copper was very commonly used. It could easily
be smelted and fused; and those processes natu-
really suggested its being mixed with other
metals, especially so as to produce bronze. Iron
was more difficult to handle. It could be purified by
smelting away all foreign elements, but it could
not be smelted or fused itself. The smith, how-
ever, understood to forge it into axes, swords, etc.
(1 Sam. xvii. 7; 2 Sam. x. 21), and led were also
known, and applied in various ways in practical
life. FR. W. SCHULTZ.

METAPHRASTES, Simeon, a Byzantine writer,
who has acquired a name in medieval literature
by a compilation and partial remoulding (meté-
prasos, whence his name) of a great number of
lives of saints and martyrs. Of his personal
life nothing is known with certainty. Leo Alfa-
tius, and, after him, Cave and Fabricius, place
him in the first half of the tenth century, in the
regnis of Leo the philosopher and his son Con-
stantine; while Oudin, and, after him, Hamberger
and others, place him in the middle of the twelfth
century, in the reign of John Comnenus.
The work itself, such as it exists in numerous manu-
scripts in the libraries of Vienna, Paris, Moscow,
and London, and such as it has been partially
incorporated with the Acta Sanctorum, is a bewil-
ering maze of old and new, genuine and spuri-
ous; a hundred and twenty-two lives being con-
sidered genuine, and four hundred and forty-
spurious. Other works ascribed to him are Epito-
la IX, Carminis Sermones, etc. The Simeonis
Chronicon is of doubtful authorship. G. 885.

METH, Ezechiel, and Stiefel, Esaias, were
the leaders of a sect of mystical enthusiasts, which,
in the first half of the seventeenth century, caused
considerable trouble to the authorities in Thuring-
ia. Stiefel, a wine-dealer in Langensalza, was
his nephew, seems to have been its principal
power. Many of their relatives and acquaintances joined them, and neither admonitions nor punishments had any effect. The Countess Juliane of Gleichen separated from her husband, convinced that she was going to bring forth the Messiah. But, when Stiefel died (Aug. 12, 1627), Meth felt sorely disappointed, as he believed him impatient to have his work done. The count continued. The views of the sect, such as represented in Zehn christliche und guttige Traktatlein von Ezehel Stiefel and Die zweif Artikel, welche Ezehel Meth von Langensalza bekennen, are almost identical with those of the Anabaptists and Schwenkfeld. See K. F. Göscher: Chronik der Stadt Langensalza in Thüringen, 1818, vol. ii. p. 310. K. F. Göscher.

METHODISM, the third epochal religious movement in the history of the Protestant Church in England, sprang from the bosom of the Church of England in the last part of the 17th century. Methodism is, against whose religious apathy it was a protest, and sought to make Christianity a more vital force, and to leave the neglected masses with the leaven of the gospel. It has with justice been called the "Second Reformation" of England, and the "starting-point of our modern religious history." (Isaac Taylor). The Puritans, whose brief term of power came to a close with the Restoration (1660), gradually lost their zeal, or were involved in the meshes of deism. The Church of England, on the other hand, had fallen into a low spiritual condition. It still had its able and pious men, competent and willing to defend the faith; but the churches were empty, and the masses neglected. The condition of the lower clergy was a lamentable one; and idleness, indifference, and ignorance reigned among them, while many of the higher clergy enjoyed the benefits of their livings, but left to curate their religious exercises. The prominent prelates of the church contemplated its condition with grief, and looked forward to its future with alarm. As they were vainly looking around them for help, it came from an unexpected quarter and in an unexpected way. Several students, in the course of the study of the Scriptures and religious conversation, of their number the most prominent were John Wesley (1703-91) and his brother Charles (1708-88), and, several years later, George Whitefield (1714-70). In sport they were called "Sacramentarians," the "Pious Club," and also, on account of their regular habits of study and mode of life, "Methodists," — a name which they themselves afterwards adopted, defining a "Methodist" as one who lived after the method laid down in the Bible. It was from this club of Methodists that the religious regeneration of England proceeded. The first period of the history of Methodism synchronizes with the history of the latter's career: the second dates from his death.

I. HISTORY OF METHODISM TILL THE DEATH OF JOHN WESLEY, 1791.

The club at Oxford, which spent several evenings in the week in the study of the Scriptures, first began to show its works in the visitation of the poor, sick, and imprisoned. After six years (1738), the Wesleys departed to Georgia, in answer to calls,— the one to be pastor of the colony, the other to be missionary to the Indians. On board ship they came in contact with twenty-six Moravians, and much to their spiritual profit. John Wesley once said, "I went to America to convert others, and was not converted myself." They both had returned, by 1738, to England. Soon afterwards John Wesley and Whitefield began preaching in London churches, and by their fervid eloquence excited a deep sensation. The movement afterwards known as "Methodism" had begun to develop its prodigious power. Like a mighty storm, the new preaching shook the hearts of the hearers, and threw new converts into the dust; so that, with great agitation and much crying, they entreated for mercy. The representatives of the movement were, on the other hand, treated to ridicule, scorn, and active persecution. But the movement spread in spite of resistance. Nothing was at first farther from the thought of John Wesley than to act independently of the English Church. He himself was a High-Churchman; but, against whose religious apathy it was a protest, and sought to make Christianity a more vital force, and to leave the neglected masses with the leaven of the gospel. It has with justice been called the "Second Reformation" of England, and the "starting-point of our modern religious history." (Isaac Taylor).

The Puritans, whose brief term of power came to a close with the Restoration (1660), gradually lost their zeal, or were involved in the meshes of deism. The Church of England, on the other hand, had fallen into a low spiritual condition. It still had its able and pious men, competent and willing to defend the faith; but the churches were empty, and the masses neglected. The condition of the lower clergy was a lamentable one; and idleness, indifference, and ignorance reigned among them, while many of the higher clergy enjoyed the benefits of their livings, but left to curate their religious exercises. The prominent prelates of the church contemplated its condition with grief, and looked forward to its future with alarm. As they were vainly looking around them for help, it came from an unexpected quarter and in an unexpected way. Several students, in the course of the study of the Scriptures and religious conversation, of their number the most prominent were John Wesley (1703-91) and his brother Charles (1708-88), and, several years later, George Whitefield (1714-70). In sport they were called "Sacramentarians," the "Pious Club," and also, on account of their regular habits of study and mode of life, "Methodists," — a name which they themselves afterwards adopted, defining a "Methodist" as one who lived after the method laid down in the Bible. It was from this club of Methodists that the religious regeneration of England proceeded. The first period of the history of Methodism synchronizes with the history of the latter's career: the second dates from his death.

The Puritans, whose brief term of power came to a close with the Restoration (1660), gradually lost their zeal, or were involved in the meshes of deism. The Church of England, on the other hand, had fallen into a low spiritual condition. It still had its able and pious men, competent and willing to defend the faith; but the churches were empty, and the masses neglected. The condition of the lower clergy was a lamentable one; and idleness, indifference, and ignorance reigned among them, while many of the higher clergy enjoyed the benefits of their livings, but left to curate their religious exercises. The prominent prelates of the church contemplated its condition with grief, and looked forward to its future with alarm. As they were vainly looking around them for help, it came from an unexpected quarter and in an unexpected way. Several students, in the course of the study of the Scriptures and religious conversation, of their number the most prominent were John Wesley (1703-91) and his brother Charles (1708-88), and, several years later, George Whitefield (1714-70). In sport they were called "Sacramentarians," the "Pious Club," and also, on account of their regular habits of study and mode of life, "Methodists," — a name which they themselves afterwards adopted, defining a "Methodist" as one who lived after the method laid down in the Bible. It was from this club of Methodists that the religious regeneration of England proceeded. The first period of the history of Methodism synchronizes with the history of the latter's career: the second dates from his death.

I. HISTORY OF METHODISM TILL THE DEATH OF JOHN WESLEY, 1791.

The club at Oxford, which spent several evenings in the week in the study of the Scriptures, first began to show its works in the visitation of the poor, sick, and imprisoned. After six years (1738), the Wesleys departed to Georgia, in answer to calls,— the one to be pastor of the colony, the other to be missionary to the Indians. On board ship they came in contact with twenty-six Moravians, and
preachers, accomplished an immense amount of good, suffering often imprisonment and other personal indignities in the work. Education was not a condition of a license to preach; but, by the rules of 1746, simply a gift for preaching and personal faith were required. They were licensed at first as “preachers on trial,” for one year. By a rule passed in 1763 they were not allowed to remain longer than two years (afterwards extended to three years) in the same place.

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

The first Methodist organizations were called “societies,” and the General Rules, so called, drawn up by Wesley for the guidance of the members, forbade blasphemy, Sabbath desecration, dishonesty, usury, etc., and enjoined works of charity, and the use of the private and public means of grace. The societies were divided into classes, and here we come in contact with a peculiarly Methodist institution, and one of its sources of power. The idea struck John Wesley in Bristol, when, in order to raise money to pay the debt of the chapel, he divided the members into classes of twelve, and appointed one of them to collect from the other eleven a penny a week. Henceforth, all the societies were divided into classes, with a class-leader, who gathered the classes together once a week, presided over their meeting, and conversed with them on their spiritual estate. The separate societies were united in circuits; and in 1748 there were nine of these, with about seventy-two societies. The circuits were occupied by itinerant and local preachers, over whom one of their number presided as the overseer, with the title at first of assistant, and later of superintendent. (The Wesleyans in America call them “bishops.”) Each society had a corps of officers called “stewards,” who met twice a week, and cared for its temporal concerns and diaconal work.

This was the excellent outward organization of the Methodist body. But that which gave it power was the fresh blood of the gospel, which coursed through its veins. All the lay-talent was employed, the gifts of preaching were put into requisition, prayer-meetings (1782) gave an opportunity for all to exercise their powers, and, with the love-feasts, an opportunity for mutual encouragement and edification.

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

Wesley's theology had a predominantly practical trend. He himself was no creative mind in this department, nor did he ever think of founding a new system of theology. He stood almost wholly upon the platform of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. His system is called Arminian; but it must not be forgotten that he did not reject, as did the followers of Arminius, the doctrines of original sin and the Trinity. He taught very definitely the fall of man, the necessity of all the ministers of the district, which purely moral perfection, in which love has constituted the so-called "district committee," consisting of all the ministers of the district, which

was to have authority to locate (subject to the confirmation of the Conference) and suspend ministers, etc. The year following (1783), it accorded to the societies the right of administering the sacraments, and ordained that no steward should be removed from office before his guilt was proved in the presence of the other stewards and the class-leaders. But, these concessions failing to satisfy all, a Plan of Pacification was passed in 1785, which went farther in the direction of separation from the Church of England, vested the power of locating ministers in the hand of the Conference (subject to the will of the stewards), in general accorded more power to the lay-element, and confirmed the law limiting the representation in the Conference to a hundred.

Kilham, discontented with the continued refusal of the Conference to admit laymen as representatives, sought to arouse opposition to that body. The Conference, in its turn, suspended Kilham, and endeavored to quiet the agitation by according more power to the lay-element in the so-called "Regulations of Leeds" (1787). Still dissatisfied, Kilham and three other preachers broke off from the parent society, and on Aug. 9, 1797, founded in Leeds The Methodist New Connection, with which 5,000 seceders at once united. This body adopts the Wesleyan teaching and polity in every regard except in its treatment of the laymen, to whom it accords an equal representation with the clergy. In 1881 it had 29,564 communicants, with 176 ministers.

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

The body carries on its work in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. In 1881 it had 185,312 members and 1,149 preachers.

In 1815 there was another separation, of the so-called Bible Christians, or Bryantes, of whom William O'Bryan was the founder. It grew out of a feeling of discontent with the renumeration of the itinerant preachers. In 1881 they had 21,200 members. In 1816, 9,000 of the Methodists of Ireland formed a new organization, under the name of the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists. The leader of the movement was Adam Averill, who revolted against the departure from Wesley's original plan in allowing the societies to hold their services at the same time with those of the Anglican Church. In 1877 the body was again united with the Wesleyan Methodists.

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

The church continued to have peace for ten years, when (in 1844) it was again interrupted by a repetition of the Fly Sheets. (Of course, no circulars were sent to every Wesleyan minister, and were directed against Dr. Bunting, who for thirty years had been one of the most influential men in the body. The cry was, "Too much centralization of power." It was evident that the Fly Sheets represented the feelings of a party. The Conference of 1847 took notice of them, and passed a law requiring every minister who had not taken part in their dissemination to sign a document to that effect. About one-fourth of the clergy (250) refused their signatures, rebelling against conduct which they regarded as unjustifiable.

The party represented by the Fly Sheets, now emboldened, established two organs,—The Wesleyan Times and The Wesleyan Banner. The agitation spread; and Dunn, the editor of the latter, Griffith, a co-editor of the former, and Everett, the author of the Fly Sheets, were excluded from the Conference, while others were reprimanded. The excluded preachers were regarded as martyrs. Meetings were held, and finally, on March 12, 1850, in London, a convention of Wesleyan delegates. This meeting, while confessing its sympathy with the teachings of Wesleyanism, demanded lay-representation and other concessions. A petition, signed by 50,000 Methodists, was presented to the Conference, which, however, refused to accept it. The excitement in Methodist circles was intense, and in a single year (1850-51) the body lost 50,000 communicants. In 1850 the British Conference in England alone had 358,277 communicants, and in 1855 only 280,858. It continued, however, year after year, to refuse any concessions; and the agitators, finding their efforts hopeless, ceased agitating. Of the 100,000 who had left the main body, 19,000 in 1857 united with the Protestant Missionary Society; 13,276 with the Wesleyan Methodist Association; and 14,000 (of ministers and members) to form the association of the United Methodist Free Churches. They hold an Annual Assembly composed of ministerial and lay delegates, each five hundred church-members being entitled to one delegate. In 1861 they numbered 72,839 members. The other reformers went to other denominations, except the few who organized the Wesleyan Reform Union, which in 1880 numbered 7,000 members.

It took a number of years for the wound which the Wesleyan Church had suffered to be healed. The increase in the number of communicants from 1855 to 1882 has been from 280,858 to 509,387 members (54,489 on trial), 2,124 ministers (298 on trial), and 341 supernumeraries. After its victory it was wise enough to give the lay membership a larger representation on the committees, and in 1877 to constitute a Representative Conference, composed of laymen and clergymen in equal proportion. It does not take the place of the Conference of a hundred, but is auxiliary to it. During this second period of its history, Methodism has not outgrown its original zeal and energy, but has shown itself more expansive, combining with the simplicity of early years a more perfected organization and broader culture. Its churches are no longer all chapels, but vie with those of other denominations in elegance of architecture, and luxury of furniture; its members also have wealth; its preachers lay more stress upon education, until now they have seminaries at Melbourne, Richmond, Didsbury (Leeds), and Belfast. The Primitive Methodists have also established a school of theology in Sunderland; and the Methodist New Connection, at Ramnoor, Sheffield.

From the very start, the Methodist body has been most active in carrying on missionary labors. At the time of Wesley's death, there were already 5,848 communicants connected with its foreign stations. Dr. Coke was the first superintendent of Methodist missions; and his indefatigable zeal secured the funds, and established stations in most parts of the world. The Fiji and other Islands of the Southern Pacific were Christianized exclusively by their zeal. The West Indies were another of the main stations of early Methodist missions; and in 1880 they had there 46,082 communicants among the negroes. In 1795 it began its mission at Sierra Leone, pro-verbal, as a convict colony, for its moral degradation, which now has 18,647 communicants. It has since established missions in India, China, and other foreign lands, as well as in Germany, Italy, France, and other countries of Europe. In 1878 the Methodist Church in Canada and British America numbered 124,000 communicants. The Australian Conference, founded in 1877, has now 70,000 members.

In surveying the history of Methodism from its beginning, we are struck with the aggressive feature of this movement. Wesley felt that the masses were neglected, and he went out to meet them with the gospel in his hand. In Great Britain, Methodism found its first great field among the destitute and neglected, the poor and forsaken: on the New Continent, it has always been first on the frontiers. It is true that the Anglican Church now vies with the Methodists in working among the lower classes, and that they neglecting them in their zeal for culture; but this remains one of the merits of the body, that it has emphasized aggressive church activity. This activity it was the further merit of Wesley to emphasize as the privilege and duty of all Christians. The laity were not to be merely receptive, but active. One of the great sources of power in Methodism has been the extent of lay-activity. Lay-preaching, the conduct of the classes, the prayer-meeting, these all have a far-reaching influence, and in this connection we may refer to the philanthropy of Methodism. Before Elizabeth Fry had entered the prisons, and long before the institution of the Ragged-schools, the Methodists were laboring among the destitute, visiting jails, distributing tracts, and establishing free Sunday schools; and among the first to condemn slavery was the founder of Methodism.

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

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


METHODISM IN AMERICA. I. EARLY HISTORY. — The great religious movement inaugurated by the Wesleys and their co-laborers could not long be confined to Great Britain. It was natural that the British Colonies should likewise be recipients of some brands from the great conflagration in the mother-country. America was no exception. Among those on the European tide of the Atlantic who were most benefited by the Wesleyan revival were the Irish Palatines of Court Mattress, Killilheen, and Balligarrane. In 1760 a party of these German refugees left their Irish home to seek their fortune in America, and arrived in New York, Aug. 10. The emigrants included in their name Philip Embury, a class leader and local preacher, and Barbara Heck, wife of Paul Heck. Embury seems to have lost a part of his zeal on coming to America; and it was not until 1766, that, upon the earnest entreaty of Barbara Heck, he began to preach in his own house to such as could be induced to go there for religious service. In February of the following year, Capt. Thomas Webb of the British army appeared among the worshippers at Embury’s house, and presented his credentials as a local preacher; and from that time forward he became an active agent in the establishment of American Methodism. Embury’s house soon became too small for the rapidly increasing audience, and a more commodious room in the neighborhood was obtained. Through the preaching of Embury and Webb, vast numbers were attracted to the services, requiring still larger accommodations. A rigging-room on William Street, was hired in 1767; but this would not accommodate one-half of the people who desired to attend. Barbara Heck, with womanly foresight and spiritual zeal, secured the erection of the first Methodist chapel in America. A site on John Street was purchased in 1770, and a building was constructed of stone, faced with blue plaster. Capt. Webb was very active in the spread of Methodism. He founded societies in various parts of the country, notably in Philadelphia, where he formed a class of seven members in 1767 or 1768, and aided in the purchase of the first Methodist church of that city (St. George’s) in 1770. Interest in the new movement increased with such rapidity, that it was impossible to supply the demand for preaching. Appeals were sent to England for help; and in response to the call, on the 8th of August, 1769, from the Conference, then in session at Leeds, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor were sent over. In 1771 Francis Asbury and Richard Wright were sent to assist in the farther spread of Methodism in this country. In the following year they were joined by Thomas Rankin and George Shadford.

The first Methodist Conference held in America convened in St. George’s Church, Philadelphia, on Wednesday, July 14, 1773, and closed on Friday, the 16th. Its members were Thomas Rankin, Richard Boardman, Joseph Pilmoor, Francis Asbury, Richard Wright, George Shadford, Thomas Webb, John King, Abraham Whitworth, and Joseph Yearboy — ten in all. The aggregate membership of the classes reported was 1,160, although there were many adherents besides. At this session the Wesleyan discipline was made binding on all the preachers and adherents of American Methodism. The second Conference occurred in May of the following year, when the returns indicated 10 circuits, 17 preachers, and 2,073 members. At the Conference of 1775 the membership of the classes reported was 1,160, and in 1776, when the returns showed a membership of 3,148. The returns indicated 10 circuits, 17 preachers, and 2,073 members. At the Conference of 1775 the membership of the classes reported was 1,160, and in 1776, when the returns showed a membership of 3,148. The Revolution, now coming on, wrought great hardship to the itinerants and to the entire body of Methodist adherents. The American Methodist movement, though steadily onward for a time, was not only checked, but caused to retrograde at last.
In 1776 there was a membership of 4,921, and an itinerant roll of 28; in 1777, 6,985 members and 98 itinerants. The year which followed this conference showed the close connection to American liberty and the cause of Methodism. British arms were successful. The itinerants were persecuted, and in some instances compelled to seek safety in seclusion; and Methodism, instead of pursuing its onward way with its accustomed vigor, declined considerably. The sixth Annual Conference convened at Leesburg, Va., May 19, 1778, when the returns indicated 6,995 members and 30 ministers,—a loss of 575 members and 8 preachers. New York and Philadelphia were in the hands of the British, and many other parts of the land were under the menace of the enemy’s guns. But Methodism emerged from the Revolution strong and vigorous, with no purpose to relinquish the field for any opposition. During the summer of 1783, a few months after the close of the war, Asbury wrote,—

"We have about 14,000 members, between 70 and 80 travelling preachers, between 90 and 40 circuits... I admire the simplicity of our preachers. I do not think there has appeared another such a company of young devoted men. The gospel has taken the hands of the British, and many other parts of the mother-country. Something must be done to check the ardor of the present time...."

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

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

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

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

The Methodist-Episcopal Church has various benevolent institutions in vigorous working-order. The Missionary Society has been in operation since 1819. There are missions, under the direction of this society, in Africa, India, China, Japan, Korea, Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Bulgaria, Italy, South America, and Mexico, of the foreign fields; and, in the home fields, among the American Indians, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Chinese, in the Territories and frontier settlements, and in various other localities known as "English-speaking" missions. In the foreign fields there are 117 members, 140 foreign missionaries, with about 70 assistants; about 200 native ordained preachers, with as many more who are not ordained; about 300 local preachers; 400 native teachers; about 37,000 members and 65,000 Sunday-school scholars; 517 day schools, 16,000 scholars; 2,500 Sunday-schools, 5,500 local preachers, 280,000 members and probationers, 512,000 scholars in the Sunday schools. The receipts of the
Missionary Society are nearly a million dollars annually. The Church Extension Society was incorporated in 1865, and is now erecting churches, in localities where the people are not able to build for themselves, at the rate of more than one for every day in the year. The Freedman's Aid Society has been in operation since 1866, and has done much to educate and Christianize the freedmen of the South. The following figures are taken from the report of the Society for 1886:

Number of institutions is 41; number of teachers employed, 169; number of pupils taught in the year 1885-86 in the institutions of the Society, 6,055; funds received and expended during the fiscal year, $174,210.06; total disbursements by the Society since its organization in 1866, $1,568,538.29.

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

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

III. METHODIST-EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH.

The question of slavery had been agitated in the Methodist "societies" in America, and in the conferences, previous to the formation of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and still continued as a disturbing element after the organization. At the General Conference of 1844, however, the agitation reached a crisis, which resulted in the disruption of the church. The Rev. Francis A. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference, had been suspended from the ministry for refusing to emancipate slaves belonging to his wife; and he appealed from this decision to the General Conference, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of the General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States."

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

IV. METHODIST-PROTESTANT CHURCH.

The original constitution of the Methodist-Episcopal Church vested the legislative power entirely in the travelling ministry. This was satisfactory for a brief time only. Local preachers of influence, and prominent laymen, soon began to desire some voice in the general government of the church. The power of the episcopacy was also a source of discontent to many. The question of electing presiding elders was discussed at the General Conference of 1820, and caused considerable excitement. William S. Stockton, a prominent layman of that church, then began the publication of The Wesleyan Repository at Tren-
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V. Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America. — This church originated in 1839 as an outgrowth of the antislavery agitation. The organization was completed at a convention held in Utica, N.Y., May 21, 1849. The Articles of Religion of the Methodist-Episcopal Church were adopted with considerable changes, though their theology remains strictly Arminian. This body abolished episcopacy; adopted lay-representation in the annual and general conferences; admitted local preachers to membership in annual conferences; made their general rules to forbid "the manufacturing, buying, selling, or using intoxicating liquors (unless for mechanical, chemical, or medicinal purposes), or in any way intentionally and knowingly aiding others so to do;" and "slave-holding, buying or selling slaves, or claiming that it is right so to do;" and declared, that "as, in the judgment of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, it is inconsistent with our duties to God and Christianity to join secret oath-bound societies, or hold fellowship with them, we will on no account tolerate our ministers and members in holding such connection." The "book-concern" is located at Syracuse, N.Y. They publish two periodicals, and have been interested in the maintenance of several institutions of learning at different times.

VI. Free Methodist Church. — This is the youngest of the Methodist bodies, having been organized by a convention at Pekin, N.Y., Aug. 23, 1890. The new church was to return to the original Methodist simplicity, and adhere more closely to the doctrines and usages of Wesley. Its doctrines are the same as those of the Methodist-Episcopal Church (of which its founders were original members), with the addition of two articles,—one on entire sanctification, and the other on future reward and punishment. Its government is a slight modification of that of the parent church. General superintendents are elected for four years; laymen are admitted on equal terms with ministers to all conferences; none are received on probation except those who confess a "saving faith in Christ;" and all who unite with the church are required to lay aside all superfluous ornaments in dress. They have two educational institutions, a monthly magazine, and a weekly church paper.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. The Evangelical Association, or “Albrights,” is the outgrowth of the labors of the Rev. Jacob Albright, a local preacher of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. He began to travel and labor among the German population of Eastern Pennsylvania about the year 1789. In 1796 he devoted himself exclusively to evangelistic work; and in 1800, finding his converts scattered abroad, without church homes, he organized them into classes and societies, after the manner of John Wesley. These societies unanimously elected Mr. Albright their superintendent, or bishop. The organization was completed in 1808 by the adoption of a creed, and rules of government. In doctrine and government it is essentially Methodist. Bishops are elected for four years by the General Conference, and presiding elders, for a like period, by the Annual Conferences. They have a college in Naperville, Ill., and a publishing-house located in Cleveland, O., where they print two periodicals in German, and two in English. See Evangelical Association.

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

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

1. Methodist-Episcopal Church in Canada.
   — The introduction of Methodism into Canada took place as early as 1788, and was fostered by the Methodist leaders in the States for a long period. In 1820 there were 2 districts, 17 circuits, 25 travelling preachers, 47 local preachers, and almost 6,000 members. The Canada Conference was organized, under the authority of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, in 1824; and, by the mutual consent of the Church and the Conference, it was organized as an independent church, with the above title. In doctrine and polity it is like the parent church.

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

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

X. British Methodists in America. — These consist of a few sporadic branches of the Methodist family that strictly affiliate with bodies on the other side of the Atlantic.

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

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

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

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

XII. General Statistics of American Methodist Churches. — The subjoined table gives the numerical force of all its sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Annual Conference</th>
<th>Episcopal Association</th>
<th>Local Preachers</th>
<th>Lay Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. E. Church</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12,142</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>1,717,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. Church South</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>5,898</td>
<td>909,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African M. E. Church</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>391,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware M. E. Church</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General M. E. Church</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>112,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Protestant Church</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>115,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist, Con-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nection of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Association</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>115,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Brethren in Christ</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td></td>
<td>115,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Amer. M. E. Church</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Methodist Church</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>12,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive M. Church</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>11,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Church of Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>115,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. Church of Canada</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>27,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Christian Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Free Church</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent M. Churches</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>27,206</td>
<td>36,669</td>
<td>3,993,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sense of the word, the practical application of encyclopaedia; the latter showing the connection between the various parts of the system; and the former teaching the order in which, and the means by which, each single part may be most appropriately studied.

METROPHANES CRITOPULUS, a native of Beroza in Macedonia; educated at Mount Athos; has been described in the form of a polemic treatise. He was elected, or rather nominated (i.e., first protector of the seal) to the patriarch of Constantinople; was in 1616 sent to England, with letters of recommendation from Cyril Lucar, to the Archbishop of Canterbury and King James. His object was to study in England and Germany, in order to become better prepared to meet the Jesuits, who at that time made great exertions to get a foothold within the pale of the Greek Church. After a stay of four or five years in Oxford, he went to Germany, where he visited the universities of Wittenberg, Tubingen, Altdorf, Strassburg, and Helmstadt, and became intimately acquainted with Conring, Calixtus, and Hornejus. In 1620 he went to Venice, where for some time he lived as a teacher in Greek. He then returned to Constantinople, and was finally appointed patriarch of Alexandria. The date of his death is unknown, but must fall after 1640. In spite of his intimate intercourse with Protestant theologians, he was by no means, what Nicolaus Comnenus calls him, a Graeco-Lutheranus. He did, in that respect, even not go so far as Cyril Lucar; indeed, in 1638 he publicly joined the synod convened against Cyril Lucar by Cyril of Beroza. The most interesting monument he has left of himself is the confession which he wrote while in Helmstädt, and which was published (the Greek text with a Latin translation) by J. Hornejus, Helmstädt, 1681. It is a comprehensive, clear, and well-written representation of the doctrinal and ritual system of the Greek Church, not in the strict form of a symbolical confession of faith, but in the free form of a theological treatise. It is full of polemics against the Roman-Catholic Church, but refrains from all criticism of Protestantism. See Dietelmaier : De Metrophane Critopul. Metropolitans.

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

MEUSEL, Wolfgang. See Musculus.

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

The history of Mexico is to a large extent veiled in darkness, but has during the last four hundred and fifty years, until recently, been a history of religious superstition and moral degeneracy. The history may be divided into three periods,—the early period, reaching down to the conquest of Cortez (in 1519); the period of the Spanish domination from 1519 to 1821; and the period of national independence. The original inhabitants of the land were the Toltecs, who came from the north in the seventh century. They were followed by the Aztecs in the thirteenth century. The latter people offered human sacrifices on a large scale, and practised the revolting rite of cutting the heart from the body while it was still alive, and offering it to the gods. They had reached a measure of civilization when the arms of the Spaniard Cortez (1519-21) put an end to their domination; and his barbaric cruelties, which have only been outdone by the Turks and Saracens, and were practised in the name of the Christian religion, crushed them, and stunted their development. For three hundred years the land was governed by viceroys sent out by Spain, during which the Roman-Catholic religion was offered to or forced upon the people, until it became all dominant, and the church acquired a vast wealth, even to the extent of one-third of the entire landed property of the country. The first movement towards national independence was inaugurated by Miguel Hidalgo in 1810, and the Spanish yoke thrown off by Iturbide in 1821. In 1824 Mexico was declared a republic, and a constitution similar to that of the United States adopted. It now consists of twenty-seven states, one territory, and one federal district. In 1861 Louis Napoleon conceived the idea of establishing French authority in Mexico; and in 1864 Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, was at his instigation declared emperor. The priesthood of the Mexican Church sympathized with the foreign movement; but the nation refused the interference, executed Maximilian in 1867 at Queretaro, and, seconded by the sympathies of the government of the United States, drove back the invaders. The government is presided over by a Presi-
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MEYER, Heinrich August Wilhelm, the distinguished commentator of the New Testament, was b. in Gotha, Jan. 10, 1800; d. in Hanover, June 21, 1873. His father was court shoemaker. After passing through the usual course in the gymnasium, he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology. He heard the lectures of Gabler, Schott, Danz, and Baumgarten-Crusius; also studied Arabic under Kosegarten, but was obliged, by his father's failure in business, to content himself with a course of two years and a half, leaving the university in 1826. In 1821 he was appointed preacher in a select school for the higher classes, at Grone, near Göttingen; and in 1822 became pastor in Osthhausen, where he married. Transferring his ecclesiastical relations to Hanover, he was appointed, in 1831, pastor at Harste, near Göttingen, with a salary of five hundred and twenty-nine thalers. From here he went, in 1837, to Hoya; in 1841, after declining a professorship at Giessen, was appointed Consistorialrat, and pastor of the Hof- und Schloss-Church, in Neustadt, a parish of five thousand souls. During these years he added to the duties of his office constant labor, in making Commentaries on the New Testament. In 1848 he resigned his pastorate, and went to Hanover to reside. In 1861 he was advanced to the dignity of an Oberconsistorialrat (member of the highest ecclesiastical court), but at his own request was allowed, in 1865, to retire on a pension. He lived a retired and uneventful life, observed a strict regularity in his habits, and might be found every morning, by four or five, at his desk. His body lies in the graveyard at Neustadt, and on the slab are the words of Rom. xiv. 8. Frau Meyer preceded her husband to the grave in 1864.
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lent, elected every fourth year indirectly by the people, who also elect a national Legislature of two houses.

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

Protestant missions, in spite of the decree of 1857 tolerating all religions, could get no admittance to Mexico till after the failure of the French enterprise, and to this day are excluded from the state of Guererro. Bibles had been introduced into the country to a limited extent, when the army of the United States invaded it in 1847. The honor of beginning missionary efforts in Mexico belongs to Miss Rankin, who of her own impulse, and independent of outside help, established a school in Brownsville, and subsequently established herself at Matamoras, in 1866. She founded more than a dozen schools, with native teachers, and finally consigned her work to the American and Foreign Christian Union. A reform movement from within the Mexican Church itself started with a priest, Francis Aguilar, and a layman, Hernandez, who in 1865 established the so-called "Church of Jesus." In 1887 Aguilar opened a hall for public worship in San José de Real. At his death the church sought aid from the Protestant-Episcopal Church of the United States. In 1869 Rev. Henry C. Riley (a Chilian by birth, but of American parentage), who at the time was preaching to a Spanish congregation in New-York City, went to Mexico under commission from the American and Foreign Christian Union. Since 1878 the Episcopal Church has supported the Church of Jesus. It has acquired by purchase two fine church edifices in the City of Mexico,—the San Francisco, and San José de Garcia. It now has a bishop (Dr. Riley, bishop of the Valley of Mexico, and Mr. Hernandez is bishop-elect of Cuernavaca), twelve Mexican presbyters, and 8,301 average attendants upon worship. The Report for 1881 only gives the number of native communicants in the City of Mexico, which is 125. In 1871 a Dominican friar, Manuel Aguas, the most eloquent preacher in the City of Mexico, who was appointed to resist Mr. Riley from the pulpit, himself became a proselyte under Mr. Riley's preaching. He engaged with Mr. Riley in prosecuting the work of the Church of Jesus, but died, much lamented, in 1872.

The Presbyterian Church established a mission in Mexico, in 1872, at Villa de Cos, Zacatecas. It has been very successful, and at present (1882) employs 8 American missionaries and 8 native preachers and helpers; has 6,040 communicants connected with its churches, 1,141 of whom were admitted in the year 1881-82. The Southern Presbyterian Church likewise conducts a mission in Mexico, with 2 American and 2 native missionaries (in 1882), and 236 church-members. The Congregationalists entered Mexico in 1872, and in 1882 had 2 missionaries, 5 native helpers, and 173 native church-members. The Methodist-Episcopal Church began its work in 1873, and in 1881 had 8 circuits, served by 9 foreign missionaries, 17 native preachers, 5 female and 28 other helpers, 388 communicants, and 388 probationers. It supports one theological school, and in 1881 conducted a mission in Mexico, with headquarters at Matamoras, a meeting-house costing $4,000, and 186 members in 1882.

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

D. S. SCHAFF.

MEYER.
Meyer was a thoroughly pure nature, truly pious, humble, modest, and honest. The proofs of his eminent scholarship and untiring industry are found in his published works. It was one of his regular habits of study that enabled him to accomplish as much as he did. He also understood how to concentrate his attention upon special subjects, and to avoid the diversion of outside studies. With the mention of the part he took in the Church Conference at Berlin, 1846, and his share in the revision of Luther’s version of the New Testament, we almost exhaust his activity beyond the sphere of his professional and literary work. As a pastor, he excelled: as a catechist and as a member of the Consistorium, he distinguished himself as an examiner of candidates of theology.

Meyer’s reputation beyond Hanover rests upon his Commentaries on the New Testament. Upon this one department he concentrated his literary efforts, and did not turn aside to write review essays, and the like. The original title of his great work was Das Neue Testament Griechisch nach den besten Hülfsmitteln kritisch revidirt mit einer neuen Deutschen Übersetzung und einem kritischen und exegetischen Kommentar [“The New Testament in Greek, critically edited according to the best helps, with a new German translation, and a critical and exegetical Commentary”]. The original plan included three parts: (1) The text and translation; (2) A Commentary on the Gospels and Acts; (3) A Commentary on the rest of the New Testament. The work was designed for students; and the comments were to be strictly philological, and expressed in terse language. In 1829 the text and translation appeared, in two volumes, at Göttingen. The first volume of the Commentary, covering the three first Gospels (419 pages) followed in 1832. But the original plan was now enlarged; and Commentaries appeared on John (1834), the Acts (1835), Romans (1836), First Corinthians (1839) Second Corinthians (1840), Galatians (1841), Ephesians (1849), and Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon (1847). Unable, on account of the new editions which were called for, of these works, to comment upon the other books of the New Testament, he gave them to his publishers to be given to the public in the same manner. The Synoptists, will find wide differences.

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

Since his death, the continuation of Meyer’s Commentary in new editions has been intrusted to Bernard Weiss, who has published Mark and Luke (1878), John (1880), and Romans (1881); Wendt, Colossians and the Acts (1880); Henrici, First Corinthians; Sieffert, Galatians (1880); W. Schmidt, Ephesians (1876); and W. Beyschlag, James (1882). A biographical sketch of Meyer by his son, Professor Dr. Meyer of Hanover, will be found in the fourth edition of the Commentary on the Philippians. [The English translation of the Commentary, except the Revelation, from the last ed. by Meyer, ed. by Dr. Dickson, Edinb., 1873-82, 20 vols.]
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UNFUG DES HEZENPROCESSES, 1703, and CHRISTLICHE ERINNERUNG, concerning the German universities (1836), in which he gives a very striking description of life at that time, especially among theological students. This latter group of works proved so popular as to lead him to be a true forerunner of Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705).

HENKE.

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

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

MICAH (who is like Jehovah). Of this so-called Minor Prophet little is known. His birthplace was Moresheth, a town near Gath, in the kingdom of Judah. The scene of his prophetic activity was Judah; — indeed, for the most part at least, Jerusalem; and, as the superscription reads, the time of his prophecies was the reign of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, principally the last; or from before the fall of Samaria (722) to the sixth year of Hezekiah. The theme of his prophecy was the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem. One of his declarations is quoted by Jeremiah (xxvi. 18). From the quotation it has been inferred that Micah, during Hezekiah's reign, gathered up his prophecies into a book, and by the public reading of it ended his prophetic career. The fall of Samaria was the direct judgment of God for the sins of the northern kingdom, specially of their rulers and false prophets (Mic. i. 5-ii. 11). But Jerusalem's turn comes next (ii. 12-iii.); and then the new day will dawn, in which Zion will be obedient to the law of Jehovah, at peace, and the centre of the world. God's scattered people will be gathered; and the destruction will come upon the Assyrians, the way of her eternal King (iv. 1-8). Before, however, this brilliant period, the inhabitants of Jerusalem will be carried away to Babylon; and in captivity run the great danger of losing their peculiarity, — their separation from the nations. From this danger Jehovah will deliver them, and restore them to their land. Micah repeats the prophecy of Joel concerning the "gathering of the nations" against Zion, and its extinction. But these events will not be until after the captivity. Then, turning to the nearer future, Micah declares that Zion's King will be maltreated by her foes (iv. 9-13). But from Bethlehem, the city of David, will come the King who will rule and protect the united, restored people, — the King whose coming has been from old, from everlasting (v. 1-15). [The prophecy of the exact place of Messiah's coming is the most interesting of all. There are two facts about Micah's prophecy: that the prophecy is evinced by the ready response the doctors of the law gave to Herod's question (Matt. ii. 5, 6), and the talk of the people about Christ (John vii. 42.)] In chapters iv. and v. Micah's prophecy reaches its height. It will be noticed that he three times sets together a nearer and a remoter future: Zion will be destroyed before it becomes the seat of the universal kingdom of peace (iii. 12, iv. 8); the people of Zion will be carried captive to Babylon before they win their victory over the "gathering of the nations" (iv. 8, 18); Zion's king will be given up to his foes before the Son of David arises, who shall found a kingdom of peace, and rule united Israel (v. 1, 8). From the height of chapters iv. and v. he descends in chapter vi. to the then present. Jehovah pleads with his people on account of their sins. He shows them what is good; but, since the people persist in their sins, Micah is inspired to pronounce a fearful curse (vi. 1-16). The believers in Israel utter a prayer of penitence, in which they humbly confess the deep and general corruption, bow before the divine wrath, but express their confidence that Jehovah will still help them, and comfort them with the conviction that the divine anger will at last pass away, that Babylon will fall, never to rise again, and in that day the walls of Zion shall be rebuilt, and the scattered children of God shall come thither from Assyria and from Egypt, and shall fill the land from the borders of Egypt even to the Euphrates, from sea to sea, and from mountain to mountain (vii. 1-13). Then they pray for a renewal of the earlier tokens of favor (vii. 14), to which God replies he will repeat in his people the marvels of the former time (vii. 15-17); and the prophet closes with an outburst of praise for the grace and mercy of God. Micah points to the desolate land, to the ruins of Jerusalem, as the sign of the coming of Messiah (viii. 14, 15). Then, having mentioned Messiah, who is to come in glory, Micah begins to deal with the prophet's later prophecies, which bear on the destruction of Jerusalem (ix. 1). Micah doubtless lived to see the fall of the city which he had predicted (935); but he died a little time before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians (586). The book falls naturally into three sections, — i. 2-iii. 1; iii. 1-iv. 1; vi. 1-vii. 20. The language is purely classical. In point of rhetorical peculiarity, Micah stands between his contemporaries, Hosea and Isaiah, but nearer to the latter than the former; for although, like the former, he is abrupt, abounding in sudden and quick changes, in depth of spirituality he is the worthy
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companion of Isaiah, sharing with him the mar-
vellous mingling of mildness and strength, of
gentleness and elevation, and the plastic liveliness
and preference for artistic turns of expression.

Lit.—Separate Commentaries by Chrysostom,
Wittenberg, 1565; Edward Pocock, Oxford,
1677; Grosschopf, Jena, 1798; Justi, Leipzig,
1799; Hartmann, Longo, 1800; Caspari, Mar-
burg; Koepfer, p. 1; [K. Klauser, in Lange,
Bischoff, 1879; English, New York, 1875];
Reinke, Giessen, 1874; [T. K. Chyney,
Cambridge, 1882]. See also Schnurrer: Animadverse.

Michael (who is like God?), one of the seven
archangels of Jewish post-exilian angelology;
is three times mentioned in the Old Testament, but
only in Daniel (x. 13, 21, xii. 1), and twice in the
New Testament (Jude 9—and Rev. xii. 7). These
passages indicate Michael's rank: he was
regarded as the guardian of the people of God,
their vigilant and efficient protector against all
foes, earthly and devilish. In the rabbinical
writings, Michael frequently appears in opposition
to Sammael. J. A. Fabricius gives the song of
Michael and the good angels in triumph over
Lucifer and the bad angels, said to have been re-
vealed to St. Amadeus (Codex pseudographus
Vet. Test. vol. 1, pp. 26, 27, Hamburg, 1723; see
English partial translation in Baring-Gould's
Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 10).

In the Roman-Catholic Church, Michael is a
saint; and his festival, called "Michaelmas," is
held on Sept. 29 (see art.). He is said to have
announced to the Virgin Mary the time of her
death, and also to have carried her soul to Jesus
after her death. There are several recorded ap-
pearances of the archangel: (1) On Mount Garga-
no, now called Mount St. Michael, on the eastern
coast of Italy, in the kingdom of Naples, at an
unknown year (the day was May 8); (2) At Chon-
is in Phrygia, near Laodicea, in the ninth cen-
tury (the day was Sept. 6); (3) On a rock in the
Gulf of Avranches, in Normandy, Oct. 6, 708.
On this occasion Michael had appeared in honor of St. Michael. (4) The most celebrated
appearance was at Rome, in the year 590. The
story is this: Gregory the First (afterwards called
the Great), who had then just been elected Pope,
was leading a penitential procession about the
9

city in order to offer up prayers for the stay-
ing of the great pestilence which followed the
inundation of 589, and which was, with famine,
greatly increasing the miseries of the city, already
threatened by the Lombards. As he was crossing
the bridge over the Tiber, directly in front of the
tomb of Hadrian, he looked up, and saw Michael
standing on the summit of the mausoleum, sheathing a bloody sword, in token that the plague
was stayed, and heard a choir of angels around
him chanting the anthem, since adopted by the
Church in her vespers-service, "Queen of heaven,
rejoice, because thou art counted worthy to suffer:
he has risen again, as he said. Hallelujah!" It is
further related, that Constantine built a church in honor of Michael (hence it was called "Michaelskirche"), about four miles from Constantinople; and at a later date there
were fifteen churches in his honor within the city.

St. Michael is the patron saint of France. It
was he who appeared to Joan of Arc (see art.).
In 1499 Louis XI. founded the military order of St.
Michael. Originally it was composed exclusively
of gentry; but afterwards literary men, judges,
bankers, and artists, though not of rank, were
eligible. The knights wore, from a gold chain
about their necks, a medal representing the
archangel vanquishing the dragon. The rites of
the order were at first held in the Church of Mount
of Michael in Nogent. (5) Michael, archangel of
Henry II. to the Sainte-Chapelle, Vincennes, and
in 1438, by Louis XIV., to the Grand-Cordeliers
in Paris. The number of knights was at first
limited to thirty-six, afterwards to a hundred:
the king was grand master. The order was sup-
pressed at the Revolutions, restored at the Restora-
tion, and ceased to exist in 1830.

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

"Michael is always represented as young and
beautiful. As patron of the church militant, he is
'the winged saint,' with no attribute save the shield
and the lance. As conqueror of Satan, he stands in
armor, with his foot upon the Evil One, who is half
human, or like a dragon in shape. The angel is
conquered Constantinople by a stratagem the fol-
owing year, driving the Latins and their emperor,
Baldwin II., out of the city, and thus restoring
the Byzantine Empire. In order to escape the
revenge of the Latins, and also in order to battle
the intrigues of an ecclesiastical party in Con-
stantinople, the Arians (see Arians), Michael
attacked the king of Aragon

1 The Incident is probably derived from the Targum of
Jonathan upon Deut. xxiv. 5, which ascribes the burial of
Moses to Michael, and Michael's answer from Zeph. iii. 1.
without any success; and the invasion was followed by the Sicilian Vespers. But both parties were too much occupied with troubles in their own homes to bestow any great attention on foreign affairs, and the union of Lyons was allowed to sink into oblivion.

MICHAEL SCOTUS. See Scotus, Michael.

MICHAELIS, the name of three learned Orientalists and keen theologians, who made valuable contributions in the departments of exegesis and Old-Testament criticism.— I. Johann Heinrich, b. at Klettenberg, July 26, 1668; d. at Halle, March 10, 1738; devoted himself especially to the study of the Oriental languages, taking Egyptology in 1698, at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, with the celebrated Ludolph. He then began giving lectures at Halle, and in 1699 was made professor of the Oriental languages. He exerted an extensive influence by representing at Halle, the seat of Spener's Pietistic school, the critical faculty, and becoming the soul of Francke's Collegium oriental. as well as by editing a critical edition of the Old Testament (1720) from five Egyptian manuscripts, ten printed editions. He also published some valuable exegetical works on the Old Testament, especially on the Hagiographa (Halle, 1720, 3 vols.). — II. Christian Benedikt, nephew of the former, b. at Eichra, Jan. 29, 1680; became professor at Halle in 1713; acquired an extensive reputation for scholarship, especially in the Oriental tongues; d. at Halle, Feb. 22, 1764. He was not very productive as an author; but his Tractatus criticus de variis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et edificandis (1749) against Bengel displays his critical acumen. His Dissert. de antiquo economico patriarchal. (1729) are also interesting. — III. Johann David, son of the former, b. at Eichra, Feb. 22, 1764. He was not very productive as an author; but his Tractatus criticus de variis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et edificandis (1749) against Bengel displays his critical acumen. His Dissert. de antiquo economico patriarchal. (1729) are also interesting. — III. Johann David, son of the former, b. at Eichra, Feb. 22, 1764. He was not very productive as an author; but his Tractatus criticus de variis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et edificandis (1749) against Bengel displays his critical acumen. His Dissert. de antiquo economico patriarchal. (1729) are also interesting.

MICHELMA (Sept. 29) is celebrated, not only in the Roman-Catholic Church, but also in the Greek and various Protestant churches, in honor of the archangel Michael; but with reference to any particular apparition of his, but generally commemorating the benefits which mankind have received from the angels. The origin of the festival seems to go back to the eighth century. The celebration was quite common in the Church. The Roman-Catholic Church celebrates three special apparitions of the archangel; namely, May 5, Sept. 6, and Oct. 16. Michaelmas is also known as the Festival of St. Michael and All the Holy Angels. In England it was preceded by a three-days' fast. See BUTLER: Lives of Saints, vol. ii. 537 sqq.

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

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

The invaders, as we call them (Barbarians, as
they were called by the Romans, and as they
prudently called themselves), who permanently
occupied the Roman territory, were all of the
Teutonic race. They came from a vast and ill-
de fined territory east of the Rhine, and north of the
Danube. Their organization was tribal; their
mode of life was more or less nomadic, or that of
wanderers; and the chief occupation of the most
active among them was hunting or war. All
these characteristics, to which may be added an
inborn love of plunder and love of adventure,
prompted them to cross the Roman frontier. They
were tempted by the weakness and the wealth of the
Roman provinces. They came on in succes-
vive waves of destruction during the fifth century.
In the year 500 the Ostrogoths occupied Italy, and
the Roman territory as far north as the Danube;
the Visigoths and the Suevi, the country from the
River Loire, south and west, including modern
Spain and Portugal; the Burgundians, the south-
eastern portion of modern France; and the Franks,
the portion of that country north of the River
Loire, as well as modern Holland and Belgium.
At this time all these tribes were nominally
Christian, but all save the Franks were Arians.

The immediate causes of this fruitful alli-
ce, the last of the Merovingian race, became
king of the Franks de jure, as he had been hitherto
de facto, being crowned as such by Boniface,
Bishop of Mentz, by order of the Pope, in 751.
Charlemagne, his son, made further conquests,
and having defeated the Saracens advancing
from Spain towards Central Europe. Pepin le
Bref, the son of Charles Martel, extended the con-
quests of the Franks; and having defeated Chi-
deric, the last of the Merovingian race, became
king of the Franks de jure, as he had been hither
to de facto, being crowned as such by Boniface,
Bishop of Mentz, by order of the Pope, in 751.

The rule of the Merovingian kings was so
esteemed, that they are known in history as rois
incontestables. Under them the disorganization of the
institutions which they found in Roman Gaul
either perished, or were transformed into instru-
ments of barbarian rule, during more than two
centuries (500-780), save the Church, which con-
stantly increased in power, wealth, and independ-
ence. Towards the close of that period, owing
to the weakness of the kings of the race of
Clovis, their stewards, or "mayors of the palace"
as they were called, became virtually the rulers
of their kingdom. The family of Pepin of
Landen furnished the most conspicuous and re-
nowned of these mayors of the palace. After the
Austrasian (or Eastern) Franks had crushed the
power of the Neustrians at the battle of Teutry
(697), the former, under the leadership of Pepin
of Heristal, conquered the Franks de jure of the
Rhine, and later, in 732, when Charles Martel
was their leader, destroyed, at the battle of
Poitiers, the power of the Saracens advancing
from Spain towards Central Europe. Pepin le
Bref, the son of Charles Martel, extended the con-
quests of the Franks, and having defeated Chi-
deric, the last of the Merovingian race, became
king of the Franks de jure, as he had been hither
to de facto, being crowned as such by Boniface,
Bishop of Mentz, by order of the Pope, in 751.

The immediate causes of this fruitful alliance
were these: the Pope's power, civil and ecclesi-
asical, in Italy at that time, was threatened by
the schismatic Lombards and by the Byzantine emperors, whose nominal subject the Pope was. To secure his independence, the Pope invoked the aid of the Frankish kings, Pepin and Charlemagne, not merely because they were the most powerful kings in Europe, but also because they were Orthodox Catholics. At the Pope's request, these kings made several expeditions into Italy, which resulted in the destruction of the Lombard and Byzantine power in that country, and the annexation of all its territory, save the Exarchate of Ravenna (the sovereignty of which was conferred on the popes), to the Frankish kingdom.

As a reward for services previously rendered to the Church, Pepin had received its sanction to his jurisdiction of an emperor was supposed to embrace theoretically the whole world, and practically all Western Europe. There were many kings, but there could be but one emperor. The ancient imperium was divided between two persons: the emperor was Imperator semper Augustus; and the Pope, Pontifex Maximus. Each was designed to be perfectly independent, and sovereign in his own sphere; and each was supposed to be bound to the constant aid and support of the other in the government of mankind. The Church was to have uncontrolled power over the conscience: the emperor was to be lord of everything else. It was hoped in this way, by the revival of the imperial Roman forms, to secure a return of that peace and order which had been so long characteristic of the Roman rule.

The Pope was then recognized (A.D. 800) in Western Europe as the universal or supreme bishop. With the king of the Franks bearing over all those under the Pope's obedience; so that, when the king became emperor (and it was designed that all the successors of Charlemagne should become such), the principal change, and a very important one, was, that his authority had the special sanction and support of the head of the Church. This theory of the dual government of the world proved impracticable. Neither the Pope nor the emperor would yield his claims to the position which each supposed assigned to him by it, and they both differed widely in their opinions in regard to their respective powers and duties. Under the feeble successor of Charlemagne, the imperial office was seized by certain Italian princes; but their rule was one of violence, disorder, and corruption. The danger to the holy see became so great, that, in 962, the reigning Pope, John XII., called upon Otho the Great, king of the Franks, and successor of Charlemagne, to come to Rome, to be there crowned emperor, and to restore order by his imperial authority. The emperor asserted that authority by deposing this very pope, and by substituting for him one whose character gave rise to less public scandal. He claimed the right, by virtue of his authority as emperor, to nominate the Pope; and this claim was put forward, and insisted upon, by many of his successors, not only of the Saxon dynasty, but by those of the houses of Franconia and Swabia as well. This gave rise to constant quarrels between the popes and the emperors. They culminated in the famous controversy known in medieval history as the "Investitures," in which the question was, whether the Pope, or the emperor, the ecclesiastical, or the civil authority, should give to the bishops throughout Europe, not merely the investiture of their sees, but also the legal possession of the vast feudal estates usually attached to them. This controversy, in which the celebrated Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII. (1076), and the Emperor Henry IV., were the conspicuous actors, involved the principle of the relations of the civil and ecclesiastical authority during the middle age. The result, so far as this particular question was concerned, was a compromise between the lay rulers and those of the Church; but the limits between their jurisdictions were never accurately defined. Hence we find throughout the middle age the most extravagant pretensions, on the part of the popes, in most cases, not merely to sacerdotal authority, but to supremacy over kings and emperors, and the constant use of the discipline of the Church — excommunication and interdict — to enforce that discipline. Out of these claims grew such disputes, not merely as those of Hildebrand and Henry IV., concerning the investitures (1076), but also the controversy between Henry II. of England and Thomas Becket, in reference to the exemption of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the civil courts; the long struggle between Gregory IX. and Frederick II., as to claims of sovereignty in Naples; between Innocent III. and Philip Augustus of France, where the Pope appears as a champion of the sanctity of marriage; the excommunication and deposition of John of England; and, later, the ignoble quarrel between Boniface VIII. and Philippe le Bel of France. In all these cases, and many like them, the popes claimed supremacy over all the secular soveraigns, the exercise of which, they insisted, was essential to the maintenance of truth and justice in the middle age.

The empire of Charlemagne was divided among his grandsons in 843. To Charles the Bald was assigned Western Francia, or France; to Louis, Eastern Francia, or Germany; and to Lothaire, the intervening territory, with Italy, and the nominal emperiorship over all. The imperial government was practically brought to an end by this treaty, and throughout Europe the feudal system of government was substituted for it.Origin to the Teutonic chiefs who invaded the Roman territory were rewarded for their services by free gifts, generally of lands in the conquered districts. At the dissolution of the empire, the persistent invasions of the Northmen, and the general disorder of the times, made necessary some new method of efficient protection. Lands were granted by the sovereign to his chief warriors, on condition that their possessors should aid the sovereign in the defence of the country. The lands thus conferred were called "feeps," and their holders, "vassals;" and the relation be-
between the parties was that of reciprocal aid and protection, the lands being held by the vassals on that express condition. Those upon whom these fiefs were conferred directly by the sovereign were called "grand-vassals." They, in turn, parceled out their grants among their followers, upon condition that they would hold these portions subject to services similar to those to which their immediate lord owed to the sovereign. During the middle age, nearly all the land in Europe, originally the royal domain, was feudalized, or held in fief. Power and the possession of land were inseparably connected; and hence the kings who had granted away the larger portion of their private lands became merely nominal sovereigns, the true rulers being the great feudal lords. The object of the feudal system was to combine military efficiency with the Teutonic gentleness of the knight, when he took for his device noblesse oblige. The Church professed to be the absolute sovereign of their private lands became merely nominal, or held in fief. Power and the possession of land, large or small, the absolute sovereign of those who dwelt upon it.

Knighthood, in the feudal age, was the means which the Church employed to teach the rude warriors that it was becoming to their social position to obey those upon whom they were conferred, and to gratify their own selfish desires, but also in the protection of those unable to defend themselves, such as the oppressed, women, and especially the Church. The typical knight was he who served the Church best in these respects, and he became the ideal hero in the popular imagination. Chivalry and the sense of honor were the characteristic outgrowths of knighthood. Whatever was valuable or permanent about them was due to the sentiment which was expressed by the combined pride and gentleness of the knight, when he took for his device noblesse oblige. The Church professed to abhor all war, save that waged against the infidel, or for the extirpation of heresy, and did not look with favor even upon the tournaments, which were such characteristic institutions of chivalry.

Monasticism, in the middle age, formed the highest ideal conception of life, because of its asceticism. The Crusades were the result of the one common impulse which moved the people of Western Europe during the middle age. They were the outgrowth of the zeal of the monks, as representing the Church, acting upon the warrior instinct, and the devotion of the knights to their religion. The result of this combination is seen, not only in the wars in the Holy Land, but in those against the Moors in Spain, and against the Albigenses in the south of France.

The Crusades were the result of the one common impulse which moved the people of Western Europe during the middle age. They were the outgrowth of the zeal of the monks, as representing the Church, acting upon the warrior instinct, and the devotion of the knights to their religion. The result of this combination is seen, not only in the wars in the Holy Land, but in those against the Moors in Spain, and against the Albigenses in the south of France.

The free cities, in the middle age, were the centres of civilization in our modern sense. They were called free, because freed from feudal vassalage, except to the over-lord, or suzerain, and because they were governed by their own magistrates, elected, generally, by the trade corporations within them. They grew in wealth and importance by the industry of their inhabitants; and they maintained a considerable commerce with each other, especially in the north of Europe. In France and Germany they usually combined with the kings in resistance to the overgrown pretensions of the great nobles, in order to secure their freedom from feudal subjection to them. Education was provided for in the earlier period by schools attached to the cathedrals and the monasteries. Out of these schools grew the universities so renowned in the middle age; that of Paris being the principal place of theological instruction, while at Bologna the Roman civil law, so far as it was then understood, was taught; and at Montpellier and Salerno medical instruction after the Arabian methods was given. All the instruction was under the general control of church authority, and was designed to exalt it. Science based on observation or physical investigation was neglected, except in some of the medical schools of a later period.

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

MIDDLETON, Conyers, D.D., an able controversial writer, and author of the famous Life of Cicero: the son of a clergyman; b. at York, Dec. 27, 1683; d. at Hildersham, July 28, 1750. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, and, taking orders, was settled at Trumpington, near Cambridge, his only charge. In 1718 he returned to Trinity as a fellow. He won for himself a wide reputation by his intrepid and caustic attacks on Bentley, the master of Trinity, who had called him "fiddling Middleton," with reference to his musical propensities. Bentley, in spite of his great scholarship, was very unpopular on account of his harsh personalitites. They came to an open war in 1717, when, by a mandamus of George I., Bentley was obliged to confer the title of D.D. on Middleton. The master, however, showed his spleen by demanding an extra fee of four pounds. Middleton gave it, under protest,
and, appealing to the courts, won a complete victory over Bentley, who was deposed of his professorship. He afterwards went too far, and was accused of libel by Bentley, found guilty, and fined. The battle, however, was not over. Bentley in 1720 was about to issue an edition of the Greek Testament, and sent out with great precipitancy some specimens. Middleton's keen eye detected errors; and immediately he assaulted Bentley in a fierce attack, completely driving him from the field, so that he renounced the idea of his New Testament, and winning the applause of the friends of Trinity, who chose him as the principal librarian of the college. In 1724 he visited Rome, and five years later wrote A Letter from Rome, showing an Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism (4th ed., 1741), in which he boldly proved that the religion of the Roman Church was a continuation of the heathenism of ancient Rome. He had a passion for controversy; and it seemed to be his delight, by sudden attacks upon received opinions, to startle the literary public. The controversies of this doughty champion were not confined to Bentley, but extended to Waterland, Sherlock, and others. In 1725 he assailed the whole medical profession and smeared them in a most vitriolic manner. In 1741 he published a great work of his life, the History of the Life of M. Tullius Cicero (2 vols.), written at the request of Lord Harvey, and after the labors of six years. There were three thousand subscribers to the work; and from the receipts he purchased for himself a home at Hildersham, near Cambridge, whither he retired for the remainder of his life. This biography has been condemned as being too partial, and praising, as Macaulay has said, acts as "wise, virtuous, and heroic," which Cicero himself condemned. In 1749 he published an Examination of the Lord Bishop of London's Discourses concerning the Use and Intent of Prophecy, etc. His Miscellaneous Tracts, published in one volume (London, 1752), comprise Disputes or Dissension between Peter and Paul at Antioch; The Variations or Inconsistencies among the Four Evangelists; Essay on the Gift of Tongues, etc. The complete edition of Middleton's works, except the Life of Cicero, 5 vols., was published in London, 1755. The best edition of the Life of Cicero is that of London, 1848.

MIDDLETON, Thomas Fanshaw, first bishop of Calcutta; b. in Kedleston, Derbyshire, Jan. 26, 1769; d. in Calcutta, July 8, 1822. He graduated with honors from Pembroke Hall, Cambridge; was appointed curate of Gainsborough, and, after several other promotions, was made archdeacon of Huntingdon, 1812, and consecrated first incumbent of the episcopal see of Calcutta, May 8, 1814. At Calcutta he founded in 1829 the Bishops' College, for the training of missionaries and clergymen for Asia. Dr. Middleton published in 1805 The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament (3d ed. by Rev. James Schofield, 1828, 5th ed., 1855). A posthumous volume of Sermons, Charges, etc., with Memoir, was issued by Bonney, London, 1824. See Le Bas: Life of Bishop Middleton, London, 1831, 2 vols.; and Miss Tonge: Pioneers and Founders.

MID'IAN (strife), the territory from the Elanitic Gulf to Moab and Mount Sinai, or, according to others, from the Sinaiic peninsula to the desert and the banks of the Euphrates. Moses lived among the Midianites (Exod. ii. 15-21); and on the desert they had friendly relations with the Israelites, until they had infected them with their own vices of idolatry and uncleanness; for which sins one thousand men from each tribe, by divine command, attacked the neighboring Midianites, and slew all their males (Num. xxv., xxxi.). The Midianites eventually recovered from this blow, and oppressed Israel, but were miraculously defeated by Gideon (Judg. vi.–viii.), and later were merged with the Medes and Medo-Persians. They have no history outside of the Bible.

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

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

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

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

(a) Mechiltha (i.e., “measure, form”) is a commentary upon parts of the Book of Exodus; as xii. 1-xxiii. 19, xxxi. 12-17, and xxxv. 1-3. It was first printed at Constantinople in 1515. The latest editions are, Mechilta, with notes by J. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1865; and Mechilta de Rabbi Israel, with notes, etc., by M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1870. A Latin translation is found in Ugolino’s Thesaurus antiqui sacrarum, vol. xiv. c. 1-586.

(b) Sifre, a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, printed in Venice in 1545. Latest edition entitled Sifre de'eh Rab, with notes, etc., by M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864. Latin translation in Ugolino’s Thesaurus antiqui sacrarum, vol. xv. c. 1-996.

(c) Sifra, also Codex of the Priestess”, a commentary on Leviticus, first printed in Venice in 1545. Latest editions by M. L. Malbim, with an excellent commentary der jiidischen Tradition, Vienna, 1876, ii.225-239 to v. 393-395; Furst : Bibl. Jud., ii. 159 sq.


3. Pesikta, also Pesikta de Rab Kahina [b. about A.D. 330, and d. in 411], comprising a complete cycle of lectures on the pericopes of the feasts and fasts. For a long time it was only known from citations found in the Jalkut and Aruch. The latest edition is that of Buber : Pesikta, Lyck, 1908. Compare Zunz, 180-229; Gerger : Judische Zeitschrift, 1890, pp. 187-195; Theodor : Zur Composition der agadischen Hotnims, in [Frankel-Graetz’s] Monatsschrift, 1879, 97-113, 164-175, 271-278, 337-339, 455-457; [Compare Theodor : Shir ha-shirim Rabba und seine Quellen, in [Frankel-Graetz’s] Monatsschrift, 1879, 337-344, 408-415, 455-462; 1880, 19-23; Zunz, pp. 296, 299; Saalfeld, in Monatsberichte für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1878, 120-125.

(b) Ruth Rabba, in eight chapters. Zunz, p. 265.


(d) Midrash Koheleth [on Ecclesiastes]. German translation by Wünche, Leipzig, 1880. Zunz, 205, 266.

(e) Midrash Esther, also Haggadath Megilla, in six sections. German translation by Wünche, i.e.

This entire collection was first published at Venice in 1545, fol. Convenient editions are those published at Berlin, 1864, and at Wilna, 1873. Compare Steinschneider : Catalogus Librorum Hebraorum in Bibliotheca Bodlejana, Berlino, 1863-90, No. 3753-3784; Wolf : Bibl. Heb., ii. 1423-1427, iv. 1025, 1056 sq.

(f) On the Five Megilloth.

(i) Debarim Rabba, on Deuteronomy, in eleven chapters. Zunz, 251-253. [German translation by Wünsche, i.e.]

(ii) On the Five Megillot.

(iii) Shir ha-Shirim Rabba, on the Song of Songs; also called Agadath Chasita. German translation by Wünsche, l.c. Compare Theodor : Shir ha-shirim Rabba und seine Quellen, in [Frankel-Graetz’s] Monatsschrift, 1879, 337-344, 408-415, 455-462; 1880, 19-23; Zunz, pp. 296, 299; Saalfeld, in Monatsberichte für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1878, 120-125.

(iv) Midrash Esther, also Haggadath Megilla, in six sections. German translation by Wünche, l.c.

Under the title of Pesica chabadah, A. Jellinek has published a smaller Midrash for the festival days, containing quotations from Genesis Rabba, Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, the Book Jezira, in his Bet ha-Midrash, vi. 36-70.

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


6. Other Midrashim. (a) Exegetical: viz., —
   (Ad) Agadath Bereishith [on Genesis], in eighty-three sections, Venice, 1618. Zunz, 293; Steinzscheider, 3727-3729.

(b) Moses ha-darshan of Narbonne, of the eleventh century. Annotations on some books of the Bible. Raymond Martini often quotes him in his Pugio fi due. Zunz, 257-259.

(c) Midrash Tsimon, or Sochar Tob, on the Psalms, with the exception of Ps. xlii., xcviii., cxv., cxxiii., etc., published at Constantinople, 1514. Latin translation by Vorstius: Capitula R. Elieser, Leiden, 1644; Zunz, 140-146; Steinzscheider, 4038-4039; Bet-ha-midrash, i., vi.

(d) Midrash Misha, on Proverbs, Constantinople, 1512, Stettin, 1861; also together with r.

(e) Midrash Shavuot: beginning of the eleventh century, and containing excerpts from older works. Constantinople, 1512, Stettin, 1860.

(f) Halachic Midrashim: viz., —


(f) Megillath Taanith. Zunz, 154-156; Steinschneider, 3834-3835.

(g) Historical Haaggadot: viz., —

(h) Megillath Antiocos: subject, "The Wars of the Hasmoneans". Zunz, 154. The Hebrew text was often printed (see Steinschneider, 1882-1888). The Aramaic text was first published by H. Filipowski at the end of his Choice of Pearls, London, 1851; then by Sluzki, Warsaw, 1863, and by Jellinek, in Bet-ha-midrash, vi. A new edition is in the course of preparation by Charles II. H. Wright (The Megillath Antiocos, a Jewish Apocryphon, with the Chaldean Text, etc.)

(i) Midrash Ele Ezerkah [so called from the first words, "These will I remember, —" Ps. xl. 5, Hebrew text] describes the martyrdom of ten eminent teachers. Zunz, 142; Steinschneider, 3730-3732; Bet-ha-midrash, vii. 34.

(j) Josippon [or Seder Joseph ben Gorion hakoHEN], in the second half of the ninth century, often printed. Best edition, with a Latin translation by Bertheaupf: Josephus Hebraicus. Zunz, 140-146; Steinschneider, 4038-4039; Bet-ha-midrash, ii., vii. 5, Hebrew text; Zunz, 145.

(k) Pesach-haggada, for the Easter festival. Zunz, 128; Steinschneider, 2671.

(l) Midrash Petirath Aaron, and (m) Midrash Petirath Moshe, on the last days of Aaron and Moses. Zunz, 140; Steinschneider, 3996-4000; Bet-ha-midrash, i., vi.

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

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

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

(p) Megillath Antiocos: [subject, "The Wars of the Hasmoneans"]. Zunz, 154. The Hebrew text was often printed (see Steinschneider, 1882-1888). The Aramaic text was first published by H. Filipowski at the end of his Choice of Pearls, London, 1851; then by Sluzki, Warsaw, 1863, and by Jellinek, in Bet-ha-midrash, vi. A new edition is in the course of preparation by Charles H. H. Wright (The Megillath Antiocos, a Jewish Apocryphon, with the Chaldean Text, etc.)

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

Of a purely legendary character are: —

(r) Midrash Vajissu, the tradition about Amillass [the Roman Antichrist]. Zunz, 282; Steinzscheider, 3734-3739; Bet-ha-midrash, i.
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(p) Midrash Eser ha-deborah, on the Ten Commandments. ZUNZ, 1424; STEINSCHEIDER, 3751, 4986; Bet-ha-midrash, i.

(q) Midrash Konen [a kind of romantic cosmology]. ZUNZ, 166, 167; STEINSCHEIDER, 3457-8249; Bet-ha-midrash, ii.

(r) Sefer Raziel [which must be distinguished from a later Sefer Raziel hagadot, a kind of commentary on the Jessira]. ZUNZ, 187; STEINSCHEIDER, 4042.


8. Texts of Midrashim. — In Latin, many are found in UGOLINO's Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum. In German, A. WUNSCH began to publish a series of translations, under the title Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Leip., 1880 sqq. E. L. STRACK.
MILDMAY CONFERENCE. 1508

Aquilæa acted as arbiters between the Orthodox party of Rome and the Eastern Monophysites. Such a position presupposes a considerable measure of independence and power, and for several centuries the Church of Milan enjoyed both in no small degree. Ambrose was elected bishop of the people, and simply confirmed by the emperor; and in the same manner all the following archbishops of Milan were elected, down to the time of Constantius (592-600). He was a friend of Gregory the Great, and went to Rome to be ordained by him; but his suffragan bishops became so indignant at this humiliation before Rome, that they separated from him. After his death, the episcopal election again became independent of Rome, and remained so until the time of Gregory VII. In the mean time, the power of the Milanese archbishop vastly increased. From the Lombard kings, whom he crowned with the iron crown, and from the German kings, whose policy it was to prevent the large fiefs from becoming hereditary, he received extensive estates, and in the ninth and tenth centuries he was the real Duke of Lombardy. To this power an attack against such a rival would not be prudent, and the Roman curia consequently chose an indirect way. The Milanese clergy generally married (even the bishops), and considered this one of the liberties of the Ambrosian Church. But when the reforms of Hildebrand began to take shape, Roman emissaries appeared in the Milanese territory, stirring up the people, the laity, against the " unholy " clergy. The party of the " Patarini " was formed, a split was produced between the flocks and their pastors, and then Rome could venture upon a plan of direct attack. In 1059, sent by Nicholas II., the famous ascetic, Petrus Damiani, cardinal of Ostia, appeared in Milan, at the head of a Roman committee, to investigate the ecclesiastical method of appointment practised in the diocese; and the result was an enormous number of accusations of simony. The people murmured at this interference from the side of Rome; but the clergy was smitten with terror, and submitted. When Nicholas II. died, in 1061, it was evident to the Milanese clergy, that their cause entirely depended upon the next papal election. Several Lombard bishops, consequently, immediately repaired to the court of the young Henry IV.; and the party succeeded in having Bishop Cadalus of Parma elected pope, and confirmed by Henry IV. as Honorius II.

But, in the mean time, the other party, the Roman curia, with Hildebrand at its head, and under protection of the Norman ruler of Naples, had elected Alexander II. pope; and, in the contest which then issued, the latter finally came out victorious, and the spirit of independence which had hitherto characterized the Church of Milan was broken. It ought to be mentioned, however, that, when in the present century, the contest arose in Italy between the national cause and ultramontanism, the Church of Milan was the only portion of the Italian Church which espoused the national cause, and showed any readiness to make sacrifices for its sake. See Arnulf: Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensis; and Landulf: Historia Mediolanensis, in Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae historica (see designation). Reculiffe.

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

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

MILICZ OF KREMSIER, the precursor of Hus; b. at Kremsier, a city near Olmütz in Moravia, in the beginning of the fourteenth century; d. at Avignon, June 29, 1374. It is not known where he made his studies, but he assumed his first office in the service of the church in 1350. In 1360 he was canon of the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague, archdeacon and secretary to the emperor, Charles IV., whom he accompanied to Germany. But his whole nature and character inclined towards asceticism; and in 1363 he resigned his offices, and retired to Bishop-Teinitz, a small town at the foot of the Bohemian Forest. Having returned to Prague, he began to preach to the poor in the streets, and in the Bohemian language. This innovation caused, at first, considerable surprise, but soon became the means by which he reached the very hearts of his hearers. To the students he continued to preach in Latin. He afterwards also learned German in order to preach in that language. One of the great practical results of his activity was the cleaning-out of " Benati," the most notorious street of the city, and its transformation into a benevolent institution,— "Jerusalem," — in which women who had been rescued from vice were taken care of. The sight of evil prevailing both inside the church and outside of it led him to the view that Antichrist had come. Reform was necessary, but it had to be made from above, by the Pope; and in 1367 he actually repaired to Rome to confer with Urban V. He was well received, but effectual nothing. Meanwhile his sincerity and energy had raised him many enemies in his home, and in 1374 they addressed themselves directly to the Papal Court at Avignon with an accusation of twelve articles. Milicz immediately went to Avignon; and the examination which was given to him shows that he would have been declared innocent of any guilt, but he died before the verdict was given. He left several minor treaties.
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in Latin (Libellus de Antichristo, Gratia Dei, Lectones quadragesimales), and a couple of devotional tracts in Bohemian.

1. — His life, written by a pupil of his, was published by Balbin, in his Miscellanea, 1682, book 18. Another sketch of his life and character, by Matthias de Janow, was used by Balbin, in his History of Bohemia, and translated into German by J. P. Jordan: Die Vorlaufer des Hospitalitatsordens, 1846. O. Lechler.

MILITARY RELIGIOUS ORDERS. The military religious orders (so called) of the middle age grew out of organizations, formed before the crusades of pilgrims to the holy places in Jerusalem, designed to care for and protect those among them who reached the sacred city in a suffering or destitute condition. Pilgrimage to places in Palestine hallowed by the presence or by the events of the life of the Saviour, was long regarded as a high religious duty in Western Europe; and it was often, indeed, a form of penance prescribed by the Church. To the mass of the pilgrims, ill provided with the means of securing their safety or comfort, the long journey amidst populations bitterly hostile was a most formidable undertaking; and it is not to be wondered at that many of them when they reached Jerusalem were better fitted to become inmates of a hospital than worshipers at the holy shrines.

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

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

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

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

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

In 1798 Bonaparte, on his way to Egypt, attacked and captured Malta, threatening the French Knights belonging to it with death if they resisted, as he claimed that they were fighting against the infidel and for the honor of Christ; he forbids them to flee, even when attacked by three men, and enjoins upon them to give no quarter to their infidel enemies, etc.

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

After the capture of Jerusalem (1244), the Templars retired, first to Cyprus, and afterwards (1280) to France. Unlike the Knights of St. John in similar cases, their work of fighting against the infidel was now done; and when they gave up the special purpose for which they had been established, and returned to Europe, they presented the spectacle of an enormously rich and powerful corporation, owing no allegiance in the different countries in which they resided, save to the Pope; while the wealth which had been lavished upon them for a special object, that object having failed, was employed by them, according to the popular belief, only to increase their own power and dignity. They were in that position which, in the history of the middle ages, the rulers of nations—of possessors of enormous privileges who do not render any adequate or equivalent service for the privileges they possess.

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

On the 12th of October, 1307, the Templars throughout France, without any warning, and pursuant to the secret orders of the king, were arrested, and thrown into prison. The next day Philip issued a proclamation, explaining in a very declamatory form his reasons for so extraordinary an act. "A terrible, horrible, inconceivable form of wickedness has come to our knowledge," he says; and he then goes on to enumerate the charges against the Templars. These charges may be classified under three heads: (1) The denial of Christ; (2) Idolatry; (3) Immoral practices. Their offence, if any, was heresy; and, by law, the ecclesiastical tribunals had exclusive cognizance of it. But the king submitted the case to the officers of the Inquisition, then recently established in France, under the authority of the fourth council of the Lateran; and the familiar methods of torture, and the refusal to confront the accused with witnesses employed by that tribunal, were freely used in this case. The Pope, on discovering that his own jurisdiction, specially reserved to him by the statutes creating the order, had been invaded by the king, submitted the proceedings begun by the Inquisition, and directed that the accused should be tried by a commission of cardinals appointed by him. He seems to have been willing to condemn those members who might be proved guilty of the alleged crimes, but not, on that account, to suppress the order itself.

This, however, did not answer the purpose aimed at by the king. After having made public the
so-called confessions of the Knights, made under torture, or promises of pardon, he called together (1311) the three orders of the kingdom; and, on his representation of the enormities committed by the Templars, he persuaded them to tell him that it was his duty, in case the Pope hesitated to abolish the order, to do so himself, citing as a precedent the conduct of Moses, who had not waited for the permission of the high priest Aaron, but had destroyed the golden calf. The Pope, unmoved by this exposition of the law, was called upon to meet the king at Poitiers, and there settle the question of jurisdiction. The Pope was abject and servile, but not cruel. He evaded a decision: he referred to a general council of the Church, which was at last effected, by which the inquisitor's powers of trying the ordinary Knights were restored, and the chief of the order were sent before a commission of cardinals representing the Pope directly. This arrangement was made upon the solemn promise of the king, that, in case of the condemnation of the Templars, they might withdraw from the country, and retain the possession of their estates within. From this time the Pope, in abject terror of the king, ceased to take any active part in the defence of the Templars. In 1310 Philip, out of patience with the non-action of the Pope, directed that a provincial council, with the Archbishop of Sens at its head, should be held in Paris. This council continued the proceedings of the Inquisition. The Templars, before it, retracted in the fullest manner the alleged confession of their crimes, insisting that it had been forced from them by torture, or the promise of release, and asserted in the fullest manner the orthodoxy of their belief and the purity of the lives of themselves and their brethren. Under the strange jurisprudence of the Inquisition, they were condemned, on this avowal and retraction, as lapsed heretics. Fifty-four of the more distinguished among them were burned as such in Paris; all maintaining the constancy of their faith and innocence of any crime, as long as the flames left them the power of speech. Jacques de Molai, the Grand Master, was the most conspicuous of these victims in every way. He had defended the order against the charge of the hideous crimes imputed to it, with the same intrepidity which his predecessors had shown on the bloody battlefields of Palestine; and, as his life was being consumed, he summoned his murderers, Philip and Clement, to meet him within a year at the bar of God, there to answer for their crimes. But Philip was not satisfied with the sacrifice of these illustrious victims. He asked of the general council of the Church, convened at Vienne, in France, a decree formally condemning the order. There were more than three hundred bishops from different portions of Europe present at this council, and their attitude was that of passive nonresistance to the king; but they could not be brought to take any action without better evidence than confessions wrung from the accused by torture. At last the wearied Pope, striving to satisfy the king, held a secret consistory, composed of such of the cardinals and bishops as were favorable to the order, but, on their report he issued a bull, dated April 3, 1312, abolishing the order, giving as his reasons therefor, that the conduct and confessions of the Knights had, at least, laid them open to suspicion; that there were rumors of grave misconduct on their part, which the Pope was abject and servile, but not cruel. He evaded a decision: he referred to a general council of the Church, which was at last effected, by which the inquisitor's powers of trying the ordinary Knights were restored, and the chief of the order were sent before a commission of cardinals representing the Pope directly. This arrangement was made upon the solemn promise of the king, that, in case of the condemnation of the Templars, they might withdraw from the country, and retain the possession of their estates within. From this time the Pope, in abject terror of the king, ceased to take any active part in the defence of the Templars. In 1310 Philip, out of patience with the non-action of the Pope, directed that a provincial council, with the Archbishop of Sens at its head, should be held in Paris. This council continued the proceedings of the Inquisition. The Templars, before it, retracted in the fullest manner the alleged confession of their crimes, insisting that it had been forced from them by torture, or the promise of release, and asserted in the fullest manner the orthodoxy of their belief and the purity of the lives of themselves and their brethren. Under the strange jurisprudence of the Inquisition, they were condemned, on this avowal and retraction, as lapsed heretics. Fifty-four of the more distinguished among them were burned as such in Paris; all maintaining the constancy of their faith and innocence of any crime, as long as the flames left them the power of speech. Jacques de Molai, the Grand Master, was the most conspicuous of these victims in every way. He had defended the order against the charge of the hideous crimes imputed to it, with the same intrepidity which his predecessors had shown on the bloody battlefields of Palestine; and, as his life was being consumed, he summoned his murderers, Philip and Clement, to meet him within a year at the bar of God, there to answer for their crimes. But Philip was not satisfied with the sacrifice of these illustrious victims. He asked of the general council of the Church, convened at Vienne, in France, a decree formally condemning the order. There were more than three hundred bishops from different portions of Europe present at this council, and their attitude was that of passive nonresistance to the king; but they could not be brought to take any action without better evidence than confessions wrung from the accused by torture. At last the wearied Pope, striving to satisfy the king, held a secret consistory, composed of such of the cardinals and bishops as were favorable to the order, but, on their report he issued a bull, dated April 3, 1312, abolishing the order, giving as his reasons therefor, that the conduct and confessions of the Knights had, at least, laid them open to suspicion; that there were rumors of grave misconduct on their part, which the Pope was abject and servile, but not cruel. He evaded a decision: he referred to a general council of the Church, which was at last effected, by which the inquisitor's powers of trying the ordinary Knights were restored, and the chief of the order were sent before a commission of cardinals representing the Pope directly. This arrangement was made upon the solemn promise of the king, that, in case of the condemnation of the Templars, they might withdraw from the country, and retain the possession of their estates within. From this time the Pope, in abject terror of the king, ceased to take any active part in the defence of the Templars. In 1310 Philip, out of patience with the non-action of the Pope, directed that a provincial council, with the Archbishop of Sens at its head, should be held in Paris. This council continued the proceedings of the Inquisition. The Templars, before it, retracted in the fullest manner the alleged confession of their crimes, insisting that it had been forced from them by torture, or the promise of release, and asserted in the fullest manner the orthodoxy of their belief and the purity of the lives of themselves and their brethren. Under the strange jurisprudence of the Inquisition, they were condemned, on this avowal and retraction, as lapsed heretics. Fifty-four of the more distinguished among them were burned as such in Paris; all maintaining the constancy of their faith and innocence of any crime, as long as the flames left them the power of speech. Jacques de Molai, the Grand Master, was the most conspicuous of these victims in every way. He had defended the order against the charge of the hideous crimes imputed to it, with the same intrepidity which his predecessors had shown on the bloody battlefields of Palestine; and, as his life was being consumed, he summoned his murderers, Philip and Clement, to meet him within a year at the bar of God, there to answer for their crimes. But Philip was not satisfied with the sacrifice of these illustrious victims. He asked of the general council of the Church, convened at Vienne, in France, a decree formally condemning the order. There were more than three hundred bishops from different portions of Europe present at this council, and their attitude was that of passive nonresistance to the king; but they could not be brought to take any action without better evidence than confessions wrung from the accused by torture. At last the wearied Pope,
on the banks of the Elbe, when he gave them the alternative of baptism, or of being drowned. Still the country gradually became civilized under the rule of these Knights; and many important cities of the middle age, which carried on an extensive traffic with the rest of Europe by means of the Hanseatic League, grew up in their territory; such as Culm, Thorn, Elbing, Dantzic, Koenigsberg, and Marienberg, the headquarters of the Knights. Prussia under the Knights is said to have contained more than fifty cities and eighteen thousand towns and villages, and more than two millions of people. After nearly two centuries of rule, the power of the Knights was greatly diminished. Samogitia, the northern portion, was taken from them, and annexed to Lithuania in 1410; and in 1446, by the Treaty of Thorn, Culm and Dantzic, and a large portion of the bishopric of Ermeland, was restored to Poland. The rest of Prussia (which in modern times is called as its capital) was left to the order as a Polish fief. In 1611 Albert of Brandenburg was Grand Master. In 1725 he adopted the Reformed doctrines, and, by the advice of Luther, married. He shortly afterwards surrendered to the king of Poland the possession of the territory which the order held in fief, and received it back from the king as a fief hereditary in his own family. The direct line of descent becoming extinct in 1813, the old duchy of Prussia passed to his collateral kindred, the margraves of Brandenburg; and thus the order became virtually destroyed. It was formally abolished by Napoleon I. in 1806, after his conquest of Prussia.

The substitution of the royal or monarchical authority in Europe for that which the Pope had exercised during the middle age, gradually destroyed the military religious orders; for the original purpose and motive of their existence had then ceased. The orders of chivalry established by the different kings in Europe have, of course, nothing in common with the medieval military orders. The modern idea is, that these distinctions are conferred upon those whose rank and achievements are in this way publicly recognized by their sovereigns.

Lit.—The fullest account of these orders is to be found in the work of Avignon: Histoire des chevaliers hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jerusalem, Amsterdam, 1780, 5 tomes. F. C. Woodhouse. The Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages, London, 1879 (New York, Young & Co.), is a useful compendium. See also Falkenstein. Gesch. d. Johanniterordens, 1867; Bedford: The Regulations of the Old Hospital of the Knights of St. John of Malta - with an Introduction explanatory of the Hospital Work of the Order, London, 1882.

MILL, John, b. at Shap, Westmoreland, about 1643; d. at Blechington, Oxfordshire, June 23, 1707. He was educated at Oxford: became fellow of Queen's College, November, 1666; doctor of divinity, changed to Gresham Coll. He was rector of Blechington, 1681; principal of St. Edmund's Hall, May, 1685. His title to notice here rests upon his critical edition of the Greek Testament, Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum lectionibus variis, Mes., etc., Oxford, 1707, folio. It was the thirteenth of thirty years of labor, and contains thirty thousand various readings. The text was that of Stephens (1550). Mill lived only a fortnight after the appearance of the work. For a criticism of it, see Bible Text, p. 274.

MILL, John Stuart, b. in London, May 20, 1806; d. in Avignon, May 9, 1873; was the son of James Mill (b. April 6, 1772; d. June 23, 1830), the author of the History of British India and the Analysis of the Human Mind, and the friend and collaborator of Jeremy Bentham. Educated with great care, but in a cloistered and pedantic manner which shut him off from all the common impressions of boyhood, and trained his powers along the rules of grammar and logic, he developed a prodigious precocity; and when, in his twentieth year, he entered literature as a contributor to the leading periodicals of the day, he attracted much attention by his power of analyzing facts, his boldness in applying principles, and the conciseness and clearness with which he states both facts and principles. In 1823 he obtained an appointment in the service of the East India Company, where he gradually rose to a very responsible position, until, in 1858, he retired on a pension at the dissolution of the company. Meanwhile he was an admirable author. In 1843 he published his System of Logic, the third great work in the field after those of Aristotle and Hegel; in 1848, his Principles of Political Economy, new and vigorous both in method and materials, hotly contested on many points, but hardly surpassed at any; in 1859, On Liberty, his most popular book, and fully deserving of its popularity; later on, Considerations on Representative Government (1861), Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (1863), The Subjection of Women (1869), etc. Posthumously appeared an Autobiography (1873), a painful book, and Three Essays on Religion (1874), rather insignificant.

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

MILLEDOLER, Philip, D.D., b. at Rhinebeck, N.Y., Sept. 22, 1775; d. on Staten Island, Sept. 28, 1851. He was of Swiss descent; graduated at Columbia College, New-York City, 1793; pastor Nassau-street German Reformed Church, New York (1793-1800), Pine-street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia (1800-05), Rutgers-street Presbyterian Church, New York (1805-13), Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York (1813-25); professor of theology, and president of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., 1825-41. He was an excellent preacher, and particularly gifted in prayer. He was one of the founders of the American Bible Society, 1816; was moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, 1808, and president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in 1823.

His publications were sermons and addresses, for list of which see Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church in America, 3d ed., pp. 388, 387.

MILLENAISM, MILLENNIUM. The first term designates a Christian doctrine, the main idea of which, in the early Church, was, that there will be a kingdom of peace and joy, in which Christ, after his second coming, will gather all the saints around him, and personally rule them. It includes the visible reign of the Messiah on earth only between the second coming of Christ and the termination of this era (eon). The duration of the thousand years was a subordinate question. This kingdom is not the consummation of a process of evolution and development of the Church, but a special implanting of the glory of the hereafter in the imperfectness of this world.

The biblical authority for this doctrine is found in the prophecies of the Old Testament, as yet unfulfilled (as Gen. xli. 1 sqq., xxv. 3 sqq.), or the words of our Lord (Matt. xvi. 28, Luke xxi. 20 sqq., xxi. 31-34 sqq.), but especially in the prophetic visions of Daniel and Ezekiel, and in the words of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 25 sqq. The chief authority has always been the Book of Revelation. There is nothing in the sermons of the apostles about an earthly millennial kingdom in his Autobiography, no word of reproach escapes him, there is a latent regret in his words whenever he speaks of his father, and that, though, in his Three Essays, he rejects every specifically Christian tenet, he almost openly recognizes that there is in religion something which he personally does not understand. His more than romantic, almost mystical, relation to his wife (see Carlyle's Memoirs) also indicates a craving for something to worship, if not a direct want of religion. See his remarkable utterances concerning Christ, p. 258, Amer. ed. For biography, see his Autobiography; London and New York, 1882. Clemens Petersen.
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MILLENAISM, MILLENNIUM. The first term designates a Christian doctrine, the main idea of which, in the early Church, was, that there will be a kingdom of peace and joy, in which Christ, after his second coming, will gather all the saints around him, and personally rule over them. It includes the visible appearance again of Christ on the earth to establish his kingdom, the destruction of Antichrist, the distinction of two resurrections, one of the saints, for the kingdom of a thousand years; and one of the rest of the dead, for the general judgment, perfection of happiness, and the dominion of the righteous over the unrighteous portion of the earth. It places a period of a thousand years between these two events. The second and millennium termination of this era (eon). The duration of the thousand years was a subordinate question. This kingdom is not the consummation of a process of evolution and development of the Church, but a special implanting of the glory of the hereafter in the imperfectness of this world.

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

The biblical authority for this doctrine is found in the prophecies of the Old Testament, as yet unfulfilled (as Gen. xli. 1 sqq., xxv. 3 sqq.), or the words of our Lord (Matt. xvi. 28, Luke xxi. 20 sqq.), but especially in the prophetic visions of Daniel and Ezekiel, and in the words of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 25 sqq. The chief authority has always been the Book of Revelation. There is nothing in the sermons of the apostles about an earthly millennial kingdom in his Autobiography, no word of reproach escapes him, there is a latent regret in his words whenever he speaks of his father, and that, though, in his Three Essays, he rejects every specifically Christian tenet, he almost openly recognizes that there is in religion something which he personally does not understand. His more than romantic, almost mystical, relation to his wife (see Carlyle's Memoirs) also indicates a craving for something to worship, if not a direct want of religion. See his remarkable utterances concerning Christ, p. 258, Amer. ed. For biography, see his Autobiography; London and New York, 1882. Clemens Petersen.
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1 Herzog treats this subject under the title Chiliasmus (Chiliasm), which is the usual German designation for Millenarianism.
of its rise, the millenarian doctrine was powerfully influenced by the historical persecutions. In the tribulation of the present, the Church took comfort in looking forward to the certainty of a speedy recompense. The Epistle of Barnabas (c. 15) is the first book having references to it. The doctrine spread from Asia Minor to the other parts of the Church, primarily among the Jews. Justin Martyr (c. Tryph., 80) knew of orthodox Christians who did not share the expectation of an earthly consummation of the Church, but himself believed it. In the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch, there are no references to millenarianism; but the conclusion cannot be drawn with certainty that they did not believe it. Irenæus (Adv. Haer., v. 32 sqq.) and Papias based their expectation of the kingdom of a thousand years on the assertion of those who had seen the apostles. The first thing to check the tide of millenarianism was the exaggerations of Montanism. Origen, who regarded matter as the seat of evil, regarded an earthly kingdom of Christ, full of physical delights, as a Judaizing fable; while Næsus, an Egyptian bishop who opposed the view of Origen, met with stormy opposition in the churches. Methodius, bishop of Tyre (d. 311), in this, as in other points, the counterpart of Origen, defended the millenarian doctrines (Sympos. decem virginitum, i. 5). The last echo in the Greek Church was heard in the pamphlet of Apollinaris of Laodicea against Dionysius of Alexandria for it (Basil., Epist., 203; Epiph., Hores., 77, 28). It maintained itself for a longer period in the West; and Lactantius (about 320; Inst. divin., vii. 14 sqq.), and Victorinus, bishop of Pettau, portrayed the millennial kingdom in the most sensual colors. Even Jerome (In Jes., i. 18) did not dare to condemn the traditional opinion. As late as the publication of Revelation (1:20) was decided by Augustine (De civit. Dei, xx. 7, 9), who declared that the Church was the kingdom of God on earth. The new relations of the State to the Church had contributed to the downfall of millenarianism. The protection the Church won for itself from the State deprived the doctrine of its vitality. In the middle ages, neither catastrophes in nature, nor degeneracy within the Church, excited millennial expectations. The clergy possessed the kingdom of the thousand years in the glory of a Church triumphant over emperor and princes. The circles which were prophetic of the Reformations looked for the regeneration of the Church, not from the visible coming of Christ, but in a return to apostolic poverty and piety, or the enthronement of a righteous Pope. Peter de Oliva (Postilla in Apocal., 1287) explained the second coming by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart.

2. The second period in the history begins with the Reformations. The growing decline of the antichristian papacy was regarded as one of the sure signs of the approach of the Lord. Others, upon the basis of the doctrine of the invisible Church, became prophets of the millennial kingdom. Innumerable of the prophecies of the启示录 were fulfilled in the skies and on the earth—constellations, comets, national changes, and the like—were regarded as indications of the end. The Reformers shared in the expectation of its proximity, but indulged in no fantastic dreams. Fanatics announced visions, and promulgated prophecies; and the Anabaptists determined in Cilicia in the beginning of the sixteenth century, establishing the new Zion at Müster (1534), with the introduction of a community of wives and goods. The Augustinian and Helvetic Confessions condemned this fanaticism, and later theologians generally referred to the thousand years as passed. Much less did the Catholic Church countenance millenarianism. The only work worth mentioning in favor of it is the Onus ecclesia of Bishop Berthold of Chiemsee (1524, c. 61 sqq.).

There is no name of importance among the millenarians of the sixteenth century. The most curious is that of the Baptist of Joris von Delft (d. 1556). Millenarian ideas were made prominent again in the seventeenth century. This was due to the religious wars in Germany, the persecutions of the Huguenots, and the Reformation in England. Ezekiel Meth in Germany, the Bohemian Brethren (e.g., Bishop Comenius in his Luz in tenesca, 1655; 3d ed., 1665), Professor Jurieu of Sedan in France (L'accomplissement des prophéties, 1686), Serarius in Holland (Assuerum regne de mille ans; De Judentorum conversione), Poiret (Économie divine, 1687), and Joseph Mede (Clavis Apocalyp., 1687), Jane Lead, and Thomas Burnet (Telluris sacra theoria, 1690, and De statu mortuorum et resurgentium), in England, advocated millenarian theories. In Germany, Spener was suspected of millenarian views by his Hoffnung künftiger bessrer Zeiten, 1693, and no doubt properly; and Joachim Lange (Apokalyp. Licht u. Recht, 1730), the Berlin Bible, and the translations of Jane Lead, introduced them into pious circles.

3. The third period begins with the middle of the eighteenth century, and opens with the celebrated commentator Bengel, whose Commentary on Revelation (1:20) was decided by Augustine (De civit. Dei, xx. 7, 9), who declared that the Church was the kingdom of God on earth. The new relations of the State to the Church had contributed to the downfall of millenarianism. The protection the Church won for itself from the State deprived the doctrine of its vitality. In the middle ages, neither catastrophes in nature, nor degeneracy within the Church, excited millennial expectations. The clergy possessed the kingdom of the thousand years in the glory of a Church triumphant over emperor and princes. The circles which were prophetic of the Reformations looked for the regeneration of the Church, not from the visible coming of Christ, but in a return to apostolic poverty and piety, or the enthronement of a righteous Pope. Peter de Oliva (Postilla in Apocal., 1287) explained the second coming by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart.
define the time of the beginning of the millennial kingdom and its length have been made from Hippolytus (d. 230) down to the present. The old Fathers held that the Lord would appear at the conclusion of the sixth millennium. Philastrius (Harres., 106) placed the time more definitely at 365 A.D., Hippolytus at 500, Jurieu at 1758, Bengel at 1836, Stilling at 1816, Sander at 1847. The old view was, that this kingdom, corresponding to the sabbath of the creation, would last a thousand years. Bengel distinguished two periods of a thousand years, — the one covering the kingdom of the saints on earth (Rev. xx. 1-3); the other, of the martyrs in heaven (xx. 4-6). Stilling gave up this distinction, and returned to the old view. Modern scholars, like Rothe, Ebrard, and Lange, regard the “thousand years” as a symbolical number.

**Seat and Citizens of the Kingdom.** — Rev. xx. leaves it indefinite whether the seat of the millennial kingdom will be heaven or earth, but the great majority of millenarians hold that it will be the earth. The Irvingites connected it with their seven congregations; the Mormons, with the Salt Lake; but the majority again agree in looking upon a renewed Jerusalem (Ireneus, etc.) as its rallying-point. The citizens of this kingdom are defined as all faithful Christians and the saints of the Old Testament (Justin, Ireneus, etc.) Poiret included Pagana like Socrates. The Ebionites, Apollinaris, and, in modern times, Serafius and Oetinger, held that even the Levitical priesthood will develop, under the sanctifying influence of the Lord, into immortality and a capacity to see God. The nobler representatives have advocated the view that it is a period of transition. The Lord will be amongst his followers. Its enjoyments will precede the dawn of the kingdom. According to Bengel, there will still be rulers, marriage, agriculture, etc. According to Oetinger, a community of goods, and equality of persons, will prevail. Others (Jurieu, J. P. Lange, etc.) have taken a different view, that sinners will still continue to be on the earth, but that the saints will be greatly in the preponderance, and the conflict with sin and temptation will still go on (Bengel, Oetinger, etc.). Nature will continue to be subject to change and corruption, as the new heavens and earth (2 Pet. iii. 7; Rev. xxii. 1) will follow the period of the millennial reign.

**LIT.** — A satisfactory work on millenarianism yet remains to be written. **CORRODI:** Gesch. d. Chiliasmus (not a full collection of materials), Frankfort, 1781, 2d ed., Zürich, 1794, 4 vols.; **LAVATER:** Aussichten in d. Ewigkeit, Zürich, 1768-78, 4 pars; **J. P. LANGE:** D. Land d. Herrlichkeit, Meurs, 1883; von Volck: D. Chiliasmus, Dorpat, 1889; **KOCH:** D. tausendjähr. Reich, Basel, 1784; comp. **DORNER:** Doctrine of the Person of Christ. — **English Works advocating Millenarianism.** Joseph Mead: Clavis Apocalyptica, etc., Cambridge, 1827; **T. BEVERLEY:** The Kingdom of J. Christ entering its Succession at 1697, etc., London, 1859; The Universal Christian doctrine of the day of judgment, applied to the doctrine of the thousand years' kingdom (herein guided by Mr. Baxter's reply), London, 1861; T. BURNET: Libr. dua posteriores, de conf. lugd. und d. fut. rerum stat., 1859; De statu mortuorum et resurrectionum, 1727, 2d ed., 1732; INCREASE MATHER: A Discourse concerning . . . the glorious kingdom of J. Christ on earth now approaching, Boston, 1770; Samuel Hopkins: A Treatise on the Millennium, showing from Scripture Prophecy that it is yet to come, when it will come, etc., Edinburgh, 1800; Bickersteth (d. 1850): Glory of the Church, Restoration of the Jews (in the complete edition of his works, London, 1853); FRIERE: Eight Lectures on the Prophecies relative to the Last Times, London, 1834, TheExpiration of the Times of the Gentiles, 1848; BONAR: Coming of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, London, 1849; CUMMINGS: Apocalyptic Sketches, London, 1849, Great Tribulation (1850), Great Preparation (1861), Seventh Vial poured out (1870?); E. Box: Apocalyptic Prophecy, 5th ed., 1862, 4 vols.; CRAVEN, in Lange's Commentary on Revelation, chap. xx. New York, 1874; SKISS: The Last Times and the Great Consummation, 6th ed., Philadelphia, 1878. — Works opposing Millenarianism. **R. BAXTER:** The Glorious Kingdom of God, London, 1861; G. Bush: Treatise on the Millennium, New York, 1832; Urwick: Second Advent of Christ, Dublin, 1839; David Brown: Christ's Second Coming, London, 1849 and often (the best work on the subject); The Priest upon his Throne (lectures by twelve clergymen), London, 1849 (an able treatment); Waldegrave: New Testament Millenarianism (Bampton Lectures), London, 1855; Carbon: The Personal Reign of Christ during the Millennium proved to be impossible, London, 1873; Briggs: Origin and History of Pre-Millenarianism, in Luth. Quart., April, 1876. See also the Theologies of Hodge and Van Oosterzee, the Commentary on Rev. xx., etc., and Chiliasm by Professor G. P. Fisher, in McClintock and Strong's Encyclop. See art. Premillenarianism.]

**MILLENARY PETITION** (so called because
signed by nearly a thousand ministers), praying for the “reformation of certain ceremonies and abuses of the Church,” was presented by the Puritan ministers to James I., on his way to London April, 1603. An Answer was presented by the University of Oxford, for which it received the thanks of Cambridge. The Hampton-Court Conference (see Conference, III.), with its incidental issue, our Authorized Version, was the unexpected and momentous result of the Petition.

MILLENIANISM. See Millenarianism.

MILLER, Hugh, geologist; b. at Cromarty, on the north-east coast of Scotland, Oct. 10, 1802; d. by his own hand, in a fit of insanity, at Portobello, near Edinburgh, Dec. 26, 1856. Born in humble life, he yet was carefully though not classically educated. In 1819 he was apprenticed to a stone-mason, and followed that trade until 1836, when he received a hand-appointment at Cromarty. His suggestion of the Auchterarder Case brought him into notice, and led to his appointment, in 1840, to the editorship of a newly-founded Free Church paper, The Witness, published at Edinburgh. In its columns (1841) appeared The Old Red Sandstone, which gave him immediate, an d was a geologist and an author. By his Footprints of the Creator (1849) and Testimony of the Rocks (1857) he popularized his favorite science, and defended revelation. His denial of the universality of the Deluge, and of the literal meaning of the word “day” in the first chapter of Genesis, occasioned much adverse criticism. His bold position on these subjects led some even to question his piety. See Bayne: Life of Hugh Miller, Boston, 1871, 2 vols.

MILLER, Samuel, D.D., LL.D., b. near Dover, Del., Oct. 31, 1769; d. at Princeton, N.J., Jan. 7, 1850. He was graduated at the University of Pennsylvania, 1789; associate pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, New-York City, 1793-1813; first professor of ecclesiastical history and church government in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J., 1813-49. Dr. Miller was a stanch Calvinist and Presbyterian. He entered Andover Seminary, June, 1809, when he received a band-appointment at Andover. Together with Newell, Nott, Hall, and Judson, he held consultations on the subject of missions, in which they were all alike interested. In June, 1810, Mills, Judson, Nott, and Newell presented an address to the general association of Massachusetts Proper at Bradford, calling its attention to the claims of the heathen world. Between 1812 and 1815, Mills made two tours to the south-west as far as New Orleans, engaged in distributing and selling Bibles, and organizing Bible societies. In 1815 he was ordained at Newport, June 27. In 1816 he suggested to the synod of New York and New Jersey the plan of educating negroes for carrying the gospel to Africa. In 1817 the Colonization Society, which had recently been organized, sent him and Rev. Mr. Burgess as their agents to explore Sierra Leone and Western Afri-
Mr. Mills reached his destination, but on the return journey died, and, like Adoniram Judson, was buried in the sea. His name will always be indelibly associated with the history of foreign missionary endeavor in the United States, as one of the Rev. Samuel Mills, New York, 1820; and Anderson: History of Missions of the American Board of Foreign Missions in India, Boston, 1874.

MILMAN, Henry Hart, D.D., church historian; b. in London, Feb. 10, 1791; d. at Sunninghill, near Ascot, Sept. 24, 1868. His father, Sir Francis, was physician to George III. He was educated at Oxford, where he took the Newdigate prize for poetry by his Apollo Beloeveder, 1812; and became fellow of Brasenose College, 1815; was ordained a priest, 1816, and appointed vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, where he remained, until, in 1835, he became rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and canon of Westminster. In November, 1849, he was promoted to the deanery of St. Paul's, London. From 1821 to 1831 he was professor of poetry at Oxford; in 1827, Bampton Lecture prize essay, as divinity, in his Hulsean Lectures for 1832, on the Principles for the Proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings. After a time the excitement ceased; and at present the History is considered as an interesting performance, but defective in needful learning: a new edition, partly re-written, and greatly improved throughout, was issued 1862; The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire, 3 vols., revised edition, 1866 (this marked a decided advance: the facts were better marshalled, and the subject was better mastered); History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. (A.D. 1455), 1854-56, 6 vols., 2d ed., revised, 1868 (this is one of the best ecclesiastical histories in the English language, based upon ample knowledge, written in a picturesque style, sympathetic, yet outspoken in its judgments). A complete edition of his Historical Works appeared 1866-67, 15 vols. 8vo. Dean Milman edited the works of Horace, illustrated, 1849, and also Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 1830-35, 12 vols., 2d ed., 1846, 6 vols., revised and enlarged by Dr. William Smith, 1854, 8 vols. (this is now the standard edition of Gibbon, republished, New York, 1880, 8 vols.). Two posthumous volumes of Milman's are Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral, 1868, and Sasanora, Erasmus, and other Essays, 1870. But this long list of volumes constitutes only a partial enumeration of his labors. He took part in religious discussions; and, true to his theological leanings, he advocated the abolition of subscription to the Articles, and proposed subscription to the Liturgy instead.

MILNER, the name of two distinguished brothers and church historians.—I. Joseph was b. Jan. 2, 1744, in Leeds; d. Nov. 15, 1797, in Hull. By the early death of his father he was left without means, but was enabled, by the kindness of friends, to pass from the Latin School at Leeds to Catherine Hall, Cambridge, where he secured the chancellor's medal for the classics in 1766. The death of his principal friend, and the exhaustion of his means, forced him to quit the university. He became head master of the Latin grammar-school at Hull, vespers' lecturer in the principal church, and vicar of Trinity Church just before his death. In 1770 he underwent a radical spiritual change, and became so powerful a preacher of repentance as to draw upon himself the sobriquet of "Methodist." He, however, overcame all prejudice, and must be regarded as one of the earliest movers in the so-called "Evangelical Movement." Among his published works are Gibbon's Account of Christianity considered, 1781; Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Howard, 1785; Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit, 1786; two volumes of Sermons, 1801, 1806; and especially a Church History, for which see below. — II. Isaac was b. in Leeds, Jan. 11, 1751; d. in London, April 1, 1820. At the death of his father he was put to work in a woollen-factory, but, with the aid of his brother, became sizar in Queen's College, Cambridge, 1770. Here he rose to the highest academic honors,—fellow-professor of experimental philosophy, 1782, and a revised edition by Dr. Grantham in 1847. The work was translated into German in 1808, 2d ed., 1849. Joseph Milner wished to present the history of the Church from a practical religious standpoint. He got the idea from John Newton's little book, "Review of Ecclesiastic His
Milnor, New York, 1848, abridged, 1855. Constant and enthusiastic support of every good cause. He was a leader of the Low-Church party. He was rector of St. George's, New York. He published only a few sermons and addresses, but made a deep impression upon his time by his like Justin, a converted philosopher, and made war of 1812. In 1814 he entered the Protestant-Episcopal ministry; and from 1816 till his death 20, 1773; d. in New York City, April 8, 1844. He was admitted to the bar 1794; in 1810 he sat in the latter part of the second century, by his Minor, of whose work Eusebius gives some extract (Hist. Eccl., v. 28); and finally by Tertullian: Adv. Valentin., 5. But of his works nothing has come down to us. See DEKLING: Diss. de Miltiades, 1768; SWEGLE: Montanismus, Tubingen, 1841. MILTIADES, Pope. See MELCHIADIS. MILTITZ. See Luther. MILTON, John, the English poet, was b. in London, Dec. 9, 1608; d. in London, Nov. 8, 1674. His father, who abandoned the Roman-Catholic communion, became a copying lawyer, and retired with an independence. Milton's education was strict; but he cultivated a love of music, and became an accomplished organist. He attended St. Paul's School, London; entered Christ College, Cambridge, 1625, and, in spite of an intervening rustication, took the B.A. degree in 1632. He had been set apart for the ministry, but, on leaving Cambridge, retired to his father's home in Horton, Buckinghamshire, where he spent six years in study, and wrote his first important poetical works, L'Allegro, II Penseroso, Arcades, Lycedas, Comus, etc. In 1638 he travelled in Italy, his poetical gifts and elegant Latinity winning for him triumphs, and his religious opinions involving him in danger. Returning to London in 1639, he became tutor to his two nephews; but he soon became involved in the controversies between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and wrote in 1641, Of Reformation, touching Church Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it; Apology for Smectymnuus, etc. He espoused the Presbyterian cause against the Episcopalian, whose cry was, "No bishop, no king." In these writings he betrays fine eloquence and an accurate knowledge of antiquity, but often resorts to biting sarcasm, and, after the manner of the age, descends to rude personalities. He was married in 1643 to a royalist lady, Mary Powell, who, after four weeks, returned to her parents, where she remained, in spite of her husband's appeals. This experience led Milton to write the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, etc. (1645), and The Judgment of Martin Bucer touching Divorce (1645), in which he advocated the propriety of divorce when the two parties were uncongenial to one another. In 1645 his wife returned to him. She died in 1652. In 1644 Milton published his famous work, Areopagitica; a Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing. Milton took an intense interest in the political agitations of the time, and left no doubt of his position, in Tenure of Kings and Magistrates (1649). The same year he was appointed secretary for foreign tongues. Other works bearing upon the political controversies appeared from Eikonoklastes (1649), against the Eikon Basilike, which advocated the cause of the royal martyr, Charles I.; Defensio pro populo anglicano (1651), against the learned Salmesius of Leyden, who had asserted the invitability of kings. Having long suffered from weak eyes, he was warned by his friends against undertaking this work. But as he nobly says, "I did not balance whether my duty should be preferred to my eyes." And indeed this second work cost Milton his eyesight. His enemies saw in this affliction a judgment of God. He himself bore it with wonderful patience and resignation. He continued to hold his public office. He began the work of the day with the reading of the Scriptures. In 1656 he was married a second time, to Catharine Woodcock, who died in fifteen months; and in 1660 he was married again, to Elizabeth Minshull. In 1665 his wife returned to him. She died in 1665. Milton was the first to lay bare before the English the greatness of Luther's personality and work. The book has no critical merits as an independent investigation of the sources; but it did most excellent service in illustrating the power of Christianity, as embodied in its great representatives of all ages, and thus stimulating the age in which it was written to an imitation of their devotion and enthusiasm. By portraying the Christian life of the Church, the brothers filled a gap. For a long time, their work remained the most popular manual on church history, until a German master [Neander], in the same spirit, but with a more comprehensive plan and with greater scholarship, worked over the materials. Joseph's complete works were edited by Isaac Milner, 1810, 8 vols., and again, 1827, 9 vols. For his life, see the biography by Isaac in vol. i. of the Sermons, 1801; and also MARY MILNER: The Life of Isaac Milner, 1842. C. Schoell. MILNOR, James, D.D., b. in Philadelphia, June 20, 1773; d. in New York City, April 8, 1844. He was admitted to the bar 1794; in 1810 he sat in the House of Representatives, and opposed the war of 1812. In 1814 he entered the Protestant-Episcopal ministry; and from 1816 till his death he was rector of St. George's, New York. He published only a few sermons and addresses, but made a deep impression upon his time by his constant and enthusiastic support of every good cause. He was a leader of the Low-Church party. See J. S. Stone: Memoirs of the Life of James Milnor, New York, 1848, abridged, 1855. MILTIADES, a contemporary of Tatian, was, like Justin, a converted philosopher, and made for himself a great name in the Christian Church, in the latter part of the second century, by his writings against Paganism and various heresies, especially Montanism. He is first mentioned by an unknown, anti-Montanist writer from Asia Minor, of whose work Eusebius gives some extract (Hist. Eccl., v. 10), as having written a work against the Montanists on the theme that a prophet should not be allowed to speak while in an ecstatic state of mind; then by a Roman writer attacking the Artemonites (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., v. 28); and finally by Tertullian: Adv. Valentinin., 5. But of his works nothing has come down to us. See DERLING: Diss. de Miltiade, 1768; SWEGLE: Montanismus, Tubingen, 1841. MILTIADES, Pope. See MELCHIADIS. MILTITZ. See Luther.
MINIMIS. 1520

MINOR PROPHETS.

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

MINOR PROPHETS, The ("brief in words, mighty in meaning"), are twelve in number; viz., Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. In the Hebrew canon they constitute only one book. They are called the "Lesser, or Minor Prophets," because their prophecies were briefer, not because they were less important, than those of the four Greater Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel). All these writings together do not equal in length those of Isaiah. Yet Hosea exercised the prophetic office longer than any other prophet; and the study of the Minor Prophets by the Greater is evident from these facts,—that Isaiah adopted a prophecy of Micah (Isa. ii. 2–5; cf. Mic. iv. 1–5); Jeremiah employed verses of Obadiah to denounce anew the punishment of Edom (Jer. iv. 16; cf. Obad. 3); and a prophecy of Joel was expanded by Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxviii. 22; cf. Joel iii. 2). The first five of the Minor Prophets antedate the earliest of the Greater Prophets, while Malachi post-dates them; so the twelve began and closed the cycle of written prophecy which stretched from the ninth to the fifth century B.C. They are arranged in three groups chronologically, but there is some question as to the order among themselves. Thus the prophets of the pre-Assyrian and Assyrian time (Hosea to Nahum) come first; those of the Chaldean period (Habakkuk and Zephaniah) come next; and the post-exilic prophets (Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi) come last. It is noteworthy, however, that the Septuagint puts the first six thus: Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah. In regard to their contents, they may be said, in general, to present peculiar difficulties, arising, in part, from the obscurity of their allusions; but, on the other hand, they yield to no other portion of Scripture in attractiveness. Nothing elsewhere exudes in vividness the description Joel gives of a plague of locusts; no such indignant protest, earnest exhortation, and terrible denunciation, are contained in such small compass as in Malachi; the "burdens" of Zechariah equal in interest the "burdens" of Isaiah; while the swift changes of Hosea from righteous anger to divine love are as characteristic as any thing in Holy Writ. The story of Jonah is as familiar a figure of speech, while it is a truthful account of a thrilling episode. Nahum's eloquence moves with the rapidity of the chariots whose motion it so graphically describes. Obadiah and Habakkuk are sublime in their poetry and their moral earnestness. To the Christian these Minor Prophets are particularly interesting, because the gospel was particularly interesting, because the gospel was

MINOR OPERATIONS OF THE HEBREWS.

MINISTER, MINISTRY. See Clergy.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION. See Education, Ministerial.

MINISTERIUM, a body in the Lutheran Church, composed solely of ordained ministers, to which is intrusted the examination, licensure, and ordination of candidates, and also trials for clerical heresy, and on appeal from a church council for lay heresy.
unrolled the scroll to Micah (Matt. ii. 6; cf. Mic. v. 2); John the Baptist was the Elijah whom Malachi had foretold (Matt. xi. 14; cf. Mal. iv. 5); the prophecy of Zechariah (John xix. 37; cf. Zech. xii. 10); and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost was a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy (Acts ii. 16; cf. Joel ii. 28).

Lit.—For a detailed examination of each prophet, and of the best commentaries upon the Minor Prophets articles in this Encyclopaedia: for an elaborate Introduction to the Minor Prophets, see Professor Charles Elliott, D. D., in Lange: The Minor Prophets (New York, 1876, pp. 3-49), and the literature there given, from which the subjoined list is partly taken. The following are a few of the best commentaries upon the Minor Prophets as a whole. —1. In Latin. By Calvin, 1559 (best ed. Brunsv., 1644-49, 5 vols.); Grotius, 1644; Cocceius, 1852; Calovius, 1877; J. H. Michaelis, 1720; Clericus, 1751; Dathe, 1773; E. F. C. Rosenmüller, 1853. —2. In French. By Calmet (R. C), 1731; Dathe, 1773; E. F. C. Rosenmüller, 1854; Keil, 1866 (Eng. trans., 1869, 2 vols.); Lange, 1869-76 (by Schmoller, Kleinert, and Lange; Eng. trans. of Schmoller and Kleinert in Lange series, ed. Dr. Schaff, 1875). —3. In German. By Luther, 1526 sqq.; Eichhorn, 1818; Hitzig, 1838 (4th ed. by Steiner, 1881); Ewald, 1840-41 (2d ed. 1867-68, 3 vols.; Eng. trans., 1878-81, 6 vols.); Umbreit, 1845; Schlegel (R. C.), 1854; Keil, 1866 (Eng. trans., 1869, 2 vols.; Lange, 1869-76; by Schneller, Kleinert, and Lange; Eng. trans. of Schneller and Kleinert in Lange series, ed. Dr. Schaff, 1875). —4. In English. By Trapp, 1854; Newcome, 1785; Henderson, 1845 (rep. Andover, 1866); Pusey, 1860-77; Cowles, 1867; Lange, 1876 (ed. Dr. Schaff, original Com. on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, by McCurdy, Chambers, and Packard respectively); Wolfendale, 1879 (homiletical). Samuel M. Jackson.

MINORITES. See Franciscans.

MINUCIUS FELIX, Marcus, author of the dialogue Octavius, which, in spite of its lack of originality, and profound theological intuition, occupies a prominent place among the ancient apologies of the Latin Church, both on account of its genuine enthusiasm and elegant form, and on account of the clear and pointed manner in which it presents and refutes all the various objections to Christianity at that time circulating among educated Pagans. Of the personal life of the author we only know that he was a successful lawyer in Rome when he was converted to Christianity; even the date of his great work is somewhat doubtful. Formerly critics generally agreed in placing Minucius between Tertullian and Cyprian. Certain parts of Octavius seem to be based on Tertullian's Apologeticus, and certain parts of Cyprian's De idolorum vanitate are evidently borrowed from Octavius. Now, as the Apologeticus was written in 197, and the De idolorum vanitate in 249, Octavius must have been written in the first decade of the third century. In 1702, however, in an epistle Ad Gerhardum Meermann, J. D. Van Hoven drew attention to the fact that the general state of Christianity, and the specific Pagan objections to it, as represented in Octavius, do not correspond to a period so late as the first decades of the third century; and, in the course of time, more and more scholars adopted the view that Minucius preceded Tertullian, and wrote his Octavius in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In 1889, finally, A. Ebert produced almost conclusive evidence in favor of this view by showing that there exists a direct relation between Octavius and Cicerone's De natum deorum, while the corresponding passages of The Apologeticus seem to have been derived from Octavius. Of the work of Minucius, there exists only one manuscript, which was presented by Leo X. to Francis I. It was first published by Faustus Sabellus, Rome, 1544, afterwards often by Halma, Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat., ii., Vienna, 1687. (There are translations into English in Reeve: Apologies of Justin Martyr, ii., and in vol. 2 of the Writings of Cyprian, in the Ante-Nicene Library, Edinburgh, 1873. See also P. Felice: Etude sur l'Ocavius de Maucius Felix, Blois, 1890; R. Kuhn: Der Octavius d. Minucius Felix, Leipzig, 1882.)

MIRACLE-PLAYS. See Religious Dramas.

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

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

First, Nature exists, but how? Does she exist by virtue of her own laws? That would be to say that she was her own cause, or, in other terms, that she is eternal. But it would also be to say that she is immutable, or, in other terms, to deny the possibility of any progress in the natural sphere.1 For a progress eternally commenced is also eternally terminated, and is no progress. So that, if science can show that any progress has taken place in the development of nature, that progress proves that nature is not eternal. Nature exists, then, not by force of her own essence, but on account of a power superior to herself and her laws.

Next, in the very lap of nature moves along the life of organic beings, obeying laws infinitely higher than those to which inorganic matter is subject. Geology declares that there was a time when no organisms were found on our globe, and fixes, so to speak, the date at which organic life first made its appearance. Whence did it come? From the very forces of nature? Science says, No. "It is a fact as sure as the law of gravitation, that life can come only from life," was said before the most learned assembly in the world, and by its president.2 The first living cell, then, 1 The reader will notice that we do not speak at all here of those internal miracles which the Holy Spirit works in the human soul. 2 Sir William Thomson's discourse at the opening of the British Association at Edinburgh, 1871.
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which was ever found on earth, whence did it come? Was it brought hither on the wings of an aerolite, as the president hinted? No. Such an hypothesis cannot be seriously maintained, as it only removes the difficulty a little farther away, without contributing anything to its solution. The presence of organic life on earth is a second fact which testifies to the existence of a cause superior to nature and natural laws.

Finally, in the midst of organic life there sprang up, at a given moment, intelligent life, the life of freedom. What was its cause? Moral obligation and the feeling of responsibility, the two distinctive characteristics of a free and intelligent being, are phenomena foreign to the world of organic forces, vegetable or animal. In the animal kingdom the individual is only the irresponsible organ and the momentary bearer of the species, obeying its instinct as its supreme law. The free being, on the contrary, can not only resist its natural inclinations, but even sacrifice them in the name of a higher law,—that of duty. In him an order of things appears absolutely superior to the instinct of organic life, absolutely superior to that of matter pure and simple. If life can come only from a living cause, in the same way freedom can come only from a free cause: but such a cause does not belong to the realm of natural forces; it belongs to an entirely new sphere,—the spiritual.

These three facts in the history of the universe reveal to us the intervention, at three different points in the development of the world, of a cause not only foreign to, but also superior to, nature. The question then arises, whether this supreme cause has forever exhausted its power of action by bringing forth its most brilliant effect, the free and intelligent human being, or whether it may be supposed still to manifest itself at proper occasions; which is only another form for that question of principle mentioned above.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Critics have ceased, of late, to deny the extraordinary character of many of the events of the life of Jesus; since, as Reuss says with good reason, "If in the acts of Jesus there were nothing surpassing every-day experience, his history would thereby only become so much the more incomprehensible." But an attempt has been made to reduce the extraordinary cures which Jesus accomplished every day to the peculiar influence which an exquisite character always exercises over diseased structures (Keman, Kelim). Recourse has been had to the idea of relative miracles that is, effects of natural but still unknown causes. Such explanations, however, would be suitable only on the condition that the persons cured by Jesus had in each case been present; but the daughter of the Canaanite woman lived in the very city of the cure; the Canaanite spoke with Jesus in the vicinity of Sidon; and the nobleman's son lay dying on his couch at Capernaum, when, at a distance of many miles, Jesus said to his father, "Thy son liveth" (Matt. xv. 22; John iv. 50). Without laying any stress on the fact that Jesus wrought other miracles than his cures, it will suffice to analyze one single case of his miraculous curing, in order to show the insufficiency of the above explanations. When the Pharisees accuse Jesus of blasphemy, because he says to the palsied man, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," he answers them, "Which is the easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or, Rise and walk?" Now, it is, of course, infinitely easier to ascertain the effect of the latter words; and consequently Jesus adds, "But, that you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise and walk." The dramatic form of this scene, which was evidently taken from life, and has been preserved identical in all the three narratives, proves that Jesus felt absolutely sure that he could cure the sick man who lay stretched on his couch, before the eyes of all present, immediately and completely. But could he have felt so if he had had nothing at his disposal but his ordinary physical, even unknown power? Certainly not: a merely psychological effect always depends, to a great extent, upon the disposition of the sick. And let it not be overlooked, that, in speaking as he does, he risks his whole position. If the sick man had not risen in perfect health from his couch, Jesus would, by his own words, have been convicted of lying and blaspheming, and his Messianic claims would have shrunk into an empty pretension.

The true character of the miracles of our Gospel appears in an equally striking light when comparing them with the fictitious miracles of the apocryphal Gospels. Those Roman standards which bend before Mary and her son, that dyer's vat from which the infant Jesus draws up clothes of whatever color he likes, that water split on the stairs, and brought back in a napkin, etc. — that is what man can invent: mere exhibitions of magical power, without any relation to the moral attributes of God. Quite otherwise with the miracles of our Gospels. They combine all the features of a divine character. Omnipotence never acts unless in the service of holiness and love. And is it not singular, that though afterwards, and with such models before their eyes, the church, confirmed in the reality of them, would have shrunk from the reportsof our Gospels, that, as Ewald has it, the working of miracles was, almost to the very end of his life, "his every-day task." It might be said that the miracles of Jesus were the simple and spontaneous effect of his sympathy with human misery, just as the alms naturally results from the meeting between the rich and the poor. It is even the abstract of an understanding of the true significance of the miracles of Jesus to explain them in that way. However great may have been his sympathy with human sufferings, he wrought his miracles, not from that impulse, but because he was the Sav-
four. His miracles belong to his office as Saviour. Otherwise he would not have cured some blind people and some lepers, raised three persons from the dead, etc.; he would have destroyed all blindness, all leprosy, death itself, forever.

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

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

With respect to the manner in which Jesus wrought his miracles, two quite different points of view may be observed in his own words on the subject. On one occasion it is the Father who accomplishes the work on the demand of Jesus (John xi. 41, 42): at another the miraculous power seems to be inherent in his personality (Luke viii. 46). In order to establish perfect harmony between these two points of view, which appear to be fully reconciled to each other in the consciousness of Jesus, it would be necessary to penetrate into the inscrutable mystery of the miracle. But we have, at least, an analogy in the spiritual miracles which he wrought before our own eyes: on the one side it is the spirit of God which seizes and converts the soul; on the other it is the work of the words of the preacher.

The miracles of the apostles stand in the same relation to those of Jesus as the miracles of Joshua to those of Moses. Nor do the miracles of the Gentiles resemble those of Elijah: they are a continuation and a complement. Without going into details, we may simply remark, that, on this point, it becomes absolutely impossible to speak of legends, as Paul himself appeals to the miracles he has wrought, and does so three times (2 Cor. xi. 12; Rom. xv. 18, 19). Therefore, if anybody chooses to doubt the reality of the miracles ascribed in Acts to Peter in founding the church among the Jews, and to Paul in founding the church among the Gentiles, he must begin by wiping out those two declarations of the apostle Peter, who states that Christ himself appealed to the miracles he wrought (Acts ii. 42, 43). The miracles recorded in the Old Testament have accompanied the whole series of revelations by which the way has been prepared for the act of salvation, just as the miracles of Jesus and the apostles have signalized the accomplishment of that act and the foundation of the church. But the latter, as, indeed, the whole apparition of Jesus, would be much more extraordinary, not to say completely incomprehensible, if they had entered history ex abrupto, without any preparatory announcement. There is an objection often made to the miracles of biblical history,—that no miracles are wrought now; and that objection is generally substantiated by the alleged observation, that miracles are most frequent in the most distant periods of history, but become more and more scarce as we approach the epochs of a higher civilization, and disappear altogether in modern times before a fuller comprehension of the action of natural laws. But here two remarks are to be made. First, miracles serve only as an accompaniment to the work of God for the salvation of the human race. That work was completed by Jesus and his apostles, and what is now left to be done is simply the individual appropriation of God's work. But for that purpose no miracle is necessary, or, rather, the miracle now retreats into the private personal sphere. Second, the alleged decrease in the series of miracles is absolutely false. In the most ancient epoch of the history of mankind (from Adam to Moses, comprising about twenty-five hundred years), biblical history does not record one single miracle, properly speaking; for the divine apparitions accorded to the patriarchs belong to another category. The first miraculous acts in the domain of nature are the signs given to Moses at the moment he entered upon his office,—illustrations of the name Jehovah, expressions of the absolute monothelism founded by him. Then six or seven centuries elapse, and no miracle occurs; but it re-appears at the moment when the existence of monothelism is seriously threatened by the invasion of the grossest paganism, in the times of Elijah and Elisha. Again two or three centuries roll on without any miracle, until the period of the Babylonian captivity, when the reign of God seemed completely wiped off from the face of the earth, and the truth of monothelism had to be vindicated in the most striking manner against the victorious power of paganism: it was the time of Daniel. Finally, an interval of four centuries separates this third epoch of miracles from the fourth, which is also the last, the most striking, and belonging to the full dawn of history,—the epoch of Jesus and his apostles. If one believes that miracles are nothing but legendary fictions, why, then, are they concentrated on certain decisive points, instead of being scattered uniformly.
over the whole surface of biblical history? and why are they most numerous in that epoch which is nearest to modern times?

The question which is said to the contrary, the biblical miracles are, nevertheless, according to all laws of historical criticism, true realities. They form the brilliant connection between the first creation which we contemplate, and the second and much more magnificent creation which we expect. They proclaim the eternal omnipotence of the creative spirit over matter created: but they do not occur incidentally at any moment; they belong, as Weiss has said, to a special history, to a superior history, which runs through ordinary history from beginning to end, to the history of salvation, which, having begun spiritually here on earth, shall find its consummation in the renovation of the universe (Matt. xix. 28). A glimpse of that truth reaches us, as it were through an open eye, from that most glorious of all miracles, the resurrection of Jesus, which surpasses all other events of the kind, not so much by the latter events themselves, as by the human mediation, as because it laid the foundation of the general resurrection, and forms the actual commencement of the final glorification of nature (1 Cor. xv. 20-28).

MIRACLES. Historical View of. Miracles are such events in external nature or in history as cannot be wrought by natural forces or human means, but only by the immediate exercise of higher, divine powers. This definition excludes from present examination, (1) the creation, because it relates to the world as already in existence; and (2) all spiritual miracles, as they are not in external nature. The older theologians distinguished between miracles of nature and of grace, meaning, by the former, miracles in the usual sense, and, by the latter, spiritual miracles; also, between miracles of power and of foreknowledge, understanding among the latter inspiration respecting the future. Only miracles of power come in here for mention. Of such the Bible gives account in each stage of revelation. Sometimes they are entirely independent of human or natural agency, e.g., voices from heaven; but usually they are manifestations of divine power through some creation. Both classes, however, show how an omnipotent, holy, and especially a gracious God works in his chosen people for the benefit of the whole human family, through their salvation.

Miracle in the Bible. — The usual Old-Testament terms for miracles are: (1) דָּקָא, [from דָּק, that which is distorted]; (2) דָּקָא, strange; (3) דָּקָא, signs; (4) דָּקָא, mighty deeds of Jehovah; (5) דָּקָא, great deeds. The usual New-Testament terms are ἔρημος and εἰμένα. The first of these latter expressions corresponds to דָּקָא, and refers to the first effect of such an exhibition of power; the second, to דָּקָא, and refers to the meaning of the act. To דָּקָא corresponds בֹּנְוָא, which points directly to the divine powers at work in the miracle itself, and its instrument. It is, however, a fair question whether the men and writers of the Bible themselves had any conception of a miracle as we have. There is no term in the Old Testament which exactly corresponds to our "Nature," as something of independent existence; but Nature was to them the theatre of the constant operations of God. It is incontestable, that the Bible describes victories, plagues, and extraordinary happenings, whether they were miraculous; whereas we should attribute them to what we call "natural causes." But, however this may be, there is a distinction made between the ordinary course of God's providence, and extraordinary actions of God, which are designated signs; so, although the conception of a miracle may not have been clear, there was still the idea of it.

Miracle in the Early Church. — The Christian theologian and apologist strongly emphasized the miraculous in proof of the divine origin of Christianity, and claimed its continuance in the church. So Irenaeus boasts of the wide spread of the gift of miracles among Christians. But at a later period the great difference between the unusual events happening in the church, which were still in the line of natural powers, and the really miraculous events in the apostolic age, was recognized by the church. Leukai and Augustine particularly calls attention to it as a wise providential arrangement; since, in consequence of the wide spread of Christianity, there was no further need of the miraculous to awaken faith, and the commonness of miracles would weaken their impressiveness (De cœ. Det, 32, 8; De utilit. cred., 16; De vera Relig., 25). Augustine, however, held firmly to the belief in the existence of miraculous powers, and that on the ground of personal experience. Later still, when Catholicism had settled its idea of "saintship," miracles were a prerequisite to canonization. At the same time, the possibility of similar actions being performed by heathens and atheists, through demonic agency, was granted. By distinguishing between the latter and the genuine divine miracles, the ethical value of both was determined. Far higher than the miracle which affected the body, such men as Augustine and Origen put that which affected the soul, — the miracle of grace, whereby the soul was healed, and its eyes opened. With the apologetic use of miracles began the discussion as to their nature. Origen explains the possibility of the operation of God in external nature by supposing it in accordance with the higher, ideal divine order, but at the same time depreciates the value and importance of the phenomenal world. Augustine says that a "miracle is not contrary to nature, but to what we know of nature" (De cœ. Det, 21, 8; Contra Faust, 26, 3). As the context in these quotations respectively shows ("the will of the creator is the nature of each created thing," and, "for whatever is done by Him who appoints all natural order and measure and proportion, must be natural in every case"), Augustine conceives of "nature" as entirely under the control of God. God can, therefore, do in it precisely as he pleases.

Miracle among the Schoolmen. — The schoolmen more sharply define a miracle in relation to nature. Thus Thomas Aquinas: "A miracle is something out of the order of nature" (Summ., p. 1, qu. 110, art. 4). But they do not advance substantially beyond Augustine and Origen, in considering whether and how far such a divine action conflicts with the laws of nature. Albertus Magnus denies that God can do any thing against
nature, but asserts that God has implanted the possibility of miracles in the very nature of things; cf. Neander ['Torrey's trans., vol. iv. 470 seq.']. This is the most peculiar idea which the schoolmen contributed to the subject. They emphasize the ethical importance of miracles. They also distinguish between miracles and wondrous events, and declare the law of nature to be the basis of their solution of the problem how an event which is contrary to the visible can yet be in accordance with the invisible order of nature. To the boast of the Roman Church to be the true church, because it possessed miraculous powers, they replied, that the time of miracles was past, that those claimed by the Roman Church were false, and that the Protestant Church had greater miracles in its amazing success.

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

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

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

The English Deists attacked the belief in miracles in another way. They separated God so far from all human and mundane affairs, that a revelation and a miracle are alike unthinkable. It was, however, Hume who gave the most momentous and destructive attack on the stand-point of the empirical philosophy, he contended that there was not sufficient evidence to prove a miracle. Bearing in mind the uniformity of nature's operations and the commonness of deception, unintentional and intentional, it will be perceived, he said, that the only persons who can give valid testimony to a miracle are those who have never deceived or been deceived. But the persons who are brought forward to testify do not belong to that category. Therefore miracles remain unproved.

In Germany, the early Rationalists followed the English Deists in separating God from the world, and declared that such a union as a miracle implied was detracting to both. On the principles of Kant ('Relig. innerh. d. Grenzen, etc. 2. Stuck, end), that it was culpable moral superstition to grant authority to the law of duty written upon our hearts, only when it is attested by miracles, the Rationalists declared that a belief in miracles wrought the most serious mischief to true virtue, and impaired the sanctity of the moral law.

While willing to grant abstractly that miracles were possible, since they might be wrought by powers, and in accordance with laws in nature, of which we know nought, as a matter of fact the Rationalists believed such powers were never exercised.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


MISERERE (have mercy) denotes a musical prayer, with text from the Fifty-first and Fifty-seventh Psalms. At occasions of penitence, at funerals, and at the services during Passion Week, it forms part of the Liturgy of the Roman-Catholic Church. Besides its regular Gregorian melody, it has been set to music by a number of the greatest composers. The most impressive melody, however, is that by Gregorio Allegri (1580–1640), always used in the Sistine Chapel in Rome on Thursday and Friday of Passion Week.

MISHNA (doctrine) is the text to which the Gemara is the commentary; and both together form the Talmud. See TALMUD.

MISSA. See Mass.

MISSA.—Missa Catechumenorum and Missa Fidelium denote the two parts of the divine service of the primitive church, from the latter of which, the celebration of the Eucharist, the catechumens were excluded. Missa Præsanctificatorum. As consecrations were considered feasts, they were forbidden through Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday, and in the Roman Church, also on Good Friday and Easter Eve. Hence those who wished to take the communion on those days received previously consecrated, pre-sanctified elements. Missa Sicca, a mass without any consecration or communion, is not heard of until the thirteenth century.
MISSIONS.

MISSION (Liber Missalis, or Missale), an office-book of the Roman-Catholic Church; contains the Liturgy of the mass. The earliest appearance of this kind of books, the Libri Sacramentorum, or Sacramentaria, dates back to the time of Gelasius I.; the latest development, to the sixteenth century, when, on the instance of the Council of Trent, a complete revision was undertaken. Editions of the Missal in the original Latin have often been published, e.g., Paris, 1739, and Berlin, 1841; and The Roman Missal for the use of the laity, containing the masses appointed to be said throughout the year, appeared in London (n.d.). See also E. F. Robertson: The Roman Liturgy and Devout Catholic's Companion, Edinburgh, 1792; and art. Mass.

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

MISSION, Inner. See Inner Mission.

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

MISSIONS, Protestant, among the Heathens.

I. INTRODUCTORY.—Christianity is through and through a missionary religion. The missionary spirit of the New Testament struck its roots in the Old Testament (against Max Muller: Lecture on Mission, delivered in Westminster Abbey, Dec. 3, 1873); so that in this respect, also Christ came to fulfill. The missionary spirit is one of the essential features of the gospel. All men stand in need of salvation. God will have all men to be saved, and come to a knowledge of the truth. The gospel must therefore be proclaimed to all nations. This great truth Christ embodied in his last command (Matt. xxviii. 19). But more than this: missionary activity is the vital law of the Christian Church; and the outgoings of the missionary spirit have a healthful and strengthening effect upon the Church itself, as the history of the past hundred years plainly shows.

The most intense and burning missionary spirit existed in the apostolic age. In this period of its first love, the whole Church was a missionary organization; and, although the number of the missionaries was not large, their enthusiasm was all-controlling, and the co-operation of the congregations was vigorous. The missionaries followed the public roads which God himself had laid out, and occupied the stations which his hand had indicated. In this divine preparation lies all-controlling, and the co-operation of the congregation.

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

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

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

II. HISTORY. 1. The Period of the Reformation.—The discovery of America in 1492 was the occasion for renewed missionary activity in the Roman-Catholic Church, which again fell into the errors of the middle ages. In his Ecclesiastis sieve de ratione concionandi, Erasmus at once sharply criticised this method of evangelization, and strongly urged upon his contemporaries the duty of carrying on missions. Luther with great emphasis denounced the worldly methods of proselyting, and quotes as Plitt (Kurze Gesch. d. lutherischen Mission) and others affirm, definitely urge the despatch of missionaries to the heathen. Nowhere can a fair inference be drawn, from his writings or sermons, that the thought of a mission to the heathen was in his mind. In spite of Ostertag, Plitt, and Kalvar, who agree in asserting that Luther employed
every opportunity that a text afforded of urging the destitution of the heathen and Turks, and the despatch of preachers to them, we must affirm that the great Reformer failed to appreciate the missionary obligations of his Church. [See Addresses to Ministers among the Heathen, Art. 4.] What is true of Luther may also be said of Calvin, who, in his comment on the great missionary commandment (Matt. xxviii. 19), does not speak a word about the present duty of the Church to the heathen. The Reformers were powerful missionaries within the limits of the Church; but, of missions to the heathen world, they did not think.

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

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

2. THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. — The state of affairs was far more unfavorable for Protestant missions in the seventeenth century than it had been in the period of the Reformation. Especially was this true in Germany. [It can hardly be said to be true of England and the Netherlands.] The Thirty-Years’ War, and the unfruitful theological conflicts about orthodoxy in Germany, kept out all thoughts of practical missionary work. In spite of this, however, a star shines here and there from the dark heavens. Seven jurists of Lübeck bound themselves to obedience to the missionary mandate, and more especially to promote the revival of the Christian churches of the East. One of them, Peter Heiling, actually went forth in 1682 from Paris to Abyssinia, where he arrived in 1684, and translated the New Testament into the Amharic language. The first to make a stirring appeal to the German Church was Ernst von Welz, who in 1684 published two works. The one bore the title, A Christian and Cordial Call to all Orthodox Christians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning a Special Society by which, with Divine Help, our Evangelical Religion may be diffused. The other bore a similar title. In the former, three questions were proposed: (1) Is it right for us Christians to monopolize the gospel? (2) Is it right that we have so many students of theology among us, and do not urge them to labor in other parts of the vineyard? (3) Is it right that we spend so much money in luxuries upon ourselves, and hitherto have not thought of contributing anything for the diffusion of the gospel? Welz wrote still another tractate, in which he urges the establishment at Zwolle in Holland, he set apart 36,000 marks ($9,000) for missions, and went to Dutch Guinea, where he soon died. Welz’s pure motives, enthusiasm, and sacrifice of his property, assure him a permanent place in the history of missions.

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

In the seventeenth century the hegemony of the seas passed into the hands of England, Holland, and Denmark. Thus a door was opened to heathen peoples. The Dutch, who deprived the Portuguese of nearly all their East Indian colonies, developed a decided missionary activity. One of the avowed aims of the East Indian Handelsmaatschappij, chartered in 1602, was the conversion of the heathen. The history of these early Dutch missions has not been sufficiently explored; but we know that unevangelical means were soon employed, as in Ceylon, where the Dutch governor made the tenure of even the lowest governmental positions, and even the governmental protection, conditional upon signing the Helvetic Confession. Thousands pressed to be baptized, which was denied to them, in order to repeat the Lord’s Prayer and the Ten Commandments. By the close of the seventeenth century, 300,000 — yes, according to Brown, by 1722, 424,392 — Singalese had been baptized. The same measures were employed in Java, where 106,000 received baptism. But a Waliza of Leyden sought by his missionary institute (founded in
1622, which collapsed after the despatch of twelve students) to develop a real missionary interest, as also did Heurnius, in his Admonitio de legatione ad Indos capessenda (1618), and Hoverbeek of Utrecht, by various writings.—Summa controversiarum cum gentibus, Judaeis, Mohammedanis et Papistis, 1659; De convertendis et convincendis Judaeis, 1665, etc. There were some faithful workers on the mission-fields, but the result of the missions was only a nominal Christianity. The Dutch also carried on a mission for a while in Brazil, where the West Indian Company (founded 1621) established a trading-port. Moritz of Nassau-Siegen, who went out as governor in 1636, sent back for eight ministers, who were to divide the mission of the first missionary operations among the organized congregations had been established, the Catechism; and some Indians were baptized, and instruction given, in the Indian languages, congregations organized, and natives trained for the ministry. Up to 1680, 14 well-organized congregations had been established, with 1,100 members. In 1644 a petition was presented for their support, and in 1714 a Danish collegium de curru evangelii promovendi was organized. But, in spite of these things, the affairs of the Tranquebar mission were conducted from Halle; and the main leader was August Hermann Francke. This godly man seems to have gotten his first missionary impulse from Leibnitz (see Kramer: Life of Francke), and was the author of that remarkable missionary tractate, Pharus missionis evangelicis, in which he urges Frederick of Prussia to take up the work of converting the heathen, especially the Chinese. As the principal representative of the Pietistic movement, next to Spener, and as the founder of the Orphan House at Halle, he was providentially fitted to induce a spirit of devotion in young missionaries, and to develop a missionary constituency at home. Without Francke, the Danish mission would soon have collapsed. He was the first to edit, from 1710 on, regular missionary reports. In one word, Halle was the centre of the Tranquebar mission, and the first real missionary hymn, that of Bøgatzky, was written under this influence,—Wacht auf, du Geist der ersten Zeugen. On the other hand, the orthodox party looked with suspicion upon the movement; the Wittenberg faculty calling the missionaries "false prophets;" and others, even Neumeister the Lausitzer, writing an anti-missionary tract, Ständer an, declaring missions to be unnecessary.

The Tranquebar mission continued to do efficient work until the close of the century, when rationalism at home undermined its roots. The English missionary societies, and, later, the Leipzig society, both failed. Its most prominent workers were Ziegenbalg and Schwartz, and the
visible results were the conversion of 40,000 souls. (See Germain : Ziegenbalg und Flütschau, and the
and Schwartz.)

Denmark also directed its attention to Lapland and Greenland. The self-denying Thomas von Westen made three missionary tours to Lapland (1716-22). Hans Egede is the real apostle of Greenland, where he spent fifteen years with his family. At the close of this period he returned to Copenhagen to train missionaries. In this latter enterprise he was not successful; but there were others to take up his labors, — the United Brethren of Herrnhut, to whose missions we now turn.

In 1731 Zinzendorf visited Copenhagen, and was induced by what he saw to carry out the missionary thoughts a previous visit to Ziegenbalg and Hallé had started. A negro returned with him to Herrnhut, and begged the Brethren to send the gospel to his fellows in St. Thomas. Members of the community at once offered themselves for Greenland and the West Indies. On Aug. 21, 1732, Döge and David Machtzmann, each with eighteen marks for travelling expenses, started for St. Thomas; and in January, 1733, Matthew and Christian Stach, for Greenland. The first Greenlander, Cajarnak, was baptized March 30, 1739. Other missionaries were rapidly sent to Ziegenbalg and Gründler (Sherring: History of Protestant Missions in India, pp. 9, 13). In Edinburgh, a Scotch Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1708, and also a Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. They sent a few missionaries to the Indians, and amongst those sent by the former society was the godly and devoted David Brainerd. [Jonathan Edwards also labored among the Stockbridge Indians.] With the grand opportunities afforded by its Colonies, and domination on the seas, England did next to nothing, during the eighteenth century, for missions. The reason is to be found in the low state of religion and the influence of the deistic movement. Never were such elegant moral sermons preached, and never had immorality reached so high a point. It was with the dawn of a new era of faith in England, at the close of the century, that the missionary spirit of the nineteenth century was begotten.

4. The Nineteenth Century. — The great religious revival, starting with the labors of the Wesleys and Whitefield, gave the impulse to recent modern missions. God was opening the doors to the nations, and the period had dawned which he had chosen for the missionary era. Not only had Cook's voyages and discoveries aroused an intense interest in the lands and peoples across the sea, but the missionary societies found in them an argument to which they could appeal. Since that time, down to Stanley's journeys in the Dark Continent, missions and geographical discovery have stood in closest connection; and we may say, with Livingstone, "The close of the geographical discovery is the beginning of the missionary enterprise." To this consideration we must add the remarkable progress in inventions, communications, and the sciences. There were enjoined to practise rigid economy, and to labor with their hands. They were to use only spiritual means, and to aim at the conversion of individuals. The United Brethren have sent out (up to April, 1883) 2,212 missionaries (male and female), of whom 604 are still laboring, 327 of whom are men (Rückblick auf unsere 150 jährige Missionsarbeit, Herrnhut, 1883). In 1882 the 150th anniversary of Moravian missions was appropriately celebrated in Herrnhut, and all the various Moravian churches of Germany and the United States.

Missions.

Unfortunately, the example of the Moravians was not at once followed by the rest of the Protestant Church. The responsibility for this neglect lies with the rationalism and the deism which undermined the faith of England and Germany. Immorality reached so high a point. Germany was more active in this century than other countries, and no other country can show such noble workers as Francke and Zinzendorf. In Holland, the duty of missionary effort was forgotten. In England, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was founded in 1701, but it lived on a sluggish existence till the opening of this century. It did very little for the Indians and negroes of America. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge did somewhat better. Collections were taken up for it at court, and George I. showed his interest by writing a couplet to Ziegenbalg and Gründler (Sherring: History of Protestant Missions in India, pp. 9, 13). In Edinburgh, a Scotch Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1708, and also a Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. They sent a few missionaries to the Indians, and amongst those sent by the former society was the godly and devoted David Brainerd. (Jonathan Edwards also labored among the Stockbridge Indians.) With the grand opportunities afforded by its Colonies, and domination on the seas, England did next to nothing, during the eighteenth century, for missions. The reason is to be found in the low state of religion and the influence of the deistic movement. Never were such elegant moral sermons preached, and never had immorality reached so high a point. It was with the dawn of a new era of faith in England, at the close of the century, that the missionary spirit of the nineteenth century was begotten.
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Unfortunately, the example of the Moravians was not at once followed by the rest of the Protestant Church. The responsibility for this neglect lies with the rationalism and the deism which undermined the faith of England and Germany. Immorality reached so high a point. Germany was more active in this century than other countries, and no other country can show such noble workers as Francke and Zinzendorf. In Holland, the duty of missionary effort was forgotten. In England, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was founded in 1701, but it lived on a sluggish existence till the opening of this century. It did very little for the Indians and negroes of America. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge did somewhat better. Collections were taken up for it at court, and George I. showed his interest by writing a couplet to Ziegenbalg and Gründler (Sherring: History of Protestant Missions in India, pp. 9, 13). In Edinburgh, a Scotch Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1708, and also a Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. They sent a few missionaries to the Indians, and amongst those sent by the former society was the godly and devoted David Brainerd. (Jonathan Edwards also labored among the Stockbridge Indians.) With the grand opportunities afforded by its Colonies, and domination on the seas, England did next to nothing, during the eighteenth century, for missions. The reason is to be found in the low state of religion and the influence of the deistic movement. Never were such elegant moral sermons preached, and never had immorality reached so high a point. It was with the dawn of a new era of faith in England, at the close of the century, that the missionary spirit of the nineteenth century was begotten.
the more determined became the conflict at home, until, in 1818, the door was finally opened to missionary operations in India by a parliamentary decree. (See India.) The new missionary interest of England was communicated to Germany; although at first, all the official organs of the Church denounced a hostile attitude, so that not the Church as a body, but detached Christian circles, took up the matter. Independent societies were formed, which may be regarded as a substitute for the orders of the Roman-Catholic Church, and may be looked upon, unless all signs are deceptive, as a divine preparation for the ecclesiastical organization of the future. We now turn to the history of the foundation of the several missionary societies, and, first of all, to England. This history forms one of the most refreshing episodes in the annals of the Protestant Church; for it is animated with enthusiastic faith, fraternal love, a childlike spirit of joy, heroic courage, pious prayerfulness, and a holy spirit of self-sacrifice.

English Societies.— The Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel amongst the Heathen was formed in Kettering, Oct. 2, 1792, by a small company, including Andrew Fuller and William Carey the cobbler, to whom the suggestion that the meeting is mainly to be ascribed. Carey had previously published his Inquiry into the Obligation of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen; and on May 31, 1792, preached his famous missionary sermon at Nottingham on Isa. liv. 2, in which he urged the convention to expect great things and to attempt great things. Carey himself was the first missionary of this society, and Fuller its first and most energetic secretary. Carey went to India, and was soon joined by Marshman, Ward, and other laborers. In 1809 the first translation of the Bible into Bengalee was accomplished, and printed at the Baptist printing-press at Seringapatam. In 1814 this society employed 14 European and 28 native missionaries, and had 500 Indian converts. It undertook new missions in Ceylon in 1812; Jamaica, 1813; Western Africa, 1840; China, 1859; and Japan, 1859. The society is supported by the Board, 95; pastors of self-supporting churches, 61; evangelists, 258; members, 38,387; income, £60,275. Its offices are 19 Castle Street, London, E.C.; organ, The Missionary Observer.

The London Missionary Society was formed Sept. 21, 1795. In the following days, six solemn services were held in the churches of London. It comprised dissenters of the various denominations, as well as members of the Established Church, and had among its incorporators laymen, as well as clergymen. Soon after its organization, the society passed under the control of the Independent Society. The society was settled upon as the first field of operations; and 29 men were sent out, among whom 4 were ministers. The ship "Duff" was purchased; and on March 4, 1797, she dropped anchor off Tahiti. After many vicissitudes, this mission was carried on to a glorious success, under the leadership of John Williams. (See Fiji Islands, Friendly Islands, Williams, etc.) The society established other stations in Southern Africa in 1798 (see Livingston, etc.), India in 1805, China in 1807 (see Morrison, etc.), British Guiness and the West Indies, 1821, Madagascar, 1818 (see Madagascar), and many of the Polynesian islands.

Statistics for 1828: English missionaries, 142; native ordained ministers, 369; native preachers, 4,826; church-members, 99,382; boys' schools, 1,468; scholars, 69,418; girls' schools, 331; scholars, 12,751; income, £116,012; organ, The Chronicle of the London Missionary Society. Its offices are in Bloomsbury Street, London.

The Society for Missions to Africa and the East was founded April 12, 1799, by ministers of the Church of England. The movement was earnestly supported by Wilberforce. In 1812 it changed its name to the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East. By 1825 it had sent out 96 missionaries, of whom 28 were German, and 62 English clergymen: the rest were laymen. In 1815 it founded the Missionary Seminary at Islington, which had, up to 1875, sent forth 420 missionaries. Fourteen of the society's missionaries have received the honor of episcopal consecration, among whom is one native, Dr. Crowther. It established stations in Western Africa (Rio Pongas and Sierra Leone) in 1804; India, 1814; New Zealand, 1814; Ceylon, 1818; British America, 1833; Eastern Africa, 1843; China, 1845; Mauritius, 1856; Japan, 1869; Persia, 1873; Victoria Nyanza, 1876. The Sierra Leone Church, with its more than 5,000 communicants, is now self-supporting. Statistics for 1828: European (male) missionaries, 230; native, 230; native lay helpers, 2,569 male, 461 female; native communicants, 36,326; schools, 1,017; scholars, 68,647; income, £221,136; organ, The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record. Its offices are in Salisbury Square, London. This society, by its tolerant and fraternal Christian spirit, has the confidence and hearty moral support of all Christian denominations.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S. P. G.), founded in 1701, began a new life in the early part of this century. It has become more and more the representative of the High-Church party and principles, and prosecutes the work of establishing new bishopries with great zeal. Feeling itself to be the representative of the Church par excellence, it has entered territory already sufficiently occupied by other societies, and has thereby caused not a little trouble. It lays great stress upon the organization of bishoprics. It has opened stations in India (1818), Ceylon, South Africa (1820), the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand (1839), Borneo (1849), British Columbia (1859), China (1874), Japan (1873), etc.; and has even intruded into Madagascar (1864) and the Fiji Islands (1879). The report of the society does not give separate statistics. The society, perhaps, has 20,000 native communicants, 12,850 helpers, 2,569 male, 461 female; native communicants, 36,326; schools, 1,017; scholars, 68,647; income, £221,136; organ, The Missionary Herald. Its offices are in Salisbury Square, London. Bishop Mackenzie was con-
secreted first bishop on Jan. 1, 1801, and was succeeded at his death by Dr. Steers. In 1881 this mission had 5 priests and 8 deacons in its employ. (See Rowley: Twenty Years in Central Africa, being the Story of the Universities’ Mission, London, 1881.)

Other independent missionary societies connected with the Church of England are, the South-American Missionary Society, founded in 1844, which had in 1881 an income of £18,678, and prosecutes work in the Falklands, Terra del Fuego, Argentine Republic, Brazil, Chili, Peru, etc.; organ, The South-American Missionary Magazine. Its offices are at 11 Sergeants’ Inn, London. The Missionary Society was founded in 1801. Its secretary seems to be its only missionary.

The Methodists have, from the beginning of their history, had an intense missionary spirit. Thomas Coke, in 1796, was the first director of their foreign 2.2. mission. The Methodist Missionary Society was formed after his death in 1815, and began its operations in the West Indies and Western Africa. He died in 1814, on his way to Ceylon, whither he was going to establish a third mission. The Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society was formed after his death in 1817, and has stations in the South Seas (Australia, New Zealand, Fijian Islands), 1822, China, 1836, and also in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Malta. Its work in Canada and British America has been taken up by the Canada Wesleyan Society, which also has a mission in Japan. The missions in the South Sea Islands are now likewise independent of the mother-society. Statistics for 1888 (including Europe, India, China, Africa, West Indies): Missions and assistant missionaries, 581; other helpers, 10,191; church-members, 99,349; income in 1881, £192,935; organ, The Western Missionary Notice. Its offices are 69 Paternoster Row, London.

The Welsh Calvinist Methodist Society (1840) has a successful mission in India, with 66 congregations and 2,055 church-members in 1881. The Primitive Methodist Missionary Society was founded in 1848. The United Methodist Free Churches Missionary Society (1856) has stations in the West Indies, China, and Africa, with 16 missionaries and 5,000 communicants. The Methodist New Connection Missionary Society (1860?) has a mission in China; employed (in 1882) 5 European missionaries, 62 local preachers, and numbered 1,131 communicants; income, £4,829. Its office is 4 London-House Yard, London.

The Foreign Mission Society of the Presbyterian Church in England was founded in 1855, has stations in India, China (1856), and Formosa (1865). In 1881, it has 2,570 communicants, and employed 17 clerical and 4 medical missionaries; income £14,028; organ, The Messenger and Missionary Record of the Presbyterian Church in England. Its offices are 7 East India Avenue, London. The Irish Presbyterian Foreign Missionary Society, founded in 1815, has stations in India, China, and Japan. The Irish Presbyterian Foreign Mission Society began its existence in 1840; has stations in India, China, and Spain, and numbered 380 European missionaries, and numbered about 300 native communicants; income, £9,924. The Friends’ Foreign Mission Society (1855) prosecutes missionary work in India, Syria, and especially Madagascar (3,250 church-members). The China Inland Mission (1865) employs 70 missionaries, and numbering 1,000 communicants, and the Congo (or Livingstone) Inland Mission, employing 14 missionaries, are undenominational. In addition to these organizations, there are a number of efficient ladies’ associations in England.

Scotch Societies.— The Glasgow and the Scottish Missionary Societies were founded in 1798, and sent missionaries to Sierra Leone, Cape Colony, India, and Japan. It was not till 1824 that Dr. Inglis succeeded in bringing the Established Church as a body to prosecute missions. Its first missionary was Dr. Duff (see Duff), who went to India, and was soon followed by Wilson, Mitchell, and others. These missionaries addressed themselves more particularly to the work of education. At the Disruption, in 1843, two societies ensued. The missionaries in India, however, united with the Free Church; but the missionary property went to the Established Church. The latter soon sent fresh missionaries to the Indies. The Gothic Missionary Society was founded in 1845, and has established stations in Eastern Africa (1876) and China (1877). In close connection with it stands the Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India. The organ of the Established Church’s missions is The Church of Scotland Foreign Missionary Record. Much more extensive has been the work of the Free Church. Besides its Indian stations, it has established missions in Southern Africa, among the Kafirs (1844) and Zulus (1867), in the New Hebrides (1849), Syria (1872), Lake Nyassa, Africa (Livingstonia mission) (1881). Statistics for 1888: Ordained European missionaries, 88; ordained native missionaries, 11; medical missionaries, 9; other European helpers, 26; native, 313; communicants, 4,271; income, £29,957. The Ladies’ Society for Female Education in India and South Africa is connected with the Free Church; organ, The Free Church of Scotland Monthly Record. Its offices are in Edinburgh. The United Presbyterian Church of Scotland began operations among the heathen in 1835, and has missions in the West Indies (Jamaica and Trinidad), Kaffraria, India, China, and Japan. In close connection with it stands the Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India. The organ of the Established Church’s missions is The Church of Scotland Foreign Missionary Record. Much more extensive has been the work of the Free Church. Besides its Indian stations, it has established missions in Southern Africa, among the Kafirs (1844) and Zulus (1867), in the New Hebrides (1849), Syria (1872), Lake Nyassa, Africa (Livingstonia mission) (1881). Statistics for 1888: Ordained European missionaries, 47; ordained native missionaries, 18; European medical missionaries, 5; native helpers, 320; European zenana agents and teachers, 17; communicants, 10,215; day schools, 182; pupils, 10,051; income in 1881, £38,915; organ, The Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church.

American Societies.— The churches of North America, as has already been noticed, were interested, in the eighteenth century, in the work of carrying the gospel to the Indians. It is characteristic that the modern missionary movement in the United States started in an institution of learning. Andover Seminary. The main mover was Samuel J. Mills (see art.), who was deeply interested in missionary subjects while a student at Williams College. At Andover Seminary, he, together with Hall, Judson, Newell, and Notz, formed a missionary society, and with these and some of them presented to Dr. E. Agassiz, of the Massachusetts Proper, convened at Bradford, an appeal in behalf of missions. The result was the founding, on June 29, 1810, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. This organization at first proposed a union with the
London Missionary Society, but the idea was abandoned; and in 1812 the first missionaries were sent to India.—Judson, Rice, etc. The former became a Baptist, and went to Burmah. The mission was ultimately established in Bombay (1813) and Ceylon (1819). The Board began its mission to the Indians in 1816; in the Sandwich Islands, 1820; in Palestine, by the despatch of Pliny Fisk and Levi Parsons, in 1818; Turkey, 1822; Zululand, 1835; South China, 1847; Micronesia, 1852; North China, 1854; Japan, 1869; Spain and Mexico, 1872; Austria, 1873; Central Africa, 1880. Statistics for 1882: American ordained missionaries, 194; American assistants, male and female, 392; native pastors, 148; native preachers, 438; church-members, 17,755 (exclusive of the Sandwich Islands); high schools and seminaries, 63; schools, 847; whole number of pupils, 98,585; income, $156,700, of which $110,000 was from women's societies. The Hawaiian Evangelical Association of the Sandwich Islands carries on an independent mission in the Micronesian Islands, with (in 1880) 40 stations and 2,904 adherents. Since 1869 the Woman's Board of Missions has co-operated with the American Board. Its organ is Life and Light for Women; it has 15,000 members. The American Missionary Association of the Congregational Church carries on operations among the Indians, negroes, and Chinese in America, and the negroes in Western Africa. It employs 84 missionaries and 180 teachers in the South, and 8 missionaries and 5 teachers in Africa; organ, The American Missionary. Down to the year 1887, the Presbyterian Church as a whole supported the American Board. At the division of the church at that time, the Old-School body constituted a separate Presbyterian Board. The New-School body continued to support the American Board until the re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in 1870; so that it is now completely under the control of the Congregational Church. Organ, The Missionary Herald. Its main offices are at 1 Somerset Street, Boston.

The Baptists, at their General Convention in Philadelphia (1819), established the Baptist Missionary Union, but in 1845, when the Baptists of the South withdrew, changed the name to the American Baptist Missionary Union. The occasion of the organization of the Baptist Society was the change of views, on the subject of baptism of the organization of the Baptist Society was the change of views, on the subject of baptism, which Judson and Rice had experienced on the subject of baptism of the Baptist Society. After the division of the church at that time, the Old-School body constituted a separate Presbyterian Board. The New-School body continued to support the American Board until the re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in 1870; so that it is now completely under the control of the Congregational Church. Organ, The Missionary Herald. Its main offices are at 1 Somerset Street, Boston.

The Freewill Baptists began missionary operations in 1838, and carry on a mission in India, with 8 American missionaries, and 19 native ordained and lay preachers (1882). A Woman's Society co-operates with the main society, and issues a bi-monthly, The Missionary Helper. The Southern Baptists, who withdrew in 1845, on account of the slavery question, carry on missions in Western Africa and China, with 7 missionarie. The Seventh-day Baptists (1849) have a mission in China. The Baptist Church in Canada began missionary operations in 1866, and supports 4 missionaries among the Telugus of India, and numbers 500 communicants.

The two branches of the Presbyterian Church in the North, at the re-union in 1870, united in the support of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which has its headquarters at 23 Centre Street, New York. It conducts missions in Syria (begun by the American Board in 1818), Persia and India (begun by the American Board in 1836), Siam (1840), and among the Telugus (1867), Liberia and Gaboon in Western Africa (1842), China (1844), Japan (1859), the United States of Colombia, Chili, and Brazil (1856-59), Mexico (1872), and among ten tribes of Indians. Statistics for 1882: 140 American missionaries; 84 ordained native, and 128 licentiate native, preachers; 240 American, and 607 native missionary societies, with 16,494 communicants, and 20,064 scholars in its schools; income, $583,124; organ, The Foreign Missionary. There co-operated with this society 7 women's missionary societies, whose contributions, 1870-71, amounted to $7,327; in 1881-82, to $175,190.

The Presbyterian Church South formed its mission society in 1862, and conducts missions among the Indians, in Mexico, Brazil, Italy, Greece, and China. Statistics for 1882: Ordained American missionaries, 20; female assistants, 20; medical missionary, 1; native preachers, 13; other native helpers, 34; day schools, 20; scholars, 500; communicants, 1,505; income in 1881, $69,309, $10,084 of which came from ladies' missionary associations; organ, The Missionary. The Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church of North America has established stations in Egypt (begun in 1832), with 7 missionaries, 18, 1864; Statistics for 1882: American missionaries, 18; female missionaries, 21; ordained native missionaries, 8; other helpers, 189; communicants, 1,565; schools, 75; scholars, 2,367; income in 1881, $77,572. Its offices are at 136 North 18th Street, Philadelphia.

The Reformed Presbyterians in the United States began missionary operations in 1859, and have 6 missionaries in Syria. The Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in America was constituted as a separate body in 1858, and established stations in China (1844), India (1854), and Japan (1850). Statistics for 1882: American ordained missionaries, 16; assistant missionaries, 24; native ordained ministers, 13; other native helpers, 147; day schools, 90; scholars, 2,340; communicants, 2,925; income in 1881, $172,960, of which $12,308 came through the Woman's Board; organ, The Sower and Mission Monthly. Its offices are in Vesey Street, New York.

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

The Cumberland Presbyterian Church began...
missionary operations in 1876, and has 7 ordained missionaries among the Indians and in Japan.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada has missionary stations in the West Indies, India, Formosa, and the New Hebrides, and employs 14 missionaries.

The missionary Society of the Methodist-Episcopal Church North came into existence in 1819, and has established stations in Liberia (1833), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres (1836), China (1847), Germany (1849), Scandinavia (1853), India (1856), Japan (1872), Mexico (1873). Statistics of 1891: American (male) missionaries, 60; native ordained preachers, 218; native unordained preachers, 463; employed by the Woman's Board, 39 American and 199 native helpers; church-members, 28,127; day schools, 331; day scholars, 11,161; theological seminaries, 8; income, $327,327. (See J. M. Reid: Missions and Missionary Society of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, New York) Its offices are at 805 Broadway, New York.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church South constituted a missionary society in 1845, and has stations among the Indians and in China (1848), Mexico (1873). Statistics for 1886: 15 American ordained missionaries; 60 native ministers, and about 2,500 communicants; income in 1881, $103,741. Its offices are in Nashville, Tenn.

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

The Evangelical Association prosecutes missionary work in Japan, with 4 missionaries, and in Germany. In Japan, according to Rev. Dr. Hartzer's report (Aug. 21, 1882), the mission had 51 native members, 3 regular preaching places, 4 Sunday schools with 15 officers and teachers and 117 scholars, and 2 day schools with 72 scholars. The secretary of the Board of Missions in this country is Rev. Dr. Wiest.

The Methodist Church of Canada (1824) has missions among the Indians and in the Bermudas and Java; employs 6 missionaries, and has 5,600 communicants.

The Board of Missions of the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States was constituted in 1821, and prosecutes missionary operations in Greece, Mexico, Western Africa, China, Japan, and Hayti. Statistics for 1891: Native communicants, 2,304; income, $198,265. Its offices are in the Bible House, New York; organ, The Spirit of Missions.

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

The Lutheran Church in Canada, removed from Leipzig in 1846, and the Lutherische Miss.-Gesellschaft. A missionary association had been formed in 1819, at Dresden, to support the Basel society. It declared itself independent in 1836, after having established a missionary institute in 1832. The late Dr. Graul, who became director in 1844, by his energy, grasp of the subject, and missionary enthusiasm, won the support of a large Lutheran constituency for the society. After a passing work in Australia, it became heir in 1810 to so much of the old Danish and Halle mission among the Tamils as the English had not already inherited. and has now 21 missionaries among them, and
The year 1836 was fruitful in the formation of German missionary societies. Gossner, who dissented from his Berlin brethren in demanding a higher literary standard than the seminaries, and who held that they ought to follow the example of Paul in working with their hands, at the age of sixty-three began an independent activity. Without any ostentation, he trained young artisans, until, within ten years, 80 missionaries were settled in Australia, India, North America, and Western Africa, who had graduated from his tuition. Gossner was every thing in his society, and pulled harder on the prayer-wheel than on the alms-bell (mehr die Bet.-als die Beutelglocke). In the second decade he sent out 58 missionaries. At his death, in 1858, the management of this society, called the "Gossner Society," was put in the hands of a committee. It now carries on operations on the Ganges, and very successfully among the Kohls. Statistics for 1880: 21 missionaries; 8,000 communicants; income, 166,929 marks; organ, Journal des Missions évangéliques. In Denmark, the Danse Missions Selskap was formed in 1821, and supported the Basel society till 1864, when it established an independent mission in India, and put itself in connection with the clergy of Greenland. There are, perhaps, 7,000 communicants connected with the Danish missions in Greenland. In Norway, the Norske Missionssekskap zu Stavanger was organized in 1842, and has 15 missionaries laboring in Zululand (100 communicants) and Madagascar (1,200 communicants). In Sweden, the Svenska Missions-Sällskapet was formed in 1835. In 1876 it was turned over to the State Church of Sweden, which supports some missionaries in Zululand and among the Tamils in India. An independent society, the Evangeliska Fosterlands Stiftelsen, was formed in 1856, and has missionaries in Abyssinia. In all, Sweden supports about 12 missionaries. A missionary society was organized in Finland, 1859, and has stations in Ovamboland, Africa. The following table of statistics may be regarded as approximately correct, and, if anything, rather an underestimate. The statistics do not include women's societies as separate organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Missions in Africa</th>
<th>Missions in Australia, India, New Zealand</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>7,350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above survey, it becomes apparent that ours is a missionary age, and that missionary activity has increased as the century has progressed. Missions are a matter of voluntary associations. This may be regarded as providential, and perhaps preparatory for the Church of the
In the West Indies, the unexampled cruelty of the Spaniards exterminated the aborigines, and substituted in their place African slaves. In 1838 England gave freedom to the slaves in her colonies, and the example has been recently followed by Spain. The population of the West Indies is 4,412,700, of whom 2,061,000 are under the crown of Spain. Here, again, the Moravians were the first to begin missionary operations (1732). They now number, on eight islands, 36,800 Christians. The Methodists followed in 1786, at Antigua, and have to-day 41,000 communicants. The Baptists came next, in 1813, and have in Jamaica 28,000, and the rest of the islands 5,160, church-members. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also carries on a very important work in five dioceses. It has given birth to an independent West Indies' Missionary association, which has sent some missionaries to Western Africa. The London Missionary Society, the American Missionary Society, the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the Episcopal Church of the United States, also have made missions in the West Indies. The London Missionary Society had, in 1882, 369 native ordained missionaries; the American Board, 148 native pastors, 488 native preachers and catechists, and 1,065 native school-teachers; and the Presbyterian Board (North), 84 native ordained pastors, 528 licentiates, and 467 lay helpers. Recently, industrial missions, which combine preaching with practical instruction in the arts of civilized life, have been organized in Central Africa. The medical missions are also doing a grand work.

The Islands of the Pacific Ocean.—Here we see a remarkable change in the condition of the natives. The American Board began its mission on the Sandwich Islands. The London Society in 1817 sent missionaries to Tahiti and the Friendly Islands. The work in Tahiti has passed over to the French Church, which has more than 6,000 communicants. The apostle of many of the groups of the South Sea Islands was John Williams. (See Williams.) The Wesleyan Church is the predominant one on the Samoan, Tonga, and Fiji Islands, where a most remarkable revolution has taken place, transforming cannibals into church-going and school-attending peoples. (See Fiji Islands.) On the New Caledonian, New Hebrides, and Queen Charlotte Islands, the London, several Presbyterian, Methodist, and Dutch societies, and the S. P. C., are laboring. The rude populations of the New Hebrides have at last become accessible. One of them, Eromanga, is famous as the scene of the martyrdoms of Williams and the two Gordons. In 1891 a memorial church was dedicated on the island, and three sons of the murderers of Williams were present. An eyrie is wholly evangelized. The Methodists of Sydney entered New Britain in 1874, with some helpers from the Tonga and Fiji Islands. Four evangelists have been murdered, but converts have been made. To New Guinea two missionaries from the Gezer Institute were despatched in 1856, but in 1871 the London Society began the active prosecution of work. (See Murray: Forty Years' Mission-Work in
We find that very little has been done on Java (only 4,000 Christians) and Borneo, where four missionaries and three of their wives were murdered in 1859. The work at Sumatra, which has been carried on for twenty years by the Rhenish Society is more hopeful; and 6,000 Christians are gathered into 14 congregations. An especially effective work has been carried on, since 1826, on the Celebes, where the Buddhists and the population is under Christian influence. On the way to India we touch upon Ceylon, with a population of 2,500,000. The Buddhists here are in the majority. The Dutch Government Christians, which once numbered 300,000, have pretty much disappeared. The two Church-of-England societies, the Baptists, Wesleyans, and the American Board, number about 25,000 native Christians. It is on the Island of Ceylon that the exclusive bishop of Colombo (S. P. G.) has his diocese. In India we tread upon the most important and most vigorously cultivated mission-field of the day. More than 650 missionaries, belonging to 35 societies, divide the territory between them. Recently the number of native Christians has grown very rapidly. Fifty-eight translations of the Bible into its languages have been made. Schools have been planted, until they have an attendance of 150,000. Female workers are beginning to make their influence tell in the zenanas; and year by year the number of native preachers and teachers is increasing. (See art. INDIA.)

In Siam, the American Baptists and Presbyterian societies have missions; the former (1889) with 500 communicants, the latter with 295 (including the Laos). China, in which the London Missionary Society began its mission in 1807, is one of the most important as well as populous empires of the globe. It has now Christian churches, with 20,000 communicants, and 10 hospitals manned by devoted American and English medical missionaries. Japan, which was opened to commerce by the United States, has been the scene of missionary operations from 1859. The Americans (Hepburn, Verbeck) were the first to occupy the ground. Hopeful as this field has been and is, through the enterprise of the Japanese Government in adopting the ways of European civilization, there is much danger ahead from the spread of materialism (Darwinism, etc.) views by American teachers at the universities. (See arts. CHINA and JAPAN.)

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

Africa.—In Northern Africa, missionary operations are carried on with some success by the United Presbyterians among the Copts in Egypt, and by Miss Whately in Cairo. The first extensive African mission-field stretches along the western coast, from Senegal to Gaboon, from which the Baptist and the Congregational mission are penetrating towards the Livingstone, or Middle Congo River. More than 200 French, American, German, English, and native missionaries, belonging to 15 societies, are laboring here, amongst peoples deeply sunk in heathenism, and exposed to a deadly climate. They have a population of 90,000 under their immediate care. Sierra Leone, populated in the early part of the century by freed negroes, is now an independent diocese. The Episcopal Church has 18,980 under its care; the Wesleyans, 17,098; Lady Huntingdon’s Connection, 2,717, etc. (For Liberia, see special article.) On the Gold Coast, Wesleyan, Basel, and North German missionaries are laboring, the first with 6,038 communicants. The Wesleyans also hold Yoruba, with 1,286 communicants. The Niger mission (begun 1857) has been successful in training up an efficient corps of native workers, at the head of which stands the colored Bishop Crowther. The Bihé mission was begun by the American Board in 1880. In Cape Colony, including Kaffraria, by the government census of 1875 there were 175,963 colored Protestant Christians. The Church Missionary and the Wesleyan societies are the most active in this district. The states north of Cape Colony (Orange, Transvaal, Bautoland) were first opened up by Moffat (see his Missionary Labors and Scenes in South Africa, and J. E. Carlyle : South Africa and its Mission Fields, London, 1878) and Livingstone. Different American and European societies have entered into this territory. For the remarkable history of missionary operations in Madagascar, see the special article. Eastern Africa was opened up by Livingstone and the Church Missionary (1856), London (1878), and Livingstone. Different American and European societies have entered into this territory. For the remarkable history of missionary operations in Madagascar, see the special article. Eastern Africa was opened up by Livingstone and the Church Missionary (1856), London (1878), and Livingstone. Different American and European societies have entered into this territory.
The whole number of Christians (not communicants) connected with the missionary fields may safely be calculated at 2,000,000. This seems a small number compared with the uneducating the heathen nations, which cannot be the law of the progress of the kingdom of Christ. We must remember that we are still in the first stage of the modern missionary movement. The work hitherto done has been preparatory. Another age will reap the harvest. We must remember again, that the law of the mustard-seed’s growth now, as much as ever before. And once more we must remember, that numbers do not exhaust the results of modern missionary activity. The gospel has had a wonderful power in civilizing and educating the heathen nations, which cannot be embodied in figures. On the other hand, we must be on our guard against an ideal conception of the results of missions. The most of the Christians are still weak, and in the first stages of Christian experience and morality. It will take time to build up independent native churches. It will take time to build up independent native churches.

MEMORIAM.

[Table of Christian population]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population of the World</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>315,020,000</td>
<td>297,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>284,707,000</td>
<td>119,249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>240,759,000</td>
<td>5,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>267,329,000</td>
<td>75,755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seas</td>
<td>4,031,000</td>
<td>2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,455,923,000</td>
<td>390,541,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


GESTAV WARNECK.

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

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

MIXED MARRIAGES. See Marriage.

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

MIZ’PAH, or MIZ’PEH (watch-tower), was the name of several places in Palestine.—I. The Mizpah of Gilead (Judg. xi. 29), probably identical with Ramath-mizpeh (Josh. xiii. 26) and Ramoth-gilead (1 Kings iv. 13), is generally identified with the modern Jebel Osh’a, “Mount of Hosea,” three miles north-west of Ramoth-gilead. Here Jacob and Laban set up the Bed of bones, as a landmark between them (Gen. xxxi. 23, 48, 52), and here Jephthah was met by his daughter (Judg. xi. 34).—II. The Mizpah of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 26) is generally identified with the modern Nebi Samwil, situated on a peak three thousand and six feet above the level of the sea, and affording one of the most extensive views to be obtained in Southern Palestine. Here Saul was elected king (1 Sam. x. 26), and Gedaliah was murdered (2 Kings xxv. 23, 25).

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

Both with respect to descent and with respect to language, the Moabites were closely related to the Israelites on the one side, and the Edomites on the other. Chemosh was the name of their national god (1 Kings xi. 7, 33; 2 Kings xxiii. 13), whence they were often called "the people of Chemosh." (Num. xxi. 29; Jer. xlviii. 46). He was worshipped with human sacrifices (Amos ii. 1), especially with sacrifices of children (2 Kings iii. 27). Besides him, also Baal-peor was worshipped in the time of Moses (Num. xiv. 3, 5; Deut. iv. 19; comp. Hos. ix. 10; Ps. cvii. 29); but it is uncertain whether he had a name to the mountain Peor, or whether he assumed his surname from that mountain as the principal seat of his worship. The rites of his worship were extremely licentious. It is probable, however, as Jerome states in his Commentary on Isa. xv. 2, that Chemosh and Baal-peor were, like Baal and Moloch, simply two different conceptions of the same divinity. However that may be, the Moabitic worship belonged to the lowest stage of the Chaldean-Canaanitic religion. Chemosh is designated as an abomination (1 Kings xi. 7, 33; 2 Kings xxiii. 13). The people themselves were addicted to the basest sensuality. Of the valor and warlike fortitude of the Edomites, there is not the least trace among them.

The Emim, the original inhabitants of the country, were subjugated by Chedorlamon in the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 5); and as, after that time, they seem to have been gradually dying out, the Moabites may not have experienced any great difficulties when settling in the country. It proved more difficult for them to maintain themselves there. In the territory north of the Arnon, the best part of the country, they were subdued by the Amorites under Joshua and, after the arrival of Israel on the stage, they underwent the same fate in the territory south of the Arnon (Num. xxxii. 34 sqq.). It is impossible, however, to define the character and the degree of the dependency in which they lived. They had their own kings. They were among Saul's enemies. By David they were punished with great severity (2 Sam. viii. 2). The Psalmist says, "Moab is my wash-pot" (Ps. lx. 8, cviii. 9). When the separation into two kingdoms took place, Moab followed Israel, and King Mesha paid a tribute of a hundred thousand lambs and as many rams (2 Kings iii. 4). For the revolt against Nebuchadnezzar the Moabites were very zealous; but, when he approached to take revenge, they joined him, and could look on in peace while Jerusalem was besieged and taken. After that time, nothing more is heard of them. From Ez. ix. 1 and Neh. xiv. 1 it is not certain that they existed any more; and when Josephus (Ant., XIII. 15, 4, and I. 11, 5) speaks of Hebron as a Moabitic city, and of the Moabites as a great nation, he does so simply on account of the descent of the population of the Moabite territory. The country belonged to the empire of the Nabataeans until 105 A.D., when it was conquered by the Romans, and the name of its capital, Rabbath-Moab, was changed into Areopolis. In the fifth century, a bishop of Areopolis is mentioned. At the time of Abulfeda, the name of Kerak, or Karak, occurs for the southern part of Moab, and that of Belca for the northern. At present, however, there are, besides isolated letters only legible through the gaps, the names of God separated from each other.)

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

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

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

"And I built Baal Neen, and made therein walls and mounds. And I went to take the town of Kirjathaim. And I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and the men of . . . And Chamos said to me, 'Go up. Take [the town of] Nebo against Israel.' And I went up during the night, and fought against it from the dawn to midday, and I took it . . . and I saw it quite . . . (In the rest of this part, more than two thousand lines have been cut away, besides isolated letters only legible through the gaps, the names of God separated from each other.)

"I, Chamos, the servant of Jehovah . . . before the face of Chamos."

(Hence follows a lacuna: at the end of it the words, "before the face of Chamos in Kirjathaim.") Probably stood here, just as in lines 17, 18 of the stone, a notice of the change of an Israelitish to a Moabitite sanctuary.)

"And I destroyed the High Place of Jehovah, and dedicated it before the face of Chamos in Kirjathaim. And I allowed to dwell therein the men of . . . and the men of . . . And Chamos said to me, 'Go up. Take [the town of] Nebo against Israel.' And I went up during the night, and fought against it from the dawn to midday, and I took it . . . and I saw it quite . . . (In the rest of this part, more than two thousand lines have been cut away, besides isolated letters only legible through the gaps, the names of God separated from each other.)

"I, Chamos, the servant of Jehovah . . . before the face of Chamos."

(If it may be presumed that mention was made here of the restoration of heathen in the room of the Israelitish worship.)

"And the king of Israel built Jazah, and sat therein, while he fought against me, and Chamos drove
him before my sight. And I took from Moab two
hundred men, fully told. And I beleaguered Jahaz
and took it, in addition to Dibon.
I built Korcha, the wall toward the forest, and
the wall . . . and I built her gates, and I built her
towers, and I built the king's house; and I made
towards the mountain water in the midst of
the town. And there were no cisterns within the
town, in Korcha, and I said to all the people, 'Make
[here the word ch[am]os] cistern in his house.
(Here follows a sentence with difficult
expressions at the beginning, and a gap in the middle. The fol-
lowing is conjectural):—

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

I built Aroer, and I made the streets in Arnon.
I built Beth Bamoth for [it was destroyed]. I built
Bezer, for men of Dibon compelled it, fifty of them,
for all Dibon was subject; and I filled [with inhabit-
ants] Bikra him which I added to the land. And I built
the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of
Baal Meon, and brought thither Chamos.'

The last gap comprises more than two lines, of
which only a few letters can be read.

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

LIT. — CLERMANT-GANNAU : La stèle de Mesa,
Paris, 1870; C. D. GINSBURG : The Moabite Stone,
London, 1870; SCHOTTMANN : Die Siegestafel
Mesa's, Halle, 1870; NÖLDEKE : Die Inschrift des
Königs Mesa, Kiel, 1870; HITZIG : Die Inschrift
des Mesha, Heidelberg, 1870; KÄMPF : Das Denkmal
Mesa's, Prague, 1870; LEVY : Mesadenkmal, Breslau,
1871; KAUTZSCHE and SOEHR : Die Echtheit und
ältere Handschriften der Moabitisich oder Selimisch? Stuttg., 1876. FR. W. SCHULTZ.

MODALISM denotes the doctrine, first set forth
by Sabellius, that the Father, the Son, and the
Holy Spirit were not three distinctpersonalities,
but only three different modes of manifestation.
See CHRISTOLOGY, MONARCHIANISM, SABELLIAN-
ISM, TRINITY.

MODERATES, the name given to a party in the
Established Kirk of Scotland during the eight-
teenth century, because of its laxity in doctrine.
Their principal members were Hugh Blair and
Principal Robertson. In general they preached
morals rather than doctrines. Opposition to
them resulted in the formation of the Secession
and Relief synods, and the final resultant is the
Free Church. See SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.

MODERATOR, the presiding officer of Presby-
terian courts (session, presbytery, synod, general
assembly). To moderate a call is to preside over
the election of a minister. Perpetual moderators
for presbyteries were proposed at the introduc-
tion of episcopacy into Scotland. For list of
moderators in the Presbyterian Church in the
United States of America, see Minutes of General
Assembly of 1875 and following.

MOFFAT, Mary (Smith), the heroic wife of the
famous missionary, Rev. Dr. Moffat; b. at New
Windsor, near Manchester, Eng., May 24, 1795;
d. July 10, 1871. She was educated at the Mor-
avian school at Fairfield, near her home, and had
her thoughts in early life turned towards the for-
gotten field. She became betrothed to Mr. Moffat
in 1816, and in 1819 followed him thither, and was
married to him in Cape Town; and in January, 1820,
the couple started upon their joint missionary
work, which was pursued for fifty years with
extraordinary fidelity and zeal. Their daughter
Mary married Dr. David Livingstone. Besides
her, they had eight children, of whom two died in
infancy. Mrs. Moffat was a woman of rare char-
acter. See JOHN S. MOFFAT: Lives of Robert and
Mary Moffat, London and N.Y., 1885.

MOGILAS, Peter, b. towards the close of the
sixteenth century; d. 1647; descended from the
princely family of Moldavia, and began his career
in the army, but entered, in 1625, the Pechersky
monastery in Kieff, and was elected its archimand-
rite in 1628, and metropolitan of Kieff in 1632.
He drew up the orthodox confession of the Catho-
lic and Apostolic Eastern Churches, which had
been revised by the synods of Kieff (1641) and
Jassy (1643), was signed by the four Eastern pa-
triarchs, and sanctioned for the whole Eastern
Church by the synod of Jerusalem (1672). The
language of the first draft, whether Greek or
Russian, is uncertain. The Greek text of the
Confession, which is a peculiar medley, showing
the transition from Old to New Greek, was first
published by Panaggiota, interpreter at the Porte,
Amsterdam, 1662; the Russian, by the patriarch
Adrian, Moscow, 1696. [See Schaff: Creeds of
Christendom, i. 58.] The work itself was the
result of the commotion which the Reformation
produced even in the Eastern Church; and is
directed at once against the Roman-Catholic
Church, laboring in St. Petersburg through the
Jesuits, and the Protestant churches, which found
a channel for their influence through Cyril Lucar.
Mogilas also published a catechism and a Russian
chronicle, and founded a Russian academy at
Kieff.

LIT. — HOTTINGER: Analecta hist. teol. dissert.,
vii.; ZELTNER: Breviar. controvers. cum. eccl. Gr.
et Ruthen., pp. 17, 18; [MOURAVIEFF : History of
the Church of Russia, translated by Blackmore,
Oxford, 1842; SCHAFF: Creeds of Christendom,
i. 275-400].

MOHAMMED, MOHAMMEDANISM. I. LIFE
OF MOHAMMED. — Mohammed, or Muhammad
(i.e., the praised, the illustrious), often misspelled
Mahomet, was b. about 570 at Mecca; d. June 8,
632, at Medina, and was buried on the spot where
he died, which is now enclosed by a mosque.
He was the only child of a poor widow, his
father, Abdallah, having died before (according
to others, a few months after) his birth. He
belonged to the heathen family of the Hashim,
which claimed lineal descent from Ishmael, and
which was related to the Korashites, the hereditary
guardians of the sacred Kaaba. He was nursed
by a Bedouin woman of the desert, and suffered
much of headache and feverish convulsions.
In his sixth year he lost his mother, and was taken
over by his uncle, Abu Talib, who had two
wives and ten children. He accompanied him
to others, a few months after) his birth. He
belonged to the heathen family of the Hashim,
which claimed lineal descent from Ishmael, and
which was related to the Korashites, the hereditary
guardians of the sacred Kaaba. He was nursed
by a Bedouin woman of the desert, and suffered
much of headache and feverish convulsions.
In his sixth year he lost his mother, and was taken
over by his uncle, Abu Talib, who had two
wives and ten children. He accompanied him
to others, a few months after) his birth. He
belonged to the heathen family of the Hashim,
which claimed lineal descent from Ishmael, and
which was related to the Korashites, the hereditary
guardians of the sacred Kaaba. He was nursed
by a Bedouin woman of the desert, and suffered
much of headache and feverish convulsions.
In his sixth year he lost his mother, and was taken
over by his uncle, Abu Talib, who had two
wives and ten children. He accompanied him
to others, a few months after) his birth. He
belonged to the heathen family of the Hashim,
which claimed lineal descent from Ishmael, and
which was related to the Korashites, the hereditary
guardians of the sacred Kaaba. He was nursed
by a Bedouin woman of the desert, and suffered
much of headache and feverish convulsions.
In his sixth year he lost his mother, and was taken
over by his uncle, Abu Talib, who had two
wives and ten children. He accompanied him
to others, a few months after) his birth. He
belonged to the heathen family of the Hashim,
which claimed lineal descent from Ishmael, and
which was related to the Korashites, the hereditary
guardians of the sacred Kaaba. He was nursed
by a Bedouin woman of the desert, and suffered
much of headache and feverish convulsions.
In his sixth year he lost his mother, and was taken
over by his uncle, Abu Talib, who had two
wives and ten children. He accompanied him
}
estine, and Syria. He made a scanty living as an attendant on caravans, and by watching sheep and goats. He said, God never calls a prophet who has not been a prophet before, and appealed to the examples of Moses and David. In his twenty-fifth year he married a rich widow, Chadjah, fifteen years older than himself. He took charge of her caravans, made several journeys, and was faithful to her. She bore him six children, but they all died except Fátima. He also adopted Ali, who became famous in the history of Islam. On his commercial journeys he became acquainted with Jews and Christians, and acquired an imperfect knowledge of their traditions. He spent much time in retirement, fasting, and prayer. He was subject to epileptic fits, in which he fell on the ground like a drunken man, and snorted like a camel. He could not read; and his knowledge of the Bible history was derived from hear-say and apocryphal sources, but entered largely into his religion.

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

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

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

Christ is acknowledged as one of the three monotheistic creeds which sprung from the Semitic race. It is an eclecticism, composed of Jewish, heathen, and Christian elements, which were scattered through Arabia before Mohammed. It borrowed monotheism and many rites and ceremonies from the Jews, and may be called a bastard Judaism, descended from Ishmael and Esau. It was professedly a restoration of the faith of Abraham. In relation to Christianity it may be called the great Unitarian religion and a scourge of the Eastern Church.

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

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

V. HISTORY. — Mohammadanism conquered Arabia during the lifetime of its founder, and spread, after his death, with extraordinary rapidity by fanaticism and the sword. His successors (Mohammed's successors as prophet-kings) fired the courage of the wild sons of the desert, used to every privation and endurance, with the battle-cry, "Before you is paradise; behind you are
death and hell." The weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the unfortunate rivalry between the Greek and Latin churches, and the distractions of the Greek Church by idle metaphysical disputes, greatly aided the conquerors. They subdued Palestine, Syria, Egypt, North Africa, the south of France, and created even the Pyrenees, threatening to stable their horses in St. Peter's at Rome, but were defeated by Charles Martel at Tours (732). This battle arrested their western conquests, and saved Europe. But in the ninth century they conquered Persia, Afghanistan, and a large part of India. In the eleventh century the Seljuk Turks conquered the Arabs, but adopted their religion; in the fifteenth century they captured Constantinople, and overthrew the Byzantine Empire (1453).

They turned the magnificent Church of St. Sophia into a mosque, and reduced the Greek Church to a condition of slavery. From that stronghold they even threatened the German Empire, until they were finally defeated at the gates of Vienna, and driven back across the Danube (1688). The German diets in the Reform period were held fully as much against the Turks as against the Luthers. Luther himself, in one of his most popular hymns, prayed for deliverance from "des Papst's und Türkten Mord," and the Anglican Liturgy, in the collect for Good Friday, invokes God "to have mercy upon all Turks," as well as upon "Jews, infidels, and heretics." The Turks have ruined every country they conquered, and are hated by the subject races, even the Mohammedan Arabs.

Some of the fairest portions of the globe, as well as a large part of mysterious Africa. The lands of the Bible are still groaning under Mohammedan misgovernment, and are looking to the West for deliverance. Diplomacy and war cannot solve the Eastern question without the moral aid of Christian missions. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but wonderfully fine." The Mohammedan population is variously set down from a hundred and sixty to two hundred millions; but about one-third of these are under the rule of Christian powers,—Russia, Austria, France, and especially England.
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STOBART: Islam and its Founder, 1876; OSBORN: Islam under the Arabs, 1876, and Islam under the Khalifs of Baghdad, 1877; CREASY: History of the Ottoman Turks, 1877; H. H. JEN-SUP: The Mohammedan Missionary Problem, 1878; R. DOZY: Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme, Leyden, 1879; SELI: The Faith of Islam, 1880; FISCHEN: Der Einfluß des Islam auf das Leben seiner Zeit (Mayence, 1827), which proved to be a large work, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit (Regensburg, 1839), which attracted general attention among scholars, was not altogether free from some offence among Roman-Catholics. It was followed, however, next year, with another large work, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit (Mayence, 1827), which proved to be in perfect harmony with the views of the Roman-Catholic Church; and in the same year the author was appointed professor of church history at Tubingen. His lectures drew large audiences, and exercised great influence on the younger generation of Roman-Catholic theologians. They were often frequented, even by Protestants. Nevertheless his Kirchengeschichte (published by P. B. Gams, Regensburg, 1847–70, 3 vols.) is not his chief work. He felt that Roman-Catholic theology was sorely in need of a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the principles of the Reformation, and of the divergencies between Romanism and Protestantism; and, after an exhaustive study of the symbolical books of the two confessions, he published his Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegenstätte der Katholiken und Protestanten (Mayence, 1847, 5th ed., enlarged and improved by Reithmayer, 1855; 9th ed., 1874) [translated into English by J. R. Robertson: Symbolism, or the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, London, 1843, New York, 1844, 2 vols.]). There is considerable idealization in his representation of Romanism; and his representation of Protestantism is not altogether free from caricature; nevertheless, though represented as a revolutionary movement, breaking up the unity of the Church, the Reformation is conceived of as sprung from a genuinely religious though misguided craving; and the treatment of the details, always moderate and always veracious, is often surprising. The sensation which the work produced was immense also among the Protestants. F. C. Baur wrote against it, Der Gegensatz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus, Tubingen, 1844; C. J. Nitzsch wrote against it, Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers, 1835; and others. Möhler answered, Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgenähte zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten, 1844; and a protracted controversy began. This controversy, especially with his colleague F. C. Baur, made his stay in Tubingen unpleasant, and in 1835 he accepted a call to Munich. The climate of that place did not agree with his constitution, and his health was gradually failing. Shortly before his death, he retired to Würzburg as dean of the chapter. In the Hermetic controversy he took no part, though it was well known that he was not in favor of the movement.

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

MOLANUS, Gerhardt Walther, b. at Hamelin-on-the-Weser, Nov. 1, 1833; d. at Loccum, Sept. 7, 1722. He studied theology at Helmstadt, and was appointed editor of the university of Tubingen in 1659, director of the consistory in Hanover in 1674, and abbot of Loccum in 1717. He was a pupil of Calixtus, and contributed much to soothe the hatred which prevailed in Germany between the Lutherans and the Reformed. He was very active in aiding the Reformers who were exiled from France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; but the negotiations which he, together with Leibnitz, carried on with the king of Prussia, concerning a union between the two evangelical churches, failed. Equally fruitless were his negotiations, first with Spinola, and afterwards with Bossuet, concerning a reconciliation with the Church of Rome. It was rumored that he had turned Roman Catholic, and he had to defend himself publicly. His life was written by Von Eenem, Magdeburg, 1734. See HILERG: Geschichte der kirchl. Unionversuche, 1828, ii., pp. 214 et seq.

MOLANUS Jan (ver Meulen), b. at Lille, 1533; d. at Louvain, 1585; was professor of theology, canon at St. Peter's, and director of the theological seminary of Louvain. He published De picturis et imaginibus sacrarum, Louvain, 1570, often reprinted, 1771 at Liège, under the title De historia sacrarum imaginarum et picturarum: De jehu heresici servanda, Cologne, 1564; Theologie practica compendium, 1585; etc. He also published a good edition of Usuard's Martyrologium, Louvain, 1565.

MOLECH, or MO'LECH (I Kings xi. 7) only once without the article, 1 Kings xi. 7, a divinity worshiped by the idolatrous Israelites. The name undoubtedly designated, like the appellative melek (king), dominion.

1. Molech in the Old Testament. — With the exception of two passages in Leviticus, and 1 Kings xi. 7, the worship of Molech does not occur before the time of Ahaz. This king offered his son to the fire (2 Kings xvi. 3); and, although Molech is not expressly mentioned, he is undoubtedly referred to (comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 9). Mention is also made of one of Manasseh's sons (2 Kings xxi. 6). At the time of Jere-miah, the worship of Molech, who is expressly referred to by name, must have been quite prevalent (Jer. xxxii. 35), and it seems to have con-
MOLACH.

continued under Josiah (Zeph. i. 5). It seems, likewise, to have prevailed in Ephraim (2 Kings xvii. 17; Ezek. xxiii. 37). Josiah abolished this form of idolatry in Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 10), and it does not seem to have been practised again by the Jews.

It is not stated from what people the Israelites drew this form of worship. It might seem probable that they got it from the Assyrians (compare 2 Kings xvi. 10 sqq.), inasmuch as they came for the first time in contact with the Assyrians under Ahaz. The Assyrians used the term "malek" as a divine epithet, and nothing more can be said. It is more probable that Molech was a Canaanitish divinity, who was worshipped by the Israelites before the reign of Ahaz (compare 2 Kings xvii. 17): this is proved by the fact that the Phoenicians worshipped a god called Melak (or Malk, Melk, etc.). Another Canaanitish people, the Ammonites, also worshipped a divinity called Milcom (1 Kings xi. 5, 33; 2 Kings xxii. 13), or Malcach (Zeph. i. 5), whose worship was introduced by Solomon into Jerusalem (1 Kings xi. 5).

The worship of Molech among the Jews consisted of the sacrifice of children (2 Kings xvii. 17, xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31, etc.); and the usual expression describing the sacrifice was to "pass through the fire." This does not mean the passage of living persons, but rather, the offering of the victims after they had been put to death, which is, in several cases, expressly referred to (Ezek. xvi. 20 sq., xxiii. 39). The place of these sacrifices at Jerusalem was Tophet (probably "place of abomination"), in the valley of Ben-Hinnom (2 Kings xxi. 19, etc.). The term "Gehenna," the designation of the lower world, was at a later time derived from this horrible place of worship.

2. Malek and Melcharth among the Phoenicians. — The Phoenician name of Molech does not appear as the proper name of a divinity, but simply as an epithet. It occurs in names of men, as Mulk-yathan ("Malk has given") ; but this is no proof that Malk was a special divinity, any more than the compound "Hannibal" proves that there was a god Baal. It is more probable that Molech, like Adon and Baal, was an epithet applied to the highest divinity. At Tyre, the derivative Melcharth (or Molech) was a special divinity, and came to be designated there and at Carthage by the term "Malk" or "Milk." On the inscriptions, Melcharch is called the "Baal of Tyre." Ahab's Baal was, without doubt, this god of Tyre; and the Molech worship of the later kings was only a resumption of that which Ahab introduced, with the addition of human sacrifices. But it may be that the absence of all reference to such sacrifices under Ahab is simply accidental. According to Josephus, there was at Tyre a temple of Zeus, and one of Heracles. Heracles is another designation for Melcharch. (See the inscription, Melit., and Philo Byblius, Melcharthus seu Mater Helios). At Carthage, a Tyrian colony, also had a divinity, Chronos-Saturn, to whom children were offered in sacrifice.

The usual distinction current since Movers, between Baal and Molech as the benevolent and destructive divinities, cannot be made out. The Phoenician religion nowhere institutes a dualism of this kind, but only a dualism of gender. In Melcharth the benevolent element was not altogether wanting, as is apparent from the proper name Gadmelcharth ("fortune of Melcharth"), Melk-yathan ("Malk has given"), etc.

Melcharch (or Molech) was the sun-god, as is evident from the festival of his resurrection, and the designation of Carthage's main divinity as Baal Chamman, ("Baal of the sun"). Nonnus Dionys., xi. 370 sqq.) calls Heracles of Tyre Helios ("the sun"). Melcharch was represented by some of the ancients with the figure of a bull and horns. The representation in the collection of rabbinical writings (thirteenth century), that the statue of Molech was of brass, with outstretched and burning arms, into which children were thrown, is of doubtful value. Clitarch speaks of living human sacrifices offered to Chronos, which were burned. They were offered, in time of danger or calamity, as the most precious gifts men could make. Sometimes large numbers were offered at once by the Carthaginians, as, on one occasion, two hundred children of the best families (Agathocles).
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MOLINA, Luis, b. at Cuenza in New Castile, 1535; d. in Madrid, Oct. 12, 1900. He early entered the Society of Jesus; became a pupil of Petrus Fonseca, the Lusitanian Aristotle; taught theology for twenty years at Evora, and was finally appointed professor of morals in Madrid. His De justitia et jure (1590-1598, 8 vols.), his Commentary on the Book of John (1592), etc., obtained for him a great reputation; but his most celebrated work is his Liber arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praeexcellentia, providentia, praeestinatione, et repudratione concordia, Lisbon, 1598, often reprinted. It is in the form of a commentary on some passages of the Summa of Thomas, an attempt at reconciling the prevailing Semi-Pelagian views with Augustine. But the reconciliation is a mere illusion: under the cover of the bland and subtle words, the conflict continues raging. The book was accepted with ostentatious praise by the Jesuits, but fiercely attacked by the Dominicans and a long and curious controversy ensued. (See the article, Congregatio de auxilia gratiae, and the literature there given).

PELT.

MOLINOS, Miguel de, b. at Saragossa, Dec. 21, 1640; d. in the dungeons of the Inquisition in Rome, Dec. 29, 1697. He belonged to a distinguished Aragonese family; was educated for the church, and ordained priest, and settled in 1669 or 1670 in Rome, where his excellent education, the amiability of his character, and his peculiar spiritual tendency, soon brought him into intimate connection with the Pope, the cardinals, and the
highest society. In 1678, shortly before his great patron, Cardinal Odescalchi, ascended the papal throne, under the name of Innocent XI., he published, against his own will as it is said, but at the instance of the Provincial of the Franciscans, Giovanni di Santa Maria, his Guida spirituale, to which, shortly after, was added the Breve trattato della cotidiana commuione. It made an immense sensation. Originally written in Spanish, it was immediately translated into Italian and French, in 1687 also into Latin by Francke [and in 1690 into English anonymously, even without publisher’s imprint]. It forms the basis for the so-called “Quietism,” and corresponds closely with other phenomena of the age. What Jansenism was in France, and Pietism in Germany, and Quakerism in England, Quietism was in Spain. But it was in many respects a more extreme and consequently a more dangerous movement. Its dying away from the external world in order to serve God internally, by meditation and contemplation alone, led, or might easily lead, to a frivolous enthusiasm, and neglect of morals. No wonder, therefore, that, while it fascinated some, it provoked others. The Jesuits smelt an affinity to the Reform in it. They understood, that, if such an indifference to the externals of religion became general, the power of the church was broken, and their own occupation gone. They immediately prepared for attack. Paolo Segneri, a member of their order, and a fanatical ascetic and penitence-preacher, published his Concordan
tia tra la fatica e la quiete (Bologna, 1681); and the effect was, that the Inquisition appointed a committee to examine the book of Molinos. But such was as yet the position of Molinos in Roman society, that the examination resulted in an unqualified acquittal. Polemics were then replaced by intrigue. Père la Chaise induced Louis XV. to urge the Pope to interfere. Rumors of people who abstained from confession, of monks and nuns who threw aside, not only rosaries and images, but even relics, etc., were eagerly circulated as evidences of the pernicious influence of Quietism. The Pope gave the case over to the Inquisition; and the Inquisition had the audacity to ask, not the Pope Innocent XI., but the man Benedict Odeschalchi, several embarrassing questions concerning his own personal relation to the affair. In the course of 1685 Molinos was arrested, and all his papers (about twenty thousand letters) were confiscated; and Aug. 28, 1687, the Inquisition publicly condemned his doctrines. The stake he escaped. He recanted, it is said; and the sentence of death was commuted into imprisonment for life. On Nov. 20, 1687, Innocent XI. issued a bull against him. The stake he escaped. He recant
ed, it is said; and the sentence of death was commuted into imprisonment for life. On Nov. 20, 1687, Innocent XI. issued a bull against him. Very severe measures were taken against his adherents.

3r. — The sixty-eight propositions, on which the verdict of the Inquisition is based, are found as an appendix to Francke’s Latin translation of Guida spirituale. A few of his letters are published in Recueil de diverses pièces concernants le quidisme, 1888. See also Three Letters concerning the Present State of Italy, printed as an appendix to De Vuurcsche, in the province of Utrecht, 1887, pastor of Arnheim, 1844, and professor of theology in Amsterdam, 1846. Church history in his domain, more especially the history of the Dutch Church before the Reformation; and his Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland voor de Hervorming (Utrecht, 1864-71, 6 vols.) is a work of the highest merit. He also wrote Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, Berlin, 1875; [John Bigelow: Molinos the Quietist, New York, 1882, which contains a translation of the bull of Innocent XI., pp. 115-127, in which are the sixty-eight propositions referred to above].
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MOLL, Willem, b. at Dort, Feb. 23, 1812; d. in Amsterdam, Aug. 16, 1879. He studied theology at Leyden, and was appointed pastor of De Vuurcsche, in the province of Utrecht, 1887, pastor of Arnheim, 1844, and professor of theology in Amsterdam, 1846. Church history in his domain, more especially the history of the Dutch Church before the Reformation; and his Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland voor de Hervorming (Utrecht, 1864-71, 6 vols.) is a work of the highest merit. He also wrote Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, Berlin, 1875; [John Bigelow: Molinos the Quietist, New York, 1882, which contains a translation of the bull of Innocent XI., pp. 115-127, in which are the sixty-eight propositions referred to above].
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vigorously, and the discipline exercised in the congregation by its own members is very severe. Concerning their original history very little is known. They are mentioned for the first time in an official report to Catharine II. From time to time they have been persecuted, but in the last half-century all persecutions have ceased. See WALLACE: Russia, New York, 1878, p. 295. 

MONARCHIANISM. Down to the end of the second century, not only the Logos doctrine, but also the conception of Christ as the Son of God, pre-existing before the creation of the world, was the exclusive possession of a few theologians. Though it was generally recognized that the Logos should be spoken of Christ, as pare theo (“in the same manner as of God,” II. Clem. ad Cor., 1.), hardly any one, with the exception of the philosophically trained apologists, was thereby led to speculate on the idea of God. All that was develop and defined concerning the personality of the Redeemer during the period between 140 and 180 was based upon the short formula of Matt. xxviii. 19. The acknowledgment of the supernatural conception of Jesus, by which his pre-existence was vaguely but indubitably presupposed, was considered sufficient to distinguish the true Christian from the strict Jewish-Christians and those who in Christ admired only a second Socrates; while, on the other hand, the acknowledgment of a real birth by a woman, and a real human life in accordance with the prefigurations of the prophets, formed a bar against Gnosticism. During this state of incipiency, a multitude of various christological views began to germinate, co-existing, at least for a time, peacefully side by side. In spite of their multitudinousness, however, they may all be reduced to two formulas,—either the Logos, or the divine Spirit, who himself had assumed flesh, and appeared in the world. For both formulas, Scripture might be quoted. Proofs of the former were taken from the synoptical Gospels; of the latter, from a series of apostolical writings which also claimed absolute authority. Nevertheless, there existed a radical difference between them; and though, for a long time, that difference may have been visible to the theological reflection only, without touching the religious instinct, there came a time when it could not fail to attract the attention even of the masses.

In the contest which then arose, the latter formula had one decided advantage: it combined more easily with those cosmological and theological propositions which were borrowed from the religious philosophy of the time, and applied as foundation for a rational Christian theology. He who was conversant with the idea of a divine Logos as the explanation of the origin of the world, and the motive power in the history of mankind, found in that very idea an easy means by which to define the divine dignity and Sonship of the Redeemer. There seemed to be no danger to monotheism in this expedient; for was not the infinite substance behind the creation capable of developing into various subjects without exhausting itself, and splitting? Nor did the idea itself—the idea of an incarnate Logos—seem insufficient to explain the Godhead of Christ. On the contrary, the more energetically it was handled, the more fertile it proved, able to correspond to any depth of religious feeling and to any height of religious speculation. Nevertheless, in spite of this great advantage, as long as the idea of a divine Logos had not reached beyond such definitions as “the fundamental type of the universe,” “the rational system of the laws of nature,” etc., the second formula could not help rousing a certain suspicion among those who in the Saviour wanted to see the Godhead itself, and nothing less.

It was, however, not an anxiety with respect to the divine dignity of Christ, which, in the second century, first called forth the first protestation to the Logos-christology: it was an anxiety with respect to monotheism. For was it not open atheism, when worship was claimed for two divine beings? Not only uneducated laymen were forced to think so, but also those theologians who knew nothing of the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and would hold nothing between atheism and Christian dogmatics. How the controversy began, and who made the first attack, is not known; but the contest lasted for more than a hundred and fifty years, and presents some aspects of the highest interest. It denotes the victory of Plato over Zeno and Aristotle in Christian science; it denotes the substitution, in Christian dogmatics, of the pre-existent Christ for the historical, of the ideal Christ for the living, of the mystery of personality for the real person; it denotes the first successful attempt at subjecting the religious faith of the laity to the authority of a theological formula unintelligible to them.

The party which was defeated in the contest, the representatives of that severe monotheism in the ancient Church which retained the office of the Redeemer in the character of Christ, but clung with obstinate tenacity to the numerical unity of the Deity, are generally called “Monarchians,”—a term brought into circulation by Tertullian, but not perfectly adequate. In order to fully appreciate the position which this party occupies in the history of Christian dogmatics, it must be remembered that it originated within the pale of Catholicism itself, and had a common basis with its very adversaries. In its deviations from what has afterwards been defined as true Catholicism, it is pre-catholic, not a-catholic. Thus, for instance, with respect to the canon of the New Testament. The deviations of several Monarchian groups on this point are simply due to the circumstance that the true canon of the New Testament had not yet been established. Nor should it be overlooked, that, with the exception of a few fragments, the writings of the Monarchians have perished. The party is known only through the representations of its adversaries. The history of Monarchianism is consequently very obscure; indeed, it cannot be written with any continuity. Only the various groups can be pointed out and described. Even the old and generally accepted division into dynamic and
modalistic Monarchianism cannot be carried through without straining the texts on which it is based.

I. The Alogians. — The first opponents to the Logos-christology, the so-called “Alogians” in Asia Minor, were undisputed members of the Church, and were treated as such by Hippolytus and Irenaeus. They were only by comparing their tenets with a later development of Catholicism, that Epiphanius found out they were heretics: it was also he who gave them their name. The starting-point of their opposition was the Montanist prophecy, which they rejected. They rejected, indeed, all prophecy as a still existing charisma; but in doing so they were only more catholic than the Church itself. Their disbelief, however, in an age of the Paraclete, led them into a criticism of the prophecy as a still existing charisma; but in point of theiropposition was the Montanist prophecy, ascribed to Cerinthus: the Apocalypse, they ridiculed. But, rejectingthe Gospel of St. John, they did not condemn them.

The Gospel, they believed, was not the Logos-christology, the so-called “Alogians” of Asia Minor. Orthodox in other points, he taught, with respect to the personality of Christ, that Jesus was not a heavenly being, but a human being, which had assumed flesh in the womb of the Virgin, in accordance with a special providence and under the concurrence of the Holy Spirit; that, having proved himself worthy by a pious life, he had received in the baptism the Holy Godhead of the former. A few years, however, after Victor’s successor, however, Zephyrinus (199–218) his pupil, Theodotus the money-broker, probably also a Greek, attempted, in connection with Asclepiadotus, to form an independent congregation, and found an independent church, in Rome. A certain Natalius, a native of Rome, and a confessor, was, for a monthly salary of a hundred and seventy dinari, induced to become the bishop of the new church; but he was afterwards, by visions of “holy angels,” who whipped him while he was sleeping, forced back into the bosom of the great Church. Twenty or thirty years later on, a new attempt at reviving the old Monarchian christology was made by Artemas; but he seems not to have identified himself with the Theodotians. Very little is known of him, however. He was still living about 270, as proven by the decision of the synod of Antioch against Paulus of Samosata.

Generally speaking, the Monarchians of Rome present the same realistic character as their brethren, the Alogians of Asia Minor. They studied Aristotle and Theophrastus, Euclid and Galen; but they neglected Plato and Zeno. They substituted the grammatico-historical method for the allegorical in the interpretation of Scripture; and, as foundation for their Bible study, they employed a very sharp text-criticism. With respect to the canon they were perfectly orthodox. They accepted the writings of St. John, which, however, simply means that the canon of the New Testament in which those writings were contained had now been firmly and finally established. But they remained an army of officers, without any rank and file. For their text-criticism, their grammar, their historical researches, the mass had no sense. Their church in Rome waned away, leaving behind no traces of itself; and it took about seventy years before the school of Antioch was strong enough to throw the dogmatics of the church into one of the most violent crises it ever has had to go through.

II. Paulus of Samosata. — By the Alexandrian theology of the third century, the dogmatic use of such ideas as τὸ διακόνιον τοῦ άναπολημέρου, etc., was not only made legitimate, but indispensable; and, at the same time, the view of the essential nature of the Saviour, as being not human, but divine, became more and more prevalent. Though Ebionite elements were still found in the intricate christology of Origen, they were present only in a latent and ineffective state; and though he himself taught a Godhead in Christ, to which he referred in his prayers, he directly attacked all those teachers who attempted to establish such a difference between the personality of the Son and that of the Father as seemed likely to destroy the essential Godhead of the former. A few years, however,
after his death, Paulus of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, that is, occupant of the most illustrious episcopal chair of the Orient, undertook once more to emphasize the old view of the human personality of the Saviour, in opposition to the prevailing doctrine. The next occasion of the controversy is not known, but was, at that time, Antioch did not belong to the Roman Empire, but to Palmyra. Paulus was vicegerent of the realm of Zenobia. To reach such a man was no easy task. Through a common provincial synod, over which he presided himself, it could not be done. But, during the Novatian controversy, the experiment of a general Oriental council had been successfully tried, and it was now repeated. The first two councils, however, failed to accomplish the condemnation of Paulus: at the third, probably in 298, he was excommunicated, and Domnus chose his successor. But, by the support of Zenobia and then of Valerianus, he did not resign his see until 272. In that year, Antioch was reconquered by Aurelian. An appeal was made to the emperor; and he decided that the church-building should be surrendered to those who maintained communication with the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome. The deposition, however; and, removal of Paulus, did not at once destroy his influence. On the contrary, under the three following bishops of Antioch, Lucian stood at the head of the rising Antiochian school of theology, and he taught in the spirit of Paulus. Yea, in the persons of the great Antiochian Fathers, Paulus may, indeed, be said to have been vindicated a second time; and how long the dynamic Monarchianism lived on in Asia Minor may be seen from the christology of the author of the Acta Archelai.

The christology of Paulus is characterized by the total absence of all metaphysical speculation, instead of which he employs only the historical research and the ethical reflection. Essentially it is simply a development of the christology of Hermas and Theodotus, only modified in its form by accommodation to the prevailing terminology. The name of the Logos was always severely vindicated. Father, Son, and Spirit are the one God; and, when a Logos or Sophia can be distinguished in God, they are only qualities or attributes. From eternity, God has brought forth the Logos in such a way that the latter may justly be called his Son; but that Son remains, nevertheless, an impersonal power, and can never become a concrete manifestation. In the proverbs, the Logos was active; also in Moses, and in many others, more especially in the son of David, born by the Virgin. But Mary did not bear the Logos: she bore only a man, who in the baptism was anointed with the Logos.

LIT.—The principal sources are the acts of the Antiochian synod of 268; that is, the report of the disputation between Paulus and the presbyter Malchian, and the final decision of the synod. In the sixth century those documents were still extant in excelsa; but only fragments of them have come down to us, in Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VII. 27-30; JUSTINIAN: Tract. e. Monophysit.; Contestatio ad Clerum C. P.; the acts of the Council of Ephesus; LEONTIUS BYZANTIUS: Adv. Nestor et Eutych., etc.—all gathered together by Bouth, in Rel. Sacr., III. Important are also the testimonies of the great Fathers of the fourth century.—ATHANASIUS, Hilary, Ephraem, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, etc. See FEUERLIN: De haeresi P. S., 1741; EHRLEICH: De erroribus P. S., 1745; SCHWAB: Diss. de P. S., 1889.

IV. THE MODALISTIC MONARCHIANS IN ROME AND CARThAGE (c. 250—c. 275).—Epiphanes, Kleomenes, Praxeas, Victorinus, Zephyrinus, Callistus. In the period between 180 and 240, the most dangerous opponents to the Logos-christology were not the dynamic, but the modalistic Monarchians, known in the West as Monarchiani or Patripassiani; in the East, as Sabelliani; though the name Patripassiani was used there too. They taught that Christ was God himself incarnate, the Father who had assumed flesh, a mere modus of the Godhead: hence their name. Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, and Hippolytus wrote against them.

Like the dynamic Monarchians, the modalistic arose in Asia, and then brought the controversy to Rome, where, for a whole generation, their doctrines formed the official teachings of the Church. Noetus was the first of this group of Monarchians who attracted attention. He was a native of Smyrna, taught there, in Ephesus, and then moved to Rome, where he was excommunicated about 230. Epiphanes, a pupil of his, came to Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, about 200, and founded there a Patripassian party. At the head of that party stood, afterwards, Kleomenes, and then, after 215, Sabellius. The latter was vehemently attacked by Hippolytus, but had the sympathy of the great majority of the Christians in Rome: even among the clergy Hippolytus was in the minority. Bishop Zephyrinus tried to temporize, in order to prevent a schism from taking place; and his successor, Callistus, or Callixtus (217-222), adopted the same policy. But the controversy grew so hot, that the Pope was compelled to interfere. Callistus chose to excommunicate both Sabellius and Hippolytus, and draw up a formula of reconciliation, as the expression of the views of the true Catholic Church; and, indeed, the formula of Callixtus became the bridge across which the Roman congregation was led towards the hypostasis-christology.

It is a curious circumstance, that Tertullian, in his polemics against the Monarchians, never mentions the names of Noetus, Epiphanes, Kleomenes, and Callistus; while, on the other hand, the name of Praxeas, against whom he chiefly directs his attack, does not occur in the numerous writings of Hippolytus. The explanation seems to be, that, when the controversy was at its highest in Rome, Praxeas had been forgotten there, while Tertullian might still find it proper to start from him, because he had been the first to bring the controversy to Carthage. Praxeas was a confessor from Asia Minor. In Rome he met with no resistance; but when, in Carthage, he began to expound his Patripassian views, in opposition to the Logos-christology, he was by Tertullian compelled, not only to keep silent, but even to retract. A representation of the individual system of Praxeas cannot be given, on account of the scarcity of the sources. It is, nevertheless, evident that a development had taken place from the Noetians to those Monarchians against whom Hippolytus and Tertullian wrote. The Noetians said, "If Christ is God, he must certainly be the
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Father; for, if he is not the Father, he is not God." And this very same passionate vindication of pure monotheism is also found among the later Monarchians. But when the Nortiens went further, and declared, that, if Christ had suffered, the Father had suffered also, the Monarchian practice of the Father, the later Monarchians avoided this Patri-passian proposition by recognizing a difference of subjectivity between the Father and the Son.

LIT. — HIPPOLYTUS: Philosophumena; TERTULLIAN: Adv. Praxeum; PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN (30), EPIPHANIUS (57), PHILASTRIUS (58-54), and the literature given after the art. CALIXTUS I. See also LANGEN: Geschichte der röm. Kirche, Bonn, 1881, pp. 192-216.

V. SABELLIANISM AND THE LATER MONARCHIANISM. — During the period between Hippolytus and Athanasius, Monarchianism certainly developed several different forms; but this whole various development was, by the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, comprehended under the one term, "Sabellianism." The consequence is, that it would be very difficult to point out in details the propositions which actually made up the individual system of Sabellius. He was probably a Libyan by birth, and stood, even in the time of Zephyrinus, at the head of the Monarchian party in Rome. By Callistus he was excommunicated, but the excommunication produced only a schism. His party was too strong to be at all prolonged; and when the individual system of Sabellius was, as a matter of fact, not only checked, but in vain. Then Origen was invited, in 244, to hold a public disputation with him in Bostra, and to have retired to a hidden grotto in the Lower Thebais, about the middle of the third century, Thebais, during the persecution of Diocletian (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 9). Those have been mentioned, L. and Rufinus, and generally accepted, monasticism, as the establishment of monasticism in the form of a social institution, or, in the plain sense of the word, as the abode of a community of monks, arose very early, and developed rapidly into one of the most prominent features of Christian life. The later history of the development is tolerably clear in all its movements, but the origins are rather obscure.

1. ORIGIN OF MONASTICISM. — According to a tradition based upon the statements of Jerome and Rufinus, and generally accepted, monasticism, as the general form of a social institution, or, in the plain sense of the word, as the abode of a community of monks, arose very early, and developed rapidly into one of the most prominent features of Christian life. The later history of the development is tolerably clear in all its movements, but the origins are rather obscure.

The principal tenet of Sabellius says, that the Father is the same as the Son, and the Son the same as the Spirit: there are three names, but only one being. That being he designate as οὐκ ὁμοιότατον, — an expression which he had no doubt chosen in order to prevent any misunderstanding with respect to the strict monotheism of the system. Nevertheless, Sabellius taught that God was not Father and Son at the same time; that he had been active under three successive forms of energy (προφορά), — as the Father, from the creation of the world; as the Son, from the incarnation in Christ; and as the Spirit, from the day of the ascension. How far Sabellius was able to keep those three forms of energy distinct from each other cannot be ascertained. It is probable that he could not help ascribing a continuous energy (in nature) to God as the Father, even while the energy was active as the Son or as the Spirit. However that may be, the doctrine of three successive forms of energy was at all events a step towards that formula, the Athanasian side, which by Monarchianism was superfluous, and founded Trinitarianism.

LIT. — Besides some sporadic but very important notices in the works of Origen and Athanasius, the principal sources are HIPPOLYTUS (Philosophumena), EPIPHANIUS (51), and PHILASTRIUS (54). See also ULMANN: De Bergilo, 1836; FOCK: De Christol. Bergilo, 1845; ZAHN: Marcellus, 1897. [See UNITARIANISM.] ADOLF HARNACK.

MONASTERY and MONASTICISM. Monasteries, as the establishment of monasticism in the form of a social institution, or, in the plain sense of the word, as the abode of a community of monks, arose very early, and developed rapidly into one of the most prominent features of Christian life. The later history of the development is tolerably clear in all its movements, but the origins are rather obscure.

The principal tenet of Sabellius says, that the Father is the same as the Son, and the Son the same as the Spirit: there are three names, but only one being. That being he designate as οὐκ ὁμοιότατον, — an expression which he had no doubt chosen in order to prevent any misunderstanding with respect to the strict monotheism of the system. Nevertheless, Sabellius taught that God was not Father and Son at the same time; that he had been active under three successive forms of energy (προφορά), — as the Father, from the creation of the world; as the Son, from the incarnation in Christ; and as the Spirit, from the day of the ascension. How far Sabellius was able to keep those three forms of energy distinct from each other cannot be ascertained. It is probable that he could not help ascribing a continuous energy (in nature) to God as the Father, even while the energy was active as the Son or as the Spirit. However that may be, the doctrine of three successive forms of energy was at all events a step towards that formula, the Athanasian side, which by Monarchianism was superfluous, and founded Trinitarianism.

LIT. — Besides some sporadic but very important notices in the works of Origen and Athanasius, the principal sources are HIPPOLYTUS (Philosophumena), EPIPHANIUS (51), and PHILASTRIUS (54). See also ULMANN: De Bergilo, 1836; FOCK: De Christol. Bergilo, 1845; ZAHN: Marcellus, 1897. [See UNITARIANISM.] ADOLF HARNACK.

MONASTERY and MONASTICISM. Monasteries, as the establishment of monasticism in the form of a social institution, or, in the plain sense of the word, as the abode of a community of monks, arose very early, and developed rapidly into one of the most prominent features of Christian life. The later history of the development is tolerably clear in all its movements, but the origins are rather obscure.

The principal tenet of Sabellius says, that the Father is the same as the Son, and the Son the same as the Spirit: there are three names, but only one being. That being he designate as οὐκ ὁμοιότατον, — an expression which he had no doubt chosen in order to prevent any misunderstanding with respect to the strict monotheism of the system. Nevertheless, Sabellius taught that God was not Father and Son at the same time; that he had been active under three successive forms of energy (προφορά), — as the Father, from the creation of the world; as the Son, from the incarnation in Christ; and as the Spirit, from the day of the ascension. How far Sabellius was able to keep those three forms of energy distinct from each other cannot be ascertained. It is probable that he could not help ascribing a continuous energy (in nature) to God as the Father, even while the energy was active as the Son or as the Spirit. However that may be, the doctrine of three successive forms of energy was at all events a step towards that formula, the Athanasian side, which by Monarchianism was superfluous, and founded Trinitarianism.

LIT. — Besides some sporadic but very important notices in the works of Origen and Athanasius, the principal sources are HIPPOLYTUS (Philosophumena), EPIPHANIUS (51), and PHILASTRIUS (54). See also ULMANN: De Bergilo, 1836; FOCK: De Christol. Bergilo, 1845; ZAHN: Marcellus, 1897. [See UNITARIANISM.] ADOLF HARNACK.
to save their life during the persecution of Decius. But Dionysius speaks only of such as actually saved their life, and returned, and of such as perished under the attempt, but of none who remained in the desert as anchorites. Still more course, the writer must be for the whole question of the origin of monasticism, if the existence could be proved, not of some single anchorite, but of whole monastic associations, during the third century. The Hierakites and the Therapeuts have been mentioned; but the former have not the character of monks, and the latter not the character of Christians. The Hierakites were simply the pupils or adherents of Hierakas; and the words of Epiphanius (Haer. 67) do by no means warrant a representation of them as a formally instituted union of ascetics. The Therapeuts are spoken of only in the book επὶ Βιοί Θεραπεύτων. They never existed. They are evidently a mere fiction. But the question is, whether that fiction mirrors some other real existence in the Christian world,—a question which no doubt must be answered with "no." When the book on every occasion argues from an alleged existence of all men and it describes the existing inequality (as, for instance, that between master and slave) as the true cause of all evil, it flatly contradicts one of the fundamental ideas of the Christian Church of the first three centuries; and, when it describes the sacred rites of the Therapeuts, it often becomes half absurd and half offensive from a Christian point of view. The book, which probably was written shortly after the time of Philo, originated among the agitations of which the Judeo-Hellenic world at that time suffered, and has no reference to Christianity. See Keim: Urchristenthum, 1878; Lucius: Die Therapeuten, 1879.

Descending from the third to the fourth century, in order to discover the first traces of Christian monasticism, the two first great authorities which must be consulted are Eusebius of Cæsarea and the Life of St. Anthony (Vita Antonii). Eusebius finished his Church History in 324; but neither in that work, nor in his Life of Constantine, and Eulogy of Constantine, written between 337 and 340, is the subject ever mentioned. In his Demonstratio evangelica, I. 8, he makes a distinction between a higher and lower form of Christian life; and the former is generally considered as referring to monasticism. But the distinction is simply that one between "knowledge" and "faith" which formed one of the fundamental doctrines of the Alexandrian school. Eusebius knew nothing of a Christian monasticism, because there was as yet nothing to be known of it; and it was, indeed, not until after his death, after the middle of the fourth century, that a rumor of the Egyptian anchorites began to spread into Asia Minor,—as seen from the writings of Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Cæsarea,—while at the same time they entered into communication with Athanasius. The report that the latter, on his flight to Rome in 340, was accompanied by Egyptian monks, is a mere fiction. With respect to the Vita Antonii, first written in Greek, then translated into Latin by Eusgiarius, and very early incorporated with the works of Athanasius (in its Greek form), and ascribed to him, two questions present themselves: first, Is it history? next, Was it written by Athana-
the unreliability increases, of course, when investi-
gation and research become necessary to the
the treatment of a subject. It is impossible, however,
to pass from Eusebius and Athanasius to the Vita
Antonii and the monks of Jerome, without being
struck by the difference. It is an entirely new
and strange world which opens up to the reader:
and, as the historian is only left with the least of
Christian life which is held forth to him; and when an
attempt has been made to explain that ideal as a direct
development of the asceticism which already ex-
isted in the primitive Christian Church, caused
by such extraordinary circumstances as the perse-
cutions of Decius and Diocletian, the attempt
has been utterly baffled by the decisive circum-
stance, that not one of the numerous hermit lives
from the fourth or fifth century can be put in
any historically possible connection with the per-
secutions. Hence, already Mosheim was prepared
to seek for the origin of Christian monasticism
outside of Christianity, in Neoplatonism. Now
we learn from Porphyry, and his extracts from
Chairemon, that in the Egyptian temples, and
wholly secluded from the people, there lived a
kind of ascetics, who slept on palm-leaves, ate no
meat, drank no wine, never laughed, etc. Fur-
thermore, Philostratus tells us, that Apollonius
of Tyana visited the Egyptian wise men in the
mountains of the Upper Nile, where they lived
naked, and always on the point of starvation.
Finally, the recent decipherment of the Greek
papyrus-rolls in the libraries of London, Paris,
Leyden, and the Vatican, presents us with a full
picture of those ascetics, or penitents, or monks,
who belonged to the worship of Serapis. (See
Remouch, "peasants," etc.) The organization
of the anchorites into large communities is generally
ascribed to Pachomius, who himself had been a
Serapis monk. (See Revillon: Le reclus du Séra-
peum in Revue égyptologique, 1880.) The Greek
designations of such an institution are, besides
Laure (see Laura), modestes and sanctos, of
which the former refers to the house, the latter
to the association (Cassian: Collat. xviii. 18):
the Latin are monasterium, conobium, claustrum,
conventus, etc. The organization seems to have
been almost military in its regularity and severity.
Nevertheless, its success was very great; though,
of course, the stories of Rufinus and Palladius,
about monastical paradies with ten thousand
monks and twenty thousand virgins, are mere
fables, utterly incompatible with the actual state
of affairs in the country. II. WEINGARTEN.
II. HISTORY OF MONASTICISM. — From Egypt
the institution spread to Palestine, Syria, Asia
Minor, and, with less success, to Northern Africa.
In the Occident, Italy, with Milan and Rome, took
the precedence next followed the islands along
the coast of Italy and Dalmatia; then Southern
Gaul, with its celebrated monasteries at Turo-
um, Masellis, Pictavium, etc. An influence
similar to that which Basil the Great exercised
on Eastern monasticism, Western monasticism
received from Monte Casino, founded in 529.
From that time the movement pursues a double
course, partly following the track of the Chris-
tian missionary among the heathen nations, partly
efforting to keep alive and satisfy certain in-
dicks within the Church itself. Monasteries
were founded all along the frontier of Christen-
dom, like fortresses, to defend the conquered terri-
ory, or like colonies, to bring fresh soil under
cultivation; and monasteries were founded at the
very centre of civilization in the great cities, form-
ing an outlet for the strong impulses of asceticism
and penitence. Never completely incorporated
with the ecclesiastical organization, nor ever
wholly absorbed by the civil organization, the
monastery occupied a peculiar intermediate social
position, which must never be lost sight of during the study of its history. Its relation, however, to the Church, was the closest, and most intimate; and from the Church and her councils it received its constitution. The Council of Chalcedon, 451, decreed that the monastery and its abbot should be under the authority of the parochial bishop, who alone was allowed to perform the acts of confirmation, ordination, and consecration. To obtain his assent, no prayer-chapel or monastic house could be built; and, without a permit from him, neither the abbot nor the monks could leave the monastery. The vagrant monks should be seized, and shut up in the monasteries; and no one should be allowed to settle down as a hermit, without having gone through a probation-term of two years in a monastery. The abbot was to be elected by the monks; but, as soon as he was elected and confirmed, he bore absolute sway over them. Double monasteries, in which recluses of both sexes lived together, such as had arisen even in the fourth century, were continued; but very strict rules for their management were issued. In the Eastern monasteries, the monks often lived in separate cells constructed around the κοιμητήριον; in the Western, all the members were gathered into the same building, the effect of which was a more rigid seclusion.

On approaching the middle ages, all relations of the institution become more intricate. The Church became dependent on the State: even her bishops and synods succumbed to secular influences. Nor did the monasteries escape the danger. They increased in number and reputation, but were, nevertheless, dragged into the vortex of violent changes which characterized the age. They became rich. To the produce of their soil were added magnificent donations. But their very wealth made them a welcome prey to jealousy and avarice. In the sixth and seventh centuries, the bishops began to levy such exorbitant taxes on them for ordination and consecration, that the councils had to step in, and free them from such unjust burdens (Concil. Tolet., X. can. 3). Of course, the relation between episcopacy and monastery developed differently in the different countries. In England, for instance, the conversion to Christianity was effected by the monks; and the whole work of civilizing the people devolved upon the monasteries. The people, consequently, felt great reverence for them; and it held hard for the hierarchy to get the ascendency over them. In France and Spain, on the contrary, the hierarchy had grown strong before the monks came; and there it took a long time before the monasteries could begin to emancipate themselves. Some monasteries of great fame, such as those of St. Gall, Reichenau, St. Emmerau, etc., entered into open contest with their bishops, but in vain. Not all monasteries obtained real independence: they acquired only a certain measure through exemptions and privileges granted them by the princes or the popes. When a prince was the founder of a monastery, it was only natural that he should place it under his special protection. But, while he might be willing enough to defend it against any encroachments from the side of the bishop, he did, generally, not hesitate to utilize it for his own advantage, appointing some favorite or unruly vassal lay abbot of it, or even abandoning it to be plundered by some troublesome creditor. At what period the intimate connection between the monasteries and the bishops of Rome began, it is difficult to decide. Gregory the Great was their warm friend; but the Privilegium S. Medardi, ascribed to him, is, like many other documents of the same kind, evidently a forgery of the monks. Even the grant of Pope John X. to the monastery of Fulda is very doubtful. The first reliable instance of a pope granting great immunities to a monastery is that of Pope John XV. and the abbeys of Hereford and Corvey; and the first monastery which really became independent of the episcopal authority by placing itself immediately under the Pope was that of Cluny, 1063.

The monastery culminated together with the Papacy. Its development received a most powerful impulse from the foundation of monastic orders. Hitherto each single monastery had been a unit by itself; belonging, it is true, to a certain rule, a certain diocese, etc., but not, therefore, maintaining any kind of connection with any other monastery. Now, the Cluniacenses formed a union, not of monks, but of monasteries; and that arrangement was then adopted by the Cistercians, the Mendicants, etc. Thus arose huge organizations, which stretched their colonies across many countries, without weakening the connection between the members and the centre. The constitutions adopted by these orders were different,—sometimes more aristocratic, sometimes more monarchical. In the Cistercian order the mother-monastery enjoyed the precedence of age. There the chapter-general assembled; thence the visitors were sent forth; but, in the formation of a resolution, all abbots had equal votes. In the mendicant orders, the centre was not placed in the local starting-point, but in the elected general, who resided in Rome, and ruled through provincials and priors. At the same time that this change took place in the organization of the monastic institution, an equally important change took place in its functions. The mendicant orders received the most comprehensive ecclesiastical privileges. They were allowed to hear mass, to dispense communion, to ordain; the Church was, indeed, near being absorbed by the monastery. The number of ecclesiastical foundations increased immensely. They were found in every large city. They were scattered through all countries. In England alone, a hundred and fifty-six monasteries were in the period between William I. and John Lackland; and each such monastery was a little world by itself, in which most interests of human life, both temporal and spiritual, were represented. The number of inmates might vary from three hundred to over two thousand; and for this huge population provisions of all kinds had to be at hand. The building should contain rooms for guests, for the sick, for the school, store-rooms, stables, etc. Generally the difference between Byzantine, Roman, and Gothic style, made itself felt also in monastic architecture; though a regard to the wants of the monks had to be kept in mind in the constructions. Partly for the sake of perfect seclusion, but also as a means of defence, the whole structure was surrounded with a wall. On the ground-floor were the refectory, the guest and...
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MONEY. From the earliest time the Hebrews used moneys, pieces of metal, to which a fixed weight was assigned, so as to make them suitable for the various articles presented in trade (Gen. xxi. 16; cf. also 2 Kings xii. 4 sq.), and which were recognized as such, either in an unwrought form, or from certain characters inscribed upon them. The representative coinage was the shekel, originally meaning "weight." There were also the half-shekel, the barleycorn, the third part and fourth part of the shekel (1 Sam. ix. 9).

From Josh. vii. 21, Judg. xvii. 2-4, we may suppose that the shekel was not a weighed mass, but a certain piece of metal, used as a representative of property, and medium of exchange. That larger sums, the correct weight of which was of great importance, were weighed again, is but natural (Gen. xxxiii. 16; Exod. xxi. 17; 2 Sam. xvii. 12; 1 Kings xx. 38; Jer. xxxii. 9). The shekel was of silver; hence the word "shekel" is often omitted, and only the metal itself is mentioned (Gen. xx. 16, xxxvii. 28, xlv. 22; Judg. ix. 4, xvi. 5, xvii. 2-4, 10; 2 Sam. xvii. 11, 12; 1 Kings x. 29; 2 Kings vi. 25). It was used in trade; e.g., in buying and selling of real estate (Gen. xxvii. 15, 16; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24; Jer. xxxii. 21), of slaves (Gen. xxxvii. 28; Hos. iii. 2). It was used for paying tithes (1 Kings xv. 19; Neh. v. 15, x. 32; Exod. xxxii. 18, xxxviii. 26; 1 Macc. x. 40, 42), as estimation of vows (Lev. xxvii. 8-37; Num. iii. 47), as amount for damages and expiation (Gen. xx. 16; Exod. xxxii. 32; Deut. xxi. 19, 29), as reward for services rendered (Judg. ix. 4, xvi. 5, xvii. 10; 2 Sam. xvii. 11, 12; Zech. xi. 12), as lease-money (Song of Sol. vii. 11), and as a present (Gen. xiv. 22). The value of certain articles was expressed by shekels (Lev. v. 15; 2 Kings vi. 25). From the common shekel is distinguished "the shekel of the sanctuary." (Exod. xxi. 18, xxvii. 24-26; Lev. v. 15, xxvii. 8; Num. iii. 60, vi. 13, 19 sq., 86): its weight was twenty gerahs (Exod. xxx. 13; Lev. xxvii. 25; Num. iii. 47, xvii. 16; Ezek. xiv. 12). The half of the "shekel of the sanctuary" was called bekah (Exod. xxvii. 26), and was equal in weight to the common shekel. There existed also, the third part of a shekel (Neh. x. 32) and the fourth part of a shekel (1 Sam. ix. 8). [The value of the (silver) shekel was about fifty-four cents of American money.]

For larger sums existed the manah, or pound (as in the Authorized Version, Ez. ii. 69; Neh. vi. 71, 72), which was equal to fifty sacred, or one hundred common, shekels; also talents, or kikkar (1 Kings xxvi. 24; 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23; xv. 19), equal to three thousand shekels. Both the manah and talent were weighed (1 Kings xx. 39, 39; Esth. iv. 9). Another coin was the kesithah (Gen. xxxiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32; Job xxii. 11), the meaning of which is obscure. Bertheau supposes it to be a signification for coins in general, whilst Gesenius values the same at four shekels.

During the exile the Jews undoubtedly made use of the monetary system then current in Babylon; whilst after the exile they availed themselves of Persian coins, as may be seen from 27, li. 60, Neh. vii. 70-72, where darics (rendered "drams"), a Persian gold coin, is mentioned. [Their value corresponded to about five dollars of American money.]

Under the Seleucids, Greek-Syrian coins were used by the Jews, till the time (B.C. 149) of Simon the Maccabæus who received of Antiochus VII. (Sidetes), the son of Demetrius Nicanor, the right of coining money...
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(1 Macc. xv. 6). Of such Maccabean coins some are still extant, with inscriptions in ancient Hebrew characters. Besides these Asmonean coins, there also existed coins of bronze, made by Herod and his successors, and small coins of bronze in the first Roman emperors, from Augustus to Nero, which are regarded as having been stamped in Judea. Side by side with these genuine Jewish coins, Greek money was continually circulated. Thus, not only in the time of the Maccabees, but also in the time of Jesus, the drachma (about eightpence) was current (Luke xv. 8, 9). Later Jews valued the shekel at four drachmae (Joseph., Antt. III. 8, 2): hence the didrachma, or double drachma, was asked as tribute-money, in place of the legal half-shekel (Matt. xxvii. 24; Joseph., Wars, VII. 6, 6). Another Greek coin was the stater of gold and silver, equal to a Hebrew shekel, and given as tribute-money for two persons (Matt. xxvii. 27). The smallest Greek coin was the lepton, or the mite (Mark xii. 42; Luke xii. 59, xvi. 2). Of Roman coins, the New Testament mentions, (1) the denarius, of about the same weight as the Greek drachma. It bore the head of the Roman emperor, and served as tribute-money (Matt. xxii. 26; Mark xxi. 24; Luke xxii. 52). As to the worth of money among the ancient Hebrews, its standard was very high, judging from the few indications we have. Thus a ram was estimated two shekels of silver (Lev. v. 15), [or about one dollar and nine cents]. A fine Egyptian horse was bought for a hundred and fifty shekels (1 Kings x. 29; 2 Chron. i. 17). Two sparrows were bought at the time of Jesus for one assarion (Matt. xvi. 29), and five for two assaria (Luke ii. 6). Abraham and Jacob buy an acre of land for four hundred shekels (Gen. xxviii. 10, 12, xxviii. 18). David purchased Araunah’s threshing-floor at fifty shekels (2 Sam. xxv. 24); and Omri buys the hill Samaria for two talents of silver (1 Kings xvi. 14). A slave was redeemed at thirty shekels (Exod. xxi. 32), which seems to have been the usual price paid for slaves, and the Jews was paid thirty pieces of silver for the betrayal of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 25; cf. also Zech. xi. 12). The amount for services rendered was (according to Judg. xvii. 10) ten shekels of silver by the year, and a suit of apparel, and victuals. Tobit pays the servant of his son one drachma daily; and laborers were paid a drachma (denary) a day (penny in E. V., Matt. xx. 2).

LIT. — MIÖONET: Description de médailles antiques, vol. 5 (1811), and suppl. vol. 8 (1837); BÖCKI: Meteorologische Untersuchungen über Geschichte, Münzfälsche und Masse des Alterthums, Berlin, 1838; BERDEL: Zur Geschichte der Inschriften, Göttingen, 1842, pp. 5-49; CAVEDONI: Bibliiche Numismatik (trans. into German from the Italian by WELRÖH, Hanover, 1855); LEVY: Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen, 1862; MADDEN: History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Testaments, London, 1884 (new ed., 1894), and his art. in the Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, pp. 36 sq.; 1872, pp. 1 sq; DE SAULCY, in the Revue numis.


ARNOLD. (RÜTSCHI.)

Tables of Bible Money.

JEWISH MONEY, With its value in American money.

A geras (Exod. xxi. 25) = $0.0273
10 gerahs = 1 bekah (Exod. xxvii. 29) = $0.0273
2 bekahs = 1 shekel (Exod. xxxi. 29; Lev. v. 15) = $0.6425
20 shekels = 1 minah (Luke xiv. 18) = $2.7960
60 minahs = 1 talent (Matt. xvi. 24) = $16.4250
A gold shekel = $2.79
A talent of gold = $26.2500

N.B. — A shekel would probably purchase nearly ten times as much as the same nominal amount will now. Remember that one Roman denary (15 cents) was a good day’s wages for a laborer.

ROMAN MONEY.

A mite (Mark xii. 42) = $0.0187
2 mites = 1 farthing (Mark xii. 42) = $0.0376
4 farthings = 1 denary (Matt. xvi. 24) = $0.15
100 pence = 1 pound (Matt. xvii. 24) = $15.00

MONGOLS, Christianity among the. It is doubtful whether Christianity ever penetrated among the Mongols while they kept confined within the boundaries of their native country, south of the Baikal Sea; but, as soon as they began to push forward to the west, they came in contact with Christian tribes, mostly of the Nestorian confession, occupying the elevated plateaus of Central Asia; and, as they extended their conquests, Armenians, Georgians, Russians, etc., came under their rule. They were tolerant: yes, they showed even an inclination to abandon their own religion (a kind of coarse deism, accompanied with a still coarser spirit-worship), and adopt foreign ones. The Nestorians, however, and the Armenians made no impression upon them; but great expectations with respect to their conversion were aroused when they entered into communication with Western Europe, and the Mongols had a common foe, the caliph of Egypt; and to the eyes of Europe the conversion of the Mongols seemed to be the most effective means of crushing him. In 1245 Innocent IV. sent two embassies to them, and in 1248 St. Louis sent a third one; but nothing seems to have been achieved thereby. Some impression, however, must have been produced by Rubruquis, also sent out by St. Louis. He went in 1263 to Khan Sertak (at that time encamped between the Don and the Volga), and from him to the Great Khan Mangy, with whom he stayed half a year, and in whose presence a great disputation was held between Christians, Mohammedans, and Buddhists. But practical results were not reached until after the destruction of the caliphate of Bagdad, in 1258, and the establishment of a great Mongolian-Persian empire. Several missionaries were sent by the Pope to the new capital of Sultanish; and in 1318 Ricoldus de Monte Croce established there a Roman-Catholic archbishopric, with a series of suffragan bishoprics, and with monasteries for Franciscans and Dominicans. But the Roman-Catholic Church made her conquests among the Nestorians, Armenians, Jacobites, and other Christian schismatics; while the Mongols were converted by the thousands to
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Isaiah. The result was, that the Mohammedan fanaticism very soon could institute persecutions against the Christians, and the Roman-Catholic mission was brought to an end. Some missionary work was also done in the khansates of Kiptchak and Delhi, but without any effect. Most successful was the Christian mission among the Mongols in China. Nestorian congregations, numbering about 30,000 souls, existed from old times in the country; and, when the Mongol dynasty ascended the throne, Roman-Catholic missionaries took up the work. John of Monte Corvino was sent to Peking by Pope Nicholas IV. He preached in the native tongue, converted about 6,000 people, and was in 1307 made archbishop of Peking by Clement V. But he did not succeed in converting the dynasty. The Mongolian princes, like most of their subject countrymen, became Buddhists in China. Finally, in 1370, the Mongol dynasty was overthrown by the Ming dynasty; and, shortly after, the Roman-Catholic mission was expelled from China. W. HEYD.

MONHEIM, Johannes, b. at Clausen, near Elberfeld, 1509; d. at Dusseldorf, Sept. 9, 1584. He studied at Cologne, and was appointed rector of the school at Essen in 1532, and of that of Dusseldorf in 1545; which latter institution he brought into the most flourishing condition, so that it far surpassed most of the German universities in number of pupils. Originally Monheim belonged to the Erasmian camp, but gradually he completely adopted the doctrines of the Reformation. His Catechism (1580) is nothing but a condensation or abbreviation of Calvin's Institutiones, and was vehemently attacked by the Cologne Jesuits. They also accused him before the Pope, the emperor, the Council of Trent, etc.; and the result was, that the Mohammedan mission was brought to an end. W. HEYD.

MONICA, or MONNICA, the mother of Augustine; b. about 332; d. at Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, May 4, 387. Her parents are said to have been Christians. She was married at an early age to Patricus, a Pagan of Tagaste, to whom she bore three children,—Augustine, Navigius, and an unnamed daughter. Her husband was apparently coarse, unsympathetic, choleric, and unfaithful; but such was her beautiful Christian life, that she was the means of his conversion. He was baptized in 371, and shortly thereafter died. Monica shared Patricius' ambition respecting Augustine's career as a scholar, but was deeply grieved when he abandoned the Catholic faith. For many years she followed him with her prayers, and at last made the journey to Milan to be with him. There the one wish of her life was met. Augustine was converted, and was baptized by Ambrose, Easter (April 25), 387. Monica shared the society of the little company of friends Augustine had gathered around him immediately before and after his baptism, and added much to the spiritual value of their intercourse. After the purpose of their meeting was accomplished, viz., his conversion and baptism, they set out for Africa. On the way, Monica fell sick, and died. As the mother of the greatest of the Latin church Fathers, and as herself a wise, loving, and Christian woman, she will always be remembered. Many a mother will derive comfort from her life, and faith to believe that the sons of prayer will not perish. In 1430 her remains were removed by Pope Martin V. from Ostia to Rome, and buried in the Church of St. Augustine. Her most imperishable monument, however, is the Confessions of her illustrious son, who has written of his unfaithful conduct with a candor unsurpassed, and who ends his biography of his mother with an outburst of sorrow over her death, and a prayer for her eternal welfare. To be mourned by such a man was praise enough. There is, indeed, as Pressensé says, "no one in the ancient church more worthy of our affectionate veneration" than Monica. See BRAUNE: Monnica u. Augustinus, Grima, 1846; SCARR: Life and Labors of St. Augustine, New York and London, 1854; BUTLER: Lives of the Saints, May 4; Mrs. JAMIESON: Legends.

MONOD, Adolphe, beyond dispute the first pulpit orator of the Protestant Church of France in our century; was b. in Copenhagen, Jan. 21, 1802; d. in Paris, April 6, 1856. He was the fourth of the twelve children of Jean Monod, pastor of the French Church at Copenhagen, and, after 1808, in Paris. The son, after studying at the College Bonaparte in Paris, went to Geneva, where he graduated in 1825. He did not yet fully rest upon the great facts of the gospel. He became conscious of the revelation of divine grace to himself on a journey to Italy in 1825. He became founder, and remained pastor, of the Protestant Church in Naples till 1827. He was then called to Lyons; but his evangelical preaching, and especially a sermon upholding the necessity of a Christian faith and life to partake of the communion, (Qui doit communier?) aroused such opposition, that he was deposed by the Catholic minister of education, before whom he was accused by the consistory. Monod did not forsake Lyons, but began preaching in a hall, then went to a chapel, and labored so effectually, that the results of these labors remain in a large church (served by two pastors) and several chapels. In 1836 he followed a call to a professorship in the theological seminary of Montauban, and continued to labor there for eleven years, spending his vacations preaching to large audiences in the churches of Southern France. At the end of this period, he was called as pastor to Paris, where for nine years he preached to large and eager congregations in the Oratoire. Adolphe Monod was distinguished for his eloquence, but especially for the purity and piety of his life. He was gifted with a clear intellect, vivid imagination, and a sympathetic nature. His theology was drawn from the Bible, of which he was a constant student, and which he read daily in the original. He was every inch a Christian. From the moment that he was apprehended of Christ, he devoted his whole heart and energies to his service. The purity of his Christian character was transparent. His conscientiousness was sometimes almost painfully exact, and his humility was apparent to all. He was, moreover, a man of prayer, to which he had constant recourse as a remedy against melancholy, to which he was somewhat inclined.

As a preacher, Monod's aim was to save men from destruction. His sermons were essentially biblical, and by the full treatment of the texts, and the earnestness, fervor, combination, and modesty of the preacher, won and persuaded the hearts of
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his hearers. His style was pure and classic; his voice melodious, full, and clear; so that one would have gone away with only an impression of beauty, had it not been for his earnestness. His first three printed sermons appeared in 1830; and in 1844 a volume appeared, the first sermon of which, entitled La crédulité de l'incrédule, covering sixty-eight pages, is a masterpiece of apologetical sermonizing. Many more of his sermons appeared; but the finest of all were two on the vocation of woman, and five on the apostle Paul. In his last sickness, two volumes of his sermons appeared (1855), and since then two more.

Monod's last days were days of much pain on a sick-bed. He knew his hour was at hand; but brighter shone forth his Christian character, and stronger was the hold his faith took on Christ. Every Sunday afternoon he gathered his friends about him; and, after listening to the reading of Scripture, he uttered short homilies of great power, which were afterwards collected in the volume, Adieux d'Adolphe Monod à ses amis et à l'Eglise. He passed away on a Sunday. Well knew Professor De Félécus said, Adolphe Monod was twice over the first of the Protestant preachers of France in our day,—first for the excellency of his oratorical genius, and then for the holiness of his life. In the midst of the instability of religious life, every one looked to him, as the sailor in the storm, at the lighthouse.” L. BONNET.

The following translations into English have been made of Monod's writings: Saint Paul, Five Discourses, Andover, 1861; Woman, her Mission, etc., London, 1870; The Parting Words of Monod to his Friends and the Church, New York, 1873.

MONOD, Frédéric, elder brother of Adolphe Monod; a devoted and distinguished pastor in France; was b. May 17, 1794, at Monnaz, Canton of Vaud, Switzerland; d. Dec. 30, 1863, in Paris. He studied theology in Geneva (1815-18), and came under the influence of Robert Haldane. In 1820 he became an associate pastor in Paris, where he edited, with great talent, the Archives du Christianisme. In 1848, when the synod refused to make an explicit affirmation of the faith of the Church, he withdrew from the State Church, resigned his position at Paris, and founded, with Count Gasparin, the Union of the Evangelical Churches of France (l'union des églises évangéliques de France). He made a trip to the United States in 1855, to collect money for a church-building in Paris, and returned to France, having accomplished the object of his mission. During the American civil war he was a staunch friend of the Union cause. He was one of the chief instruments in the religious awakening of France, and left behind him an example worthy of imitation.

MONOPHYSITISM. See CHRIST, MONOGRAM OF.

MONOPHYSITES, those who held the doctrine that Christ had but one composite nature. The christological statement of the Chalcedonian synod of 451, based upon the famous letter of Pope Leo I., and pursuing an intermediate course between Nestorianism and Eutychianism, was intended to be the final word in the long conflict. (See Marcian's decree of Feb. 7 and July 28, in Mansi: Concil. Col., viii. 473 and 498.) The adherents of Cyril, however, though very far from willing to accept the views of Eutyches, considered the doctrines of the synod of Chalcedon as Nestorian heresy, and rose everywhere in opposition. In Palestine, the monk Theodosius fanaticized the whole swarm of monks, took possession of Jerusalem, filled the city with murder and robbery, and expelled the bishop, Juvenal. After the lapse of twenty months, Juvenal was restored: but Theodosius fled to the monks of Mount Sinai; and there, out of the grasp of the imperial authority, he continued to work against the Chalcedonian doctrines. In Egypt a large party refused to recognize the deposition of Dioscorus; and the appointment of Proterius as his successor caused an insurrection in Alexandria, during which a number of soldiers were burnt alive by the mob in the former temple of Serapis. Proterius could be maintained only by military force; and when the Emperor Marcian died (457), the party of Dioscorus, which gathered around the presbyter Timotheus Ælius and the deacon Petrus Mangus, at once revolted, and killed him. Ælius was chosen bishop; and a synod, which he summoned, pronounced the confessions of his adversaries, also the bishop of Rome, Leo I., and the patriarch of Constantinople, Anatolius. The power which the party displayed on that occasion made an impression even upon the emperor, Leo I.; and he contented himself with simply asking the opinion of the bishops of Christendom with respect to the legitimacy of the election of Ælius. Of course, only such reports have been preserved as go against Ælius; but, even from these, it is evident that a large portion of the clergy was strongly opposed to the decree of the synod of Chalcedon: thus, the bishops of Pamphylia Secunda declare that the Chalcedonian Confession is, like the Epistle of Pope Leo I., only an individual argument, and by no means a general creed. Ælius was deposed, but he was allowed to go to Constantinople to defend himself; and his successor, Salophacialus, was a neutral figure, who could give no offence to the Monophysites. In Antioch, the monk Peter Fullo, openly supported by Zeno, the son-in-law of the emperor, opposed the Chalcedonian decree with great vehemence, and finally expelled the bishop, Martyrius. Everywhere in the East the Monophysites were strong; and when Basiliscus ascended the imperial throne in 475, they gained the upper hand. In an encyclical letter of 476 he formally condemned the synod of Chalcedon and the epistle of Leo I. In the very next year, however, Basiliscus was dethroned by Zeno; and Zeno's great object was to compromise matters. In 482 he issued his famous edict, the so-called Henotikon, in which Nestorius and Eutyches were condemned, but without any formal recognition of the Chalcedonian Confession; while, on the contrary, the twelve chapters of Cyril were accepted. For a moment the storm seemed to have been averted. It could not, however, long escape the jealous eye of the Roman pope, that, practically, the Henotikon was entirely in favor of the Monophysites. Not only the Chalcedonian Confession, but even the Epistle of Pope Leo I., and thereby the prestige of Rome, were in danger. When Pope Felix III., in 492, sent Count Constantinople to announce his accession, they carried with them grave admonitions to the Emperor Zeno,
and severe reproaches to the Patriarch Acacius. But, before they reached Constantinople, they were seized, deprived of their papers, and frightened into abject compliance with the schemes of Acacius. Justinian, however, even took the sacrament in his church, in company with Petrus Mungus of Alexandria, known as a rank Monophysite. In revenge, Felix III. deposed Acacius, and put him under the ban, and induced a Constantinopolitan monk to pin the bull to his clothes while in the church. Thus it came to an open breach between Rome and Constantinople. In 489 Acacius died; but, as his successors refused to erase his name from the diptychs, no reconciliation could be effected. On the contrary, the hostility became more pronounced, when, in 491, Anastasius succeeded Zeno as emperor. Before his accession to the throne, he had committed himself to the establishment with Rome. But when the emperor promised to convoke an oecumenical council, from the diptychs, no reconciliation could be persuaded. In order to appease the orthodox party, the emperor promised to convocate an ecumenical council, which should settle the whole question, and re-establish harmony between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. In 489 Acacius died; but when Anastasius opened negotiations, in 515, with Pope Hormisdas, the Pope demanded, as conditions of his participation in the council, the full recognition of the synod of Chalcedon and the open condemnation of Acacius; and, as the emperor could give only an evasive answer, the negotiations were completely broken up in 517. (See Mansi: Concil. Coll., viii. 324, 389, 524; and Jaaffé: Reg. Pontif., 101.) A great change took place, however, when Justin I. ascended the throne, in 518. He was a mere tool in the hands of his nephew, Justinian; and Justinian belonged to the orthodox party. In Constantinople, in Jerusalem, in Tyre, and in many other places in the East, the friends of the synod of Chalcedon once more came to the front. The negotiations with Rome were reopened; and, without great difficulties, the patriarch Johannes of Constantinople was induced to accept the name of Acacius. The Henotikon was not mentioned at all in those negotiations. It was quietly buried; and thus community was re-established between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. Rome had conquered, and she used her victory with energy; she immediately set to work to have orthodoxy re-established in Antioch and Alexandria. It proved impossible, however, to eradicate Monophysitism. Especially in its home, Egypt, it was too powerful to be subdued: it had to be managed. Such was also the plan of Justinian, who in 527 succeeded Justin on the imperial throne. But, in the mean time, the arrogance of Rome had everywhere called forth a re-action; and at the imperial court the Monophysite party formed once more, under the protection of Theodore, the wife of Justinian. Petrus of Apamea, Zoraras, Anthimus of Trebizond, and other Monophysite leaders, lived in Constantinople; and, by the intrigues of Theodore, Anthimus was even made patriarch after the death of Epiphanius, in 535. For a moment, the wrath of the emperor was once more turned against the Monophysites by the visits of Pope Agapetus to Constantinople. Anthimus was deposed, and Me massa appointed his successor. But Agapetus died in Constantinople, 538; and his successor, Vigilius, placed on the pontifical throne by Theodora, and kept there by Belisarius, was himself a Monophysite. Though he publicly professed submission to the decrees of the synod of Chalcedon, he secretly confessed of faith to Anthimus and other Monophysites, in which he rejected the doctrine of two natures in Christ, etc. (See Liberatus: Brevis- rium, 22.) In the last year of his life, the emperor was even induced by Theodora to sanction the extreme Monophysite views of the Aphthartodocetae; and he was prepared to force those ideas on the Church, when he suddenly died, 556. Justin II. his successor, dropped the matter, and took up a somewhat different attitude in the controversy. In the sixth year of his reign, when the Monophysites had lived for about forty years in and about the capital, un molested, and even recognized, persecutions were instituted against them. Their churches were closed; their bishops and priests were imprisoned, their monasteries inspected, and the in mates compelled to take the sacrament in the churches of the orthodox. The persecutions were at no period so very severe, but they lasted till the time of the Emperor Mauritius and the patriarch John Jejunator. Meanwhile, the Monophysite party had itself split into several fractions. The above-mentioned Aphthartodoceta held that the body of Christ was made incorruptible by its union with his divine nature; while another fraction went still farther, and declared that the body of Christ had not been created, but had existed from eternity. Thus the contest with the Orthodox Church had lost much in interest, and consequently in ardor; and the result was, that the Monophysites gradually and quietly separated from the Orthodox Church,— the State Church,— and formed independent churches,— the Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, Abyssinian, etc. (For the dogmatical development of the controversy and the pertaining literature, see article on Christology.) W. Moller.

MONOPHYSITES, those who held that Christ had but one will, as he had but one nature. Monothelism was the simple and natural consequence of Monophysitism, and originated from the endeavors which the State Church made, in the seventh century, of conciliating the Monophysites. The Emperor Heraclius (610-641), pressed as he was on the one side by the Persians and on the other by Islam, had a vital political interest in the reconciliation; and in the Constantinopolitan patriarch Sergius, a Syrian by birth, and probably of Jacobite descent, he found an eager ally. The principal objection of the Monophysites to the Chalcedonian Confession it seemed possible to meet, without infringing upon the doctrine of two natures in Christ, by an adroit development of the idea of one divine-human energy in Christ, in which the two natures melted together; and it was with that tool in their hands the emperor and the patriarch Sergius used. During his stay in Armenia, in 622, Heraclius opened negotiations with Paulus; and, though the latter hesitated, some years later a union between the State Church and the Armenian Church was actually brought about at the synod of Chozaurus. In 626, during the reign of the Lazians, Heraclius succeeded in gaining Bishop Cyrus of Phasis for the new doctrine and the
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union; and when, in 628, he returned from a victorious campaign against the Persians, bringing back the true cross to Jerusalem, he entered into communication with the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius. The Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, Anastasius II., had died in 606 or 610, and his chair had remained vacant since that time. The emperor now proposed to elevate Athanasius to that see, on the condition of his recognizing the Chalcedonian Confession, such as explained by the new doctrine. Athanasius accepted. Shortly after, in 630 or 631, Cyrus of Phasis was appointed bishop of Alexandria; and in 633 he reported to Constantinople that thousands of Monophysites were by the new doctrine won for the union. In Alexandria, however, the first opposition arose. A monk, Sophronius, a native of Damascus, who had lived for some time in Rome, came to Alexandria, and was much startled by the new doctrine, which he designated as rank Apollinarismian. He immediately repaired to Constantinople; but Sergius and Pope Honorius succeeded in appeasing him for a time. The remarkable letter which the pope on that occasion wrote to Sergius is still extant in a Greek translation (Mansi: Con. Coll., xi. 537), and proves, beyond doubt, that he was a Monothelite; that is, a heretic. Shortly after Sophronius was elected bishop of Jerusalem; and the official announcement of that event he accompanied with a confession, the so-called Synodicon (Mansi: Con. Coll., xi. 537), and a modus vivendi was then established between Rome and Constantinople, according to which it should be permitted to speak both of a single and of a double will in Christ. A true peace, however, was not obtained; and when, in 678, the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus invited Pope Agatho to participate in a great ecumenical council, which should settle the whole question, he received for a long time no answer at all. Finally, in 680, followers of Monothelism became the official doctrine of the Orthodox Church, both in the East and in the West; and in the eighth century it found a most subtle exponent in John of Damascus. Monothelism continued, however, to be professed by all the Monophysite churches; but all the attempts which afterwards were made of introducing it in the Orthodox Church failed. [For the dogmatic development of the controversy and the pertinent literature, see art. CHRISTOLOGY.] W. MÖLLER.

MONSTRANCE (Latin, monstrantia, monstrum, ostensarium, expositiorium) denoted originally any receptacle in which relics were shown off to the people. From the thirteenth century, however, when the doctrine of transubstantiation had been defined, the elevation of the host introduced as a part of the mass, and the festival of Corpus Christi established, the name was restricted for the receptacle of the consecrated host. The form was at first that of a Gothic tower; afterwards, during the period of the renaissance, that of a radiant sun; in the Greek Church, that of a coffin. The materials were gold or silver, or some costly stuff. The place of the monstrance was the high-altar of the church. No one but an ordained priest was allowed to touch it. To steal it was punished with death.

MONTAIGNE, Michel Eyquem de, b. at the Château Montaigne, in the department of Dordogne, France, Feb. 28, 1533; d. there Sept. 13, 1592. He studied law, and was in 1554 appointed councillor to the Parliament of Bordeaux, but retired in 1569, after the death of his father, to his estate, and devoted himself to the study of philosophy. Once more, however, he was called
back into practical life. In 1581 he was elected mayor of Bordeaux, which position he filled with great honor for four years. The book which made his fame—besides a kind of diary kept on a journey in Germany and Italy in 1580, but not published until 1774—also the book on which he won the prize in 1580, the second in 1588. It has often been reprinted, and translated into foreign languages. The best edition is that by Le Clerc, Paris, 1865. His life has been written by Bayle St. John (London, 1857) and Bégioire de Laschamps (Paris, 1890). The foundation of Montaigne's philosophy is an absolute scepticism. Nothing can be known with certainty,—not a fact in history, not a law in nature. This scepticism, combined with a natural indifference, made him in religion a stanch conservative. Since nothing can be known with certainty, it is proper to accept what the Church teaches; and practically he stuck to this maxim, though his brother became a Protestant, and he himself was an intimate friend of Henry of Navarre. In his moral system, too, his scepticism prevailed. He recognized no absolute moral authority. Duty and conscience were to him merely incidental and shifting forms. Do as your nature tells you to do was his highest moral principle. But, in analyzing the various forms of conscience and the various conceptions of duty, he shows a wonderful keenness and knowledge of human nature. See J. Goitel: Essai sur la morale de M., Geneva, 1874; Thimm: Der Skepticismus M., Göttingen, 1875; Henning: Der Skepticismus M., Jena, 1879.

MONTALEMBERT, Charles Forbes René, Count de, b. in London, April 15, 1810; d. in Paris, March 12, 1870. He was educated in England by his grandfather, James Forbes; and the great Irishman O'Connell seems to have exercised considerable influence on his development. In 1828 he accompanied his father to Stockholm; and while there he made his literary debut by a remarkable article on Sweden, in the Revue Française. In 1830 he joined Lannoy as contributor to the Avenir; and a campaign was opened against the educational monopoly of the state, and the university, for the purpose of bringing the whole popular education into the hands of the Roman-Catholic clergy. In connection with Lamennais and Lacordaire, he founded a free school, in which he himself taught; but the school was immediately closed by the police. As peer of France, he was cited before the Chamber of the Peers; and Sept. 19, 1831, he defended his cause in a most brilliant speech. He was sentenced, however, to pay a fine; and the school remained closed. A still heavier blow was struck at him by the papal encyclical of Aug. 15, 1832. He stood as one of the leaders of that peculiar movement which endeavored to unite ultramontanism in the Church with radicalism in the State; but the encyclical disapproved in very severe terms of the whole movement. Dec. 8, 1834, Montalembert gave in his profession of unconditional submission, retired from public life, and went travelling. During his stay in Germany, he became deeply engaged in the study of mediæval literature and art, the results of which were Du Vandalisme et du Catholicisme dans l’Art and Vie de St. Elizabeth. After his return to France, he again took a very active part in political life. The reforms of Pius IX. he hailed with great enthusiasm, also the revolution of 1848. But he was soon disenchanted both by the Pope and the emperor, and the last part of his life he devoted to literary pursuits. In 1858 his Histoire des Mœurs d’Occident (8 vols.) began to appear, translated into English by Mrs. Oliphant (Monks of the West, Edinburgh, 1861-67, 3 vols.); but it was never completed. It is a plea in a case, rather than an historical representation; for as an historian the author lacked the critical faculty, as, in practical politics, he lacked judgment. He had eloquence and enthusiasm. Among the interests which called forth his sympathies was the civil war in the United States; and “his last pamphlet was a hymn of triumph over the success of the Union arms” (La victoire du Nord aux États-Unis, Paris, 1855, Eng. trans., Boston, 1856). He earnestly opposed the papal-infallibility dogmas, and, by so doing, won only abuse from the church which he had so faithfully served. He submitted, however, when the dogma was promulgated. An edition of his complete works appeared in 9 vols., Paris, 1861-68. His life was written by Augustine Cochin (1870), A. Perreaut (1870), and Ch. Foissart (1877). See also Mrs. Oliphant: Mmoirs de Count de Montalembert, Edinburgh and London, 1872, 2 vols.

MONTANISM. About the middle of the second century (in 166, according to Epiphanius: Hier., c. viii. 1) Montanus appeared as a new prophet in Phrygia, at Ardashian on the frontier of Mysia, and found many adherents, among whom were Alcibiades and Theodotus. Under him, also, prophetesses appeared—Pricilla and Maximiilla. Prophecy was, indeed, the most prominent feature of the new movement. Ecstatic visions, announcing the approach of the second advent of Christ, and the establishment of the heavenly Jerusalem at Pepusa in Phrygia, and inculcating the severest asceticism and the most rigorous penitential discipline, were set forth as divine revelations, of which the prophet was only the bearer, and proclaimed as the direct continuation and final consummation of the prophetic gift of the apostolic age. In spite of the sensation it created and the discussion it caused, the movement remained for a long time within the pale of the Church; but as it grew in strength, penetrating from Asia Minor into Thrace, it naturally roused a stronger opposition and, in several places, synods were convened against it. Some persons considered it to have been caused by a demon, and employed exorcism against it, such as Sotae of Anchialus, Zoticus of Comane, and Julian of Apamea. Others attacked it in a literary way, such as Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and Miltiades. Gradually the very contrast to it developed—a party which rejected all Christian prophecy, and even denied the authenticity of the Gospel according to John on account of the Paraclete therein promised. At last, towards the close of the eighth decade, it became necessary for the Montanists to separate from the Orthodox Church in Phrygia, and form a schismatic congregation, organized by Montanus himself, which, however, did not stop the vehement literary polemics carried on against them by Serapion, Theodotus, and the Anonymous.
The first time the Montanists are spoken of in Western Europe is in those letters, which, during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, the confessors of the congregations of Lugdunum and Vienna sent from their prisons to Asia Minor and Rome. Between Asia Minor and the Gallic congregations there existed very intimate relations. Among the martyrs of Lugdunum and Vienna were several Phrygians. The principal object of the letters was, consequently, simply to inform the Christians of Asia Minor and Phrygia of the sufferings which their brethren in Gaul had endured. But, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 1), a kind of statement was added to the letters, of the view which the Gallic congregations took of the Montanist prophecy; and the presbyter Irenæus, who carried the letters to Rome, was enjoined to beg the Roman pope, Eleutherus, to continue in peaceful communication with the Asiatic congregations. Characteristically enough, Eusebius omits the statement; but every thing seems to indicate that the view it contained was very kind and mild. Now, in his book Adversus Praxeum, Tertullian speaks of a Roman pope, who, in opposition to the example of his predecessors, felt inclined to make peace with the Phrygian and Asiatic congregations, and recognize the prophecy of the Montanists, but was persuaded by the calumnies of the Monarchian Praxes to change his mind, and condemn Montanism. That Roman pope was probably the very same Eleutherus (174-189) to whom Irenæus was sent; and a condemnation of Montanism by Eleutherus would go far to explain the harsh measures which his successor, Victor, chose to employ in the paschal controversy. A Montanist congregation was at all events not formed in Rome; but the Montanist views of church discipline took, nevertheless, root there, and came more than once in conflict with the somewhat laxer practice of the Roman popes.

Condemned in Rome and in its native country, Montanism found a new home in North Africa, and its most prominent representative in Tertullian. He adopted all its views, and further developed them. The speedy advent of Christ, and the establishment of the millennium, are the fundamental ideas of his theology. A Christian church, which governs the world by slowly penetrating it, he does not understand. The living gift of prophecy, according to the divine plan of salvation, constitutes the true mediator between the times that are and the coming millennium; and the true preparation from the side of the Church is the establishment of a moral discipline which forces her members away from the whole merely natural side of human life. Science and art, all worldly education, every ornamental or gay form of life, should be avoided, because they are tainted by Paganism. The crown of human life is martyrdom. Fasts were multiplied, and rendered more severe. The second marriage was rejected, and the first was not encouraged. Against a mortal sin the Church should defend itself by rigidly excluding him who committed it, for the holiness of the Church was simply the holiness of its members. With such principles, Tertullian could not help coming into conflict with the Catholic Church. This is that in which the substance of the Church was the Holy Spirit, and by no means the episcopacy, whose right to wield the power of the keys he even rejected. Soon the conflict assumed such a form, that the Montanists were compelled to separate from the Catholic Church, and form an independent or schismatic Church. But Montanism was, nevertheless, not a new form of Christianity; nor were the Montanists a new sect. On the contrary, Montanism was simply a re-action of the old, the primitive Church against the obvious tendency of the Church of the day,—to strike a bargain with the world, and arrange herself comfortably in it.


MONTE CASINO. The celebrated monastery of Monte Casino, situated on a mountain of the same name in the province of Terra di Lavoro, fifty-five miles north-west of Naples, was founded in 526 by Benedict of Nuraia; which article see. In 580 it was totally destroyed by the Lombards; the monks barely escaping to Rome, where they remained for a century and a half, having been installed in the palace of the Lateran by Pope Pelagius II. In 719, at the reign of Gregory II., by abbot Petronax, it soon took rank, both in wealth and in literary and artistic distinction, beside its sister-institutions of St. Gall, Reichenau, and Corvey. Paul Warnefried, once the chancellor of the last Lombard king, Desiderius, became one of its innames, and wrote here his Historia Longobardorum. Abbot Bertharius (856-884) founded the hospital and the medical school, which for centuries were the chief institutions of their kind in the world. During his reign, however, the monastery was captured and plundered by the Saracens; and the monks were expelled. They lived for some time in Naples, then at Capua, and were finally brought back to Monte Casino by abbot Aligernus, 949-985. Under Frederic of Lorraine (1056-57), who became pope under the name of Stephen X., and his successor, Desiderius (1059-57), who became pope under the name of Victor III., the prosperity of the institution reached its point of culmination. The number of monks and pupils was much increased; the church was rebuilt with great splendor; and the place became, indeed, one of the centres of civilization. Under abbot Bruno (1107-11), Leo of Ostia wrote his Chronicon Casinense, and in the same century Petrus Diaconus wrote there his De viris illustribus Casi.
In 1349 the magnificent buildings of the institutions were destroyed by an earthquake, and about the same time the moral decay began. In the sixteenth century the monastery was principally known on account of its wealth. Four bishoprics, two principalities, 20 countships, 350 bishoprics, two principalities, 20 countships, 350

villages, 23 harbors, 33 islands, 200

castles, 440 villages, 23 harbors, 33 islands, 200

mills, and 1,662 churches belonged to it: the annual revenue of the abbey amounted to half a million of ducats. In 1866 the monastery was secularized. See GATTULA: Historia Abbatiae C., Venice, 1733; LUOGI TOSTI: Storia della Badia di M.C., Naples, 1843, 3 vols.; ANDREA CARAVITA: Prefetto del Archivio Casinense, Naples, 1870, 2 vols.

MONTES PIETATIS (Italian, Monte de Pietà; French, Mont de Piété, Table de Prêts) were a kind of charitable institutions where poor people could obtain small loans, on the security of pledges, without paying any interest. The first institution of this kind was founded by the Minorite Barnabas at Perugia, in 1484, for the purpose of rescuing poor people from the claws of the usurers: it was confirmed by Paul III., not, as often said, by Leo X. From the States of the Church the institution rapidly spread into Lombardy and Venetia, and thence into France, Germany, England, and Spain. Where the State has taken the control of the institution, a small interest is generally paid, sufficient to defray working expenses.

MONTESQUIEU, Charles de Secondat, Baron de, b. at the Château Le Bréda, near Bordeaux, Jan. 18, 1689; d. in Paris, Feb. 10, 1755. He studied law; was appointed councillor to the Parliament of Bordeaux in 1714, and became its president in 1716, but resigned his office in 1726, and devoted himself wholly to study and literature. After travelling for several years in Germany, Italy, and England, in order to make himself acquainted with the state of social and political development in those countries, he settled at La Bréda, from which he only made occasional visits to Paris. In 1721 appeared his Lettres persanes; in 1734, his Considerations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et leur décadence; and in 1748, after twenty years' preparation, his Esprit des Lois (of which twenty-two editions were sold in eighteen months), Eng. trans. by Thomas Nugent, new ed., Cincinnati, 1873, London, 1878, 2 vols.; and of all his works, London, 1777, 4 vols. The best collected edition of his works are those of Lefèbvre (Paris, 1816, 6 vols.) and Lequieu (Paris, 1819, 8 vols.). Montesquieu is generally mentioned among the so-called "Encyclopédistes," and he was, indeed, a contributor to the Encyclopédie Française; but spiritually he differed very much from that coterie. Though not a theologian, he was a student of religion, and well aware of its decisive influence on the character and history of a people. He accepted the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a divine revelation in Scripture, and his contempt of atheism was as pronounced as his contempt of superstition. His principal influence, however, he exercised, not on the science of religion or morals, but on social and political science.

MONTFAUCON (Montefalconius), Bernard de, b. at Soulacé, a village of Southern France, Jan. 15, 1655; d. in Paris, Dec. 31, 1741. He entered the army in 1772, and made two campaigns in Germany under Turenne, but joined the Congregation of St. Maur in 1767, after the death of his parents, and took the vows, May 18, 1767, in the monastery La Daurade in Toulouse. Having resided for some time at Soreze (where he studied Greek), La Grasse, and Bordeaux, he was in 1857 in St. Germain-des-Prés, the literary centre of the order. In 1868 he published his Analecta Græca; in 1690, his La vérité de l'histoire de Judith; and in 1698, his excellent edition of Athanassii Opera Omnia, 8 vols. fol., with biography and critical notes. He then went to Rome, where he stayed for three years; and while there he published with brilliant success his Vindiciae editionis S. Augustini a Benedictinis adorna in the attacks of the Jesuite. As shown by his Diarium Italicum (Paris, 1702), his visit to Italy considerably widened his studies, drawing also the monuments of antiquity within their range. The results thereof were, Palæographia Graeca, 1709 (a masterpiece, by which he at once founded and perfected a new department of science); Bibliotheca Christiana, 1715; L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures, 1719, 10 vols. fol. (with about 40,000 illustrations): Les Monumens de la monarchie françoise, 1729–33, 5 vols. fol. (unfinished). Meanwhile he did not neglect his work as an editor, publishing his Collectio nova Patr. Græc., 1709, 2 vols. fol.; Hexaplorum Origenis qua; supersunt, 1713, 2 vols. fol.; and J. Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, 1718–38, 13 vols. fol. See TASSIN: Histoire de la congre. de St.-Maur, 855–616. GEORG LAUBMANN.

MONTFORT, Simon de, one of the leaders of the fourth crusade; protested against the employment by the Venetians of the crusading army in their war with the Byzantine Empire; and finally separated from the crusaders, and went on his own hook as a pilgrim to the Holy Land. By Innocent III. he was made leader of the crusade against the Albigenses; beginning his career with the capture of Béziers (July 22, 1209), where every living soul was slaughtered, and ending it by the siege of Toulouse (June 26, 1218), where he was struck by a stone from a catapult, and killed. He was one of the most cruel and unscrupulous soldiers known to history; but he was daring and dashing, and fanatically attached to Romanism. He has, consequently, by Roman Catholic writers been exalted as the true champion of Christ; and his followers even reproached God with his death. See his biography in GUIZOT: Mémoires relatifs à I'Histoire de France.

MONTGOMERY, James, an English religious poet and hymn-writer; b. at Irvine, Ayrshire, Nov. 4, 1771; d. at Sheffield, April 30, 1854. His father was a Moravian missionary; and both he and Mrs. Montgomery died at Barbadoes in 1793, while the son was at school in Fulneck, the chief Moravian settlement in England. He resisted the thought of becoming a clergyman, and was apprenticed to a grocer in Mirfield. Running away, he became a shop-boy at Wath, Yorkshire; from there went to London, and, after returning to Wath, finally settled at Sheffield (1792), where he became proprietor and editor of a paper, — The Iris. In 1789 he was sentenced to prison for three months, and to pay a fine of twenty pounds, for having printed a poem, — The Bastille, — surrounded by a woodcut representing Liberty and
the British Lion. He was soon after again sent to prison for six months, on account of reflections upon a colonel of militia, published in his paper. In spite of these exhibitions of judicial condemnation, when he retired from the editorial care of his paper, in 1825, he was entertained at a public banquet, and at his death received the honors of a public funeral. In 1830-31 he delivered a series of lectures, on poetry and literature, before the Royal Institution. In 1846 a life pension was settled upon him, of a hundred and fifty pounds. Like Cowper, he was never married. He made no public profession of religion till his forty-third year, when he united with the Moravians, but ever afterwards prominently advocated the work of missionary societies and other Christian institutions. He was eminent for his piety; a "character in whom was as much of the beauty of holiness as it was given to any one mortal to attain and exhibit." (Dr. A. P. Peabody, in North-American Review, 1887).

Mr. Montgomery was one of the best sacred poets of his day; and although Jeffrey, in 1807 (Edinburgh Review), condemned the shallow taste which read his poems, and prophesied speedy oblivion for their author, Southey, Professor Watson, and others, spoke enthusiastically of the blending of piety and a fine imagination in his productions. Professor Wilson, in Blackwood's Magazine, said, "His poetry will live, for he has heart and imagination profound. . . . Montgomery, of all the poets of this age,— and we believe, also, out of it,— is in his poetry the most religious man. All his thoughts, sentiments, and feelings are moulded and colored by religion. A spirit of invocation, prayer, and praise, pervades all his poetry; and it is as sincere as it is beautiful." Among his larger poems are Prison Amusements, 1797 (written during his first imprisonment in York Castle); The Ocean, 1805; The Wanderer of Switzerland, etc., 1806 (condemned unsparringly by Jeffrey, but known by heart by William Cullen Bryant); The West Indies, 1810 (commemorating the abolition of that slave-trade); The World before the Flood, 1813; Greenland (founded on the history of Moravian missions, 1819), etc. Mr. Montgomery is now known chiefly by his hymns, which have passed into all collections. Many of them first appeared in newspapers, and were collected in The Songs of Zion, being Imitations of the Psalms, 1822; The Christian Psalmist, or Hymns, Selected and Original, Glasgow, 1825; and Original Hymns for Public, Private, and Social Devotion, London, 1853. Among his best are the missionary hymns, "O Spirit of the living God," "Hail to the Lord's Anointed" (read by the poet at the close of a speech at a missionary meeting in the Wesleyan Chapel, Liverpool, April 14, 1822, and put by Dr. Adam Clarke, who was presiding, in his Commentary on Ps. lxix.), the fine advent hymn, "Angels from the realms of glory," "Forever with the Lord," etc.

Editions of Mr. Montgomery's works were published between 1818 (3 vols.) and 1855 (4 vols.); a Memoir, with extracts from his writings and journals, by Holland and Everett, London, 1855-56, 7 vols.; and an abridgment of this work, by Mrs. Knight, Boston, 1857.

MONTGOMERY, Robert, an English religious poet; b. in Bath, 1807; d. at Brighton, Dec. 8, 1855. In 1828 appeared his poem, The Omnipresence of the Deity (2d ed. 1856), which gained a rapid popularity; which was soon followed by other poems, as Satan (1829). In 1830 he entered Lincoln College, Oxford; took orders; was appointed curate of Whittingham, 1835; preacher at Percy Chapel, London, 1836, where his preaching was very popular, and preacher of St. Jude's Chapel, Glasgow, 1838. Among Montgomery's other numerous poetical works are, A Universal Prayer; Death; A Vision of Heaven; A Vision of Hell (1828, 4th ed., 1829); The Messiah (1832, 5th ed., 1842). His poems were the subject of a withering criticism by Macaulay (see Essays), but received the commendation of Southey. Collected edition of his Poetical Works, London, 1841-43, 5 vols. Mr. Montgomery also assisted in the translation of Nietzsche's System of Christian Doctrine, 1849.

MONUMENTAL THEOLOGY denotes the study of artistic monuments of various descriptions,—inscriptions, coins, medals, statuaries, paintings, architectural constructions, etc., so far as they are expressive of theological ideas. A mere glance at the medieval cathedral of Europe and to the modern meeting-house of America shows, that though, in the congregations which built those houses of worship, the piety may have been the same, the theology was certainly not; and a further comparison cannot fail to lead to a definite conception of the theological differences, since the very outlines of the structures show that they were made to meet different wants, built to realize different ideas. Thus, the study of the literary monuments of theology may at every point be aided by the study of the corresponding artistic monuments. In some cases it will be supplemented (a great portion of the history of the Church of Rome during its first centuries has been dug out of the Catacombs): in others it will be strikingly illustrated. It is impossible to visit, for instance, a royal burial-place in a Protestant country in Europe without being struck at the glaring difference between the tomb of the last Roman-Catholic and the tomb of the first Protestant prince; and an impression of what the Reformation was and meant will, like a stream of living blood, gush, with its vivifying power, through the shadowy ideas derived from the reading of the literary documents of the event. Intuition is the one great spiritual fertiliser. Two plain tombstones from some out-of-the-way village cemetery—one from 1783, and one from 1888—may tell more impressively than any heavy volume could do, what rationalism and evangelicism really are, and how they affect human life.

It was the great excavations and comprehensive archaeological researches which were undertaken in Rome during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and more especially the works of Onufrio Panvinio (De praecipuis urbis Romae sanctioribus basilicis, 1554), and Antonio Bosio (Roma soterrae, 1652), which first drew attention to the theological importance of many architectural monuments; and already Baronius, in his Annales (1588-1607), not unfrequently derives his proofs from coins, paintings, etc. The enthusiasm with which classical archæology was studied from the very first days of the renaissance benefited also the study of ecclesiastical archæology. The great works of
MONUMENTS.

Montfaucon — Antiquité expliquée, 1719 (reaching down to the fifth century of our era), and Les Monuments de divers monarques français, 1729 — contain much of specific theological interest. Special art subjects of distinctive theological character, such as sacred painting, attracted general attention, and were frequently treated. (See Rohr: Pictor errans, Leipzig, 1879; and Ayala: Pictor christianus, Madrid, 1780.) When illuminated manuscripts were printed, the miniature pictures were reproduced. (See the Greek Menologium, edited by Cardinal Alboni, Rome, 1727, the Syrian Evangelarium, edited by Assemani, Florence, 1742, etc.) Indeed, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the artistic monuments of the Church become not only a recognized, but also a highly-valued portion, of the materials employed by the theologian, especially the church historian. (See Felliccia: De ecclesiastica politia, 1777.) In the nineteenth century the study has been developed into an independent branch of the theological system. (See Piper: Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie, Gotha, 1867.) Museums have been formed in Berlin, 1854, at Cologne, 1860, etc.; and, though very rarely taught as a peculiar department, monumental theology everywhere receives great attention, both in lectures and text-books. See J. F. LUNDT: Monumental Theologie, New York, 1876, new edition, 1881; J. N. DIETFOLDER: Theologie u. Kunst im Urchristenthum, Augsburg, 1882; cf. art. by F. Piper, Theologie, monumentale, in the first edition of Herzog, vol. xvi. pp. 752-807.

MONUMENTS are found among all peoples and in all ages. They are generally very simple, — a stone set up, or a heap of stones. Many such reminders of important events are mentioned in the Bible. Thus Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones to "witness" their covenant (Gen. xxxi. 45-46). Moses ordered the elders to set up stones on Mount Ebal, upon which the "law" was inscribed (Deut. xxxii. 1-4). Joshua fulfilled the request (Josh. viii. 32). Twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan, and twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, commemorated the passage (Josh. iv. 3, 9). Samuel and Saul erected stones in memory of victories (1 Sam. vii. 12; xv. 13). Others were also erected in memory of the dead (Gen. xxxv. 20; 2 Kings xxi. 17). In old times, as now in the East, stones were thrown upon the graves of enemies (Josh. vii. 20, viii. 28; 2 Sam. xviii. 17). Heaps of stones also marked the way (Jew. xxi. 15). (See Schrader: Der babylonische Ursprung der siebenlagigen Woche, in Studien und Kritiken, 1874.)

But it is certain that their use was made up of twelve moon-months of twenty-nine and a half days. Some passages, however, as, for instance, the account of the age of Enoch (Gen. v. 23), indicate, that, at a very early time, the Hebrews were also acquainted with the solar year; and it cannot have been a long time before they observed that the seasons depended on the revolution of the sun (according to old parlance), and not on that of the moon. The discrepancy between the solar and the lunar year they then smoothed over by means of an intercalary month. (See the art. YEAR.) The day of the return of the new moon was always, from the oldest times, a day of note, and is mentioned along with the sabbath in Amos viii. 5, 2 Kings iv. 23; but only the seventh new moon was celebrated as a special day of festival (Lev. xxixii. 24; Num. xxix. 1). All the great annual festivals, however, — Passover, Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Day of Atonement, etc., were celebrated on fixed days of the month.

Of the idea, so very common among the peoples of antiquity, that the moon was the cause of the dew, and generally exercised a mysterious influence on vegetation, there is no direct trace in the Old Testament; but passages like Ps. lxxxi. 6, 15, show that the Jews and Moabites, with a mind on the idea, preserved a connection between the moon and certain diseases. With respect to the worship of the moon, very old among the Semitic peoples, — according to some, even older than the worship of the sun, it was forbidden in Deut. iv. 18, xvi. 3. Nevertheless, Josiah put down a number of idolatrous priests who burnt incense to the sun and the moon and the planets (2 Kings xxii. 15); and Jeremiah complains (vili. 2) that there were people in Jerusalem who worshipped both the sun and the moon. Job xxxi. 27 speaks of another form of the moon-worship, — throwing kisses at her, instead of burning incense to her, which chimes well in with the general Semitic idea of the goddess of the moon.

WOLF BAUDISIN.

MOORE, Clement Clarke, LL.D., b. in New York, July 15, 1779; d. in Newport, R.I., July 10, 1865. His father was Rev. Henry Moore, of the diocese of New York (1748-1816). He was graduated from Columbia College, 1798; and from December, 1821, to June, 1850, he was professor in the General Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New-York City,— first of Hebrew and Greek, afterwards of Oriental and Greek, literature. The ground upon which the seminary now stands was his gift. He was the author of the first Hebrew lexicon published in the United States (Hebrew and Greek Lexicon, New York, 1808, 2 vols.), and of the famous ballet, familiar to American children, called the "Visit from St. Nicholas," beginning, "'Twas the night before Christmas, when all through the house." He also edited a collection of his father's sermons, 1824, 2 vols.

WOLF BAUDISIN.

MOORE, Henry, an early Wesleyan minister; b. in Dublin, Dec. 21, 1751; d. in London, April 27, 1844. He joined the Wesleyan movement, and in 1780 was an itinerant upon the Londonerry circuit; but later in London, as the constant companion of John Wesley, he did most efficient service. After Wesley's death, he figured promi-
MORAL LAW. The meaning of the word "law," when applied to the sphere of moral action, is by no means identical with the juridical sense of the term. On the contrary, whenever an attempt has been made, theoretically or practically, at establishing perfect congruity between morality and legality, the results have proved disastrous; for the word "law" changes its sense as it moves from one sphere into another.

In nature and natural science, law means simply a formula expressing the invariable recurrence of the same effect from the same cause. It involves a necessity which admits of no exceptions,—a must which cannot be resisted. When rising from the realm of natural forces to the sphere of social agencies, the law may still be said to involve necessity, but only so far as, on the principle of justice, it is enforced by the state. The difference is apparent. While the laws of nature accomplish themselves, as inherent, constitutive elements of the very forces in action, the laws of the state can be accomplished only by the free will of man. Their necessity depends upon the power of compulsion and punishment which the state is possessed of,—upon something outside themselves. Their must is in reality simply a shall.

We designate this stands the moral shall; and yet it differs more widely from juridical law than does the latter from natural law. Juridical law recognizes the free will of man, but only as it recognizes any other natural fact. In principle it rejects it, being willing, under all circumstances, to transform its shall into a must; and, by compulsion and punishment, to enforce itself in spite of the freedom of the human will. Moral law, on the contrary, recognizes the free will of man, not only as a fact in nature, but as the very condition of its own realization. Under no circumstances can it dream of transforming its shall into a must; for where the shall begins there morality ends. Compulsion, punishment, and other means of enforcing a law, can reach the act only in its external manifestation, not in its inner motive and purpose; and there lies its morality. Even when moral law demands with absolute authoritative necessity, obedience to it, that obedience to it shall be the very manifestation of the freedom of the will.

But whence does this shall come? Is not its very existence an inextricable enigma? A feeling of compulsion is quite comprehensible when produced by external forces which affect the soul in a certain way. All our sensations come to us under this form. We are impressed from without; we become conscious of the impression; we feel that the act of consciousness is a necessary result of the impression: but that feeling of compulsion has nothing strange about it. Quite otherwise with the moral shall. It is not come to us from without; it cannot be reduced to an impression from some external object; and, what is still more extraordinary, in spite of its authoritative and obligatory character, it does not impress us with a feeling of compulsion. From the very depths of the soul it seems to rise; and it sounds like an appeal to our freedom, or, rather, like a hint at the right use of the freedom, accompanying its hints, as it were, with light shadows of pleasure and pain. How is it, then, to be explained?

Every creature has a purpose for which it was created, and which is expressed in its organization, and shall be realized in its life; and from the very purpose of man's existence and life, inherent in his organization, bodily and spiritual, the moral shall arises. It is the spark produced when the soul is touched by her own purpose. Representing the course of all human ambition, so far as that goal can be reached by free human activity, the moral shall indicates at every point what we have to do, or not to do, in order to develop in consistency with our own nature, and accomplish the purpose of our being; and, as we accept or neglect its hints, the shadows of pleasure and pain enter our conscience, and fill it with light or darkness. The sceptic, the sensualist, the materialist, may ask, How can such a thing as the purpose of human nature and of human life—that is, a thing which is not, but only shall be—produce a feeling, and make felt its own existence, though it is not existing? The answer cannot be given directly. But all these wants and cravings and impulses, on which organized life in general, the whole activity of plants, animals, and men, depends—what are they but movements of the inherent purpose of the organization towards realization?

MORAL PHILOSOPHY is a term generally used to designate philosophical ethics, in contradistinction from theological or Christian ethics. Its object is to find an absolute rule of conduct outside of religion, independent of divine revelation, in the very nature of man. The problem arose in Greece, when the Greek mythology (that is, the Greek religion) had lost its hold on the civilized portion of the people; and the Greek philosophy produced two typical solutions,—the Epicurean and the Stoic,—which, in the course of time, have exercised an incalculable influence, not only on ethical speculation, but on the practical morals of individuals, classes, and ages.

Both these systems agree in determining the happiness of the individual as the final goal of moral conduct; but, in the definition of what individual happiness is, they differ widely from each other. To the Epicurean, happiness is enjoyment, the greatest possible amount, consequently prudent, and even calculating; while to the Stoic, happiness consists in an inner self-sufficiency, which not only can afford to despise enjoyment, but which also enables to endure suffering.
MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

ecumenism (most easily accessible to the student through the works of Horace Lucretius, and Cicero, who, however, was not an Epicurean, but an eclectic) has always exercised its greatest attraction on men of a light and sanguine temperament, and found the most adherents among rich and ambitious people. It is, however, not only the elegance and comfort of life which are deeply indebted to Epicureanism: also art, poetry, and science owe much to it. On the other hand, it has been the father of unspeakable debaucheries, and the cause of great ruin. Stoicism (most easily accessible through the works of Seneca, Epicurus, and Marcus Aurelius) attracts chiefly characters of a more serious and sombre hue, and has found its most eminent disciples among practical people, men of power, statesmen. Its influence on art, and even on science, has been comparatively small; but it has produced not a few great ideas, political, social, and moral, which Christendom has recognized and adopted.

In the history of Greek philosophy, the Epicurean and Stoic schools, respectively founded by Epicurus and Zeno, were preceded, the former by the Cyrenaics (founded by Diogenes), the latter by the cynic school (founded by Antisthenes). The centre of the whole development, however, is occupied by Plato and Aristotle; and especially the latter is of paramount importance in the history of moral philosophy. He also determines the highest moral end as happiness: he is, indeed, the father of the happiness-principle. But he defines happiness as activity, not as enjoyment or self-sufficiency,—as an activity which at every point hits the mean between two opposite extremes, such as is determined by the intellect. To him, man is principally a political being, and can realize his highest moral aims only in the state. Thus the individual becomes absorbed by the family, and the family again by the state; that is, morals become absorbed by politics. Though the direct influence of Aristotle on practical life may be rather small, all ethical speculation borrowed from him.

The middle ages had, properly speaking, no moral philosophy. Though the forms, and, with some modifications, also the ideas, of the Aristotelian ethics, were retained by the schoolmen, the subject was generally treated as an appendix to dogmatics. (See Ethics.) But the renewal of the study of antiquity, and the enthusiasm which the classical literatures, and more especially their philosophy, produced, soon called forth a desire to construct an independent philosophical foundation for the ruling moral code; and in the seventeenth century modern moral philosophy was fairly started by Hugo Grotius and Hobbes, though in an indirect way, and from a rather political point of view. The gross and outspoken materialism of Hobbes, amounting almost to a materialism of Hobbes, amounting almost to a complete a priori from the conception of human nature, and a posteriori from the fact of its universal acceptance, appeared in a more definite shape and with a more direct moral bearing. The moral law, they protest, is an inherent part of human nature; and it is inscrutable and authoritative, because, as a part of human nature, it is a creation of God. With Hobbes there began in England a very lively debate on moral philosophy, which has not yet ended, and which, especially in the eighteenth century, produced a very rich and varied literature. It is characteristic of this debate, that the question is not so much about the end of morals as about its sources,—Whence comes the feeling of duty? what is duty? Answered in various ways, the question generally leads to the assumption of a special moral organ,—a moral sense (Francis Hutcheson), a conscience. The existence of a moral sense, a conscience, cannot be doubted; but, unfortunately, the question is not thereby fully answered, because, irrespective of the different degrees of development, the moral sense is never perfectly alike in any two individuals; and when a longer interval, for instance, a period of some centuries, is allowed to intervene, conscience may give, and has given, completely contradictory decisions.

With Kant's "categorical imperative," moral philosophy made a great conquest. That principle broke the back of Aristotle, of the happiness-principle, and utterly destroyed the reigning eudemonism. It demonstrated obedience to duty, regardless of happiness, as a peremptory demand of reason. It determined, once for all, the whole subjective or formal side of duty; but of the objective side of the idea of the contents of duty, it tells us nothing. One may learn from Kant to obey his duty; but he cannot learn what his duty may be, if he happens to be uncertain on that score. A principle was still wanting from which positive duty could be deduced with the same authority to reason as divine revelation exercises over faith. After the time of Kant, however, two remarkable attempts have been made of demonstrating such a principle, and establishing moral philosophy on a basis independent of religion; namely, Utilitarianism, and the application of the theory of Evolution to ethics: which two articles see.


MORAL THEOLOGY. See CASUISTRY.

MORAVIAN CHURCH, the name by which the United Brethren (Unitas Fratrum) are generally known.

I. HISTORY. — This church, which must not, as is often done, be confounded with the United Brethren in Christ, is a resurrection, in a new
form, of the Bohemian Brethren (q. v.), who flourished from 1457 to 1627 in Bohemia and Moravia, and from 1549 to 1700 in Poland. At the beginning of Luther's Reformation, they numbered about 400 parishes and 200,000 members, were using their own Hymnal and Catechism, and employing two printing-presses for the spread of evangelical literature. In the spirit of frequent persecution on the part of the Roman Catholics and Utraquists, they increased in number, and grew in influence, until they obtained legal recognition (1600). One of the ends for which they labored was a closer fellowship among Protestants. They succeeded in effecting an alliance, based on the Consensus Sendomiriensis, among those of Poland (1570). This alliance, however, bore no abiding fruits. The anti-Reformation, inaugurated by Ferdinand II., overthrew the Brethren as a visible organization in Bohemia and Moravia (1627); but they continued in Poland and Hungary to the end of the seventeenth century. At the same time there was preserved in their original seats a "hidden seed," which kept up, as far as possible, the tenets and usages of the fathers, held religious services in secret, and prayed for a resuscitation of the church. Such prayers were heard. In 1722 two families named Neisser, led by Christian David, "the servant of the Lord," fled from Moravia, and, by invitation of Count Zinzendorf (q. v.), settled on his domain of Berthelsdorf in Saxony. About three hundred Brethren, in the course of the next seven years, emigrated from Moravia and Bohemia to the same place. They built a town called Herrnhut, or "The Watch of the Lord," and were joined by a number of other Protestants from various parts of Germany. This settlement became the centre of the Renewed Brethren's Church. In addition to the fact that its nucleus consisted of descendants of the Bohemian Brethren, such a renewal was brought about by the adoption of the leading features of their constitution; by the introduction of their discipline, as set forth in the Ratio Disciplinae of Amos Comenius; and of much of their liturgy as found in the German hymnals; by appropriating their doctrine in the same a union of believers representing the old Brethren's Church by Bishop Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, with the concurrence of Christian Sitkoviæus, these two being the survivors of the old succession. As concerns the doctrinal tendency, the noteworthy fact may be added, that the Lord's Supper is still projects which he had formed for the extension of God's kingdom looked in a different direction. It was only after these projects had failed that he was made to see that Herrnhut, to use his own words, constituted "the parish to which he had from all eternity been fore-ordained." By that time, however, there was gathered a body of Christians, not exclusively descended from the Bohemian fathers, but representing a union of the Slavonic element of the Ancient Brethren's Church with the German element of Pietism. In the very nature of the case, therefore, a new and different development began. It was shaped by Zinzendorf. He had, indeed, declared that he would do all in his power to fulfill those hopes of a renewal of the Brethren's Church which filled the heart of its aged bishop Comenius; but at the same time he was by conviction a Lutheran, and had adopted Spener's idea in its deepest import,— of establishing ecclesia in ecclesia. This idea he carried out to ends of which its originator had never thought. He and his coadjutors were not to interfere with the State churches, and yet, on the other, they were not to interfere with the State churches, but to set forth within the same a union of believers representing the old Brethren's, the Lutheran, and the Reformed elements,— one Unitas Fratrum. Accordingly he did not allow the Brethren to expand as they had expanded in their original seats; but exclusive Moravian towns were founded, where no one but a member owned real estate, and the Church controlled, not only their spiritual concerns, but also their industrial pursuits. In such towns a high type of piety was developed. They fostered a missionary spirit, which sent messengers of the gospel to the most distant parts of the heathen world, and found fields at home, through the so-called "Diaspora," on the continent of Europe, and, through domestic missions, in Great Britain and America. They educated in their boarding-schools thousands of young people not connected with the Moravian Church; and, during the long and dreary period of rationalism, they afforded a sanctuary for the old gospel, with its blessed promises and glorious hopes. At the same time there occurred an appearance of a self-satisfied spirit, which, on the one hand, looked upon the Moravians as "a peculiar people" in an extraordinary sense, and, on the other, took acceptance with God for granted, as belonging of necessity to all the members of a church in which the Saviour was pre-eminentely made the central figure of theology and of practical religion, and his name literally constituted a household word. For a brief period (1745-49), known as "the time of sitting," and in a few of the settlements, a far greater evil manifested itself. Fanaticism broke out among ministers and people. It did not lead them into gross sins, but gave rise to the most extravagant conceptions, especially as regarded the atonement in general, and Christ's wounded side in particular; to the most senseless, puerile, and objectionable phraseology and hymns; and to religious services of the most reprehensible character. Such fanaticism Zinzendorf himself unwittingly originated by the fanciful and unwarranted ways in which he expressed the believer's joy and the love which the pardoned sinner bears to the Saviour. But, when he and his coadjutors began to realize the magni-
tude of the evil, they earnestly labored to bring back the erring ones to the sober faith and reverent love taught by the Scriptures. Such efforts were crowned with success; and the entire restoration of the church to spiritual health formed the best answer to the many attacks made upon it at that time and for a long period afterward, in part by well-meaning theologians, and in part by scurrilous enemies.

Zinzendorf was consecrated a bishop in 1737, and during his lifetime practically stood at the head of the church, although he had many assistants; and synods, of which he had the principal control, were often held. After his death, the synods assumed their proper position, and the executive power was vested in elective boards. The polity which he had introduced kept the Unitas Fratrum numerically small; but it was gradually established in Saxony, Prussia, Denmark, Baden, Switzerland, and Russia. In all these countries, except Switzerland, the exclusive system was introduced: on the part of their governments, liberal concessions were granted. There are fifteen exclusive settlements on the continent of Europe, and nine other Moravian churches.

Turning to Great Britain, we find that the Moravians established themselves in that kingdom in 1735; chiefly through the labors of Peter Bohler, who became God's instrument in leading John Wesley to a knowledge of the truth. In 1779 they were acknowledged, by an act of Parliament, in full fellowship with the church of England. In 1782, a church was organized in New York; and in 1784 another in Pennsylvania. They established, on the same plan, Hope in New Jersey (which enterprise proved a failure), and Salem in North Carolina. Their other churches are, as a rule, elected to the governing boards, thirty-four in number, never introduced the German polity.

Georgia was the colony in which the Moravians began their work in North America (1738); but they soon relinquished that field, and came to Pennsylvania (1740), where they built Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Lititz, in which three towns the exclusive system was introduced. Subsequently, they established, on the same plan, Hope in New Jersey (which enters, a town, and a failure), and Salem in North Carolina. Their other churches were free from the trammels of this polity. It was totally relinquished in 1844 and the subsequent years. During the century in which it continued, it necessarily kept the church small in this country also: since its relinquishment, the Moravians have increased rapidly, and during the last twenty years have doubled their membership. The number of their churches is seventy-eight.

II. GERMAN MORAVIAN TOWNS. — Although the exclusive system on the continent of Europe has undergone modifications which seem to point to its eventual abolition, its essential features are still maintained. The membership, “according to difference of age, sex, and station in life,” is divided into classes, called “choirs,” from διαδοχή. At the head of each choir stands an elder, or, in the case of a female class, a deaconess, charged with its spiritual interests. Special religious services are held, and an annual day of covenanting and praise is observed. Such classes, or choirs, are maintained in other Moravian churches also. Every settlement has a Brethren’s, a Sisters’, and a Widows’ House, which supply the inmates with comfortable homes at moderate charges. A Sisters’ House is inhabited by unmarried women, who maintain themselves by work suited to their sex; and a Brethren’s House, by unmarried men, who carry on various trades. There are two superintendents for each house,—the one looking after the religious concerns of the inmates, who are bound by no vow, and can leave at option; the other managing the temporal affairs. The financial and municipal interests of a settlement in general are directed by the Board of Overseers, with the warden as its president; while spiritual matters are looked after by the Elder’s Conference, with the senior pastor as its president. Religious services for all the inhabitants are held every evening in the church.

III. THE CONSTITUTION, MINISTRY, RITUAL, AND USAGES. — (a) In 1857 the entire constitution of the Unitas Fratrum was remodelled. It embraces three provinces,—the German, the British, and the American. They are locally independent, but together constitute one organic whole in regard to doctrine, the fundamental principles of discipline and ritual, and the foreign missionary work. Hence there is a general and a provincial government. The former consists of a General Synod (meeting every ten years at Herrnhut, and attended by delegates from all the provinces, as also from the foreign mission-field) and of an Executive Board. This Board is called the “Unity’s Elders’ Conference,” and has four departments, two of which (the Departments of Missions and of the Unity) are elected by the General Synod; and, as this conference is at the same time the executive board of the German province, the other two by its Provincial Synod. The Department of Missions superintends the foreign missionary work; and the Department of the Unity, the British and American provinces, in all such matters as come within the legislative scope of the General Synod. In the British and American provinces, provincial concerns are managed by their own synods and executive boards, known as Provincial Elders’ Conferences.

(b) The ministry consists of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Unordained assistants, whether men or women, are formally constituted acolytes. The Moravian episcopacy is not diocesan, but represents the entire Unitas Fratrum. Hence bishops have an official seat, both in the synods of the provinces in which they reside, and in the General Synod, and can be appointed only by this body, or by the Unity’s Elders’ Conference. In the bishops is vested exclusively the power of ordaining. They constitute a body whose duty it is to look to the welfare, and maintain the integrity, of the Unitas Fratrum in all its parts, and especially to bear it on their hearts in unceasing prayer before God; and although they are not, ex officio, connected with the government, they are, as a rule, elected to the governing boards over which they preside.

(c) The ritual is liturgical in its character. A litany is prayed every Sunday morning. Special services, at which offices of worship are used, distinguish the festivals of the ecclesiastical year, certain “memorial days” in the history of the Moravian Church, and the annual days of covenanting of the choirs. The hymnology is rich, and church music very fully developed. Some of the most celebrated is: A Sister’s House, Zinzendorf, Countess Zinzendorf, Spangenberg, Louise von Hayn, Gregor, James Montgomery,
IV. Doctrine. — The Moravian Church does not set forth its doctrines in a formal confession of faith, as was done by its Bohemian fathers; but the cardinal points are found in its Catechism, in its Easter Morning Litany (Schaff’s Creeds, ill. p. 789), and in its Synodical Results, or code of statutes drawn up by the General Synod. The doctrines of the total depravity of human nature, of the love of God the Father, of the real Godhead and real humanity of Jesus Christ, of our reconciliation to God and our justification by faith through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost and his operations, of good works as the fruit of the Spirit, of the fellowship of believers, of the second coming of the Lord, and of the resurrection of the dead unto life or unto condemnation, are deemed to be essential. (Spangenberg: Exposition of Doctrine, London, 1784; Plitt: Glaubenslehre, Gotha, 1863; Plitt: Zinzendorf’s Theologie, Gotha, 1860–74, 3 vols.)

V. Enterprises of the Church. (a) Schools. — There are in the three provinces 47 boarding-schools for young people not connected with the Moravian Church, at which schools about 2,500 pupils of both sexes are annually educated. Each province has a theological seminary.

(b) Foreign Missions. — Although three Protestant missions existed prior to the Moravian missionary work, such enterprises were all undertaken in connection with the planting of colonies. The Moravians were the first Protestants who went among the heathen with no other purpose in view than that of winning. In 1732 Leonard Dober and David Nischemann (q.v.) inaugurated on the Island of St. Thomas that work to which the church still clings, and by which God has wonderfully blessed. At various times, missions — in the service of which large amounts of money were spent, and many lives sacrificed, but which eventually proved unsuccessful — were undertaken in the following countries: Lapland (1734–86), shores of the Arctic Ocean (1757–88), Ceylon (1735–41), Algiers (1740), Guinea (1737–41 and 1767–70), Persia (1747–50), Egypt (1752–89), East Indies (1750–84), and the Caimuck territory (1758–1823). The field, at the present day, embraces the following seventeen mission provinces: Greenland (1738), Labrador (1771), Indian Country of North America (1784), St. Thomas and St. John (1782), St. Croix (1782), Jamaica (1784), Antigua (1786), St. Kitts (1775), Barbadoes (1785), Tobago (1786, renewed 1827), Dominica (1793), Leeward Islands (1796), Mosquito Coast (1848), Surinam (1785), South African Western Province (1768, renewed, 1792), South African Eastern Province (1825), Australia (1849), and West Himalaya (1853). The annual cost of this extensive work is about $290,000. This amount is made up of the contributions of the members of the church, by gifts from friends of the cause, by grants from missionary societies in the three provinces, by the interest of funded legacies, and by the missions themselves through voluntary donations and the profits of trades. The London Association in aid of the Missions of the United Brethren, founded in 1817, is composed of members of various churches, not of Moravians, and contributes about $25,000 a year. The Brethren’s Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel among the Heathen, founded in England in 1741, supports the mission in Labrador, and owns a missionary vessel, which has now been annually sailing to that distant coast for a hundred and thirteen years without encountering a serious accident. The converts are divided into four classes,— new people (or applicants for religious instruction), candidates for baptism, baptized adults, and communicants. In the year 1889 the extensive field in the West Indies will cease, in consequence of an enactment of the General Synod of 1878, to be a mission, and will be constituted the fourth self-supporting province of the Unitas Fratrum. According to the latest statistics, the seventeen mission provinces comprise 115 stations and 307 additional preaching-places; 7 normal schools, with 70 scholars; 215 day schools, with 16,616 pupils, 215 teachers, and 634 monitors; 94 Sunday schools, with 13,355 pupils and 884 teachers; 312 missionaries, male and female; 1,471 native assistants; and 78,846 converts.

(c) Bohemian Mission. — This work was begun in 1870. At first it advanced very slowly, on account of the restrictions imposed through the Austrian laws. In 1880 these restrictions were removed, and the Unitas Fratrum was legally acknowledged by that same government at whose hands it received its death-blow in the anti-Reformation. This mission embraces 4 stations, an orphan-house, 4 missionaries, and 246 members.

(d) Leper Hospital. — In 1851 the Moravians took charge, in Jerusalem, of a hospital, previously established, for lepers. This institution is supported by contributions from the three provinces.

(e) Diaspora (from δασπορα, in 1 Pet. i. 1), a work carried on by the German Province, and having for its object the evangelization of the State churches on the continent of Europe, without depriving them of their members. Evangelists itinerate through the various countries of Germany, through Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Livonia, Estonia, and other parts of Russia, visiting, preaching, and organizing “societies.” This mission embraces 61 central stations, 92 laborers, and about 80,000 “society members.”

VI. Statistics. — The Three Home Provinces: 269 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 97 undained assistants, male and female, in various departments of church-work, not counting teachers; 30,741 souls. Foreign and Bohemian Missions: 415 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 20 ordained assistants; 140 undained assistants; 1,471 native assistants; 78,892 souls. The Unitas Fratrum, therefore, numbers in all 414 bishops, presbyters, and deacons; 1,739 male and female assistants (together, 2,153 laborers); and 107,633 souls and has, besides, about 90,000 souls in its Diaspora societies.
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BISHOP K. DE SCHWEINITZ.

MORE, Hannah, Miss (often printed Mrs., i.e., Mistress, — a term of respect formerly given to ladies, married and unmarried); b. in Stapleton, Gloucestershire, Feb. 2, 1745; d. in Clifton, Sept. 7, 1833. She was educated at Bristol by her father, who was the village schoolmaster. At the age of sixteen she produced a pastoral drama, entitled The Search after Happiness (not published until 1773), and in 1774 the tragedy, The Inflexible Caprice (which was acted for one night at Bath), and several poems; in 1778, a tragedy, Percy (brought out by Garrick, and played for fourteen nights); and in 1779 her last tragedy, The Fatal Falsehood: both the latter were played at Covent Garden. But, her views having changed, she declared that she did not “consider the stage, in its present state, as becoming the appearance or countenance of a Christian; on which account she thought proper to renounce her dramatic productions in any other light than as mere poems.” Henceforth she turned her attention to religious themes and non-dramatic poetry, and wrote very many pieces, long and short. Of these the most famous are the popular stories as Parley the Porter, Black Gilesthe Poacher, Cheap Repository, begun at Bristol, 1795. Such stories as Parley the Porter, Black Gilesthe Poacher, and, above all, The Shepherd of Salsbury Plains, have not only been very widely circulated, but have endeared their author to many households. Not read much to day, but once very popular, are Thoughts on the Manners of the Great, 1788; Religion of the Fashionable World, 1795; Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education, 1799; Hints toward forming the Character of a Young Princess, 1805 (she had been recommended by Bishop Porteus for governess to the little Princess Charlotte, daughter of George III.; but court-etiquette required a lady of rank for this position); Celest in Search of a Wife, 1809 (ten editions sold in first year); Practical Piety, 1814; Christian Morals, 1812; Essay on the Character and Writings of St. Paul, 1815; Modern Sketches, 1819.

When she gave up writing for the stage, she also turned her back upon the fashionable and brilliant society in London, in which she had lived as a favorite for five years, and retired to Bristol, and then, in 1796, to her “little thatched hermitage” at Cowslip Green, at Wrington, ten miles from Bristol. There, in 1790, she was joined by her sisters, who had long kept school at Bristol. In 1792 they all moved to Barley Wood. In 1809, Hannah More, who surmounted her sisters, removed to Clifton, where she died.

Hannah More was in every way a remarkable woman. She was considered one of the great reformers of contemporary manners and morals. Her philanthropic labors were abundant and successful. In conjunction with her equally devoted sisters, she “devised various schemes of benevolence and usefulness; and at the least of which was the erection of schools, which, though at first confined to the children of their immediate surroundings, soon extended their operations over no less than ten parishes where there were no resident clergymen, and in which upwards of twelve hundred children were thus provided with the benefits of moral and religious education.” The More sisters, aided by their friends, also distributed Bibles and prayer-books. Hannah More received, it is said, upwards of thirty thousand pounds sterling for her writings, and bequeathed ten thousand pounds sterling for charitable purposes. A writer in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (8th ed.) thus speaks of Hannah More as a writer:

“The works of Hannah More have always been highly esteemed by the religious world; and she is generally considered as one of the most distinguished of that class of writers who unite great piety with considerable literary talent, and dedicate the creation of fancy, as well as the deduction of reason, to the service of religion. Her poetry is not much praised. Her prose is justly admired for its sententious wisdom, and the dignified religious and moral fervor which pervades it.”

The Complete Works of Hannah More appeared, London, 1830, 11 vols.; a Selection, 1847-49, 9 vols.; Miscellaneous Works, 1840, 2 vols. There are two American editions of her works, Philadelphia (Lippincott's) and New York (Harper's). Her life was written by WILLIAM ROBERTS (1834, 4 vols.; 3d ed., 1838, 2 vols.), also by H. THOMPSON (1838), and by Mrs. R. SMITH (1844).

MORE, Henry, the Cambridge Platonist, b. at Grantham, Lincolnshire, Oct. 12, 1614; d. at Cambridge, Sept. 1, 1687. He was educated at Eton, where he passed (1631) to Christ's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A., 1635, and M.A., 1639, followed immediately by a fellowship. He spent the remainder of his life in the university, acting as private tutor, frequently to persons of rank. From his father he inherited the advowson of the rectory of a Younger Princess. He also declined to accept a bishopric which his friends had obtained for him. For a very short time in 1675 he held a prebend's stall in Gloucester's cathedral, and this was his single preferment.

A great charm attaches to this modest and devoted man. He passed through a remarkably religious experience, — from strict Calvinism to theosophy and mysticism, — yet without injury to his profoundly pious nature. He lived a very secluded life, but by no means a selfish or lazy one. "His very chamber-door was a hospital to the needy; " and "work after work sprung with easy luxuriance from his pen." He was very learned, although much was merely curious and really worthless lore. He delighted in Cabalism, and in discovering secrets and mysteries where
none existed. But, withal, he made real progress in things divine, and was by more than one holy man considered as the "honestest person upon the face of the earth." Principal Tulloch calls him the "most poetic and transcendent, and, on the whole, the most spiritual looking, of all the Cambridge divines." Like some other geniuses, e.g., Calvin, he formed his system of thought in early manhood, and maintained his loyalty to it through life. More's Philosophical Poems, published in 1659, appeared in 1662, 4th ed., 1712. In 1708 appeared his Theological Works, according to the Author's improvements in his Latin edition. In 1892 appeared his Discourses on Several Texts of Scripture. His Life was written by Rev. Richard Ward, London, 1710. See particularly the exhaustive study of Henry More by Principal Tulloch,— Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century, vol. ii., 300-400—and President Porter, in Ueberweg as above; also Mullinger: Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century, London, 1867, chap. iv.

MORE, Sir Thomas, the author of the Utopia, and martyr of the old faith; the son of a judge of the King's Bench; was b. in London about 1480; suffered on the block July 6, 1535. He was educated, in part, in the house of Cardinal Morton, who sent him to Oxford. He became closely identified with the advocates of the new culture,—Grocyn, Linacre, and Colet,—and entered into intimate relations with Erasmus. At his father's solicitation, he studied law at New Inn and Lincoln's Inn, and in 1503 became a member of the House of Commons; but, drawing upon himself the anger of Henry VII., he retired for the time from political life. Erasmus found him translating sayings of Lucian, writing biting epigrams, engaged in ascetic exercises, and contemplating the assumption of the cowl. But his healthy nature led him to marry in 1507, and resume the practice of law. He translated the works and life of Pico of Mirandula, defended Erasmus and his New Testament against the attacks of the Louvain professor Dorpius, and secured a royal order making the study of Greek obligatory at Oxford (1518). Henry VIII., whose accession he had welcomed in a poem, attached him to his court in 1518.

In 1516 More wrote his famous work, the Utopia, the type of many national romances. In the form of a dialogue with one Raphael, who has visited the Island of Utopia in the South Seas, he criticised the national and social state of England, and promulged a new system. Plato's republic was in his mind. He affirms perfect freedom in his island, the equal obligation of work, and a communion of goods. The marriage relation he left untouched; but women were to have the equal privilege of exercising the functions of the priesthood and arms. Religious freedom also existed in his island, and differences in religious forms; and the only condition of citizenship was a belief in immortality and God. The Utopia, written at a time when it had already been urged by Wolsey to enter the service of the king, was a programme of political and social reforms.

Luther appeared between the completion of
More's *Utopia* and the beginning of his political activity, and there is little doubt that the doctrinal principles and stormy agitation of the German Reformation changed More's position. He soon became the champion of the Catholic party in England, and published, in answer to Luther's reply to Henry in 1528, the *Responsio ad concinacia Lutherti*, which demonstrated that he could use more condemnatory epithets in good Latin than any other man in Europe. He defended the doctrines and all the ceremonies of the Catholic Church in his *Dialogue* (1559) and smaller writings against Tyndale, Frith, and others. The king held him in high estimation, and at the fall of Wolsey, in 1529, delivered to him the great seal of chancellor. In the matter of the king's divorce with Catharine of Aragon, More at first refused to give a judgment on its lawfulness, and resigned his office (1532) on the plea of ill health. His character was above reproach. It was, in spite of the legal process, a legal murder. In his trial, abnormal charges were brought against him; and, when it became apparent that Henry was going to break with the Pope, he was accused, with Bishop Fisher, of having been mixed up with the Maid of Kent; but it appeared that he had merely visited her as a saint, and given her some money to pray for him, and he was exonerated.

More and Fisher were now recognized throughout the land as the heads of the Catholic party. In March, 1534, they were summoned to swear to the Act of Succession. More was willing to assent to the transfer of the succession to Elizabeth, but he did not altogether escape the wrath of the sovereign. He was arrested, and accused of heresy. By means of the rack he was induced to recant, but immediately repented, and retracted his recantation. As new attempts of conversion failed, and the Roman-Catholic clergy loathed to bring his case out before the public, he very conveniently died in his cell from poison. He was, nevertheless, burned the next day in the Place Notre Dame. 

**MOREL, or MORELLI, Jean Baptiste,** a native of Paris, who, having embraced the Reformation, sought refuge in Geneva towards the middle of the sixteenth century. Of his personal life very little is known; but he became suddenly noted by the publication of his *Traité de la discipline et police chrétienne*, 1561. In direct opposition to Calvin, but closely imitating the constitution of the first Christian church, he demanded that all great questions of doctrine, morals, or government, which might arise in a congregation, should not be decided by a more or less hierarchically organized consistory or presbytery, but by the congregation itself, by the application of universal suffrage. Calvin, to whom he presented the manuscript, declined to read "so long an exposition of a subject already decided by the word of God;" and Morelli, who realized the danger of publishing the book in Geneva, went to Lyons, and had it printed there. It produced an immense sensation, and was immediately rejected and condemned by the national synod of Orleans, 1562. Having returned to Geneva, Morelli was summoned before the consistory, convicted of heresy, and excommunicated; after which the case was handed over to the civil authorities. His book was publicly burned by the hangman; and any one who owned a copy of it was ordered to deliver it up immediately, under penalty of the severest punishment. Meanwhile the author himself had been prudent enough to leave the city, but he did not altogether escape the wrath of Calvin and Beza. He obtained a position at the court of Navarre as tutor to the son of Jeanne d'Albret; but the remonstrances of Beza induced her to dismiss him, 1566. The synods of Paris (1569) and Nîmes (1572) also condemned the book, but at the same time it evidently began to arouse the interest of the laity. See *Waddington: Romus, Paris, 1855*. Of the author nothing further is heard. He seems to have died some years later in England.

**MOREL, Robert,** a native of Auvergne, 1663; d. at St. Denis, Aug. 29, 1731; entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1672, and was
appointed librarian at St. Germain-des-Prés in 1680, and afterwards, prior of the convent of Meulan, but retired to St. Denis in 1699, having become completely blind. Some of his devotional books are still read, - *Effusion de cœur, 1710; Entréeïa spiritualis* (three collections), 1720-22; *Imitation de Jésus Christ, 1722*, etc.

**MORESTSHIKI** *(self-immolators)*, a fanatical sect of Siberia and other portions of Russia, so called from the custom of voluntary suicide in a pit filled with combustibles on fire. Such a death is believed to insure a happy immortality. The ceremony of self-immolation takes place once a year in a retired spot.

**MORETI, Louis**, b. at Bargemon, in Provence, March 25, 1649; d. in Paris, July 10, 1690; studied literature under the Jesuits at Aix, and theology at Lyons, in which latter city he was ordained a priest, and preached for several years with success. He published a collection of poems, a translation of Rodriguez's *Christian Perfection*, a new edition of the *Lives of Saints*, etc.; but his great work which at once made him a literary lion, was his *Dictionnaire Historique* (1737, 1 vol.; last ed., by Drouet, 1759, 10 vols. fol.). It was translated into Spanish and English. The latter translation is by Jeremy Collier, London, 1701, 2 vols.

**MORGAN, Thomas**, one of the exponents of the later English deism; d. at London, Jan. 14, 1743. Little is known of his life. He was for a time pastor of a Presbyterian church, but lost his position in 1720, on adopting Arian views. He practised medicine for a time, especially in Bristol, and then went to London, where he gave himself up to literary work. He is remembered by his theological work, *The Moral Philosopher* (3 vols., London, 1737-40), in which he vigorously advocates the belief in God as the creator, preserver, and regent of the world, and combats atheism. But he recognizes only one infallible proof of the divinity of a doctrine, - its moral truth and inherent reasonableness. That which distinguishes him from the other deists is, that he finds a great gulf between the Old and New Testament. The Mosaic religion is a very low type of religion; and the Mosaic law a narrow type of religion; and the Mosaic law an oppressive system, in which there is nothing true or good. In general, he minimizes the dignity of the religion, history, and God of the Old Testament. The Christianity to which he pays homage is a purely rational system, consisting of ethical elements, and purified of the dregs of Judaism. In his view, everything that is untrue and impure in traditional Christianity was derived from Judaism. Paul was the truest Christian, because the least a Jew; and he was a veritable free-thinker. In his system, Morgan approached very close to Maréchal. See *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Whiston, 1749*; *Leland: Desitcal Writers*; *Lechler: Gesch. d. Deismus.*

G. LECHEL.

**MORGANATIC MARRIAGES** are those between a man of superior and a woman of inferior rank; in which it is stipulated that neither the latter, nor her children shall enjoy the rank, or inherit the possessions, of her husband. The adjective comes from *morgane*, a corruption of the old High-German *morgengebo* (*morning gift*), a kind of dowry paid on the morning before or after the marriage.

**MORIAH** *(appearance of Jehovah)*, the hill upon which Abraham offered his son Isaac according to divine direction (Gen. xxii. 2), and on which, later, the temple was built (2 Chron. iii. 1). By "the land of Moriah," in the first passage, is meant the "land in which Mount Moriah was" (cf. "the land of Jazer, Num. xxxii. 1"). Moriah was probably not the usual designation of the temple hill, because it does not occur in the pre-exilic books. See *Temple*.

**MORIGIA, Jacobo Antonio de.** See *Barnabites*.

**MORIKOFER, Johann Kaspar**, b. at Frauenfeld, Thurgan, Switzerland, 1799; d. at Zurich, Oct. 17, 1877. He was successively rector of the city school of his birthplace (1830), pastor in Gottlieben (1853), in Winterthur (1870), and in Zurich. He wrote several valuable and laborious books upon Swiss literary and ecclesiastical history, based upon previously unused or little-used sources, and written in a sober but attractive style. The chief of them are *Die schwierzische Literatur des achzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1861; *Bilder aus dem kirchlichen Leben der Schweiz*, 1864; *Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen*, 1867-68, 2 vols. (an excellent work); *Johann Jacob Breitinger, Zürich, 1874*; *Geschichte der evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz*, 1876.

**MORIN, Étienne**, b. at Caen, Jan. 1, 1625; d. in Amsterdam, May 5, 1700; studied theology and Oriental languages at Sedan and Geneva; was pastor of the Reformed Congregation of St. Pierre sur Dive, near Lisieux, afterwards at Caen; and became, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when he sought refuge in Holland, professor of Oriental languages in Amsterdam. Of his numerous writings, the principal are *Dissertationes* (Geneva, 1683), *Exercitaciones de lingua primaeque* (Utrecht, 1694), *Explanazioni sacre* (Leyden, 1698), a life of Bochart, in the Opera Bocharti, etc.

**MORIN, Jean**, b. at Blois, 1591; d. in Paris, 1650; belonged to a Reformed family, and studied theology at Leyden, but was disgusted at the controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians; embraced Romanism, and entered the Congregation of the Oratory. He was for many years employed by Urban VIII. in his negotiations with the Greek Church, but acquired his greatest fame as a writer; though the violence with which he attacked the Masoretic text of the Old Testament, and exalted the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, caused much opposition. His principal works are *Exercitaciones in utrumque Samarianorum Pentateuchum* (1651), *Exercitaciones de hebraica graeceque textus sinceritate* (1653), *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis* (1682), with his life, etc. He also edited and translated the Samaritan Pentateuch in Le Jay's version.

**MORISONIANS.** See *Evangelical Union*.

**MORLEY, George, D.D.,** b. in London, 1597; d. at Chelsea, Oct. 29, 1684. He was graduated M.A. at Oxford, 1621; was chaplain to the Earl of Carnarvon, 1628-40, then to Charles I., who made him a canon of Christ Church, Oxford. He remained with the king through his troubles, and declined to sit in the Westminster Assembly. He was imprisoned in 1648, left England the
following year, nor returned until he was sent by the Royalists, during the protectorate of Richard Cromwell, to win over the Presbyterians to the episcopal form of government and to the use of a liturgy. This mission was all the more congenial to him, as he believed Charles II., whose chaplain he had been at The Hague, to be a sincere Churchman. He had also to employ all his dexterity in keeping the Royalists, naturally impatient and restless on the eve of the Restoration, from ruining his design by injudicious actions. Dr. Morley was rewarded by Charles II. with the successive appointments, in the same year, to the deanery of Christ Church and the bishopric of Worcester. In 1661 he sat in the Savoy Conference, and led on the bishops' side in the debates. He had also to employ all his temper soon brought him into violent conflict with the Duke of York, who emigrated from Jerusalem to America in B.C. 600, during the reign of King Zedekiah. In the battle alluded to, the Nephites were exterminated, with the exception of a few individuals. The descendants of the victorious Lamanites are the North American Indians. The Book of Mormon is claimed to be the condensed record, made on golden plates by the prophet Mormon, of the history, faith, and prophecies of the ancient inhabitants of America. These plates he intrusted to Moroni his son. Moroni survived the awful battle of extermination. He died the last of the Nephites, but, before dying, hid up the golden plates in the hill Cumorah, the very site of the final battle between the Nephites and Lamanites, where two hundred thousand of the former had been slain. Among the records of the Book of Mormon are accounts of three migrations to the American continent: 1. Of Jared, who came over from Jerusalem about eleven years after Lehi. The book also contains accounts of the coming of Christ among these early Americans, about A.D. 34 and 35, and his repeating his Sermon on the Mount, and his appointment of twelve American apostles, and his giving orders to them personally touching baptism by immersion, and his holy communion. The buried golden plates in Cumorah, in the Western part of New York State, were discovered by Joseph Smith, Sept. 22, 1823; and on Sept. 22, 1827, he secured them, took them to his home, translated their contents, which were said to be in "reformed Egyptian," and printed and published them as the Book of Mormon. In discovering and securing the treasures, it is claimed he was guided and helped by an angel, perhaps by the spirit of Moroni himself, who had died fourteen hundred years before. And, after the translation was completed, it is understood that the angel resumed the custody of the original plates. Joseph Smith, the Mormon sect, was born in Sharon, Windsor County, Vt., Dec. 23, 1805. He had six brothers and three sisters. In 1815 his father moved to Palmyra, and afterward to Manchester, contiguous towns in Ontario (now Wayne) County, N.Y. In 1820 an unusual religious excitement prevailed in Manchester and the region round about. Five of the Smith family were awakened, and united with the Presbyterians. Joseph, in his own account of his early life, says he "became somewhat partial to the Methodist sect." He says he prayed to be guided aright; and that finally two heavenly messengers bade him not to join any sect, and three years afterwards, another celestial visitant outlined to him about the golden plates he was to find, and the prophet he was to be. This was on Sept. 22, 1823; and from this time on, he avers, his days and nights were filled, and his life was guided, by "visions," "voices," and "angels." The hill Cumorah was about four miles from...
Palmyra, between that town and Manchester. Here, in the fall of 1827, he claimed he unearthed the golden plates. For more than two years, by the aid of the "Urim and Thummim" found with them, he was engaged in translating their contents into English. In March, 1830, the translation was given into the printer's hands. This is the original form of the book of Mormon. What light it will appear to others may be gathered from the following extract, never before published, from the records of the proceedings before a justice of the peace of Bainbridge, Chenango County, N.Y.: —

"People of State of New York vs. Joseph Smith. Warrant issued upon oath of Peter G. Bridgman, who informed that one Joseph Smith of Bainbridge was employed in looking for mines, but the major and had been at the house of Josiah Stowel in Bainbridge most of time since; had small part of time been employed in looking for money, but the major part had been employed by said Stowel on his farm and going to school; that he had a certain stone, which he had occasionally looked at to determine whether any hidden treasures were in the bowels of the earth; that he professed to tell in this manner where gold-mines were a distance under ground, and had looked for them several times, and informed him where he could find those treasures, and Mr. Stowel had been engaged in digging for them; that he found the digging part at Bend and Monument Hill as prisoner represented it; that prisoner said that it was in a certain root of a stump five feet from surface of the earth, and with it would be found a tail-feather; that said Stowel and prisoner thereupon commenced digging, found a tail-feather, but money was gone; that after money moved down; that prisoner did offer his services; that he never deceived him; that prisoner looked through stone, and discovered Josiah Stowel's house an chest houses while at Palmyra, at Simpson Stowel's, correctly; that he had told about a painted tree with a man's hand painted upon it, by means of said stone; that he had been in company with prisoner digging for gold, and had the most implicit faith in prisoner's skill." Horace Stowel sworn. Says he see prisoner look and proposed looking through another stone which prisoner laid a book open upon a white cloth, and proposed looking through another stone which was white and transparent; hold the stone to the candle, turn his back to book, and read. The deception appeared so palpable, that we were disgusted, finding the deception so apparent. Prisoner pretended to him that he could discern objects at a distance by holding this white stone to the sun or candle; that prisoner looked into a hat at his dark-colored stone, as he said that it hurt his eyes.

"Jonathan Thompson says that prisoner was requested to look Yeomans for chest of money; did look, and pretended to know where it was, and that prisoner, Thompson, and Yeomans went in search of it; that Smith arrived at spot first (was in night); that Smith looked in hat while there, and when very dark, and told how the chest was situated. After digging several feet, struck upon something sounding like a board or plank. Prisoner would not look again, pretending that he was alarmed the last time that he looked, on account of the circumstances relating to the trunk being buried came all fresh to his mind; that the last time that he looked, he discovered distinctly the two Indians who b forgave, and in view of one of the prisoners he discovered a quarrel ensued between them, and that one of said Indians was killed by the other, and thrown into the hole beside of the trunk, to guard it. Thompson says that he believes in the prisoner's professional skill; that the board which he struck his spade upon was probably the chest, but, on account of an enchantment, he kept away from the chest while digging; that, notwithstanding they continued constantly removing the dirt, yet the trunk kept about the same distance from the chest. Says prisoner said that it appeared to him that salt might be found at Bainbridge; and that he is certain that prisoner can divine things by means of said stone and hat; that, as evidence of fact, prisoner looked into his hat to tell him about some money witness lost sixteen years ago, and that he described the man that witness supposed had taken it, and disposition of money. And thereupon the Court finds the defendant guilty."

While digging for treasure at Harmony, Penn., he boarded in the house of Mr. Isaac Hale. On the 18th of January, 1837, he married the daughter, Emma Hale, much against her father's wishes, having been compelled to take her away from her home for the wedding. In 1828 Martin Harris, a farmer of Palmyra, was supposed to have the manner of said stone; that he found the digging part at Bend and Monument Hill as prisoner represented it; that prisoner had looked through said stone for Deacon Attelon, and Cowdery ordained him. And, in 1829 Oliver Cowdery, a school-teacher of the neighborhood, filled the same office. On May 15, 1829, by command of an angelic messenger calling himself John the Baptist, Smith baptized Cowdery, and then Cowdery baptized him. Afterwards he ordained Cowdery to the Aaronic priesthood, and Cowdery ordained him. And, in process of time, it is claimed, Smith received the Melchizedek priesthood at the hands of the apostles Peter, James, and John. Some of the prophet's family, and some of a family named Whitmer, in Fayette, Seneca County, N.Y., became converts; and on April 6, 1830, in Whittmer's house, the Mormon "Church" began its history. That day it was organized, with a membership of six, — the prophet and two of his brothers, two Whittmers, and Oliver Cowdery. Within a week or two the first miracle of the "new dispensation" was wrought; the prophet casting out a devil from Newell Knight of Colesville, Broome County, N.Y., whose visage and limbs were frightfully distorted by the demoniacal possession. In December, 1830, Sidney Rigdon, a Campbellite preacher in Ohio, became a convert. Rigdon was erratic, but eloquent; self-opinionated, but well
versed in the Scriptures; and in literary culture and intellectual force was the greatest man among the early Mormons. He was born in Pennsylvania, and was twelve years older than Smith. Thereafter the next set strengthened and spread. Joseph was a veritable Numa Pompilius in the frequency and stress of the "revelations" he received for the guidance of his people in things great and small. Kirtland, O., two miles from Rigdon's previous cure, was the first "gathering-place" of the saints. In 1831 the settlement was made there; and in the same year Jackson County, Mo., became the seat of another rendezvous. But, wherever the Mormons "gathered," in no long time quarrels ensued between them and the surrounding Gentiles. These arose, for the most part, from the claims of the Mormons to be a chosen people and under special divine prerogatives, and acting upon them. They were the Lord's saints, and the earth is the Lord's. They were led by an inspired prophet. Therefore, whenever the day of election for civil officers came, they must vote solidly the Whig or the Democratic ticket, as the leader should indicate. It is obvious to any one knowing of the fierce zeal of partisan politics, how this course on the part of the Mormons would subject them to constant embroilments with surrounding citizens. In 1843 the Saints carried their arrogance so far as to nominate Joseph Smith for President of the United States. And everywhere the outcome was the same,—expulsion and banishment, with more or less of outrageous violence. Those that had settled in Jackson County were driven out (1200 of them) into Clay County, in 1839; thence, after three years, into Caldwell County; and in 1839 from Missouri entirely. Meanwhile those that settled at Kirtland were also driven from Ohio in 1838; then all fled, and gathered at Nauvoo, a place built by them, on the Mississippi River, in Illinois. Here they remained for five years, and built up a considerable town, and erected a spacious temple. But the animosities engendered and perpetuated by the theocratic claims of the Saints culminated in the cruel murder of their prophet Joseph and his brother Hyrum, by a mob, in the jail at Carthage, near Nauvoo, June 27, 1844. The two were defenseless prisoners, and the governor of the State had pledged to them safe conduct to the jail and before the court; and their murder was a most foul assassination.

The martyr-like death of Joseph Smith threw a mantle of dignity over his person and a halo of control, sought not to take into their own hands any measures of vengeance for the murder of their chief. After recovery from the first consternation over the awful tragedy, they began to ask themselves, Who shall rule the church?

The "First Presidency" had been Joseph Smith, with Hyrum Smith and Sidney Rigdon his counselors. Rigdon alone was left. Of the "twelve apostles," Brigham Young was one, and their president. Young hurried to Nauvoo from a "mission" that he was conducting in the Eastern States. By his shrewd sense, firm will, and practical ability he carried all before him. Rigdon, who had been charged with disaffection, even in Joseph's day, was put down, and cut off. The quorum of the twelve was pronounced to be the earthly guide of the church, and Brigham became at once the acknowledged leader.

Brigham Young was born in Whittingham, Windham County, Vt., June 1, 1801, and was one of a family of eleven children,—five sons and six daughters. His father removed to Sherburne, Chenango County, N.Y., in 1804, and the family grew up in the latter State. In his twenty-second year, Brigham became a Methodist. In 1831 and 1832 all the members of the family joined the Latter-Day Saints. On the 14th of February, 1835, at Kirtland, Brigham was made one of the newly organized quorum of the apostles. In 1844, when forty-three years old, he became the Mormon chief. He was strong where Smith was weak; viz., in prudence, sagacity, common sense, practical energy. These natural Cromwellian qualities he brought to the front, and put and kept in force. He wasted no time in getting and giving "revelations." Only one "revelation" proper is on record as promulgated by him.

After the prophet's death, the Gentiles were not a whit more willing for the Mormons to sojourn among them. Contentions, existing and threatened, waxed rather than waned. Brigham's practical sense promptly decided that his people must flee away to some remote region, where collisions and conflicts should cease; and his sturdy will and untiring energy bent themselves to carry out the decision. Early in 1846 he and his people began to leave Nauvoo. Gradually they were massed on the Missouri River, near what is now Council Bluffs. Their chief encampment there they called "Winter-Quarters." And in 1847 Brigham and a hundred and forty-two "pioneers" pushed resolutely westward over a wilderness track of eleven hundred miles, and arrived in the Great Salt Lake Valley on July 24. Ever since, that day is the great day for celebration to Utah Mormons, quite eclipsing July 4. A few wintered in the valley: most, including Brigham, returned to "Winter-Quarters." In 1848 he led four thousand of the faithful to Utah; and there he lived and ruled in right kingly manner for thirty years, dying Aug. 29, 1877.

At his death the quorum of the twelve apostles became the ruling body of the church. Brigham Young, as "president," had two counselors, or vice-presidents, who with him constituted the "First Presidency." But it is now an understood thing, that, when a president dies, the First Presidency falls, and rulership devolves upon the quorum of the twelve. John Taylor, who was in jail with the Smiths when they were killed, and who was himself wounded, was president of this quorum, and as such was chief of the church...
from Brigham's death until Oct. 10, 1880. At this last date he was chosen president of the church, and there, Oramon and Joseph F. Smith his counsellors. The present (1881) quorum of the twelve consists of the following, with one vacancy:—

Wilford Woodruff (president), Orson Pratt (made one of the first quorums at Kirtland, Feb. 1835), G. Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith the prophet of the present twelve who was a member of the first twelve), Charles C. Rich, Lorenzo Snow, Erastus Snow, Franklin D. Richards, Brigham Young (son of the late president), Albert Carrington, Moses Thatcher, Francis M. Lyman, John H. Smith.

The Book of Mormon, and Book of Doctrine and Covenants. — These comprise the inspired writings, which, as modern "revelations," the Mormons place by the side of the ancient Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Their own account of the Book of Mormon has been given above. The usual belief is, that the most of it, as written, letter for letter, one Solomon Spaulding, a Presbyterian clergyman of Western Pennsylvania. He had been accustomed to maintain that the aborigines of America were the descendants of some of the tribes of Israel; and, in a time of infirm health, he wrote a kind of romance supporting this view. This he called the Manuscript Found, and tried to publish. In his work was much repetition of phrases common in Scripture, such as, "and it came to pass," and also the use of the names Lehi, Nephi, Moroni, Lamanites, etc. There is substantial evidence of the above-named facts. It is supposed that this manuscript fell into the hands of Joseph Smith, and that he, and perhaps Sidney Rigdon and others, introduced into it, and appended, in a style savoring strongly of revivalism, the large portion found in the Book of Mormon, touching the Lord Jesus Christ's descent in America soon after his ascension from Judaea, and his organization of another apostolate, and establishment of another church, and his reiteration and enlargement of his wishes, doctrines, and commandments.

The Book of Doctrine and Covenants is the collection of all the multifarious "revelations" that Joseph Smith claimed to have received, and promulgated, together with the one only written "revelation" put forth by Brigham Young, viz., at "Winter-Quarters" in 1847, to inspire and guide the Saints in their projected western pilgrimage through the wilderness.

Theoretically the Mormons hold the Bible and these two books to be the divinely inspired "Scriptures," of authority, and for guidance, the Old Testament as addressed particularly to the Jewish Church; the New Testament, to the Judaic and European Christian Church; the Book of Mormon, to the "American" Christian Church; and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, to the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

But practically, authority and guidance for them emanate from their living leaders; and few of either chiefs or masses read any of the four sacred books in order to know and ponder and follow by recorded doctrine. The Saints are anthropomorphists, teaching plainly that God exists in form of a man. Brigham once boldly preached, "Adam is our Father and our God, and these of us who are alive today have to do." They are Arians, making Jesus the Son of God, but of another and different substance from the Father. They are Macedonians, esteeming the Holy Spirit as no person, but only an influence or emanation. They believe in the pre-existence of human spirits. Multitudes of these spirits are now in a waiting place, desiring to come to earth; for it is only through the way of fleshly embodiments that they can reach the final bliss of their perfected being; hence it is a work of great benevolence to pro-
and give your eternal exaltation in spite of earth and hell.

They believe the day of miracles has not ceased, but that many such have been wrought, especially healings of the sick, in the time and by the power of this "Latter-Day" dispensation. And they believe in giving one-tenth of their income and increase to the building of the temples, and insuring the progress of the church.

Schisms.—One only that is of any considerable importance now exists, known as the "Josephite." The Josephites are so called after Joseph Smith, the son of the prophet, their chief. They call themselves the "Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints." They have headquarters at Plano, Ill., and maintain a few preachers in Utah, who do not, however, make much headway. They repudiate polygamy (say that the prophet never taught it), brand Brigham as a "false prophet," and claim they are the right line of succession of the father in the leadership of the church. Just after the prophet's death there were Rigdonites and Strangites, resisting Brigham's assumption of the succession. And in Utah there have been Morrisites, reproaching Brigham that he was so barren of "revelations," and Godbeites, refusing to submit to Brigham's dictation in the domain of matters civil and commercial. But the Josephites alone, as an organized body, have been able to withstand dissolution.

Statistics.—When the Mormons entered the Valley of the Salt Lake, in 1847, the region belonged to Mexico. By the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in March, 1848, it and a good deal of other territory was ceded to the United States; but no civil government was provided by Congress until the Organic Act, of Sept. 9, 1850, created the Territory of Utah. More than a year before this, the Mormons organized forthemselves the "State of Deseret" (a word meaning honey-bee in reformed Egyptian), elected Brigham governor, and sent a delegate to Washington to ask admission into the Union.

Utah has an area of 84,476 square miles. By the United States census of 1880, its population is 74,470 males, and 69,436 females; total, 143,906. Of these, perhaps 18,000 are Gentiles. Then, besides the 125,000 Mormons in Utah, probably there are 25,000 more in the Territories of Idaho, Arizona, and Wyoming, and in the States of California, Nevada, Iowa, and Illinois. And, in addition to the 150,000 in America, doubtless as many more of the Saints are to be found in the Kingdom and Colonies of Great Britain, and in Scandinavia, Germany, Switzerland, and the Sandwich Islands, making about 300,000 of them in all. Mormonism was first preached in Great Britain by the apostles Kimball and Hyde, in 1837. And from the first, the British mission, and of late the Scandinavian mission, have been most vigorous for not avenging the death of Joseph Smith, or righting the persecution of the Saints. The drama is continued for nearly a whole day, and these Mormon "mysteries" are well calculated to imprint themselves deeply and sternly upon the fanatic congregations admitted to them. It is not too much to claim the secret "endowment" ceremonies as a powerful agency in weaving around the participants an iron band of awe and dread, of slavish obedience and compulsory brotherhood, and in ministering an unpatriotic, if not treasonable, bent to the Mormon system.

The Father, passing the angels who stand as sentinels, being enabled to give them the key-words, the signs and tokens, pertaining to the holy priesthood, and gain your eternal exaltation in spite of earth and hell.
The corner-stone of the great temple at Salt Lake, to be built of splendid granite, and with foundation-walls twenty feet thick, was laid April 6, 1853. It is about half finished, and has already cost more than $1,500,000. The laws of Utah pay nearly $1,000,000 of tithing yearly. A perpetual emigration fund is managed by the authorities of their church. As early as 1858, there were in it $34,000. From this fund loans are made to the poorer Saints abroad to make possible their emigration. When they get to Utah, they are obligated to pay back the loan into the fund as promptly as possible.

Present Sources of the Strength of Mormonism. — It may suffice to mention three principal ones.

1. Religious Earnestness. — It is a mistake to count the Mormons a mere horde of sensualized barbarians. Sidney Rigdon was a type of the fervent religious enthusiasm which pervaded the belief and obedience of the early converts. And the British mission especially has always had, and now has, in a large number of devout, God-fearing priests. The members of the Church present itself as a winnowing van, and the fair-weather followers disappeared. It is remarkable how much of contentment, temperance, heroism, and striving after the golden age of a real brotherhood, remained, and pushed hopefully westward. It is true, that the religious fanaticism of the Mormons entails deplorable results. It calls for implicit obedience to the “priesthood;” and that kind of obedience changes fair-minded and kind-hearted men into unjust and unfeeling agents of a despotism. Witness the exceptional favor with which the “blood atonement” idea, viz., that it is good to slay the body to save the soul, is regarded in the Mormon community. And the same “obedience” fired the whole people, in 1857, to the fierce resolve not to allow their governor, Brigham Young, to be superseded by his lawfully appointed successor, Cumming. And the adventurers brought out of the United States troops, under Col. Sidney Johnston, to enter their territory. And witness the atrocious massacre, in the fall of 1857, at Mountain Meadows, of a hundred and twenty men and women, emigrants of Arkansas en route to California, and into the dastardly murder of Dr. K. Robinson in Salt Lake City, in October, 1866. So fanaticism outworks frenzy and cruelty. And yet, without doubt, the element most promotive of vigorous unity among the Mormons, making them strong to bear, and tenacious to hold, and powerful to act, is the firm belief in the hearts of the masses, that these are the “latter days,” and they are the chosen saints thereof, wielding the powers, and holding forth the knowledge, of the true faith for this world, and getting ready for a no distant supreme exaltation in the next.

2. Organization. — One need not study long to note how thoroughly and skilfully organized for power the Mormons are. One will directs. (In Brigham’s time this was pre-eminentely true.) And by ecclesiastical communications and telegraphic wires the direction is speedily known unto the utmost limit of the land of their habitation, and promptly the entire massed bodies move in the line directed. Meetings of the high councils, quorums, bishop’s courts, teachers, etc., are everywhere held with great frequency. So a vivid and intelligent interest in the “church” is perpetuated throughout all the valleys and outlying districts. Petty offices abound in the system: greater offices are rewards. Twice every year, on the 6th of October, general conferences of the whole body are held. At each and every one of these, the people, by a show of hands, vote to sustain the principal officers: their organization; but the “quorums,” in private sessions, have arranged all these names beforehand. At each conference, also, scores of names are promulgated of those called as missionaries to go abroad to preach the “gospel.” And within a month or two all these go, largely without purse or scrip; and they do preach fervently, and successfully make converts. And the income from tithes builds meeting-houses and tabernacles and temples, and furnishes supplies to fill up gaps, and tide over difficulties in working the system. The Perpetual Emigration Fund is of most practical efficiency to swell their numbers, and increase their strength.

There is no organization on earth, unless it be that founded by Ignatius Loyola, that is so well fitted as the Mormon to interest and keep loyal its members, to combine their faculties and forces, and to move that combination with efficiency and power whithersoever one master will dictates.

3. Polygamy. — In one sense, polygamy is a weakness to Mormonism. It arrays woman’s nature in rebellion to the system, and arouses the detestation of Christian civilization. And since 1862 it has put the Mormons in the attitude of disobedience and defiance to the laws of their country. There are no laws of Utah Territory against polygamy, and, indeed, no territorial laws whatever about marriage anyway. All the members of the territorial Legislature being Mormons, this is to be expected. From 1847 to 1862, therefore, it may be said that the Mormons in Utah violated no statute law in practising polygamy. But in 1862 Congress enacted a statute prohibiting polygamy in the Territories of the United States. Since then, at least, all who have contracted plural marriages in Utah are plain violators of law. With decency, civilization, Christianity, and statute law arrayed against polygamy, it may seem strange that it can be made an element of weakness in the Mormon institution, and destined one day to draw destruction upon the system. And yet there are senses in which polygamy contributes unity and strength to Mormonism. Because, first, it ostracizes the Mormons from all the rest of civilized mankind; and the forces of repulsion from “the world” drive the Saints in upon themselves, to be welded closer together, and to stay each other up for countenance and protection. And again: the unfortunate women committed to the practice of polygamy, and the children begotten from it, even if they become, as often they do, malevolent and fiercely hating, know themselves to be caught in a net from which they see no escape; and they remain in their place and practice, because, though their hearts are broken, their homes are saved by a religious sanction from foul disgrace. And once more: the thousands who are not polygamists (for be it remarked that not more than one Mormon married man out of six Mormon married men in Utah is a polygamist) will uphold polygamy heartily,
because some near kinsfolk, as sisters or daughters, are practisers of it. Such as these, therefore, though not in polygamy (and many of them disliking it, and some detesting it), will yet stand up for it; and for them, too, with the actual practisers, it becomes a bond, binding all together into a unity amazingly compact and unbreaking.

The Mormons and the United-States Government. — In 1846, the Mormons organized their territory into the State of Deseret ("the land of the honey-bee"); but Congress refused to recognize it, and, instead, called their country Utah Territory. President Fillmore appointed Brigham Young governor, and United-States courts were set up. The next year Brigham Young led in an open revolt against United-States laws, drove out the United-States officials, and successfully resisted all attempts to supersede him in the governorship, until in 1858, through the diplomacy of Mr. Thomas L. Kane, an understanding was effectuated between the Mormon leaders and Gov. Cumming, the nominee of President Buchanan, whereby the governor was allowed to take his seat in the capital of the Territory. For the first two years an armed force was kept up in the Territory, but in 1860 it was withdrawn. In 1857 the secretary of state for the United States addressed a circular to the United-States ministers in Great Britain, Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, instructing them to call the attention of the governments to which they were accredited to the laws of the United States against polygamy, and to request that the governments take steps to prevent Mormon efforts to gain converts. In 1882 the Edmunds Bill to legalize polygamy out of existence passed Congress.

Lit. — The publications consulted in the preparation of this article are marked by an asterisk; those written by Mormons, by an M. Liverpool, London, and Manchester are the English cities.

Mormon Newspapers. — Times and Seasons (published first at Commerce, Ill., November, 1839, then at Nauvoo, Ill., until after February, 1846). Millennial Star (published first at Manchester, May, 1840, afterwards, and still at Liverpool, Innsbruck (semi-monthly), published at Salt Lake City, Utah; started Jan. 1, 1868, still continued).


(Missionary Bishop of Idaho and Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

Morning Lectures. — Neale gives the following account of these famous sermons, which have been declared to be "one of the best compendia of theology in the English language," and which were published under the title Morning Exercises at Cripplegate, St.-Giles-in-the-Fields, and in Southwark, being divers sermons preached A.D. 1559-1689, by several ministers of the gospel in or near London, London, 8 vols. quarto, republished, London, 1844, 6 vols., under the editorial care of James Nichols. "The opening of the war (between Parliament and King Charles I.) gave rise to an exercise of prayer, and exhortation to repentance, for an hour every morning in the week. Most of the citizens of London having some near relation or friend in the army of the Earl of Essex, so many bills were sent up to the pulpit every Lord's Day for their preservation, that the minister had neither time to read them, nor to recommend their cases to God in prayer: it was therefore agreed, by some London divines, to separate an hour for this purpose every morning, one half to be spent in prayer, the other in an available exhortation to the people" (Hist. Puritans, Harper's ed., vol. i. p. 424). These services were held in various churches consecutively, and, after the end of the war, were continued, until the Reformation, in a modified form; the sermons taking up points of practical divinity.

Morocco, a sultanate of north-western Africa, bounded by Algeria, the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and Sahara, comprises an area of about two hundred and sixty thousand square miles, with a population variously estimated at from two to fifteen millions. The bulk of the population are Moors, Berbers, Arabs, and negroes, who have been brought into the country from the Soudan as slaves: all those tribes are Mohammedans. In the cities live some thousand Jews and a few hundred Spanish Roman Catholics and English Protestants. No missionary attempts have as yet been made in the region.

Morne, Giovanni de, b. at Milan, Jan. 25, 1509; d. in Rome, Dec. 1, 1580. He pursued his studies at Padua, and was appointed bishop of Modena in 1538, cardinal in 1542, bishop of Novara in 1548, and dean of the Sacre Coq.
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In 1854. Like Contarini, Fregoso, Reginald Pole, and others, he arrived, independently of Luther’s teaching, to the evangelical doctrines of justification by faith, of the insufficiency of good works, of the superstition of the worship of saints and relics, etc.; and his stay in Germany, whither he was sent in 1538 by Paul III. as nuncio to King Ferdinand, could not but confirm him in his views. Protestants had appeared in his diocese as early as 1530. By Paolo Ricci they were formed into a congregation, and in 1541 Morrison addressed a letter to that congregation. Meanwhile the bishop did not interfere: nay, he even authorized the spreading of the book, Del beneficio di Gesu Christo crocifisso verso i cristiani, printed at Modena in 1542, among his flock. Nevertheless, that strength of character which makes a man a reformer he had not; and when the Inquisition was established, in 1542, he began to waver. Under Paul IV. (1555–59) he was, nevertheless, accused of heresy, and imprisoned; and he was not released until the accession of Pius IV., who declared him innocent, and re-instated him in his offices. Very characteristic is the remark with which, in the next last sitting of the Council of Trent, he summed up what the council had accomplished: "Perhaps something more could have been expected; but God will make out of that which has been done a way to something better." See Frick, in Schelhorn’s Aeminentes literarum, vol. 12; MUNCH: Vermischte hist. Schriften, ii.

MORRIS, Thomas Asbury, b. in Kanawha County, Va., April 28, 1794; d. in Springfield, O., Sept. 2, 1874. He was brought up in the Baptist faith, but joined the Methodists, and was licensed 1814, and received as a travelling preacher into the Ohio Conference, 1816. He travelled as an itinerant over Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee until 1824, when he became the first editor of the Western Christian Advocate. In 1836 he was elected bishop, and labored successfully until 1888, when he retired in old age and weak health. He issued from the Methodist Book Concern a volume of Sermons, of which fifteen hundred copies had been sold up to 1830 (Allibone), Miscellany, 1837, and Church Polity, 1859. Marlay says, "Morrison was a presiding officer he was the beau ideal of a Methodist bishop. He had rare practical wisdom, quick and accurate judgment, and inflexible decision."

See MARLAI: Life of Bishop Morris, New York, 1885.

MORRISON, Robert, the father of Protestant missions in China; b. at Buller’s Green, Morpeth, Northumberland, Jan. 5, 1782; d. at Canton, Aug. 1, 1884. His father was an elder in the United Presbyterian Church, and, after giving his son a primary-school education, took him into his shop, his business being last-making. The boy, however, had a decided inclination for study; took up Latin, Hebrew, and theology, under a Presbyterian minister, and afterwards attended Hoxton Academy in England. His mother died in 1802. In 1804 he offered himself to the London Missionary Society; was appointed the first missionary to China; and, on the completion of his training-institution at Gosport; took up the study of Chinese under a Chinaman resident there; and on Jan. 31, 1807, sailed, by way of New York, for Canton, where he arrived Sept. 8. He at first dressed in Chinese costume, but subsequently removed it. He became interpreter for the East-India Company, and engaged to render a translation of the Bible into Chinese, the preparation of Chinese tracts and a dictionary. In 1808 he was married to Miss Morton, who died in 1821. He revised and published a Chinese version of the Acts in 1811; issued an original Chinese catechism, and engaged to render a translation of the Bible into Chinese, the preparation of Chinese tracts and a dictionary. In 1808 he was married to Miss Morton, who died in 1821. He revised and published a Chinese version of the Acts in 1811; issued an original Chinese catechism, and engaged to render a translation of the Bible into Chinese, the preparation of Chinese tracts and a dictionary. In 1813 he completed, with the assistance of Rev. Mr. Milne, the translation of the entire New Testament; and so that the entire Bible was printed in 1819. He also made a translation of The Morning and Evening Prayers of the Church of England. His most laborious literary work was his Chinese Dictionary, published by the East-India Company, at Malacca, where he was never very successful, and was removed in 1845 to Hong Kong. In 1817 he was made doctor of divinity by Glasgow University, and in 1824 paid a visit to England, returning, two years later, to China, having married a second time. Mr. Morrison added to his literary and civil labors private efforts to spread the gospel. The public proclamation of the gospel was forbidden. In 1814, "at a spring of water issuing from the foot of a lofty hill by the seaside in Macao, away from human observation, he baptized his first Chinese convert, Tsai-Azo, a man twenty-seven years of age." In 1830 he welcomed Messrs. Bridge and Abed as his first fellow-missionaries from the American churches. After his death, his remains were taken to Macao, where they still rest; the site being marked by an appropriate inscription. The life, work, and labors of Mr. Morrison have been the subject of many biographies, and his translations and dictionary have been superseded by better ones (Professor Williams), his name will always have an honorable place beside those of Martyn, Judson, Carey, Williams, and other workers in the heroic age of modern missions. See Memoirs of R. Morrison, D.D., compiled by his Widow, with Critical Notices of his Chinese Works by Samual Kidd, 2 vols., London, 1839; Milne: Retrospect of the First Ten Years of the China Mission; S. Wells Williams: Robert Morrison, in Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal, pp. 819–827, Philadelphia, 1876.

MORSE, Jedediah, D.D., b. at Woodstock, Conn., Aug. 23, 1761; d. in New Haven, June 9, 1826. He was graduated at Yale College, 1783; acted as tutor there, and ministered to the First Congregational Church of Charlestown, Mass., from 1786 to 1806. He was especially prominent in the movement of the Trinitarian controversy. From 1806 to 1811 he edited The Panoplist, a religious magazine which he had founded. He is "the father of American geography," having issued in 1784 at New Haven, for the use of schools, the first work of the kind
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in America. He later on much improved upon this last book. He also wrote: A Compendious History of New England, Cambridge, 1804; Annals of the American Revolution, Hartford, 1824. See William B. Sprague: Life of Jedediah Morse, New York, 1875. — Sidney Edward, son of the preceding; b. at Charlestown, Mass., Feb. 7, 1794; d. in New York City, Dec. 25, 1871. He was educated at Yale College law; entered journalism; established two religious newspapers, The Boston Recorder (1815), and, in connection with his brother Richard Cary Morse (Charlestown, June 18, 1795; d. at Kissingen, Germany, Sept. 22, 1808), The New- York Observer, 1823. The two brothers edited the paper jointly until 1858, when the control passed to Rev. S. Irenaeus Prime, D.D. Mr. S. E. Morse issued several atlases. His brother was Samuel Finley Breese Morse, the inventor of the electric telegraph; b. at Charlestown, Mass., April 27, 1791; d. in New York, April 2, 1872. See his Life by Dr. Prime, New York, 1875.

MORTAR. See MILLS.

MORTIFICATION. "Any severe penance observed on a religious account" is held in some branches of the Church to be an effectual way of winning the favor of God. But such austerities are often considered substitutes for obedience to God's commands; and the doers of them relax their effort to serve God continually, hoping by future austerity to atone for present sin. The truth is, God does not call upon us to mutilate our bodies in any way, but does ask us to give him our hearts. To one who loves God, penance is superfluous, while penitence is continual. See Penance.

MORTMAIN (French, mort, "dead," and main, "hand") denotes a peculiar placement of property, so that it becomes more or less completely withdrawn from circulation, and, so to speak, held by a dead hand. Thus in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Roman-Catholic Church was in possession of nearly one-half of the whole national wealth of Germany, of more than one-third of all real estate in England, etc. In order to prevent such a situation, a limit was fixed a scale for mortuaries. Finally settled by a statute of 1161117VIII., which thereafter inclassicallanguages, 1768, and in the philology at Leipzig, and was appointed professor there in the ecclesiastical principilities of Germany, as, for instance, in Mayence, 1574, 1650, 1660. In English legislation, a long series of mortmain statutes results from Magna Charta to George II.

MORTON, John, b. at Bere, Dorsetshire, Eng., 1419; d. at Knoll, Kent, Sept. 15, or Oct. 16, 1560; studied canon and civil law in Balliol College, Oxford, and began to practise law in the Court of Arches, London. Having been introduced to Henry VI. by Cardinal Bourchier, he was made a member of the privy council, and received, after his oration, a proclitigous number of ecclesiastical benefices. By Edward IV. he was made bishop of Ely (1475); but Richard III. suspected him, and put him in prison. He escaped to the Continent, where he made the acquaintance of Henry VII., after whose accession to the throne he returned to England. In 1486 he was made archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1490 a cardinal. He was a man of great practical ability, and a shrewd politician. Nor was his reign as archbishop of Canterbury without influence on the history of the English Church, though his investigations of its then corrupted state led to no actual reforms. See Williams: Lives of the English Cardinals, London, 1862; 2 vol.; and, in connection with his brother Richard Cary Morse (Charlestown, June 18, 1795; d. at Kissingen, Germany, Sept. 22, 1808). The New-York Observer, 1823. The two brothers edited the paper jointly until 1858, when the control passed to Rev. S. Irenaeus Prime, D.D. Mr. S. E. Morse issued several atlases. His brother was Samuel Finley Breese Morse, the inventor of the electric telegraph; b. at Charlestown, Mass., April 27, 1791; d. in New York, April 2, 1872. See his Life by Dr. Prime, New York, 1875.

MORTUNITY, in the ecclesiastical law of England, denotes a present offered by a parishioner to his minister upon the death of some member of his household. In the time of Henry III. it was brought into the church together with the corpse, whence it was called "corps-present." Having afterwards become the occasion of much exaction from the side of the clergy, the whole matter was finally settled by a statute of Henry VIII., which fixed a scale for mortuaries.

MORUS, Samuel Friedrich Nathanaeli, b. at Laubau in Upper Lusatia, Nov. 30, 1736; d. at Leipzig, Nov. 11, 1792; studied theology and philology at Leipzig, and was appointed professor there in classical languages, 1765, and in theology, 1782. He was a pupil of Ernesti, and one of the most prominent representatives of the historico-grammatical method of exegesis inaugurated by him. He published a volume of sermons (1786), an Épitome Theologie Christiane (1791), a number of Dissertationes, 1., 1797, ii., 1794, etc. See Beck: Recitatio de Moro, Leipzig, 1783; and Höppner: Uber das Leben des Morus, Leipzig, 1793.

MOSAIC LAW. See DECALOGUE, MOSES.

MOSCHUS, Johannes (also called Εὐκράτης, Eucrat, corrupted Evratus), lived, according to notices scattered through his own writings, during the reigns of Tiberius II., Mauritius, Phocas, and Heraclius. He was probably a native of Palestine, and spent many years as monk in the monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem, as a hermit of the desert east of the Jordan, and as an...
the princess was bathing in the sacred Nile, to which found the child. By a happy combination of circumstances, its mother was appointed its nurse. This deliverance may be compared with that of Moses, which the Egyptians attached much efficacy, that without the least trace of critical sense, but contains, nevertheless, much valuable information concerning the history of the Church. According to Photius, it comprised 304 chapters: the editions now extant contain only 219. The best edition is that in Migne: Patr. Graec., 87. There is an Italian translation (1488), a Latin (1422), French, Arabic, etc. (See Fabricius, ix. p. 168.) An old life of him is found in Migne. WAGENMANN.

Moses (מֹשֶׁה, "drawn out"), the liberator of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and the founder to whom history, without a dissenting voice, ascribes the religious instruction of the Israelite nation; received the name "Moses" on account of his wonderful deliverance in infancy (Exod. ii. 10). It is probable, from the fact that no other biblical character bears this name, that it was of Egyptian origin. The old derivation, still followed by many scholars, is the Egyptian mo couch "to draw out," and υπόκεις, "the child." Modern Egyptologists, however, declare themselves against this combination, and prefer the derivation mes, mesu ("water") and ski ("to take"); hence the spelling of the LXX., Moses, Moyses. All modern Egyptologists, however, declare themselves against this combination, and prefer the derivation mes, mesu ("child"). Born of the tribe of Levi, at a time when the Egyptian oppression was most severe, and an ordinance had gone out to destroy all the male children of the Israelites, he was placed by his mother, Jochebed (Exod. vi. 20), when he was three months old, in an ark in the Nile, where he was found by an Egyptian princess. It is probable that she was Bint-antha or Meri, daughters of Rameses II., whose residence seems at this time to have been Tanis (Zoan), where he was constructing large public works; or perhaps Thermut. According to Eusebius, the deliverer of Moses was called Morris; according to Josephus, he was the daughter of Rameses, which is not to be identified with Heliopolis (Josephus), but with Tanis (Brugsh, Köhler), which Rameses adorned with magnificent monuments, and is identified by Ebers with the daughter of Setis I., who was at the same time the sister and wife of Rameses II. It was while the princess was bathing in the sacred Nile, to which the Egyptians attached much efficacy, that she found the child. By a happy combination of circumstances, its mother was appointed its nurse. This deliverance may be compared with the legendary deliverances of Semiramis, Cyrus, Romulus, etc., in infancy; but the circumstances of it accord exactly with the national customs and history of Egypt (Ebers), and it is not improbable that the legends were formed upon the basis of it (Ewald).

The deliverance and training of Moses were a providential preparation for his future work. He was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii. 22). Philo (Vita Moses) exaggerates this statement when he says he was schooled in all the learning of Greece and the Orient. It is, however, altogether probable that he came into intimate relations with the priesthood, the patron of all learning; and Manetho (see Josephus: Contra Apion., I., 26, 9; 28, 12) affirms that he was at first priest of Osiris, and bore the name Osarsif, which was subsequently exchanged for Moses. The Bible knows nothing of the military career and the successful campaign against the Ethiopians, of which he was the leader, which Josephus ascribes to him. Moses may be compared with Semiramis, Cyrus, Thermouthis, Thermut, and a certain Messi, "prince of Cush." The only circumstance which the Bible relates of this period is his murder of an Egyptian taskmaster (Exod. ii. 11 sqq.), which forced him to flee to Midian in order to escape the wrath of the Pharaoh. In Midian — that is, the southern portion of the Sinaitic peninsula — he acted as herdsman, and married the daughter of a priest, called Reuel ("friend of God," Exod. ii. 18), or Jethro ("excellency," iv. 18, xviii. 1); one of which names was probably a title of honor.

The forced sojourn in the solitude of the wilderness was, like his life at court, adapted to prepare Moses for his work. He was taught his own impotency. The voice from the burning bush, which typified the continuance of Israel in spite of the oppressions of Egypt, but the condescension and indwelling of the Holy God in mercy among his sinful people without consuming them (Hofmann, Kurtz, Lange), announces to him his mission, and the deliverance of the children of Israel, who should go forth from Egypt with a rich booty and many honors. Exod. iii. 21, xi. 2, xii., 55 do not at all refer to a mere borrowing of precious things. Moses, resisting at first, ultimately yields to the divine word of command, and receives signs attesting his mission, in the transformation of the rod into a serpent, and covering his hand with the marks of leprosy. Moses' last scruple on the score of his want of eloquence was met with the assurance that his brother Aaron should supply this defect (iv. 11 sqq.). Returning to Egypt with Aaron, they deliver their message; but the Pharaoh replies by the ten plagues, after Moses had transformed his rod into a serpent before the Pharaoh. The Egyptian magicians attempted to do the same thing, but the Hebrew does not necessitate the meaning that they actually succeeded in changing their rods into serpents (Kurtz, Köhler). The first nine plagues were in accord with the conditions of the country, and can be illustrated by natural calamities, but cannot be explained as mere natural phenomena. The tenth, the destruction of the first-born, probably by a pestilence, induced the Hebrews to demand of the Pharaoh the freedom of his children; and the people went forth enriched with gifts. The exodus occurred on the 15th of Abib, and started from the city of Rameses, which is not to be identified with Heliopolis (Josephus), but with Tanis (Brugsh, Köhler), which Rameses adorned with magnificent structures. [For the locality of the passage of the Red Sea, and other circumstances of the exodus, see EXODUS.] The Egyptians, repenting of their emancipation of the enslaved people,
pursued after them, and followed into the open channel the waters had left. A panic, however, ensued in the darkness. A strong east wind suddenly started up, bringing the water down again with tremendous speed, and engulfing chariots and riders. This wonderful deliverance at the Red Sea, Moses commemorated in the “Song on the Sea” (Exod. xiv. 1 sqq.), whose authenticity ought not to be an occasion of dispute. This, the first national Hebrew song, has an unsurpassed majesty. It sings of the arm of the Lord and his mighty power as having accomplished the marvellous rescue.

The wanderings in the wilderness that followed were peculiarly well adapted to educate the people by forcing them to trust in God. They murmured incessantly; and only the divine care and provision of the pillar of cloud, the manna, the water from the rock, the quails, the victory over Amalek, through the mighty intercession of Moses and the sublime manifestation of God on Mount Sinai, could preserve and quiet the people. Arrived at Sinai, the people had a wonderful manifestation of the divine glory, and heard the divine voice. The covenant was established between Jehovah and his people through the mediation of Moses, and the law was given. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the water from the rock, the quails, the victory as having accomplished the marvellous rescue.

The other years of the fruitless wanderings are
die without entering into the land of promise. The other years of the fruitless wanderings are
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The wanderings in the wilderness that followed were peculiarly well adapted to educate the people by forcing them to trust in God. They murmured incessantly; and only the divine care and provision of the pillar of cloud, the manna, the water from the rock, the quails, the victory over Amalek, through the mighty intercession of Moses and the sublime manifestation of God on Mount Sinai, could preserve and quiet the people. Arrived at Sinai, the people had a wonderful manifestation of the divine glory, and heard the divine voice. The covenant was established between Jehovah and his people through the mediation of Moses, and the law was given. The people fell away to the worship of the golden calf; but Moses found an occasion of showing the water from the rock, the quails, the victory as having accomplished the marvellous rescue.

The other years of the fruitless wanderings are
die without entering into the land of promise.
It is impossible to exaggerate the historical importance of Moses. He not only brought to Israel deliverance, and helped it to a national existence; according to the uniform tradition, he was the human founder of the theocracy, the mediator between Jehovah and Israel. From his time on, Israel's God Jehovah, with his divine names, designates the divine being as a living person who makes himself known to his people by word and deed, and desires their worship (Exod. xix. 9). The conception which Moses had of Jehovah was not that of a national God, but of Him to whom the whole earth belongs, before whom all peoples must bow (Exod. xix. 5), and whose glory must fill the earth (Num. xiv. 21). The will was expressed in the law given to Moses on Mount Sinai, which included rules for secular and religious life, for public and private conduct. They constitute an organic whole. The Decalogue, which was engraved on stone tables, introduces them both in the Books of Exodus and Deuteronomy, and was designed to be made prominent as the fundamental law. The law of love to God (Deut. vi. 4 sq.) is likewise recorded (x. 12, xi. 13, xxx. 6, 20); while the law of love to one's neighbor is not forgotten (Lev. xix. 18). It was this system of law which made Israel a nation.

It is not possible to determine that the Pentateuch is of Mosaic origin with the same certainty as that Moses was the founder of the Israelitish nation. It must be granted that he possessed peculiar talents, and enjoyed peculiar advantages, for writing the code of laws; and that he wrote down the divine laws which he received, is to be assumed in one brought up at the Egyptian court. The law, as it is found in the Pentateuch, contains reminiscences of Egypt (Exod. xx. 2; Deut. v. 6, 15; Lev. xix. 34, xxv. 42, xxvi. 45; Num. xv. 38), although the Egyptian influence on the law of love to one's neighbor is not forgotten (Lev. xix. 18). It was this system of law which made Israel a nation.

As the mediator of the old covenant, Moses is accorded a place of peculiar pre-eminence by Christ and the apostles. The essential point is, that he was regarded as the founder of theocracy. The entire old covenant is personified in him (John v. 45 sq.). He is mentioned with the prophets as the lawgiver (Luke xvi. 29), and especially in conjunction with Elijah (Matt. xvii. 8). He also represents the entire old covenant, in which the law predominated, in contrast to the new. The law was given by Moses: grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John i. 18).


Moses Chorenensis, b., probably, in the beginning of the fifth century, at Chorni, a place in the Armenian province of Taron; was one of the young scholars sent by Sahak and Mesrob to Athens and Alexandria, to study Greek, and became then bishop of Bagrevaud, after the death of Esnik, but retired into solitude between 460 and 470, on account of the Persian invasion, and died, it is said, a hundred and twenty years old. A great number of translations from Greek into Armenian is by the Mekhitarists ascribed to him. More certain, however, is his original authorship. His chief work is his History of Armenia, in four books, of which, however, the last one has become lost. Though this work has lost much of its authority since A. von Gutschmid subjected it to a minute examination (see the memoirs of the König Sächsischer Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1876, I-IV), it is still the principal source of Armenian history, and interesting in various respects. It was first published in Amsterdam, 1695, then, with a Latin translation by Whiston, London, 1736, and last, with a French translation by Le Vaillant de Florival, Venice, 1836. Among his other works are a Handbook of Geography, first printed at Marseille, 1693, then by Whiston, London, 1736, last, with a French translation and commentary by St. Martin, Paris. In this case we must hold, that, from time to time, men of God incorporeal precepts into the body of the Mosaic code. The trunk, however, of the law of the Pentateuch is Mosaic; and we believe that a sound criticism will return to the view that the regulations of worship in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are of Mosaic origin. [See Pentateuch.] Moses is properly regarded as the father of Jewish historiography, although the entire description of his own life did not originate with him. As a student attracted not only the attention of his age, and author of a History of the Christian Church; b. at Lübeck, Oct. 9, 1693 or 1694 (or perhaps later); d. at Göttingen, Sept. 9, 1755. He entered the university of Kiel in 1716, and as a student attracted not only the attention of his professors, but also of men like Leibnitz and Buddeus, by his German and Latin writings. In 1719 he became a member of the faculty of philosophy, taught logic and metaphysics, and preached, exciting much admiration by his sermons. In 1723 he accepted a call as professor (ordinarius) to Helmstedt. Among his other writings up to this time were the Vindicia Antiquus Christianorum Disciplinae (Kiel, 1710) and Observations Sacre (Amsterdam, 1721). During his...
residence at Helmstadt, honors and ecclesiastical sinecures were lavishly heaped upon him by several administrations. He became more and more the main support and pillar of this university, whose influence was rapidly waning before the newly established institution at Göttingen. After refusing repeated invitations to the latter, he accepted a call in 1747, the office of chancellor being created especially for him. He, however, did not enjoy the same freedom and authority at Göttingen as at Helmstadt; and he frequently wished himself back in the old position.

Mosheim was not only the most learned theologian in the Lutheran Church of his day, but was also one of the first German authors and scholars of his age. There was no one who wrote such a pure style, with such elegant fluency, and so much felicity of expression, as he. He was also master of an elegant Latin style. This aesthetic quality was ministered to by his early acquaintance with the literature of England, France, and Italy. As a theologian he occupied an intermediate position between that of the extremes of pietism and deism. He was opposed to the confessional orthodoxy on the ground that the confessional orthodoxy on the ground that the law of Christ requires so much holiness of heart, (2) “The external holiness of the soul,” and (2) “The external holiness of the soul.”

As a preacher, Mosheim was much admired by his contemporaries; and his sermons, published in 7 vols. (1725 and often), were highly esteemed as models of sermonic method. For other writings of Mosheim, see BAUR: Epochen d. kirchl. Geschichtsschreibung, pp. 128 sqq. Compare LÜCKE: Narratio de Mosheimio, Göttingen, 1887.

HENKE

MOSQUE (from Arabic masjīd, “a house of prayer”) is the Mohammedan place of worship. The first one was built by Mohammed himself at Medina, in a graveyard opposite to the spot where his camel knelt on his public entrance into that city. The most famous mosques are Masjīd el Nebi (“the Mosque of the Prophet”) at Medina, replacing the original one; El-Hamram at Mecca, enclosing the Kaabah; Santa Sophia in Constantinople, originally a Greek basilica; the Mosque of Omar, in the haram enclosure at Jerusalem; the Great Mosque, at Damascus; and the mosque at Hebron; and the alabaster mosque of Mehemet Ali, at Cairo. The most elaborate mosque is the Great Mosque at Delhi, built by Shah Jehan (1681–56). Mosques are found, of course, in every Mohammedan settlement, and vary as much in cost and beauty as do our churches; but in general features they are alike, and consist of a domed building, a court with a fountain, in which ablutions are performed prior to entering (and often several of these), a minaret or tower, from which the muezzin calls the faithful to prayer. Inside they are open spaces, devoid of pictorial ornamentation, except by quotations from the Koran, often beautifully done, upon the walls. They contain the mihrab (a niche surmounted by a vaulted arch), towards which the faithful pray, because it is placed in the direction of Mecca; and the minbar, or platform-pulpit, upon which the ministers stand during service. Frequently, if not always, one sees a number of ostrich-eggs suspended from the ceiling directly before the mihrab: these symbolize immortality. The bareness of a mosque—no seats, no pictures, no statues—is in striking contrast with the ornate though tawdry ornamentation of the Roman and Greek churches; for instance, as they exist side by side in Jerusalem. The mosque is a composite building, in that its dome is Byzantine, its minaret is the Christian campanile, without its bell, forbidden in Mohammedan worship (see art. BELLS), while the court is like a khann. Women are occasionally seen in the fore part of mosques. The Mohammedan removes his slippers before entering: the Christian puts on huge slippers over his shoes. Formerly only Mohammedans were allowed in them; but now the “infidel dog” enters them with much impunity, although liable to curses, and sometimes to opposition. In connection with them are schools where the Koran is taught. In the Mosque El-Azhar at Cairo is the great university of the Mohammedans, whither students come from all parts of their world; as many as ten thousand, it is said, being congregated there at one time. Other establishments, benevolent in character, are also connected with mosques.
MOUNT HOLYOKE FEMALE SEMINARY is situated in South Hadley, Mass., amid the charming scenery of the Connecticut Valley. It was opened in 1837, and during the forty-five years ending in June, 1882, has sent forth 1,780 graduates. At a period when there existed no permanent school of a high order for girls in the United States, it was founded by the personal efforts of one far-seeing and large-hearted Christian woman. In those days there were no princely gifts from millionaires to educate the daughters; it was by small offerings from many slender purses that the enterprise was begun. There was in it, however, a hidden vitality, which has kept it growing ever since. The first edifice, a four-story brick building ninety-four feet by fifty, now forms part of a quadrangle, whose buildings placed in line would extend some 575 feet. In 1870 there was added to these a fire-proof library building, now containing 11,000 volumes; in 1876, the Lyman Williston Hall, for science and art; and in 1881, an astronomical observatory, completely equipped with new instruments of the best make. The grounds, also, have been much enlarged, and now include fifty acres. To establish a permanent institution offering the best educational advantages at a moderate expense was but a part of Miss Lyon's design. It was to be so planned and carried on, that its entire culture should result, not merely in thorough and extensive intellectual attainments, but also in symmetrical and efficient Christian lives. The course of study, being solid rather than showy, has always required some maturity, and considerable advancement, in order to enter upon it. There is no preparatory department. In addition to the regular curriculum, extensive courses in French, German, or Greek, may be pursued; and instruction is also provided in drawing, painting, and music. Thoroughness has marked the school from the first. Classes are subdivided, so that the number reciting together is not large. Text-books are made but the starting point, not the limit of research; the library being a constant and indispensable resort. The natural sciences are amply illustrated by extensive cabinets and superior apparatus; the history of art, by paintings, casts, photographs, and engravings. The most fitting feature of the family life, that the ordinary housework is done by the young ladies, with the supervision of the teachers and matrons. About one hour a day is thus employed. Each pupil has her own definite duties, and retains the position assigned her for a term or more, unless some personal reason requires a change. If ill, she is excused; and her place is supplied, for the time, from a reserve corps. Several considerations had weight in deciding upon this plan. It promised to be at once more economical and more independent than to employ scores of servants; it would give healthful exercise; it would tend to preserve and increase a taste for home duties; and its practical testimony to the dignity of useful labor would do good. Thus it has proved; and time has shown other advantages not so clearly foreseen. Observing how smoothly the domestic affairs of this family of three hundred are carried on without servants, the pupil is strongly impressed with the value of system, co-operation, and prompt activity. She learns how to take responsibility, and to enjoy it. She sees how the comfort of all comes from the fidelity of each to her brief task; and by degrees it becomes her habit to look out for the general good rather than her own ease.

Our whole system," remarked one of the earlier teachers, "is really an arrangement for gaining and applying moral power." The shaping of character may, indeed, be considered its special work. The impress of the Holyoke training is clearly visible upon a large majority of the women educated here. Favored by the retired location, as well as by the family life, with its constant and familiar intercourse between teachers and pupils, more work of this kind can be done than would be possible under other conditions. Much is effected by regulations tending to insure habits of promptness and diligence, of order and system, of self-control and thoughtfulness for others; while religious influences, unsectarian yet positive and strong, underlie and crown all the rest. Pupils soon observe, that, while it is not asked what church they are wont to attend at home, it is considered a question of the utmost consequence whether their talents shall be given to selfish aims, or consecrated to Christ. They hear much of the various benevolent enterprises of the day, and learn to look forward to an active and useful life. The sabbath Bible lessons, and those studies of the prescribed course which may be termed religious, make a good basis in preparing for the Christian activities of future years. Fully three-fourths of the whole number of students have subsequently taught more or less, and many have done missionary work in foreign lands or at home.

The seminary is not yet endowed. Its ordinary expenses are usually covered by the receipts for board and tuition, moderate as are the terms; and, for needful improvements, it never looks in vain to its numerous friends. A small annual income from funds bequeathed for the purpose is used in assisting, to some extent, deserving pupils who need such aid.

See Life of Mary Lyon, American Tract Society; Historical Sketch of Mount Holyoke Seminary, 1873.

MOURNING AMONG THE HEBREWS. It is characteristic of all Oriental people, that while they freely vent their vehement feelings, more especially that of grief, in violent though wholly involuntary gestures, they at the same time try to express those feelings by means of symbolical and often merely conventional signs. In Scripture, where the act of mourning such as performed by the Hebrews is often described, the same double mode of expressing a feeling also occurs: now the involuntary and purely pathological utterance of the sorrow, such as crying, wringing the hands, etc.; and then the symbolical and merely conventional sign, such as dressing in sackcloth, sprinkling ashes on the head, etc. It must be noticed, however, that in many cases, as, for instance, in that of rending the clothes, the conventional symbol evidently originated as a simple and natural expression.

Among the most conspicuous purely pathological utterances of sorrow, such as occur among the
MOURNING.
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MOZARABIC LITURGY.

Hebrews are tearing off the hair, and plucking out the beard (Ex. ix. 3; Job i. 20; Josephus, Ant. 15, 3; 9; 15, 7; 5), running the head against the wall (Josephus: Ant., 16, 10, 7), spreading the hands, and laying them on the head (Lam. i. 17; 2 Sam. xiii. 19), beating the breast (Isa. xxxix. 12; Nah. ii 7; Luke xviii. 13, xxii. 48), and smiting upon the thigh (Jer. xxxix. 10; Ezek. xxi. 12). Must torturing and even maiming of the body seem also to have occurred, at least at a later period, among the Hebrews, though they were strongly forbidden (Lev. xix. 28; Deut. xiv. 1). Among the most conspicuous symbols, or conventional signs of sorrow employed by the Hebrews are sprinkling the head with ashes, or dust, or sand, or throwing such things up in the air, and allowing them to fall down, and cover the head (Josh. vii. 6; 2 Sam. xiii. 19, xv. 32; Jer. vi. 26; Job ii. 12); dressing in sackcloth (2 Sam. i. 11; Ps. xxxviii. 13; Joel i. 8) of sombre colors, and without folds or forms (Isa. iii. 24); covering the lower part of the face, or the whole head, as a token of silence (2 Sam. xv. 30; Ezek. xxv. 17; Jer. xiv. 3); shaving off the beard and the hair, the proud ornaments of the Eastern man (Isa. vi. 9; Jer. xvii. 2, xxii. 12; Jer. vii. 29); laying aside all ornaments (Exod. xxxiii. 4; Ezek. xxvi. 16), even the sandals (2 Sam. xv. 30). Among the mourning-symbols which may be considered as having originated as simple pathological expressions are fasting (which article see), neglect of the usual care of the body, the clothes and other appearances, and more especially rendering the clothes (Gen. xxxvii. 29, xliv. 13; Matt. xxvi. 65). With respect to the last-mentioned ceremony, very minute rules were given by the rabbis: it should be performed standing, in public, sometimes from the left and sometimes from the right.

Mourning for the dead lasted for seven days (according to the law, the days of uncleanness), or in special cases longer. The national mourning for Moses and Aaron lasted thirty days (Num. xx. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 8; comp. Josephus: Bell. Jud., 3, 9; 5); the Egyptian, for Jacob, seventy or eighty days (Gen. i. 3; comp. Herodot., 2, 85); the Romans, for Augustus, — a severer, for the first three days; a milder, for the next four days; and a still lighter, for the period from the seventh to the thirtieth day, during which, however, it was not allowed to take a warm bath, or to shave. According to rabbinical precepts, a widow of not many age, not married again until after the lapse of three great festivals, and, if she had a sucking babe, not until after the end of two years; but a widower could marry after the lapse of thirty days. Parents were mourned by their children a whole year, during which the time a son was not allowed to partake in a banquet or any other kind of social feast. The death-day of a parent was always kept sacred by the children as a day of mourning. On the days of mourning, the house or the tomb resounded with the wailings of men and women. Songs of lamentation, sung with the hope and occasion, have been preserved in 2 Sam. i. 17, iii. 33; Jer. ix. 17; 1 Kings xiii. 20; 2 Kings ii. 12, xiii. 14; and a rabbinical collection is found in Ugolino: Thesaurus, vol. xxxii. p. 1300.

Sometimes the songs of lamentation were accompanied with instrumental music, especially by flutes (Matt. ix. 28). Rich people hired mourners,—men and women who were trained to perform the ceremony (2 Chron. xxxiv. 25; Jer. ix. 17); and so great expenses were often incurred by the display of mourning-clothes and by mourning-banquets, that laws were issued against the reigning prodigality. According to Hos. ix. 4, however, participation in a mourning-banquet made a man unclean (comp. Esth. iv. 2). A number of monographs on the subject are found in Ugolino: Thesaurus, vol. xxxiii. Lieder.

MOYER’S LECTURES, a course of eight sermon-lectures in defence of the divinity of Christ, founded by Lady Rebecca Moyer (d. in London, 1720), who ordered her heirs to pay twenty guineas annually to some able minister for the purpose. The courses ended about 1774, the lease having then expired of the estate (a dwelling-house in London) out of which the annual payment was made. Darling (Cyclopaedia Bibliographica) gives a list of the lecture head, a part.

MOZARABIC LITURGY, a form of service of venerable age, once in use in some churches of Spain. The designation is a participial form of the word “Arab.” Mozarab, or Mostarab, seems to have been almost a name of ridicule given to certain Christian congregations in Spain who were tolerated by the caliphs. At the close of the fifteenth century, there were six such congregations in Toledo alone. These had their own Liturgy, which was ascribed to Isidore of Seville, but which, without doubt, is of earlier date, and was only revised or confirmed by him and the other members of the Fourth Council of Toledo, in 833. Some Roman-Catholic authors (see Preface to Migne’s edition, vol. xxxv.) attribute its composition to the apostles who founded the Church in Spain. Its divergence from the Gallican Liturgy precludes the view that the latter was the original and model. Through the middle ages it held its place in spite of the Roman Liturgy. Popes John X. (in 918) and Alexander II. (in 1064) sanctioned its use; and Cardinal Ximenes edited the first printed edition (1500), with some changes. Two years later, the Breviary was printed. Both editions contain in defence of the divinity of Christ, founded by Lady Rebecca Moyer (d. in London, 1720), who ordered her heirs to pay twenty guineas annually to some able minister for the purpose. The courses ended about 1774, the lease having then expired of the estate (a dwelling-house in London) out of which the annual payment was made. Darling (Cyclopaedia Bibliographica) gives a list of the lecture head, a part.

MOZARABIC LITURGY, a form of service of venerable age, once in use in some churches of Spain. The designation is a participial form of the word “Arab.” Mozarab, or Mostarab, seems to have been almost a name of ridicule given to certain Christian congregations in Spain who were tolerated by the caliphs. At the close of the fifteenth century, there were six such congregations in Toledo alone. These had their own Liturgy, which was ascribed to Isidore of Seville, but which, without doubt, is of earlier date, and was only revised or confirmed by him and the other members of the Fourth Council of Toledo, in 833. Some Roman-Catholic authors (see Preface to Migne’s edition, vol. xxxv.) attribute its composition to the apostles who founded the Church in Spain. Its divergence from the Gallican Liturgy precludes the view that the latter was the original and model. Through the middle ages it held its place in spite of the Roman Liturgy. Popes John X. (in 918) and Alexander II. (in 1064) sanctioned its use; and Cardinal Ximenes edited the first printed edition (1500), with some changes. Two years later, the Breviary was printed. Both editions contain

18. The latter bearsthe strange name of Sancta Maria de la O, because “all present shout a long ‘O!’ in order to signify that great longing with which all the saints in limbus, the angels in heaven, and the whole world, observe the nativity of the Redeemer” (Migne’s Patrology, lxxxv. p. 170). (2) The lessons or pericopes differ; e.g., the parable of the rich man and Lazarus precedes Lent in order to counteract the excess of this period. Instead of having merely two lessons
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for the main service from the Epistles and Gospels, it has three lessons from the Epistles, Gospels, and prophets. (3) It gives prominence to homiletical matter, and in this respect it stands alone. After each of the three readings, there is a short homiletical discourse to the people, in which the homortatory element predominates. (4) The use of the Agios three times after the Benedictus, the breaking of the host into nine parts, each of which has a special name and meaning, etc., recall the custom of the Greek Church. (5) The Mozarabic Chant differs from the Gregorian by being more melodious, etc. It is called the "Eugenian," after a certain archbishop of Toledo, Eugenius. In general, we may say that this Liturgy is one of the most venerable products of Christian antiquity, that it draws largely upon the Scriptures, and is equal to any other Liturgy in the purity, dignity, and warmth of its tone and language. See Migne: Patrologia, Vol. LXXVI.

[The "Church of Jesus" in Mexico has adopted the Mozarabic Liturgy.]

PALMER.

MOZLEY, James Bowling, D.D., canon of Worcester, regius professor of divinity,—an office which he held, in conjunction with his vicarage, until his death. He was appointed Bampton Lecturer for 1855; and his work on the Miracles, which was the outcome of that lecturership, attracted great attention. While Mozley was a student at Oxford, the influence of Newman, Hurrell Froude, Keble, and Pusey, was in the ascendant; and he was an enthusiastic yet independent follower of those early leaders in the Tractarian movement. But, when Newman entered the Church of Rome, Mozley kept firm in his allegiance to the Anglican Church. As the bishop of his day, he was at once recognized as one of the best theological thinkers of his day. Besides the works already referred to, there were published, after his death, his Sermons, 1878; and Lectures and Other Theological Papers, 1883. WH. M. TAYLOR.

MUGGLETONIANS.

MUGGLETONIANS, the followers of Ludowick Muggleton (b. 1609; d. March 14, 1697) and Churchman; but the developments of that party were not to his taste, and he found no other that he could join. That this is a true statement of the case may be seen in his writings, which may be classified under the three heads of critical, theological, and apologetic. Under the critical we should range his Essays on Stradford, Laud, Cromwell, Luther, Arnold, etc., in which one sees very clearly the strong Tractarian bias of the author; although even in these he rises above party, into the discussion of principles, always with great power, and often with the conviction of his readers. Under theological we place his elaborate Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, 1855 (perhaps the ablest modern English book upon the subject); his work on The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, 1855; and his The Baptismal Controversy, 1862. Under the apologetic may be put his answer to Newman, entitled The Theory of Development, which, along with the well-known letters of Archer Butler, furnished an antidote for the evil in his former teacher's work; whereby the Mozarabic Chant may be classified under the three heads of critical, theological, and homiletical. We should range his Essays on Strafford, Laud, Cromwell, Luther, Arnold, etc., in which he was, on the same recommendation, made regius professor of divinity,—an office which he held, in conjunction with his vicarage, until his death. He was appointed Bampton Lecturer for 1855; and his work on the Miracles, which was the outcome of that lecturership, attracted great attention. While Mozley was a student at Oxford, the influence of Newman, Hurrell Froude, Keble, and Pusey, was in the ascendant; and he was an enthusiastic yet independent follower of those early leaders in the Tractarian movement. But, when Newman entered the Church of Rome, Mozley kept firm in his allegiance to the Anglican Church. As the bishop of his day, he was at once recognized as one of the best theological thinkers of his day. Besides the works already referred to, there were published, after his death, his Essays, Historical and Theological, London and New York, 1878, 2 vols.; Practical and Parochial Sermons, 1876, and Lectures and Other Theological Papers, 1883. WH. M. TAYLOR.

MUEDDIN, or MUEZZIN, an official attached to a Mohammedan mosque, whose business it is to call the faithful to prayer five times in the twenty-four hours. He chants these words each time, as he walks around the mosque, or stands on a balcony outside the minaret: "Allah is most great. I testify that there is no God but Allah I testify that Mohammed is the apostle of Allah Come to prayer. Come to security." "Prayer is better than sleep" is added in the morning. (Muf'ti (Arabic, "expounder of the law"), a Turkish official of half-ecclesiastical, half-civil, character. As the Koran is not only the spiritual, but also the material, foundation of all law among Mohammedans, the expounder of the law, the muf'ti, is at once priest and judge. There is a muf'ti in every large town in the Turkish Empire.

MUGGLETONIANS, the followers of Ludowick Muggleton (b. 1609; d. March 14, 1697) and
John Reeve, journeyman tailors. These two professed to be the "two witnesses" of Rev. xi. 3-6, and announced that the last days had come, and they were divinely commissioned to prophesy, and had also authority to curse all who opposed them. Muggleton declared that he stood in the same relation to Reeve that Aaron did to Moses, i.e., he was his "mouth." They gathered a large following; and the Muggletonians, as the sect was called, existed in England down to one day, Mr. Joseph Gander, who died in 1868, being, it is said, the last adherent. Their doctrines are thus stated in Blunt's Diet. of Sects, s. v.: "Earth and water were not created, but self-originated; the Evil One became incarnate in Eve; the Father was the sufferer upon the cross, having left Elijah to govern heaven while he came to earth to die." They also taught that God has a human body, and that there is no Trinity, properly speaking.


MÜHLENBERGO, Heinrich Melchior, D.D., the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania and adjacent States; b. Sept. 6, 1711, at Eimbeck, Hanover; d. Oct. 7, 1787, at New Providence (Trappe), Montgomery County, Penn. With the foundation of the Lutheran Church in the North American Colonies, and especially in Pennsylvania, the name of H. M. Muhlenberg is most honorably connected. Three imperfectly organized congregations in Pennsylvania (New Hanover, New Providence, and Philadelphia) sent (1733) three delegates to England, Holland, and Germany, to solicit donations for the erection of churches and schoolhouses, and to petition for the sending of a suitable pastor for themselves, and of missionaries for the German Lutherans, in considerable numbers settled in diverse places of the eastern portion of Pennsylvania. Those delegates met with much sympathy, especially from the Rev. Fr. Mich. Ziegenhagen (1722-76, chaplain of the royal St. James Chapel at London), and from the directors of the benevolent institutions founded by the Rev. Dr. Aug. Herm. Francke at Halle (and after his death, 1729, continued by his son Dr. Dr. G. A. Francke), Dr. Freylinghausen, and other representatives of the Pietism of Philipp Jacob Spener, who were also professors of Halle University, and took a lively interest in the work of missions. That delegation and subsequent correspondence resulted (1742) in the sending of H. M. Muhlenberg to Pennsylvania, where he first once came into collision with Count Zinzendorf, who, having arrived in the fall of the preceding year, had assumed the character of a superintendent of the Lutheran congregations, but now began to establish Moravian churches. H. M. Muhlenberg, assisted by other missionaries sent from Halle, and by a number of suitable men whom he met with in the Colonies, founded during his lifetime a large number of congregations in Pennsylvania and beyond its boundaries. The German Evangelical Lutheran ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, organized 1748, became the mother-synod of a considerable number of synods in the United States.

H. M. Muhlenberg had devoted himself to the study of theology, 1737 and 1738, at Göttingen; identified himself with the Spenerian Pietism, began as a student the instruction of poor and neglected children; enjoyed the respect of some young men of the same turn of mind, but in aristocratic families (Counts Reuss and Henkel); continued his studies at Halle, where he at the same time was employed as a teacher in the Orphan Home of Francke; served, after having been ordained at Leipzig, from 1739 to 1741 as pastor of Grossohnen, Lustatia; published a number of controversial writings; and followed, 1742, the call offered to him by Dr. Francke in behalf of the German Lutherans in Pennsylvania. On his voyage he spent two months in England; took, in crossing the ocean, much interest in the spiritual welfare of his fellow-passengers; preached to them in the English language (he was able to proclaim the gospel in four languages); arrived, Sept. 22, 1742, at Charleston, S.C., and paid a visit to the Lutherans, who, on account of cruel persecution, had left Roman-Catholic Salzburg and its neighborhood, at Ebenezer, near Savannah, Ga. On the 25th of November, after a perilous voyage, he arrived at Philadelphia; entered at once upon his work; administered, under great difficulties, to the three congregations which had petitioned for a pastor, and extended his usefulness to other localities, receiving, 1745 and in later years, additional strength, especially through colaborers sent from Halle (P. Brunnholtz, Nic. Kurtz, J. H. Schaum, J. F. Handschuch, J. D. M. Heinzellmann, W. Kurz, J. L. Voigt, J. A. Krug, Fred. Schultz, J. H. Ch. Helmuth, Chr. Em. Schultz, J. Chr. Kunze, J. Fr. Schmidt). April 23, 1745, H. M. Muhlenberg married a daughter of Col. Conrad Weiser of Tulpehoken, a man well known in the colonial history of Pennsylvania. With H. M. Muhlenberg, and the other missionaries sent from Halle, a number of other Lutheran pastors, laboring at diverse localities in the North-American provinces (J. Chr. Hartwich, B. M. Hausle, J. S. Gerock, etc.), connected themselves in the course of time, and the field of labor was extended. Shortly after the middle of the last century, that field extended from Frederick, Md., through Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, to Hudson and to New-York City. It must be admitted that this result was eminently owing to the practical tact and persevering energy of H. M. Muhlenberg, who for a long time had more or less the supervision of the Lutheran congregations of that large territory, and, with passengers, attached to Lutheran doctrines, maintained a friendly relation to representatives of other Protestant denominations, among those particularly to the Rev. M. Schlatter, the patriarch of the German Reformed Church in the United States. A.D. 1748, the first Lutheran synod was organized, which proved a blessing for the proper foundation, organization, and discipline of congregations. This synod stood in very friendly relations to the Swedish Lutheran ministers, who, under a superintendent appointed by the higher authorities in Sweden, served a considerable number of congregations in the present states of Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

H. M. Muhlenberg resided during the years 1745-61 at New Providence, Montgomery County, Penn. In 1751 and 1762 he was, during the sum-
lishing peace and order in that congregation, in Lutherans (Zion Church) was erected from 1766 to 1769, and for a long period admitted to be the finest and largest church-edifice in Pennsylvania. The winter 1774-75 H. M. Mühlenberg spent in Ebenezer, Ga., where he succeeded in re-establishing peace and order in that congregation, in settling some legal difficulties concerning its property, and in introducing an improved constitution. In July, 1776, he, with the permission of the Philadelphia congregation, again took up his residence at New Providence. Having, with his whole family, pronounced in favor of American independence, he was exposed to many inconveniences. He continued to preach, as circumstances demanded his services, and to assist the congregations with his counsel. In 1784 the University of Pennsylvania honored him with the title D.D. In his latter years he suffered from various bodily ailments. At his death the Lutheran synod of Pennsylvania numbered twenty-four clerical members. The synod, as well as the congregations, were established on the unaltered Augsburg Confession and on all the other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. The rigor of the doctrinal position was modified by Pietism as it prevailed at Halle. Halle ceased, after the death of H. M. Mühlenberg, to exercise its specific influence on the Lutheran Church in the United States.

Of three sons of Dr. Mühlenberg who received their preliminary education for the sacred service in Germany, the most renowned is J. Peter C., major-general of the United-States army, b. Oct. 1, 1756; d. May 29, 1815, after having most successfully served the Church of the Holy Trinity at Lancaster, Penn., for thirty-five years. As an eminent naturalist, excelling especially in botany, he carried on correspondence with many scientific men of Europe, and was a member of various philosophical societies.
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Among his multitudinous labors the most important may be classed as follows: (1) The Christianizing of education; (2) Church unity, or his lifelong aim and desire for the union, in some practical form, of the evangelical bodies of Christendom; (3) Christian brotherhood, exemplifying itself in institutions of charity and benevolence for the poor and oppressed. He gave himself predominantly to Christian education from the time of his leaving Lancaster (1826) till he entered the pastorate of the Free Church of the Holy Communion, New York, in 1846. Bishops, doctors, judges, and merchant-princes are among his scholars; and his methods are perpetuated in a multitude of schools throughout the land, patterned after his. In the early years of the Church of the Holy Communion, many noble charities had their birth. Scarcely an important movement in the Episcopal Church had their birth. Scarcely an important movement in the Episcopal Church, could he, at the end of his days be named that did not, more or less directly, originate with him. It was during his ministry in the Church of the Holy Communion, that he enunciated most emphatically those "Evangelical Catholic" principles which he believed to be the true theory of the Christian Church. His most signal expression of these principles is found in what is known as The Muhlenberg Memorial. See Evangelical Catholic Papers, New York, T. Whittaker, 1879.

His greatest exemplifications of Christian brotherhood are the institutions of St. Luke's Hospital in New York, and the Church Village of St. Johnland on Long Island, New York. St. Luke's Hospital was begun, as to the foundation-stone, in 1865, completed for occupancy in 1868. St. Johnland was incorporated in 1870, but came into preliminary operation three or four years earlier.

The whole of Dr. Muhlenberg's long life was one stream of blessed charity. "His faith was not a theological formula, but a living conviction and power. It was a free, joyous allegiance to Jesus Christ. The incarnation was the central idea of his theology and the inspiration of his Christian brotherhood in Christ, brotherhood through Christ." He never married, and, though born to affluence, did not leave money enough for his funeral. He died in St. Luke's Hospital, and was buried at St. Johnland. See Anne Ayres: Life and Work of William Augustus Muhlenberg, New York, Harper Brothers, 1880.
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receiving the prize at Göttingen, the faculty made him doctor of laws. He felt, however, that a legal career was not his vocation. The ideal of a higher life was presenting itself to his mind; and, in consequence of it, he determined to direct his attention to the study of theology. He heard the elder Planck in Church History, Eichhorn on the Pauline Epistles, and others. The Göttingen theology, however, did not satisfy him, nor its scientific method, but rather repelled him, driving him off, for a time, to the study of philosophy and even of medicine. The doubts which had been excited increased until they threatened to destroy his faith. In 1822 he returned to Breslau, but failed to get comfort in the lecture-room. It remained for Tholuck to quiet his doubts, and to exert a powerful and permanent influence upon his spiritual life. While he was on a visit to Breslau, Müller, at the suggestion of a friend, visited him. Nearly fifty years afterwards, in the dedication of his Dissertations in Dogmatics (Dogmatische Abhandlungen), he refers to Tholuck's influence upon his mind of the Lord: "When the call of the Lord made me a theologian, and I was overflooded with doubts and conflicts as I gave myself up to a closer study of theology, and especially of philosophy, then the suggestion of a friend now departed led me to you. You called my attention to the moral spirit of Christianity, and again aroused in me the confidence that saving truth is found in evangelical faith, and nowhere else." He afterwards carried on a correspondence with Tholuck, whose personality, rather than theology, influenced him.

After spending the winter at Breslau, in the earnest study of the Bible, Müller went, at the urgent advice of Tholuck, in the spring of 1823, to Berlin. Here it was not Schleiermacher, but Strauss, Neander, and Tholuck, who met the demands of his mind and heart. In February, 1825, he was called to be the successor of his friend Radeke, in the pastorate of Schönbrunn and Rosen. He had already married, and entered with much zeal upon his work. He had large plans for literary work, and contemplated writing histories of pietism and German mysticism. He first appeared before the public as an author in a work (Zur Beurteilung d. Schrift: D. kathol. Kirche Schlesiens) upon the ecclesiastical concerns of Silesia, and opposing Theiner. A second edition was called for. Soon after, he came into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities by refusing to introduce the new Liturgy; and in May, 1830, he announced this as his final decision to the Conspiratorium. His official relations to the church were thus endangered; but he was happily delivered from the inconvenience of a removal from his pastorate by a call, in 1831, to Göttingen, as university preacher, with the promise of a professorship as soon as he should publish a learned work. He habilitated in 1832 with a dissertation on Luther's doctrine of predestination and the freedom of the will (Lutheri de praedest. et lib. arbitrio doctrina). He gathered about him an increasing number of hearers, and in 1833 published a volume of sermons under the title D. christl. Lehre von d. Sünde ("The Christian Doctrine of Sin"). The second part followed, in 1838, by another on the same subject, in rejoinder to the reply of Strauss.

More important than these contributions was his work, D. christl. Lehre von d. Sünde ("The Christian Doctrine of Sin"). The second part followed, in 1844, which continued the investigation into the possibility of sin. Six editions have since appeared. The second and third contained many additions, taking notice of the criticisms, especially those of Roth in his Ethics, and of Vatke and Dorner. The last three editions have hardly any changes.

In the Dedication, he denies that intellectual thought stands in contradiction to Christian experience, and that meditation upon sin leads to the destruction of the religious fear of it. As against Hegel, he denied that a system of absolute knowledge is inconsistent with the actual state of the world pervaded by evil. Here, also, he gives due prominence to the consciousness of sin and guilt, which is made too little of in Schleiermacher's system. This personal consciousness of sin is declared to carry with it the sense of condemnation. Sin is intelligent self-determination. No recent system of theology is so closely allied to the theology of the confessions as this of Julius Müller, who asserts the reality of guilt and the necessity of an objective atonement.

Müller had several calls to other universities, but remained at Göttingen till 1838, when he accepted the professorship at Halle, made vacant by Ullmann's removal to Heidelberg. [Here, during the remainder of his life, he exerted a wide influence, both by the stimulus of his lectures, and his simple, sincere Christian character.]

With Dorner of Berlin he was the most learned and profound lecturer in the department of systematic theology in Germany, and, with Tholuck, the chief centre of attraction to the students at Halle.] In August of the same year he lost his wife, and in 1844 he was made a widower for the second time. He took a prominent part in the measures resulting in the Vollendung (see art.), and participated actively in its meetings till 1854. In 1850 he founded, in conjunction with Neander and Nitzsch, the Deutsche
Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben ("German periodical of Christian Science and Life"), to which he contributed many valuable articles. — Would there have been an Incarnation if the Fall had not occurred? 1850; Faith and Knowledge, 1853, etc. These have, for the most part, appeared in his Dogmatische Abhandlungen ("Theological Discussions"), Bremen, 1870.

From the year 1858 on, he suffered greatly from insomnia, headaches, and other bodily infirmities, and in the following year was attacked by a stroke of apoplexy; so that, for the remainder of his life, he confined his labors almost exclusively to the lecture-room. He saw his colleagues and friends, Hupfeld and Tholuck, pass away before him, but had much comfort from his visits, during vacation, to the homes of his nine married children. On May 6, 1875, he celebrated, surrounded by them and his grandchildren, the fifty-eighth anniversary of his ordination. In the summer of 1878 he resigned his professorship to make way before him, but had much comfort from his visits, and admirers; but a provision of his will stipulated that all his manuscripts should be destroyed. See Sketch of his life by his son-in-law, Leopold Schulze, Bremen, 1879. — DAVID HUPFELD.

MUMPLOQT, The Colloquy of, was occasioned by the incorporation of the countship of Münpegart with the duchy of Württemberg by inheritance. The Reformation had been established in the country in 1530, according to the Calvinistic type; but the Duke of Württemberg then tried to re-organize the church according to the Lutheran type. In order to solve the various complications which arose from those circumstances, a disputation was arranged between the Calvinists and the Lutherans in the castle of Münpegart. It lasted from March 21 to March 26, 1588. On the Calvinist side spoke Beza; on the Lutheran, Andreae. But the only result of the disputation was, that the differences between the two parties became deeper and more glaring. No official protocol was kept. See A. Schweizer: Die Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster, Münster, 1853, vol. ii.; [L. Keller: Geschichte der Wiedertäufer zu Münster, Münster, 1880; and the arts. Anabaptists and Bockholes].

MÜNTER, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich, b. at Gotha, Oct. 14, 1781; d. in Copenhagen, April 9, 1880; was educated in Copenhagen, studied theology at Göttingen, travelled in Italy, 1786, and was appointed professor of theology in the university of Copenhagen, 1788, and bishop of Zealand, 1808. Of warm, genial, and erudite, and was a very prolific writer in Danish, German, and Latin. Among his works, many of which have still considerable value for church history, and Oriental languages and antiquities, the principal are an edition of the Copitische translation of Daniel, Rome, 1824; Über die kirchlichen Alterthümer der Gnostiker, 1790; the publication of the statute-book of the Templars, 1794, which he discovered in the Corsini Library in Rome; Die dänische Reformationsgeschichte, 1802, 2 vols.; De schola Autiochenas, 1811; Religion der Karthager, 1816; Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen, 1833-34, 3 vols.; Effia et orgacla Montanitaram, 1829, etc. — O. THELEMANN.

MÜNZER, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich, b. at Gotha, Oct. 14, 1781; d. in Copenhagen, April 9, 1880; was educated in Copenhagen, studied theology at Göttingen, travelled in Italy, 1786, and was appointed professor of theology in the university of Copenhagen, 1788, and bishop of Zealand, 1808. Of warm, genial, and erudite, and was a very prolific writer in Danish, German, and Latin. Among his works, many of which have still considerable value for church history, and Oriental languages and antiquities, the principal are an edition of the Copitische translation of Daniel, Rome, 1824; Über die kirchlichen Alterthümer der Gnostiker, 1790; the publication of the statute-book of the Templars, 1794, which he discovered in the Corsini Library in Rome; Die dänische Reformationsgeschichte, 1802, 2 vols.; De schola Autiochenas, 1811; Religion der Karthager, 1816; Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen, 1833-34, 3 vols.; Effia et orgacla Montanitaram, 1829, etc. — L. PEIT.

MÜNZER, Thomas, was b. about 1490 at Stolberg in the Harz region, and educated at Aschersleben and Halle. After studying theology at Leipzig, he was first appointed teacher at the Martini Gymnasium in Hansewiek, 1817, then chaplain and confessor in the nunnery of Beutitz near Weissenfelde, 1519, and finally (1530) preacher at the Church of St. Mary in Zwickau. There his proper career began; though his craving for...
adventures, his passion for secret societies, and his talent as a deacon of the Reformation, had already previously revealed themselves. In Zwickau he immediately joined a union of fanatics, mostly weavers, who, with Nikolaus Storch at their head, had organized themselves under the leadership of twelve apostles and seventy-two disciples, and held secret convections, in which they proclaimed the principles of the revolution. The activity of the union soon developed into open conflicts with the civil authorities; but the magistrates stepped in with energy, and a great number of the members were expelled from the city. Müntzer left in April, 1521.

Wandering through Bohemia, where, in spite of the prevailing fermentation, he seems to have made only a slight impression, and Mark Bredenbur, he arrived, in the beginning of 1522, at Wittenberg, where Carlstadt and the Zwickau prophets had brought matters to a most dangerous crisis. Müntzer immediately joined in the general excitement; but when in March, Luther reappeared in the city, and began to preach, he soon came to feel that the place for the realization of his ideals was not there, and he consequently left. Having been elected pastor of Alstedt in 1523, he soon gained the entire confidence of his flock; and all the changes which he proposed in the ecclesiastical organization of his congregation were willingly accepted. But even at Alstedt he felt Luther as an obstacle, and to destroy the influence of Luther became his first object. From the presses of Eilenburg, Jena, and Alstedt, a swarm of libels were issued against Luther; but as those pamphlets also preached half religious, half social. He had drawn some inspiration from Joachim of Floris, Suso, and Tauler; and there were genuine elements of religious mysticism in his own nature. But the violence of his temper, and the incoherence of his character, prevented him from grasping the principles of the Reformation under any other form than that of wild fanaticism and uproar. His writings, which are few, and composed in an obscure and bombastic style, are unimportant, and show a singular combination of meagreness and confusion. To receive divine inspiration Müntzer claimed, in Latin by C. G. AURBACH (Wittenberg, 1718), ANGER (Zwickau, 1794), and in German by MELANCHTHON (Hagenau, 1655), A. L. SCHLÖZER (Göttingen, 1768), STROBEL (Nuremberg, 1786), A. VON BACZKO (Leipzig, 1812), GEBER (Sondershausen, 1831), STRIEP (Weissenau, 1866), SEIDEMAN (Leipzig, 1842), H. LEO (Berlin, 1856).

MURATORI, Ludovico Antonio, b. at Vignola, Oct. 21, 1672; d. at Modena, Jan. 23, 1750; studied theology, philosophy, and canon law in the university of the latter city; and was appointed conservator in the An. Luther, in 1524, at Mühlhausen, and there he found articles, in which they pretended to receive divine revelations. The activity of the union soon developed into open conflicts with the civil authorities; but the magistrates stepped in with energy, and a great number of the members were expelled from the city. Müntzer left in April, 1521.

MURATORIAN CANON. See CANON, p. 390.

MURDER AMONG THE HEBREWS was, from the very beginning of their life as a nation, considered one of the greatest crimes. The First Commandment of the second table forbade it, and the law applied to it the justa talionis in its widest scope. No fine was sufficient to expiate a murder. The very country was considered as defiled by that crime, and could be cleansed only by the blood of the murderer. Neither the city of refuge (Deut. xix. 4-13) nor the altar (Exod. xxi. 14) could shield him against the avenger of blood (which article see). Could the murderer not be found out, the elders of the city nearest to the place where the murdered man was discovered, should bring a young heifer, without blemish, to a "rough valley" in the neighborhood, sacrifice it, and by prayers and ablutions make manifest their detestation of the deed (Deut. xxi. 1-9). To the full definition of murder belongs intention (Exod. xxi. 14); and in Num. xxxv. 10-22
various criteria are mentioned from which intention might be inferred. If a person killed another accidentally, he was still liable to the revenge of blood, if the victim died immediately; but he might escape the revenge by shutting himself up in a city of refuge. Even if the victim were a thief, the slayer would not be excommunicated, only when the murder had taken place during night (Exod. xxii. 2, 3). Killing by poison is not mentioned in the Mosaic law. Later Jewish legislation treated it as a kind of witchcraft, and the very attempt was punished by death (Josephus : Antiquit. Jud., lib. ii. 15). Nor is murder of wife, or husband, or children, mentioned. Patricide is first spoken of in 1 Tim. i. 9. Fratricide was not punished more heavily than other kind of murder (Gen. xxvii. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 6). Suicide was specially abhorred (1 Sam. xxxi. 5; 2 Sam. xvii. 23). See also Josephus : Bell. Jud., 3, 8, 5. [1597] MURDOCK, James, D.D., b. in Westbrook, Conn., Feb. 16, 1776; d. in Columbus, Miss., Aug. 10, 1856. He was graduated from Yale College, 1797; entered the Congregational ministry; pastor in Princeton, Mass., 1802-15; professor of ancient languages in the University of Vermont, 1815-19; professor of sacred rhetoric and ecclesiastical history in Andover Theological Seminary, 1819-28; retired to New Haven, and from then till his death devoted himself exclusively to the study of church history, orientalia, and philosophy. The principal fruits of this learned leisure are a translation from the German of Münnscher's Elements of Dogmatic History, New Haven, 1830; a translation from the Latin of Mosheim's Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, New Haven, 1832, 3 vols., revised edition, New York, 1839 and often since (republished in London, edited by Soames, 1841, and Reid, 1845); a translation of Mosheim's Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine the Great, New York, 1851-52, 2 vols.; The New Testament : a literal translation from the Syriac Peshito version, New York, 1854. (This is a standard work) He also edited, with preface and notes, Milman's History of Christianity, New York, 1841, and wrote two original works, The Nature of the Atonement, Andover, 1823, a discourse which attracted considerable attention, and Sketches of Modern Philosophy, especially among the Germans, Hartford, 1849. MURNER, Thomas, b. at Strassburg, 1475; d. at Obernehmheim, Aug. 23, 1537; entered the Franciscan order in 1490; was ordained priest in 1494; studied afterwards theology, philosophy, canon law, etc., in Paris, Krakow, and Freiburg, and attempted at various places to teach logic and even jurisprudence by means of charts (Charitüdium logicae et Chartiludium institute summariæ). Greater reputation, however, he acquired as a poet. In 1509 appeared his Schelmenzunft und Narrenbesehnung: in 1514, his Ein andechtig geistliche Badenfort, etc.,—very incisive satires on the faults and follies of his time. But, though he had an open eye for the corruption of the Roman-Catholic Church, he was decidedly hostile to the Reformation. Against Luther he wrote no less than thirty-two pamphlets, of which five or six have been printed. After the establishment of the Reformation in Strassburg, he lived for some time at Obernehmheim, but was driven away by the outbreak of the Peasants' War, and fled to Switzerland. Having settled at Lucerne, he became the head of the Roman party, and one of the most energetic opponents of Zwingli. But in 1529 he had to flee also from Lucerne; and he was then able to return to Strassburg, where he spent the rest of his life. His life was written by G. E. Waldau, Nürembr., 1775. FRANZ LIST (Münche) MURRAY, John, founder of the Universalist denomination in America; b. in Alton, Hampshire, Eng., Dec. 10, 1741; d. in Boston, Mass., Sept. 3, 1815. His parents were members of the Church of England, and followers of Wesley. In 1751 they settled near Cork, Ireland. In 1760 Murray returned to England, and joined Mr. Whitefield's congregation; but embracing, somewhat later, the teachings of James Kelly (see art.), a Universalist preacher, he was excommunicated. In 1770 he emigrated to America, and became the Universalist minister, his first sermon in Good Luck, N.J., Sept. 30, 1770. His field of labor was at first New Jersey and New York, but afterwards, almost exclusively, New England. He was largely instrumental in the formation of the Independent Christian Universalists, and in 1815 was elected head of the Universalist society, an original works, The Nature of the Atonement, Andover, 1849; and became a Presbyterian pastor, first at Wilkesbarre, Penn., 1829, and from 1834 till his death, at Elizabethtown, N.J. In 1849 he was moderator of the (Old School) General Assembly. His fame rests upon his able and witty controversy with Bishop Hughes, afterwards published under the title Leiters to the Right Rev. John Hughes, Roman-Catholic Bishop of New York, New York, 1847-48, 3 series (collective ed., revised and enlarged, 1855). These letters appeared in the New-York Observer, over the signature of "Kirwan." They attracted wide notice at the time, and made his name a household word. They have been translated into several languages. He addressed another series to Chief-Justice Taney, published in 1832 under the title Romanism at Home. Dr. Murray also wrote Notes, Historical and Biographical, concerning Elizabethtown, 1844; and Men and Things as I saw them in Europe, New York, 1853.
MUSÄUS, Johann, b. at Langenwiesen, in Thuringia, Feb. 7, 1613; d. at Jena, 1681; studied philosophy and humaniora at Erfurt, afterwards theology at Jena; and was appointed professor there, first in history (1642), then in theology (1645). Possessed of an excellent philosophical training, he at once vindicated the application of philosophy to theology against the disciplines of the stiff Lutheran orthodoxy, and condemned its too universal use by the Reformed theologians. (See his De usu principiorum rationis, Jena, 1647, against the Dutch theologian, Nicholas Vedelias.) His conception of theology as an object, not only of the intellectus, but also of a pia affectio (see his Introductio in theologiam, Jena, 1679), led him to emphasize the importance of good works and of the sanctity of the will, to such a degree, that he has since been designated as a precursor of Spener. To the stiff and fixed definitions then prevalent in orthodox Lutheran dogmatism he was strongly opposed; and he refused to subscribe to the Consensus repetitus fidelis vere Lutheranæ, drawn up by Calov in 1655. A long and bitter controversy ensued (Theologorum Jenensium Errores, Wittenberg, 1676, principally directed against Musäus; Der jenischen Theologen Erklärung, Jena, 1676, Musäus’ answer, 718 pp. in quarto); but he lost the battle, and was compelled to renounce in a formal way all sympathy with the so-called “sincrétismus.” See HACKENSCHMIDT, in Studien und Kritiken, 1890.

HENKE.

MUSCULUS (MEUSEL), Andreas, b. at Schneeberg, in Saxony, 1514; d. at Francfort-on-the-Oder, Sept. 21, 1581; studied theology at Leipzig and at Wittenberg, where he became an enthusiastic disciple of Luther, and was in 1540 appointed professor of theology at Francfort-on-the-Oder. He was one of the gladiators of the Lutheran party; and in his controversies (with Stancarus, Staephylus, Abdis Prötorius, the magistrates of Francfort-on-the-Oder, etc.) he never yielded, though the students pelted him with stones in the street, and stormed his house. He published forty-six books, and partook in the drawing-up of the Torgau-Book and the Formula Concordiae. His life, written by CUR. H. WINGARTEN, was published at Francfort-on-the-Oder, 1586.

MUSCULUS (MÜSSLIN or MEUSSLIN), Wolfgang, b. at Dieuze, in Lorraine, Sept. 8, 1497; d. at Bern, Aug. 30, 1563; was educated in the Benedictine monastery near Liexheim, but left it in 1527, roused by Luther’s writings; studied in Stralsburg under Capito and Butzer; married, and was appointed pastor at Augsburg in 1531, and professor of theology at Bern in 1549. Originally in favor of a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, he afterwards gave up the idea entirely, and followed an exclusively Calvinistic direction, as seen both from his Commentaires and his Loci communes (Basel, 1560, and afterwards often reprinted). See his life by L. GROTE, Hamburg, 1855.

MUSCRAVE, George Washington, D.D., LL.D., b. in Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1804; d. there Thursday, Aug. 24, 1889; he entered the junior class of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, but his poor health prevented his finishing the course; yet, pursuing private studies, he finally entered Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed, 1828, and was pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, July, 1839–52; was corresponding secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1852–53, and of the Board of Home Missions, 1853–61, 1868–70; from 1862 to 1866, pastor of the North Tenth-street Church, Philadelphia. He was president of the Presbyterian Historical Society, a director of Princeton Theological Seminary from 1838, and a trustee of the College of New Jersey from 1859 until his death in 1889. In 1866 he was moderator of the (Old School) Presbyterian General Assembly. He was particularly prominent in the re-union movement of 1867–69, and was chairman of the joint committee on reconstruction, May, 1870. He was a stanch Calvinist and Presbyterian and an eloquent speaker. He never married. See Presbyterian Re-union Memorial Volume, New York, 1870, especially pp. 541 sqq., for his work in connection with the re-union.

MUSIC AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS AMONG THE HEBREWS. Instrumental music, although, according to Gen. iv. 21, of profane, Cainitish origin, appears to have been used in Hebrew antiquity, especially in the service of God, and the more so, since Israel has been separated from among the Shemitic tribe to be the people of God. A larger variety of instruments of the people probably brought along out of Egypt. When the people sang praises to God for his great deeds,—be it after a victory, or after a deliverance out of great distress (Exod. xv. 4, 20; Num. xxi. 17 sq.; Judg. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xvii. 6; 2 Chron. xx. 28; Neh. xii. 22; Ps. lxv. 25 sq.; 1 Macc. iv. 24, 54, xiii. 51); or at the anointing of a king, or a marriage (1 Kings i. 39 sq.; Jer. xxv. 10; 1 Macc. ix. 39), or when the people met on solemn occasions (2 Sam. vi. 4 sq. 15; 1 Chron. xiii. 8, xv. 16, xvi. 5 sq., xxv. 1 sq.; 2 Chron. v. 12 sq.), even at idolatrous feasts (Exod. xxxii. 6),—song and music, also dancing, together with poetry, were combined for the one great purpose. According to the Mosaic law (Num. x. 2–10; Lev. xxiii. 24, xxv. 9), trumpets only were used, not so much in divine service, but for announcing holy seasons, or as signals at sacrifices, and in the marching and in war. Since, however, the assemblies of the theocratic people had the character of a divine service, the trumpets could only be blown by the priests (Num. x. 2 sq.). The song of the female choirs mentioned (Judg. xi. 34; 2 Sam. xviii. 6 sq.) was not of a religious character. The cultivation of sacred music, which was commenced under Samuel, especially through the establishment of the school of the prophets (1 Sam. x. 5; xix. 19, 20), reached its height under David, who, encouraged and assisted by the choir of the prophets (2 Chron. xxix. 25), was not only an expert in song and music himself, but also an inventor of musical instruments, as may be seen from Amos vi. 5. His chief of the musicians instructed the people (2 Sam. i. 18); and the wonderful effects—soothing, on the one hand (1 Sam. xvi. 14 sq.), and inspiring, on the other hand (1 Sam. x. 5, xix. 20; 2 Kings iii. 15)—of the music of David, of the choir of the prophets, as well as of the temple orchestra (2 Chron. v. 12 sq.), indicate a certain degree of perfection of sacred music, in spite of its simplicity. According to 1 Chron. xxiii. 5, the-
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I. Instruments of Percussion and Agitation. — The most ancient percussion instrument mentioned in the Scripture is the _kinnor_, or harp, in its nature and properties, an instrument of the _cymbal_ class, but which belonged, 1. The _kinnor_, first mentioned in the Old Testament, as Gen. iv. 21. It was used as an instrument to accompany spiritual as well as worldly song (Gen. iv. 21). It was often mentioned in the Old Testament, as in Ps. lxvi. 25; Isa. xxvii. 8, and often. 2. _Tselshin_ (1 Sam. vi. 5), "shaking instruments," consisting of two iron bars, with movable rings and bars of metal inserted in the frame, by the sharp impact of which upon the frame, when shaken in the hand, a piercing sound was produced. 4. _Shalishim_ (1 Sam. xviii. 6) are either a kind of cymbals, or triangles.

II. Stringed Instruments, or _neginoth_, to which belonged, 1. The _kinnor_, first mentioned in Gen. iv. 21. It was used as an instrument to accompany the _hallel_ virtual as well as worship song (Gen. xxxi. 27; 1 Sam. xvi. 16 sq.; 1 Chron. xxv. 6; Isa. v. 16, xxiii. 8, etc.). 2. The _nebel_, a stringed instrument apparently much resembling the _kinnor_, or harp, in its nature and properties, though considerably different in form. According to Josephus (Ant., VIII. 12, 13), it had twelve strings, which were played upon with the hand. One variety of it had only ten strings (Ps. xxxiiii. 2; exviii. 9), and from an expression in Isa. xxii. 24 ( Heb., "all manner of nebel instruments"), we gather that the instrument, like the harp, was used in various sizes and shapes. 3. The _sabbeka_ (John v. 3), probably also, a stringed instrument. With this instrument female performers visited the Roman Empire.

III. Wind Instruments. — 1. The most ancient of these was the _wug_ (Gen. iv. 21; Job xxi. 19, xxx. 31; Ps. cl. 4), a kind of bagpipe. 2. The _halil_, or flute, the making of which is bored through (1 Sam. v. 5; 1 Kings i. 40; Isa. v. 12, xxx. 29; Jer. xviii. 38; Matt. ix. 28, xi. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 7; Rev. xvi. 22; 1 Mac. iv. 54, ix. 39). It was originally formed from the reed, by the simple contrivance of cutting a larger or smaller number of holes of its length, but it was afterwards more artistically made of wood, bone, horn, and ivory. It is still used in Palestine. 3. The _mashrokitca_ (Dan. iii. 5) was an instrument of the pipe class, but what kind is impossible to determine. 4. The _shophar_, "horn," often interchanged with _keren_; hence it is difficult to draw a distinction between them. Both, originally made out of the horns of the ram, were probably in later times of metals. The instrument was used in the service of God, in making announcements, and for calling the people together in the time of holy solemnities, of war, or rebellion, or of commensation. By the Septuagint it is rendered _lympanon_, drum. It is often mentioned in the Old Testament, as Exod. xv. 20; Job xxi. 12; Ps. cxlv. 9; and from an expression in Isa. xxii. 9, 27; 1 Sam. xvi. 16 sq.; 1 Chron. xxv. 6; Jer. xxxi. 13; Num. x. 10; Judg. iii. 7; 1 Sam. xiii. 8, 10; 2 Chron. xv. 14; Isa. xviii. 3. 5. The _chatotserah_, the straight trumpet, was also used for signalling. The two silver trumpets appointed by Moses to be made for the use of the people, in the time of the construction, and were used for announcing to the people the advent of the different feasts, for signalling the journeying of the camps, and for sounding alarms in time of war (Num. x. 1-10). Solomon increased the number to a hundred and twenty (2 Chron. v. 12).
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MUSIC. Sacred. Of the music of the ancient Jewish Church, little need be said in this article. In the days of Solomon, the office of praise in public worship was not left to regulate itself. Of the thirty-eight thousand Levites, four thousand were set apart to praise the Lord with the instruments of music which David had made (1 Chron. xxii. 5). Two hundred and eighty-eight chosen cunning men were instructed in the songs of the Lord (1 Chron. xxv. 7). In the tabernacle and in the temple, both the instrumental and vocal performers were selected from among the Levites, and they were specially trained for the service. The music was of the crudest and most rudimental kind: it was without harmony, with very little melody; recitative and responsive, or hymnsal and chant.

It was the Incarnation which gave birth to song. After the Last Supper, our Lord and his disciples sang together before going to the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26). “At midnight, Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God,” (Acts xvi. 25). Then we find the apostle exhorting the church at Ephesus, and that at Colosse, to worship in “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16).

We are told of the Christians of apostolic times, that “they were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God,” and that “they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God” (Luke xxiv. 53; Acts ii. 47). Such is the New-Testament basis of the history which we are to review.

Primitive Christians were characterized in history by Pliny, as those who sang hymns to the praise of Christ. The first efforts to systematize the music of the early church were made by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, 374-397. For the most part, his work was the adaptation of Greek music to the use of the church. The introduction of the four scales, known as the “Authentic Modes” (1. Dorian; 2. Phrygian; 3. Lydian; 4. Mixolydian), is generally ascribed to Ambrose.

But, much as Ambrose did, his work was greatly surpassed by that of Gregory the Great, 590-604. Gregory changed all this. His aim was to simplify the music of the church, regarding, as he did, all rhythmic singing as too light and frivolous for the purposes of worship. Short melodies, or chants, for the psalms, were prepared, - melodies with only a few intervals, - consisting of the “Intonation” (two or more notes for the minister or precentor), the “Recitation,” the “Mediation,” and the “Cadence.” There were no flats or sharps, there was no rhythm, there were no bars, or measures of time, there was no harmony, as we understand it: and yet these Gregorian Chants form the basis of the cathedral music, both in the Roman Church and in the Anglican, to this day; while many of them, adapted and harmonized, have made their way more or less widely through all branches of the church. They were the chief music of the Anglican Church, not only immediately after the Reformation, but even late in the seventeenth century: they are in Marbeck’s book (1556), in Morley’s (1597), in Lowe’s (1681), in Clifford’s (1694), and in Canon John’s Collection of Choral Uses of the Churches of England and Ireland.

Choirs were formed as early as the fourth century; and the Council of Laodicea found it necessary to forbid congregational singing. But Gregory reformed the abuses, and restored music to the people. It is said that a copy of his Antiphonary is in possession of the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland; a facsimile of which was published in 1867.

After Gregory’s time, there was a marked decline in the music of the church. By the seventh century the priests had monopolized the singing, and they sang only in Latin. From thence till the Reformation, the people were almost songless in public worship. In the eleventh century, Guido Aretino gave a new impulse to musical study: he introduced a system of notation, and the practice of solmization by scales of six sounds only. The names of notes still in use were suggested by an ancient hymn to John the Baptist:

“Ut” “Re” “Mi” “Fa” “Sol” “La,” became thus the names of six tones. “Ut” was afterwards changed to “Do,” and “Si” was added to complete the scale. Before the eleventh century, in written music the length of notes was not indicated. The oldest notation is on three or four lines, without bars or measures, and with square or angular notes variously colored. By the twelfth century the position of a note determined its pitch, and the shape, its length. A Latin manuscript of the tenth century shows some slight knowledge of chords. It may be said that the organ is the mother of harmony, and the violin the mother of melody; that Germany was the birthplace of harmony, and Italy the home of melody. In the fourteenth century we first meet the word contrapunctum, or “counterpoint.” Toward the last of this century some Belgian musicians brought to Rome the first harmonized masses that had been seen there.
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The sixteenth century witnessed a great revival of musical interest and a great advance in musical knowledge. In France, at the suggestion of Beza, the court poet Marot prepared and published a version of some of the psalms in French rhymes, which became so popular, that the Sorbonne, though at first favoring them, at last felt constrained to forbid their use. These psalms, Calvin adopted, and published in Geneva, with a preface of his own. Luther devoted much time and attention to the preparation of music for the people, and published a small book in which the hymns and the tunes were mostly of his own composition. The people received this volume with avidity; and the air was full of the sound of sacred song. Cardinal Cajetan said of Luther, “By his songs he has conquered us.” The “Infectious frenzy of sacred song,” as it was called, was not confined to Germany, but was almost co-extensive with the Reformation. Sternhold and Hopkins (1548–49), followed by Rouse (1641), by Tate and Brady (1596), and then by Watts (1674–1748), carried on the work in England. With the Church in Rome the music had become so secular, that it came under the censure of the Council of Basle; and afterward the Council of Trent almost resolved to banish music from the church altogether. In 1563 Pius IV. appointed eight cardinals to carry out the will of the Council. Meanwhile a great musician had been raised up for the emergency,—Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, b. in Palestrina (Prpeneste) near Rome, 1524; d. in Rome, 1594. The exact date of his birth is uncertain. This name marks the greatest epoch in the history of music after that of Gregory the Great. Palestrina starved through seven pontificates, but in and by his sufferings he became great. The committee of cardinals applied to Palestrina to save music to the church by such a composition as would silence opposition. In answer to this request, Palestrina composed his Missa Papae Marcelli. When the Pope heard one of these masses, he declared that it must have been some such music that the apostle of the Apocalypse heard sung by the triumphant hosts of angels in the New Jerusalem. The crisis was passed, and music was saved to the church. Palestrina may be said to have founded a school of church music. He was skilled in all the intricacies of his art, and carried the science of counterpoint much higher than had been done before. Some of his masses and motets are still in use in the Roman-Catholic Church; and three of his motets, adapted to psalms, are still in use in the English cathedral service. He was buried with great pomp in St. Peter’s. His last words were directions to his son for the publication of his manuscripts,—“for the glory of the Almighty, and his worship in the congregations of the faithful.”

The oratorio, for a time, advanced side by side with the opera; but a divergence came, not long after the beginning of the seventeenth century. Carissimi and the Scarlattis had prepared the way in Italy; and Bach (1685–1750), Handel (1684–1759), Haydn (1732–1809), and Mendelssohn (1809–47), besides others less conspicuous, made the oratorio extremely popular in Germany, England, and the United States. Of the masters of the symphonic school, and of the great writers for the lyric stage, it is not necessary here to speak. A recent elaborate work in the style of the oratorio is Gounod’s Redemption.

We turn to take a brief survey of the history of church music in America. When the Puritans came to this country, they brought with them Ainsworth’s Version of the Psalms. In 1640 The Bay Psalm-Book was published; and the music for the later editions was taken principally from Ravencroft’s Collection (London, 1618). About the year 1690, music was first published in this country. In 1712, or thereabout, the Rev. John Tufts published A Very Plain and Easy Introduction to the Art of singing Psalm-Tunes. In 1718 Dr. Cotton Mather published Psalterium Americanum: this was followed in 1721 by Walter’s singing-book,—The Grounds and Rules of Musick explained. There was much ignorance, and not a little bigoted prejudice, among the churches against singing by note; but gradually singing-schools were established, which prepared the way for a general awakening of interest. In 1761 a music-book was published, under the title of Urania: three years later, another collection of music was published in Boston by Josiah Flaggs. The 1770 William Billings published in Boston a collection which had a wide popularity. Choirs and singing-societies had become general; and rapidly the people learned to sing the simple melodies and crude harmonies which were furnished them.

The republication of the Lock Hospital Collection (Boston, September, 1809), and of the Harmonia Sacra (Andover, 1816), marked a new era in musical culture in this country. It was the first grammatical music given to our people. Early in this century, Lowell Mason, Mus. Doc. (1792–1872), and Thomas Hastings, Mus. Doc. (1784–1872), began their musical careers,—the one in Boston, and the other in New York. Singing-schools and musical societies and conventions were multiplied. More than seventy distinct musical publications were issued by these two writers; and for some years a new collection of tunes was expected each year.

About the year 1856 this rapid multiplication of tune-books ceased, and ceased quite suddenly; and the present era of the “hymn-tune book” began. Much music, meanwhile, has been prepared expressly for the use of the sabbath school; and many books of what is called “refrain-music” have been published, for use in conference-meetings and revival services. With the growth of general musical cultivation, there has been developed a disposition to deny to the church a distinct repertoire, and to mingle secular music with sacred, and even to crowd out the sacred by the secular. The choral music, which has maintained its place so successfully in Germany and England, has not been popular here, where the people prefer light and frivolous melodies, or operatic airs, or else intricate harmonies, which can be sung, for the most part, only by professional choirs. The re-action will be, it is not for the writer to predict.

MYSTAGOGY (introduction to the mysteries). The latter term is applied by the Greek Fathers, and to the sacraments. Mystagogus was the name of an initiator into the mysteries, a sort of spiritual guide, as to-day, in medical science, a teacher or Adviser. Mystagogues were used in the decoration of houses and rooms on joyful occasions, were thrown in the way of victors in their triumphs, and were woven into wreaths and chaplets for heroes and guests. Mystagogues figured particularly at weddings, as the shrub was symbolic of virginity, and of conjugal love. The Jews used its branches to cover their booths during the feast of tabernacles. See D. F. Strauss: Ulrich von Hulten, Leipzig, 1858. Mystagogus was also put in wine to give it a spicy taste and smell; and this unintoxicating wine was a favorite with the ladies. Jesus, before his crucifixion, was offered wine mingled with myrrh (Mark xiv. 30), probably the sour wine of the Roman soldiers.

MYSTACOCUE (an initiator into the mysteries), MYSTAGOGY (introduction to the mysteries). The latter term is applied by the Greek Fathers, and in the Greek Church, to the sacraments; and the former, to the priest who prepares candidates for baptism.

Mysticism has been defined as belief in an immediate and continuous communication between God and the soul, which may be established by means of certain peculiar religious exercises; as belief in an inner light, an illumination of the soul, a contemplation of the divine, which may be thus written down in the heart, and expressed in mystic language, etc. This definition, however, identifies mysticism too closely with its extravagances, its more or less unsound developments,—quietism, enthusiasm, fanaticism, etc., and overlooks that...
there is a mystical element in all true religion, both objectively in the revelation, and subjectively in the faith. According to general acceptance, therefore, mysticism simply means a one-sided development of that element. Religion is an equal interaction of the consciousness of God and the consciousness of self. But the mystic disturbs the balance by throwing himself wholly upon his consciousness of God, and, so to speak, losing the consciousness of his own self in the feeling of God. As soon, however, as the mirror of the personality of man is dimmed, the image of the personality of God is also dimmed, and the strange, pantheistic speculations, so characteristic of mysticism, begin; while, practically, the strained ideas of the power of human life to grasp and represent the divine lead into asceticism, ecstasies, etc.

In history, mysticism generally appears as the re-action against the formula. Whenever the intellectual strain has become crystallized into stiff dogmas, and the definition begins to tyrannize over the free flow of spiritual life, the element of feeling, mystical in its very nature, rises and protests. Thus Brahmanism called forth Buddhism; the Talmud, the Cabala; the Mohammedan Koran-worship, Sufism; and, within the pale of Christendom, the theology of the Spanish Inquisition called forth the Alonbrados, Jesuitism, Quietism, Jansenism, etc. This must not be understood, however, as if the appearance of mysticism in history merely consisted of a series of abrupt outbursts. On the contrary, between the single phenomena there is a strong internal connection. At the foundation of the Christian Church, John stands as the born mystic in the circle of the apostles. Later on, Alexandria, the tomb of pro-Christian mysticism, became the cradle of Christian mysticism. From the Alexandrian theology ensued monasticism and the pseudo-Dionysian writings; that is, the practical organ and the speculative representation of Christian mysticism. Finally, during the middle ages, mysticism gained the ascendency over scholasticism in the Western Church, and produced a strong internal connection between the Johannean logos-doctrine and the Alexandrian theology, and between the pseudo-Dionysian writings and the Victorines. Indeed, mysticism and scholasticism, though the former generally appears as the re-action against the latter, are simply the two faces of the head of Janus, equally important in the history of the Church; and when in the middle ages, scholasticism stood at its highest, mysticism also reached its fullest development.

The medieval mysticism falls into three groups, — the Greek, the Gallo-Bromanic, and the Germanic. The mysticism of the Greek Church found in the fifth century its type in the pseudo-Dionysian writings, and, in the seventh century, its most considerable representative in the monk Maximus. After that time, it seems, in the cells of the monks, to have sunk into a merely pathological quietism; and, if the middle state of life, the Hesychastics can be designated as a kind of religious somnambulism, the Greek Church may be said, in the synods of Constantinople of 1341, 1347, and 1550, to have established somnambulism as the highest form of divine revelation. A corresponding phenomenon is found in the Western Church in the visions of the female saints, — Elizabeth of Schönau, St. Hildegarde, St. Birgitta, St. Catharine of Siena, and others; but the phenomenon has there a distinctly popular character. Nicolaus Cabasilas, in the fourteenth century, shows that the Greek mysticism, however, was capable of higher inspirations, which is a striking fact, that, even in the Greek and Russian churches of to-day, mysticism presents a peculiar aspect of merely pathological somnambulism. Another trait is also very characteristic, — the tendency the Greek mysticism evinces to fall into heryesy. From the old mystical Gnosticism and Manichæism grew up a great number of heretical sects, some of which were very powerful, as, for instance, the Paulicians in the seventh century, and, later on, the Bogomiles, who were intimately connected with the wide-spread communities of the Cathari in the Western Church.

The passing conflict between scholasticism and mysticism, which took place when Bernard of Clairvaux attacked Abelard, afterwards developed into a continuous contest. The pseudo-Dionysian writings, which were introduced in the Western Church in the ninth century by Scotus Egerius, formed the Gnostic-mystic mysticism. Its principal seat was the monastery of St. Victor in Paris; and its principal representatives were Hugh, Richard, and Walter of St. Victor, all belonging to the twelfth century. Its most characteristic trait may be found in the curious fact, that, though it made a decided opposition to scholasticism, it was itself scholastical, and used the same forms and methods as its adversary. No wonder, therefore, that Bonaventura in the thirteenth, and Gerson in the fourteenth century, endeavored to reconcile the two antagonists. In the writings of Joachim of Floris this mysticism assumed an apocalyptic character. Among its aberrations may be mentioned the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, the Fraticelli, the Beguines, and the Beghards, etc. At the beginning of the thirteenth century a mystical pantheism stood in full bloom in the Rhine regions among the Brethren of the Free Spirit. The doctrine is generally put in connection with the Aristotelian pantheism of Amalric of Bena, and David of Dinant; and Meister Eckart, a provincial of the Dominican order, and consequently one of the chief champions of orthodoxy, is often mentioned as one of the centres of the whole movement. Eckart's views are at all events very closely related to those of Scotus Egerius. Among his successors were Tauler, the great mystical preacher; Suso, a poetical genius; Ruybroek, the doctor ecstaticus; and others. From the Rhine region, the movement passed on into the Netherlands, where Gerhard Groot formed the community of the Brethren of Common Life, to which Thomas à Kempis belonged. Its final result was the German Reformation.

In the history of the Reformation, the Anabaptists designate a wild outburst of an unsound, fanatical mysticism as theistic, as soon as doctrinal correctness gained the ascendency in Lutherdom over the living faith, the protests of mysticism appeared often in very curious forms, such as the montanistic chiliasm of Petersen, the ascetic theosophy of Gichtel, the pantheistic spiritualism...
of Dippel, etc. (See G. Arnold: Kirchen- und Ketzer-Geschichte, 1809, vol. ii.) During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, mysticism entered into various combinations with Pietism, Hermubtianism, Methodism, etc., producing, in the eighteenth century, the Hebraeans in Holland, the Hutchinsonians and Jumpers in England, the Zionites in Norway, etc., and, in the nineteenth century, the Antonians in Switzerland, the Harmonists in North America, the Muckers in Württemberg, etc. But most of these phenomena belong under the head of chiliasm, or fanaticism, rather than under that of mysticism. The Reformed Church also had its mystics in the Labadists, besides a number of wild aberrations; and it is a curious fact that the Reformed Labadism on the one side is connected with the Roman-Catholic Jansenism, and on the other with the Lutheran Spenerian. The Jansenists are the mystics of the modern Roman-Catholic Church. But also the Alombrados in Spain, and the Molinitists in Italy must be mentioned, besides a number of independent phenomena. — St. Francis of Sales, Fénelon, Michael Bajus, etc.


M.YTHICAL THEORY, The, and the Legendary Theory, form a group of their own among the false theories of the life of Christ. They agree in considering the gospel narrative, in all its supernatural and miraculous features, as a poetical fiction: but they differ in the closer definition of the character of the fiction; the one dissolving the statements into myths, the other into legends.

The myth starts from an idea, and invents facts to embody and represent it: the legend starts from facts, which it modifies and alters, until they fit a certain idea. The myth-making instinct belongs naturally to the childhood of a nation, and may be considered as a stepping-stone towards truth. The various mythologies — the Indian, Greek, Scandinavian, Finnish, etc. — are splendid examples of its activity. The legendary instinct appears much later in the life of a people, and arises from an exuberant imagination and religious enthusiasm, but also from an utter want of the critical faculty. It seems to be merely a weakness, a lack of power to grasp the truth, and to distinguish it from fiction. — the mediæval martyrology is a typical instance of its modus operandi.

The mythical theory was applied to the gospel history by D. F. Strauss, in his Leben Jesu, 1835. He does not deny the historical existence of Jesus: he even admits him to have been a religious genius of the first magnitude. But, from pantheistic premises, he resolves all the supernatural and miraculous elements of Christ's person and history into myths, or imaginative representations of religious ideas. The ideas thus symbolized, especially the idea of the essential unity of the divine and human, are declared to be true in the abstract, as applied to humanity as a whole, but denied in the concrete, or in their application to an individual. The theory may be reduced to the following syllogism: There was a fixed idea in the Jewish mind, nourished by the Old-Testament writings, that the Messiah would perform certain miracles, — heal the sick, raise the dead, etc.; there was a strong persuasion in the minds of the disciples of Jesus, that he actually was the promised Messiah: therefore the mytho-poetic faculty instinctively invented the miracles corresponding to the Messianic conception, and ascribed them to him.

The legendary theory was applied to the gospel history by E. Renan, in his Vie de Jésus, 1863. He agrees with Strauss with respect to the fictitious character of the gospel narrative; but he has a better appreciation of the reality, and of the environments, of the life of Jesus. He correctly remarks, that the term "myths" is more applicable to India and primitive Greece than to the ancient traditions of the Hebrews and the Shemitic nations in general. He prefers the terms "legends" and "legendary narratives," which, while they concede a large influence to the working of opinions, allow the action and the personal character of Jesus to stand out in their completeness. He regards the so-called "legend" of Jesus as the fruit of the consentaneous enthusiasm and imaginative impulse of the primitive disciples. No great event in history, he says, has passed without creating a cycle of fables; and Jesus could not have silenced those popular creations, even if he had wished to. Thus he brings the gospel history down to a level with the history of Francis of Assisi, and other marvellous saints of the Roman-Catholic Church; though, inconsistently enough, he prefers to quote the myth of Saky–Muni, the founder of Buddhism, as a parallel, thus falling back upon the mythical theory.

NAAMAN, a distinguished Syrian general, who, through the agency of Elisha, was miraculously cured of leprosy by dipping himself seven times in the Jordan. The story is found in 2 Kings v., and teaches many valuable lessons of the goodness of God and the pride of man. On the traditional site of Naaman's house in Damascus, there is to-day a leper-house. Our Lord refers to Naaman's cure in his sermon to the Nazarenes (Luke iv. 37).

NAASENES. See Gnosticism, p. 880.

NA'BAL (fool), a synonyme of churlishness and bestiality; the husband of the wise Abigail (who subsequently was married to David), and a wealthy citizen of Maon, a town of Judah near Hebron. He would have avenged on David and his band; whereupon David determined his destruction, but was prevented by Abigail's prudent gifts. Nabul, on being told by her of her action as he was recovering from a drinking-bout, was seized with an illness, from which he died in ten days. This episode is related in 1 Sam. xxiv. 2-43.

NABAT'EAENS. See Arabia, p. 123.

NA'DAL, Bernard Harrison, D.D., LL.D., b. in Talbot County, Md., March 27, 1812; d. at Madison, N.J., June 20, 1870. He was admitted as a preacher at the (former) Baltimore Conference, 1833, and had various charges, several in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Washington. While stationed at Carlisle, he studied in Dickinson College, and was graduated 1848. From 1854 to 1867 he was a professor in Indiana Asbury University. From 1867 till his death he was professor of church history in Drew Theological Seminary, and, after Dr. McClintock's death, was acting president. Dr. Nadal was a vigorous abolitionist. By his speeches and sermons on this subject he made a great impression. His attainments were quite extensive, and he was a welcome contributor to the religious press. He was, for a session, chaplain to Congress. See Memoir, in the posthumous volume of his sermons, New Life Dawning, and other Discourses, New York, 1873.

NA'HIR is the name of Abraham's grandfather, the father of Terah (Gen. xi. 26). This younger Nahor had eight sons (Gen. xxi. 23), among whom was Bethuel, the father of Rebekah. When Abraham went forward to the west, Nahor remained in Mesopotamia, in "the city of Nahor" (Gen. xxiv. 10), and continued a Pagan. The relation, however, between the two lines—that of Abraham and that of Nahor,—was not immediately broken off (Rebekah, Leah, and Rachel).

NA'HUM (consolation), one of the twelve Minor Prophets, who consol'd Israel with the prophecy that Jehovah would punish its chief enemy, Assyria. He is called (i. 1) the "Eikonomus"—the hisser, as a village in Galilee which had been pointed out to him; and perhaps this was the same as the present El-Kauzeh, near Ramah, in Naphtali. Some hold that Alkuseh in Assyria was the prophet's birthplace; but, as this rests upon a tradition dating back only to the sixteenth century, we prefer to connect Nahum with the place mentioned by Jerome. Some hold that the prophet wrote in Assyria; and appeal is made to the Assyrian coloring of the imagery, to the absence of references to any sojourn in Judah, and to the language. As to the Assyrian coloring, it is nothing more than we would naturally expect from a vivid imagination. As for the absence of references to any sojourn in Judah, which Ewald presses, Maurer and Hitzig refer to i. 4, and Umbreit to i. 13—ii. 3, as making directly the opposite impression. Ewald brings forward three words—nabû (ii. 9), sülû (iii. 17), nā (iii. 17)—as being of Assyrian origin; and the last two certainly are. But no one has thought of asserting that Jeremiah uttered his prophecy in Assyria because he uses the third of these words (li. 27) and other Oriental terms.

The date of Nahum is put by most of the critics in the reign of Hezekiah; some, however, regarding it as having been uttered before Sennacherib's invasion; others, during its continuance, and occasioned by it. Ewald makes the prophet a contemporary of Josiah, and regards him as having the attack of Phraortes against Assyria in mind. It has been thought that Sennacherib's defeat before the walls of Jerusalem was fresh in the prophet's mind; but this cannot be made out with any certainty from i. 9, 11, 12, ii. 13. The only safe starting-point for determining the date is the passage iii. 8 sqq. Here an historical fact is appealed to, which Schrader has confirmed from the cuneiform inscriptions. These record the destruction of No-Amon (see margin to iii. 8), or Thebes, which was accomplished by Assurbanipal in his second campaign against Egypt (probably 685 B.C.). Nahum threatens Nineveh with the same fate that had come upon Thebes, and had the destruction of the latter vividly before his mind. We may, therefore, set the date of the prophecy at 660 B.C.

The prophecy depicts the power of God in the judgment against Nineveh, and derives it from her sins. The genuineness has been undisputed, except the first part of i. 1 by Eichhorn, Bartholdt, Ewald, etc. But there is no good reason for disputing this: for, as Hävernick says, why should it be considered unfitting if the prophet, before announcing his name, should declare the purpose of the book? Nahum's style is distinguished by poetical beauty and classic purity. Lowth, in his Hebrew Poetry, pungently says, "Of all the Minor Prophets, no one seems to equal Nahum in sublimity, warmth, and boldness," etc.

LIT. — Commentaries,—Luther, 1555; Chytræus, Viteb., 1565; Haferssreffer, Stuttg., 1683; Abarbanel, Helmst., 1705; H. A. Grimm, Düsseldorf, 1790; Forrer, Hamburg, 1843; Lehmann, Leipzig, 1820; Hokelemann, Leipzig, 1842; O. Straus, Berol., 1853; Kleinert (Eng. trans., in the Lange series by Professor Eliott, New York, 1870); Gandall, in Speaker's Commentary.
peculiarities of the animals named. The nomen chon, etc.) or historical occurrence (Gen. xi. 9, xxii. 14, xxvi. 20, xxviii. 19, etc.). The same natural characteristic (e.g., Rama, Mizpah, Jericho, etc.) or designates the specific historical place of occurrence (Gen. ii. 20, iv. 29). The name was also regarded as an ornament; as, for instance, in the case of Benjamin (Gen. 35, 18), Nabal (1 Sam. xiv. 25), etc.

In the Bible, names are specially significant as pledges of the divine guidance, and defining the relation of the bearer to God. Such names were either given at birth,— as Noah (Gen. v. 29), Jahmael (xvi. 11), Isaac (xxi. 3), Jesus (Matt. i. 21), etc.,— or subsequently, on some particular occasion, as the entrance upon new relations, as in the case of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 5), Sarah (xvii. 15), Israel (xlii. 20), Joshua (Num. xiii. 16), Cephas (John i. 42), Barnabas (Acts iv. 30), etc. In the same way, perhaps, Saul took the name " Paul" from his first convert, Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii. 12). The prophets laid much emphasis upon a name. Nathan calls Solomon Jedidiah (2 Sam. xii. 25); and Hosea (i. t.) and Isaiah (vii. 9, viii. 3) press out of or into the natural name that which God characterizes in His people. Thus Israel is said to "walk in the name of the Lord " (Zech. x. 12), that is, to experience his power; and the expression, " Thy name is called upon us " (Jer. xx. 3, margin), is only a further explanation of the previous expression, " Thou art in our midst. " And, when God announces his mighty presence, it is said, " Thy name is near " (Ps. lixxv. 1).

Likewise in the New Testament, the expression, " the name of Christ," refers to all that Jesus is to men, and to the manner of his revelation of himself to them. Thus Acts xii. 14, " As he chose a man on account of personal qualifications he calls him by name (Exod. xxxii. 2; Isa. xlv. 3, 4). The reception of a new name from God (Isa. lxv. 15; Rev. ii. 17, etc.) indicates a new personal relation to God, inaugurated by grace.

The names used by different nations are an important monument of the national spirit and moral tone. Likewise the names current in Israel are a significant testimony to its peculiar calling, and amongst no people of antiquity do religiously significant names occur of a religious origin. Matthew HIffer's collection (Onomastikon) contains a hundred names of this kind. Composed with the divine name, בַּיָּמִים (Elohim), רֶחֶם (Tavor), and, later, with רֶוֶם (Jahbec), they contain references to God's attributes, and his relations to the chosen people, or express hope in and thanks and petition to God. The religious significance of the name was enhanced by the connection of the naming of boys with circumcision (Luke i. 19, ii. 21). To be called

by one's name was another expression for the rights of inheritance (Gen. xlvii. 10; Deut. xxv. 7). Children frequently received names which were not words arbitrarily chosen, but expressed the distinct impressions which objects made upon, or the special relations in which they stood to, the person. Thus, as it would appear, the first giving of names of persons. They bring out some prominent characteristic connected with the birth, etc. (Gen. xxv. 25-30; 1 Sam. iv. 21, etc.), or designate the specific historical place of the individual (Gen. iii. 20, iv. 29). The name was also regarded as an ornament; as, for instance, in the case of Benjamin (Gen. 35, 18), Nabal (1 Sam. xiv. 25), etc.

New York, 1876. See the Introductions to the Old Testament of BLEEK, KEIL, REUSS, etc., and WULF.
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NATHAN.

NAPHTALI. See Tribes of Israel.

NARD. See BRISE.

NARDIN, Jean Frédéric, b. at Montéliard in 1687; d. at Blamont in 1728; studied theology at Tübingen; was strongly impressed by the German Pietism, and was appointed pastor of Hericourt in 1714, and of Blamont in 1715. A collection of his sermons (Le prédicateur évangélique. Bâle, 1735) was often reprinted, but not in Paris, 1821, in 4 vols. His life was written by Duvernoy.

NARTHEX, an architectural term, of somewhat doubtful etymology, designating that portion of the ancient church — sometimes without and sometimes within the building — in which the catechumens and penitents gathered. It communicated with the nave by the "beautiful gates," where stood the Audientes; and with the outside, by the "great gates," where stood the catechumens.

NASMITH, David, Scotch philanthropist, b. at Glasgow, March 21, 1799; d. at Guildford, Nov. 17, 1839. He was the originator of city missions, having established the first one, in Glasgow, 1826. He founded the London City Mission, 1835, and city missions in many other cities of Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. From 1821 to 1828 he was secretary to the united benevolent societies of Glasgow, but spent the remainder of his life in propagating his benevolent schemes. See John Campbell: Memoirs of David Nasmith, London, 1844.

NATALIS (NOEL) ALEXANDER, b. at Rouen, Jan. 19, 1638; d. in Paris, Aug. 21, 1724; entered the Dominican order in 1653; taught, for several years, theology in San Filippo Neri, Paris, and was appointed provincial of his order in 1706. On the instance of Colbert, he wrote his Selecta historia ecclesiastica capitae, Paris, 1677–86, 24 vols.; to which he afterwards added six volumes of Old-Testament history. The work is a series of dissertations, rather than a continuous history. It is written in a liberal spirit, and from a Gallican point of view. The first parts, in which the Gallicanism of the author had no opportunity of showing itself, gained much favor even in Rome, but so much the greater was the disappointment caused by his representation of the middle ages; and by a decree of July 13, 1684, Innocent XI. forbade people to read the book, under penalty of excommunication. Natalis Alexander, however, did not recant. He defended his book, and Benedict XIII. finally removed it from the Index. He also wrote a Theologia dogmatica et moralis (Paris, 1693, often reprinted), some homilies, etc. See UHLORN.

NATHAN (given), a name of frequent occurrence among the Hebrews. A son of David, born to him by Bathsheba, in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v.14; 1 Chron. iii. 5), bore that name, and may have received it in honor of the celebrated prophet...
NATHAN'ÅEL. See BARTHOLOMÆW.

NATIVITY OF CHRIST. See Christmas.

NATURAL ABILITY. See INABILITY.

NATURAL LAW. The definition of a natural law always consists of three constituent elements, — matter, its inherent force, and the invariable- ness of the activity of the force. By induction, this invariance — the external identity of effects when the causes are identical — is first made into an internal necessity (that is, an empirical result is made into a postulate of reason); and then all natural laws are combined into one great totality, the law of nature, denoting the internal necessity with which the whole world of phenomena springs from the causality inherent in nature. Twice the idea of the law of nature, or natural law, touches theology, and has to be considered by the theologian — once in the department of dogmatics, and again in the department of ethics.

Christian dogmatics must define the relation between the necessity of the law of nature and the omnipotence of the living God, both with respect to the creation and with respect to the government of the world. The question is, whether the law upon which nature, the whole world, all creation, stands, admits or excludes any further direct interference from the side of God; and the answer to that question will decide whether the possibility of miracles may be considered. Nature may be conceived of pantheistically, as an accomplishment of God's will; and it may be conceived of deistically, as an accomplished fact, which, from the moment of its completion, becomes utterly external to God. In both cases, the possibility of miracles must be denied. The theological representative of the first-mentioned view is Schleiermacher. Christian ethics must define the difference between the causality of natural forces and the causality of the human will, between the necessity of nature and the freedom of man, between natural law and moral law. On account of this sharp distinction between phenomena and noumena, theoretical and practical reason, subject and object, etc., it came natural to Kant to define the difference between natural and moral law as one between fact and commandment; but, when the distinctions of Kant had been blurred by the philosophy of Schelling, it came equally natural to Schleiermacher to oppose the forced and strained idea of duty descending from Kant, and give an exposition of Christian ethics from the view, not of duty, but of the highest good, though thereby even spiritual life assumed the aspect of a natural process, and the idea of the freedom of will be came much obscured.

Thus natural law is, both in dogmatics and in ethics, confronted with freedom, — in the former with the freedom of God, in the latter with the freedom of man; and the great problem of theology is, that neither the omnipotence of God be deistically circumscribed, nor the freedom of man pantheistically destroyed, by the necessity of nature. Everything depends upon the true conception of the spirit, and "the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

NATURAL RELIGION. See Religion.

NATURAL THEOLOGY is the scientific exposition of the existence, nature, and attributes of God, so far as revealed to us by nature. Of the legitimacy and value of this science, two directly opposite views have been propounded. On the one side, it has been said that natural theology is not a science, but a misunderstanding; first, because the idea of God, and all the ideas immediately connected with or dependent on it, are intuitions, of which no evidence or demonstration can be given; and, next, because nature, on account of its very character, can give no revelation of God. To this point of view may be answered, that, though the idea of God is truly an intuition, the scientific refutation of the denials of that intuition is not only not valueless, but even necessary. And the second objection depends simply on a superficial and materialistic view of nature, which may mislead, but can never vindicate for itself, the title of being truly scientific. On the other side, it has been said that the natural revelation of God is so complete as to make a supranatural revelation quite superfluous, and that, consequently, natural theology is the only true theology existing. It is apparent, however, that, about the salvation of man, nature can tell us nothing; and consequently a natural theology which does not establish itself as an introduction to Christian theology is in its very essence a denial of Christianity.

Natural theology figures particularly in the deistic controversies of the last century. The deists claimed that there was no need of any revealed theology. See DEISM.


NAUDAUS, Philippus, b. at Metz, 1654; d. in Berlin, 1729; sought refuge in the latter city in 1687; became a member of the academy of mathematicians, and acquired a name in the history of theology by his stanch defence of the old doctrinal system of the Reformed Church, with its strict Calvinistic orthodoxy. He fought for supralapsarian predestination, imputative justification, etc.; and in his great work, La souveraine perfection...
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 Nazareth.

De Dieu, he opposed every attempt at mitigating
the old doctrines. But the times when doctrinal
correctness was thought of paramount importance
had gone by, and the works of Naundus exercised
only a small influence. A. Schweizer.

Naumburg, Convention of, 1561. Soon after
the accession of Pius IV. (Jan. 6, 1560), prepara-
tions were made for the re-opening of the Coun-
cil of Trent; and threatening rumors began to
spread, of a new religious war for the purpose of
stamping out Protestantism. The Protestants,
was it said in Roman-Catholic circles, do not
adhere any longer to the original Confession of
Augsburg. They have split into many parties;
they allow all kinds of innovations among them-
selves, and are consequently no longer entitled
to those rights which were granted to them by the
peace of Augsburg. To the Protestants it was
evident that unity and concord were absolutely
necessary; and, at a meeting of Duke Christof of
Württemberg, the Elector Friedrich the Pious of
the Palatinate, and his son-in-law, Duke Johann
Friedrich of Saxony (at Hilsbach, June 29, 1560),
it was determined that all the Protestant princes
should be invited on-the-Saale, in order to come to an
agreement both with respect to a new subscription to
the Confession of Augsburg, as a manifestation of
their unity, and with respect to the policy to be
adopted towards the Council of Trent. The con-
vention met Jan. 29, 1561, and lasted till Feb. 8,
holding twenty-one sittings. Personally present
were the Elector Friedrich III. of the Palatinate,
and his son, the Count-palatine Casimir, the Elect-
or August of Saxony, the Count-palatine Wolf-
gang of Zweibrücken, and his cousin Hans Georg,
Duke Johann Friedrich of Saxony, Duke Christof
of Württemberg, and his son Eberhard, Duke
Ulrich of Mecklenburg, the Dukes Ernst and
Philipp of Brunswick-Grubenhausen, Margrave
Charles of Baden, Count Georg Ernst of Henne-
berg, Landgrave Philipp of Hesse, and his son
Ludwig, Duke Franc of Lauenburg, besides a
great number of counts and barons who had not
been specially invited. Several princes who were not
personally present — the Elector Joachim II.
of Brandenburg, the Margraves Hans and Georg
Friedrich of Brandenburg, the Dukes of Pomme-
rania, Mecklenburg, Lauenburg, Holstein, etc. —
had sent representatives to Naumburg the next day;
but others adopted other measures to show their dis-
agreement. More harmony prevailed with respect
to the second great question of the convention,—
the Council of Trent. Two papal legates, —
Bishop Delfino of Faro, and Bishop Commandone
of Zante, — and an imperial embassy, arrived at
Naumburg, and were introduced to the conven-
tion at its sixteenth sitting (Feb. 8). They were
very politely received; but when it was discov-
ered that the papal breves inviting the Protestant
princes to participate in the Council of Trent
began with the words, Dilecto filio, they were sent
back unopened, with the remark that the Protes-
tant princes were not, and would never be, the
sons of the Pope. The convention finally an-
swered the emperor and the Pope, that none of
its number would participate in the Council of
Trent; that they wanted a national German
council, — a council in which they not only could
be heard, but also have a vote, etc. 

Lit. —Horn: Hist. d. zu Naumburg gehaltenen
Conzents, Frankf., 1704; Grilbe: D. Naumburger
Fürstenstag, Leip., 1798; Calvinich: D. Naumbur-
ger Fürstenstag, Gotha, 1870. Wagenmann.

Nave, an architectural term of doubtful ety-
ology (some deriving it from navis, a vessel;
others, from navis, a ship), denotes the body of
the church, between the choir — from which it is
generally separated by a screen, or by rails — and
the porch. It is the receptacle of the congrega-
tion proper; just as the choir is the receptacle
of the clergy, and the porch or narthex, that of
the penitents. It generally has one or more aisles
on each side, and contains the pulpit, the baptismal
font, and the organ.


Naylor, James, a Friend preacher; b. at
Ardsley, Yorkshire, Eng., about 1616; d. 1690.

In 1651 he was convicted on the charge of
the Naumburgers in 1560,

By the accession of George Fox, and himself became a preacher among
the Friends. His success disordered his mind;
and he allowed himself to be addressed in such
extravagant terms, and to be treated in such a
quasi-reverential way, that he was tried by Par-
liament for blasphemy, and condemned to be
whipped twice at different times, to be branded,
have his tongue bored with a hot iron, and be
imprisoned during pleasure, with hard labor.
This cruel sentence was executed, and he was
two years in jail. On his release he was an altered
man. His lunacy had left him, and he was again
received into the confidence of the Friends. His
Writings were published in a collected edition,
London, 1716. His Life has been several times
written, 1657, 1718, and by Joseph Gurney Bevan,
1800.

Nazarenites. See Ebionites.

Nazareth (from a Hebrew root signifying
to sprout, to germinate, referring to the rich vege-
tation of the place), a city of Galilee, stands in
a valley among the mountains which separate
the plain of Zebulon in the north from the plain of
Esdraelon in the south, in the same latitude as the
southern end of the Sea of Galilee. The valley
is long and narrow, but opens up towards the
plain of Esdraelon, above which it is elevated
more than three hundred feet. A zigzag mule-
track leads from the plain to the valley; and the
traveller is most agreeably surprised when he
reaches the upper end of the path, and discovers
the quiet green valley, and the stately city with its
white walls. The gardens abound in olive-
trees and fig-trees, and some palm-trees are also
found; and the view from the tops of the north-
western mountains, reaching north to Mount Her-
on, and west to the Mediterranean, is one of the
finest in Palestine.
The place is never mentioned in the Old Testa-
ment, or by Josephus; but its name occurs very
often in the New Testament. It was the abode of
the parents of Jesus (Matt. ii. 23; Luke i. 29,
ii. 4, 30, 51); he spent his youth there (Matt.
xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1; Luke iv. 22); it was the
scene of his first public activity (Luke iv. 16);
The religious significance of the Nazarite vow must be sought for in its analogy to the priesthood. The abstinence from wine, the avoidance of defilement by the dead, even the long hair, which was an emblem to the Nazarite, was the mitre to the high priest,—every thing reminds of the regulations of sacerdotal life. Indeed, though the Nazarite did not serve at the temple, his vow was a temporary and voluntary adoption of that idea on which the life of the priest was placed by birth. The institution was very old among the Hebrews: it probably originated among the Semitic nomads, and not in Egypt; comp. the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.), the Nabatæans (Diod. 19, 94), etc. The examples of Samson and Samuel show that it flourished during the period of the Judges. After the era of Saladin's victory in 1187, and still more after the conquest by the Turks in 1517, the prosperity of the city sunk very low. In 1620, however, the Franciscans succeeded in making a settlement of the Christians in the Orient. According to the Capuchins, of whom 2,500 are Greek, 2,000 Mohamme-
dan, 800 Latin, 100 Protestant, and 80 Maronites. The Latin inhabit the western, the Mohammedan the eastern, and the Greek the northern, quarters. In the Latin Church of the Annunciation, which occupies the central portion of the Franciscan monastery, there is a crypt under the high altar, where formerly stood the casa santis, which in 1291 was removed by angels to Tersato in Dal-
matia, and thence to Loreto near Ancona. The Latin quarter also contains the Protestant church, the school of the Protestant mission, and a female orphan-asylum founded by the Female Education Society in London. [See Renan's description in his Life of Jesus, and Schaff's, in Through Bible Lands, chap. xxxvii.]

**NAZARITES.**

The most important kind of vows occurring among the Hebrews was that taken by the Nazarites,—a vow of abstinance, of separation unto the Lord. It was regulated by the law (Num. vi. 1-21); which prescribed that the Nazarite, man or woman, who took the Nazarite vow, should, for the term of the vow, abstain from wine and every other intoxicating liquor, from the vinegared made of any such liquor, and, indeed, from any thing coming from the vine, from the kernels to the husks. He should, furthermore, allow his hair to grow, and keep himself clean from all defilement by dead bodies, even those of his parents, or sisters or brothers. In other respects he was not excluded from intercourse with his fellowmen. If, for instance, by a case of sudden death in his own house, the Nazarite became unclean, he should, on the legally fixed day of his cleansing, the seventh, have his hair shaved off; and on the eighth he should offer two turtle-doves or young pigeons,—one as a sin-offering, and one as a burnt-offering,—after which his head should again be consecrated, and his term begin anew. When the term of the vow was completed, the Nazarite offered one he-lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, one ewe-lamb of the first year for a sin-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering; after which his hair was cut at the door of the tabernacle, and burnt, together with the sacrifice. The vow fulfilled, the Nazarite was allowed to drink wine, etc. Generally the term of the vow was thirty days; but instances of vows for life also occur; as Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist, etc.
NEALE.

ent championship of “Catholic” views won him not only suspicion, but obloquy. He was under the inhibition of his bishop (Chichester) for fourteen years: in 1867 he was burnt in effigy. His preferment and income were of the humblest. But his zeal and industry matched his great and varied talents. “His life was divided,” says the Congregationalist Josiah Miller, “between excessive literary toil and exhausting labors of piety and benevolence.” He founded, in 1856, the Sisterhood of St. Margaret. Desperately unpopular for a time, the order was before his death in demand everywhere, as furnishing the best nurses in England.

As an author his productiveness has few parallels. A full list of his books is impossible within our space: those esteemed the greatest are his History of the Holy Eastern Church, and of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, 4 vols., 1847-51, and his Commentary on the Psalms, from Primitive and Medieval Writers, 1860: the latter was left incomplete, and was continued by Dr. Littledale. We may mention, also, his Readings for the Aged, four series, 1850, and later; Hierolous, or the Church Tourists; Ecclesiological Notes on the Isle of Man; Voices from the East; History of the so-called ‘Jan- sentia’ (with John Aikin); Sermons for Children, 1867; The Patriarchate of Antioch (a posthumous fragment), Lond., 1873; an adaptation of Pilgrim’s Progress, 1863. This last, we are told, caused some controversy; but so did every thing of his, when noted by others than the comparatively few who received his principles. He had strong convictions, and the full courage of them: in his own view he was a witness, and at need a confessor, of a system of absolute truth. On almost every page of his writings, whether prose or verse, learned or popular, his point of view and his resolute purpose are apparent. They are books of useful matter, but have been cast into the shade by his translations. Most of these appeared 1851. The Hymnal Noted is chiefly given to long metres, which seem to the uninstructed somewhat dry and formal; yet many, even of these, have gained large acceptance. Medieval Hymns and Sequences (2d ed., enlarged, 1863) afford more variety and many valuable novelties. Among the most precious of these is Neale’s first selection from the famous Rhythm of Bernard de Morlaic, completed 1858. No strains have been more thrilling or more effective than these; and their cry of “heavenly homesickness” came no more genuinely from the heart of the Cluniac monk than from that of the inhibited priest at East Grinstead: feelings like these cannot be counterfeited, nor work of this sort done to order.

After the Rhythm of Bernard, his noblest work is Hymns of the Eastern Church, 1863. There he was on ground familiar to him, and to him alone; and the mine he opened yielded treasures indeed. Whatever the originals, such renderings from any language into English as some of these (if we except John Wesley’s free paraphrases from the German) had not been known; nor were there many original sacred lyrics of such beauty as Art thou Weary, Safe Home, The Day is past and over. Within twenty years, more or less of these Greek hymns, like others from the same busy brain and hand, have made their way almost everywhere.

Dr. Neale was a singular compound of medi- val (he would have called it primitive) doctrine and devotion with modern culture and English manliness. He was the sworn foe of “breadth” and “liberalism;” but his large gifts and nature transcended his self-imposed (or, as he thought, God-imposed) limits, and made much of his work catholical in the sense which he repudiated. Those who most disliked his “Romanizing” tendencies have been forced to admire his vast industry, his rigid consistency, his patience under long adversity, injustice, and neglect, his superiority to all questions of self-interest, his heroic and unflinch- ing faith. His tone toward “sects” and heresies might seem full of arrogant contempt; but, as he says of St. Theodore of the Studium, there are those “whom the world, judging from a superficial view of their characters, has branded with unbending haughtiness and the merest formality in religion, while their most secret writ-
ings show them to have been clinging to the cross in an ecstasy of love and sorrow." And many who have little sympathy with his peculiar type of theology and ecclesiasiticism hold his memory in affectionate reverence as that of a great hymn-writer, a great scholar, and a great saint.

FREDERICK M. BIRD.

NEANDER, Joachim, a distinguished German hymn-writer of the Reformed Church, and a supporter of the doctrines of Labadie (see art.); was b. in Bremen, probably in 1590; d. in Bremen in 1860. Untereyck, who was at that time the representative of the movement of Labadie (or the pietism of the Reformed Church) at Bremen, was the subject of much ridicule. Neander, who was a wild youth, sympathized with this spirit, but was suddenly converted on attending one of Untereyck's services. From that time on, he was intimately identified with the pietistic movement of Germany. After studying in Heidelberg, he went to Frankfurt, where he met Spener, and was called to Düsseldorf as preacher, and master of the Latin School. He was suspended for a time, on account of his peculiar religious views, but was re-instated in 1877, after signing a document disapproving of the separatist tendency of Labadie's movement. Two years afterwards he was called as pastor to St. Martini Church, Bremen. Neander is one of the few great hymn-writers of the German Reformed Church (Tersteegen, Hentrietta of Brandenburg, Lampe, etc., being the others), and one of the greatest of Germany. He wrote sixty-four hymns, which appeared under the title A und O, Joachim Neandri Glaub und Liebe, etc. They were taken up and sung by Spener and his friends, and in 1898 several were admitted to the Darmstadt Collection. Among the best of these hymns is the so-called German Te Deum Lobe, den Herren, den mächtigen König der Ehren ("Praise to Jehovah, the Almighty King of Creation!"), etc. They are characterized by simplicity and sincerity of thought, and warmth and purity of expression. Neander was also the author of some classic tunes, as Wunder-könig der Ehren ("PraisetoJehovah, the Almighty King of Creation!").

NEANDER, Johann August Wilhelm, the father of modern church history, was of Hebrew descent, and, before his transition to Christianity, bore the name of David Mendel; b. Jan. 17, 1789, at Göttingen; d. July 14, 1850, in Berlin. Through his mother he was related to the philosopher Mendelssohn and to the medical counsellor Stieglitz in Hanover. Soon after his baptism he was taken by his mother, who had been separated from her husband, to Hamburg, which, in subsequent years, he regarded as his home. He was educated by the help of friends, especially Stieglitz. At the gymnasium at Hamburg he was especially interested in the study of Plato, which prepared him for the acceptance of Christianity. But that which determined him most strongly in its favor was Schleiermacher's Reden über die Religion ("Discourses on Religion"). On Feb. 15, 1806, David Mendel was baptized, in the Church of St. Catharine at Hamburg, under the name of Neander (New-man). The state of his mind was pictured in an essay he wrote before his baptism, and gave to pastor Bossau. It was an attempt to describe the various stages of religious development; and it became apparent that he looked at Christianity from an ideal standpoint, rather than as the absolute truth. But that his baptism was a washing of regeneration, a renewal of the whole man, is vouched for by his resolution to study theology, and to serve the Lord with his whole heart. Up to the spring of 1806 he had been intending to study law, and left Hamburg with this in view. He went to the University of Halle, where he came especially under the influence of Schleiermacher; but he was compelled, by the commotions of war, to exchange it for Göttingen, where Planck was then teaching. He preached his first sermon at Wandsbeck in 1807, on John i. 1 sq. On his return to the university from a visit to Hamburg, in the fall of this year, he put Schleiermacher, Schelling, and Fichte aside, and substituted in their place the New Testament and the Church Fathers. A few months afterwards, he laid a confession before his friends, binding himself to the strictest views, but promising to preserve the Lord to preserve him from errors. His theological course over, he returned, in the spring of 1809, to Hamburg, where he taught for eighteen months, preached from time to time, continuing with great zeal the study of church history. In 1811 he habilitated at Heidelberg with the dissertation, De fidei gnoseoaechrist. idea et ea, qua ad se invicem atque ad philosophiam referantur, ratione secundum mentem Chme. Alex. In 1812 he was made professor extraordinary at the university, and the same year issued the first of his monographs,—Ueber d. Kaiser Julianus u. s. Zeitalter, Leipzig [Eng. trans., Julian the Apostate, New York, 1856]. In 1813 he was called to Berlin to labor at the side of Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Marheineke, where he lectured on church history and the exegesis of the New Testament with great success, and continued his literary labors. In 1818 Neander appeared the monograph, D. heil Bernhard u. s. Zeitalter; in 1818, D. geneitische Entwicklung d. vorhernstigen gnostischen Systeme; in 1822, D. heil. Chryostomus und Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. Gesch. Christenthums u. d. chrstl. Lebens [Eng. trans., by Ryland: Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages, Lond., 1852]; and finally, in 1825, Anti-Gnostikus, Geist d. tertullianus u. Einleit.in dessen Schriften. All these monographs were a preparation for the main work of his life, —Allgem. Gesch. d. chrstl. Religion u. Kirche [Eng. trans. by Torrey: General History of the Christian Religion and Church, 12th ed., N. Y., 1882, 6 vols.]. The demand for a new edition of his Julian, which he had scruples about re-issuing in its previous form, decided his mind to undertake this great work. The first volume appeared in 1826; and the work was continued down to Boniface VIII., the fifth volume appearing in 1845. A new edition of the earlier volumes appeared in an improved form after 1842. Schneider prepared an additional volume, reaching to the Council of Basel (1430), from Neander's papers in 1852. A third edition of the entire work was published in 4 volumes in 1856, with a comprehensive preface by Ullmann. Neander also published D. Gesch. d. Pfanzung u. Leitung d. chs. Kirche durch d. Apostel, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1832.
In order to appreciate the position of Neander as a church historian, it is necessary to take into consideration the views which had, up to this time, prevailed amongst church historians. The most important church historian of that time was Planck, and he belonged to the so-called pragmatic school. The views of this school prevailed when Neander began his great work. It must not be forgotten, however, that higher conceptions of church history had begun to be expressed by Schelling, Marheineke, and Gieseler. The pragmatic school only looked at Christianity as a system of doctrine. It failed to look upon it as an historical development. It lost sight of objective forces in its interest in individuals whose thinking and plans are the only causes of all changes. Of higher causes it knows nothing. It substituted, in the place of the fulness of a living development, its own poor shallow conception of Christianity. Instead of devotion to events, instead of a revelation of the fulness of Christ's life, church history was turned into a gallery of pictures representing human follies and errors, which the historian felt free to condemn or to ridicule.

Neander broke through the rules of the pragmatic school in his very first work, Julian, when he remarks at the beginning, "How little it is in the power of any one to create anything! how little one can achieve in a conflict with Providence, which leads and forms, according to its own eternal decree, the spirit of all the periods of history!" He substituted for psychological arts the rich results of a study of the historical sources; and it is only necessary to observe the way in which Neander introduces the work of Julian into the progressive development of the church, to become aware that his conception of history was a system born in the hidden depths of man's nature, but as a power which has come down from heaven, in that heaven has opened itself to man, and becomes concrete in the lives of individuals whose peculiarities are not destroyed, but transformed and glorified. Every Christian, therefore, repeats the life of Christ in his own characteristic way. In no one is that life repeated in its comprehensive fulness. Each only presents a single aspect of it. Neander is constantly representing the one life of Christ in its conflict with sin, its adoption and rejection of worldly principles and forces in the various phases of rationalism and supranaturalism, sober-ness and mysticism, speculative and practical effort. To this general conception is due the edifying character of Neander's History. "The understanding of history presupposes the understanding of that which is its operating principle." And the history of the church, being a representation of Christ's life as it pervades mankind, can be understood only in proportion as the life of Christ is known by experience. The history of the church is the church's consciousness of its own life. Pectus est quod facit theologum ("It is the heart which makes the theologian") was Neander's often-used motto. He therefore expressly says, that it was his purpose from the beginning to present the history of the church as a striking proof of the divine power of Christianity and as a school of experience.

One of Neander's characteristics as an historian is his talent for portraying individual traits of character and life. He honored the individual as no other historian before him, and brought out the objective features of his subject, without mixing in his own subjective thoughts and opinions. Closely connected with this talent is his ability, which we have already referred to, of understanding and sympathizing with the experiences of others, and unvetting them to the world with his own. Hence that mildness of judgment which Neander displayed side by side with an absolute love of truth. The objectivity of Neander's portrayal of events and persons is the most important feature of his work. But here we are brought to his weakest point. The concrete and individual are relatively far more prominent than the universal. The body consists only of an aggregation of separate individuals, but the aggregate is not sufficiently emphasized. In one word, Neander's defect is a failure to give prominence to and appreciate the church as such. Instead of the church, we have a collection of single portraits of individuals animated with the life of Christ. The biographical element predominates. He loves to dwell upon the spiritual life of his characters, and has depicted with a master's hand the hidden life of the church; but in doing so he has neglected to portray its all-conquering power over the world. The influence of the church upon the formation of dogmatic beliefs, upon civil law, social customs, art, and architecture, he does not sufficiently bring out. In spite of the variety of individual character
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and experience, the history of the church in his hands does not present an harmonious and progressive development. It is an endless portrait-gallery. Neander has given us a commentary of the parable of the heaven, but fails to give a commentary of the parable of the mustard-seed.

Neander’s division of church history is extremely simple. So far as the spiritual life of the church is concerned, it falls into three periods. The boundary between the first and second is the growth of a priesthood,—a fact to which he cannot call attention too often; for his history is a history of the universal priesthood. The first period is a period of pure spiritual religion; the second is characterized by a re-inswathement of Christianity in habiliments like those of the Old Testament; the third is marked by a reaction, and an effort of Christian liberty to re-assert itself.

Neander’s personal influence in the classroom was little less important than, if not quite as important as, his literary activity. He labored in Berlin for thirty-eight years. In his exegetical learning he excelled a pathologist. This he did also in his commentaries [Exposition of First John, the Philippian, and James, translated by Mrs. Conant, New York, 1856]. He also lectured on systematic theology (in which he depended too much upon Schleiermacher), and, after Schleiermacher’s death, on ethics. His lectures in these two branches appeared after his death, in the three volumes, Dogmengeschichte [Eng. trans. by Ryland, 2 vols., London, 1856], Katholizismus u. Protestantismus, and Geschichte d. Ethik.

Neander’s personal influence upon his students was also very great, and became a rich blessing to many. He presents the figure of a man of simple and childlike spirit, helpless in the practical affairs of life, faithful to his calling, severe towards himself, and temperate, full of love and gentleness towards others, and wholly and unreservedly devoted to the Lord. But he could be severe, and entered a protest against the ecclesiastic Kirchenzeitung [Evang. Ch. Journal, Hengstenberg’s organ], and opposed, not only with great firmness, but often with heat, both pantheistic and spiritualistic speculations, and the more rigid wing in the church which insisted upon a strict system of doctrine. His activity was a beneficent to thousands; and, amongst those who contributed to the revival of faith and theology in the first half of this century, he has, beyond dispute, one of the most prominent places, perhaps the most prominent if we look at practical results.

Throughout the whole of his life, Neander had to contend against a feeble constitution. In 1847 he began to suffer with his eyesight, and was prevented from continuing his History. Attacked with a stroke of apoplexy, he lingered only a few days before he was called to his heavenly home. Throughout the whole of his life, Neander had to contend against a feeble constitution. In 1847 he began to suffer with his eyesight, and was prevented from continuing his History. Attacked with a stroke of apoplexy, he lingered only a few days before he was called to his heavenly home.}


NEAPOLIS (new city), a town eight or ten miles from Philippoi, in Northern Greece, containing at present about six thousand inhabitants. It is memorable as the first place in Europe visited by Paul (Acts xvi. 11); and, since Neapolis is the port of Philipopolis, he probably embarked for his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 1, 6).

NEBIOTH. See Arabia, p. 128.

NEBO is mentioned in Isa. xxv. 1, after Bel, as a deity worshipped by the Babylonians. The Septuagint has Sabao. Among the Assyrians and Babylonians. In the cuneiform inscription the name reads Nabu or Nabius. It occurs frequently in Babylonian and also Assyrian patronymics, as, for instance, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabu-kudurrusur “Nebo protect the crown”). Nebu- nabal-usur “Nebo protect the son”). Nabassar, Nabu-nasir (“Nebo protect”), etc. It is also found in the Chaldean name Samgarnebo, Sungur-Nabu — “be gracious Nebo” (Jer. xxxix. 5); and perhaps the name Abednego (Dan. i. 7) is a corruption of Abed-Nebo. The cuneiform inscription of Nebuchadrezzar also shows that Nebo was worshipped as a benevolent deity; and their great number,
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that the worship was quite extensive. In the later Babylonian Empire, all the kings, with very few exceptions, were named after him; while, out of fifty names of Assyrian kings, only two show that derivation. The character of the deity is further proved by the epithets applied to him,—"the governor of the heavens," "the governor of the world," "the god of science," etc. It is not improbable that the Assyrian nabu, which means "to speak," "to announce," is connected with the Hebrew nabi, "prophet," or, more correctly, "messenger." In the Assyro-Babylonian star-worship, the planet Mercury is assigned to Nebo; and the Greek-Roman nations have not failed to recognize in Nebo their Hermes-Mercury, the mediator between the divine and human spheres. He was, however, a younger god, son of Merodach. A statue of him, dating from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C., has been found at Nineveh. — WOLF BAUDISSIN.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR. Nebuchadnezzar was son of Nabopolassar, who, in combination with the Medes, had effected the destruction of Nineveh B.C. 606 (?) and appears first as his father's co-regent and general. In the latter capacity he headed an army against Necho, king of Egypt, who, possibly in ignorance of the (impending or accomplished) overthrow of the Assyrian power, went up against the King of Assyria to the River Euphrates (cf. Jer. xxxv. 11, xxxiv. 1, liti. pass.; Ezek. xxvi. 11, xxxiv. 11, xxxiv. 11, liti. pass.; Dan. i.-v. pass.; cf. Tob. xiv. 15; Judith, pass.)

NE'DO (prophet), a mountain, of the range Abarim, in Moab, from which Moses surveyed the promised land, and whence he died (Deut. xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 1-5). It was rightly located by Eusebius as six Roman miles (south-west) west from Heshbon, and is called "Nebheb" by the Bedawin. From its summit, one can in clear weather see Mount Hermon,—in short, the view of Moses. In 1875 Professor Paine maintained the identification of Nebo with the eastern summit of this mountain of Moab, called by the Arabs "Jebel Nebba," and Psigah with a projecting western shoulder, called "Siaghab." See PSIGAH, and ARTU "Nebo," in RIEHM'S Handwörterbuch d. bib. Altertums.

NE'BÖ, a city of Moab assigned the Reubenites (Num. xxxii. 38), identified by Professor Paine with a ruin a mile south of the summit of Mount Nebo.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR (Babylon., Nabu-kudurri-usur; "Nebo, protect the crown," though the exact sense is disputed; Heb., נבוכדנזר, נבוכדנזר, etc.; LXX., Ναβουκδανουσ, third of the name, the most famous of the Babylonian kings, who reigned B.C. 605-561, is mentioned in the Old Testament as follows: 2 Kings xxiv. xxv., and 2 Chron. xxxvi. passim; Ex. ii. 1, v. 12, 14; Neh. vii. 6; Jer. xxvii., xxviii., xxix., xxxii., xxxiv. pass., xxxv. 11, xxxvii., xxxiv., liti. pass.; Ezek. xxvi., xxvii., xxviii., pass.; Dan. i.-v. pass.; cf. Tob. xiv. 15; Judith, pass.)
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Nebuchadnezzar, a certain Gedaliah was appointed governor. His assassination, two months later, instead of securing new independence for Judah, was followed by dread of Babylonian vengeance, which led to the flight toward Egypt of those who were left in the land.

Having thus wiped out all semblance of inland power in Palestine, Nebuchadnezzar turned his attention northward, and began vigorous operations against Tyre. The siege of that city occupied thirteen years. Ezek. xxix. 18 seems to indicate that it was not wholly successful. But Nebuchadnezzar must, by force of arms or treaty, have secured himself from molestation in this quarter before venturing on his campaigns in Egypt; and we know that he gained a foothold in Cyprus. His name was doubtlessly known and feared in all the Phoenician colonies.

In his thirty-third year (B.C. 572)—it seems to have been the twenty-seventh of Ezekiel's exile, Ezek. xxix. 17 (B.C. 572)—he undertook, probably on account of his fondness for building here evidenced appeared also in the construction of a splendid palace, of strong city walls and citadels, enclosing and protecting a vast area, probably also the so-called "Median Wall," stretching from the Euphrates to the Tigris.

The fondness for building here evidenced appeared also in the construction of a splendid palace, of strong city walls and citadels, enclosing and protecting a vast area, probably also the so-called "Median Wall," stretching from the Euphrates to the Tigris. Terraced gardens, and a system of canals and reservoirs for irrigation, are also attributed to him. Of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity, and the sequence which arises from such moral causes as the strength of inclination or motives, and the connection which there is in many cases between them and such certain volitions and actions."—FLEMING: Vocabulary of Philosophy, ed. C. P. Krauth, Philadelphia, 1860, pp. 342, 343.

NEBUZAR-ADAN (Bab. Nebu-sir-id-dina, "Nebu gave seed"), one of the generals of Nebuchadnezzar; conquered Jerusalem in the nineteenth year of the reign of that king, having taken a part of the city a month previously. After the occupation he fired the temple, whose treasures he sent to Babylon, the royal palace, and the most conspicuous houses, and carried away its inhabitants as prisoners. Five years later on he carried away seven hundred and forty-five more Hebrews. As the Chaldeans were besieging Tyre, and waged war against the Moabites and Ammonites, they were easily suspected of conspiracy, or perhaps they actually had conspired (2 Kings xxv. 8 sqq.; Jer. xxxix. 9 sqq.; xxl. 1 sqq.).

NECESSITY, MORAL, is "that without which the effect cannot well be, although, absolutely speaking, it may." A man who is lame is under a moral necessity to use some help, but absolutely he may not. The phrase 'moral necessity' is used variously, and generally it is used for necessity of moral obligation. Sometimes, by moral necessity, is meant that sure connection of things that is a foundation for infallible certainty. In this sense it signifies much the same as that high degree of probability which is ordinarily sufficient to satisfy mankind in the conduct and behavior in the world. Sometimes, by moral necessity, is meant that necessity of connection and consequence which arises from such moral causes as the strength of inclination or motives, and the connection which there is in many cases between them and such certain volitions and actions."—FLEMING: Vocabulary of Philosophy, ed. C. P. Krauth, Philadelphia, 1860, pp. 342, 343.
NECROLOGIUM (NECROLOGY), also called obituarium, obituarium, calendarium, etc., was the name of a book kept, in imitating one of the original diptychs of the church, in all religious houses, and containing the names of those dead for whom prayers should be made,—members of the house, its benefactors, members of houses with which a compact for mutual intercession had been made, etc.

NECROMANCY (from the Greek θεραπεύεται, "divination by means of the dead") was exercised under two different forms,—the one consisting in examining the viscera of one newly dead or slain, in order to draw out omens; and the other, in raising the soul of one departed, in order to obtain direct information concerning the future. Eusebius, in his Vita Constantinii (I, 36), says of Maxentius, that he opened the wombs of pregnant women, and searched the viscera of newly-born infants. Similar stories are told about Valerian, and even about Justinian. The method, the raising of the souls of the dead, was of course much more frequently used, and is often spoken of by Justin, Clemens Romanus, Tertullian, and others. After the sixth century the word began to be used in a vague sense of all exercise of pretended supernatural powers.

NECTARIUS, Patriarch of Constantinople, was the successor of Gregory Nazianzen, and the predecessor of Chrysostom. Immediately after the Council of 381 had been called, Gregory Nazianzen retired, and the see of Constantinople became vacant. Nectarius, a native of Tarsus, and at that time a very old man, lived in Constantinople as a senator, but was just about to return home. Before departing, however, he paid a visit to Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, who was present in Constantinople on account of the council; and the bishop became so impressed by the venerable old senator, that he put his name on the list of candidates for the vacant see. The emperor's choice fell upon the senator, to the great surprise of the bishops, who had never before heard his name, but soon learned that he was not an ecclesiastic, nay, even not baptized; and Nectarius, who was soon after installed in his patriarchal see of Constantinople, immediately retired from the garrison of his native city, but was afterwards reached by the religious revival, which at that time took place in the city, and became himself a revival preacher among his comrades. In 1819 he denounced his position in the army; and May 16, 1823, he was ordained in Mr. Clayton's chapel, in the Pantoum, London. After laboring for some time at Mena, he settled in the lonesome valleys of the Queras and Freissiniere in the Hautes-Alps. Some remnants of the Waldenses had at one time sought refuge there, but they had utterly degenerated. Not only had fights and drunkenness taken the place of the hymns of their ancestors, but they had even forgotten the commonest arts, and sunk into barbarism. The work which lay before Neff in that place was almost overwhelming. He performed it, however, though it cost him his life. When in 1827, he returned, dying, to Geneva, the settlements in the far-off valleys were converted and flourishing. See GOLLY: Memoirs of Neff, London, 1882; A. Bost: Lettres de Félix Neff, Geneva, 1842, 2 vols., and Vie de Félix Neff, Toulouse, 1800.

NEGRI, Francesco, b. at Bassano, in the Venetian territory, in 1569; d. at Chiavenna, in the Grisons, after 1559; entered the Benedictine order, but left it again on the outbreak of the Reformation; joined Zwingli, whom he accompanied to the Conference of Marburg, 1529; was present at the diet of Augsburg, 1530; and settled finally at Chiavenna as a school-teacher. He published several books of philological interest, and is the author of the curious allegorical drama, Tragedia de libero arbitrio, Geneva, 1549, translated into French in 1559, La tragedie du roi Franc-Arbire.

NEGRO EVANGELIZATION AND EDUCATION IN AMERICA. 1. The Evangelization of the negroes began, both at the North and South, at an early date. Their warm natures—full of hope, faith, and love—presented a fruitful soil for religious truth; and in spite of the wrong and cruelty of slavery, and of its denial of education, much was done in giving them oral religious instruction. The Methodist Church was organized in America in 1768; and in 1800 it reported an aggregate colored membership of 13,450, who were enrolled in the white churches. To prosecute this work among the slaves demanded the heroism of an apostle. Slaveholders were
The churches, where the negroes sat during the Civil War, had given attention to the religious condition of the slaves. In 1801 the Charleston Baptist Church was organized in New-York City, and now has 300,000 members.

The Baptists, at least two generations before the Civil War, had given attention to the religious condition of the slaves. In 1801 the Charleston Baptist Association petitioned the Legislature for an amendment of the law passed the preceding year, imposing restrictions on religious meetings, as far as it respects persons of color, and renewed it the next year with a degree of success. Pastors of white Baptist churches, some of the most eminent, labored with great zeal and ability to allay prejudice and convert the slaves, and, as a rule, the slaves of persons identified with Baptist churches sat with their masters in the same house of worship, occupying the rear seats or the galleries, where the white members, who were received into membership by baptism upon evidence of conversion and were administrated the sacraments of the Lord. In these churches the colored members had no voice in the government, or in cases of discipline, except those cases relating to their own race, when they voted with the whites. In the sparse settlements, on large plantations, and in the smaller towns, this mixed church-membership prevailed. Planters frequently paid liberally from theirown members. The church-property was held by white trustees; but in their spiritual matters these churches were independent, though taking counsel of their white brethren in licensing and ordaining their preachers. They elected their own officers, administered the ordinances, conducted their own discipline. That the religious effort thus put forth was successful, is shown by the fact, that, in 1850, the colored Baptists of the country, so far as reported, numbered 88,895; South Carolina having 14,691; Georgia 16,552, and Virginia 85,546. In 1860 their numbers are estimated variously at from 400,000 to 500,000.

The Presbyterians, in like manner, took an early interest in the religious instruction of the slaves. The synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1787 recommended "to all the members belonging to their communion to give those persons who are present held in servitude such good education as may prepare them for the better enjoyment of freedom." This action was sanctioned by the General Assembly in 1793. In 1815 the Assembly urged upon the Presbyterians "to adopt such measures as will secure, at least to the rising generation of slaves within the bounds of the church, a religious education." In 1825 the Assembly notice "with pleasure the enlightened attention which had been paid to the religious instruction and evangelization of the unhappy slaves and free people of color," and "especially commend the prudence and zeal combined in this work of mercy by the presbyteries of Charleston, Union, Georgia, Concord, South Alabama, and Mississippi." It adds, "No more honored name can be conferred on a minister of Jesus Christ than that of an apostle to the American slaves." In 1839 one minister in Georgia is reported as devoting his time exclusively to the colored people; and most, if not all, settled pastors and stated supplies, preach as often as once a week to them. Similar reports are subsequently made from other portions of the field occupied by the colored people. In the houses of worship of the whites, provision was made for the blacks, where they might enjoy the privileges of the sanctuary. Services were held for them on the plantations, and it was the custom to have household servants at family prayers. On large plantations it was not uncommon for a minister to preach statedly to their slaves. The colored members of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina numbered 13,887.

The English bishops who had charge of the missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the American Colonies showed a warm interest in the religious instruction of the negroes. In 1724 a list of inquiries was sent to the missionaries in the Colonies, asking, "Are there any infidels, bond or free, within your parish? and what means are used for their conversion?" The answers from Virginia to this question are various, but show, that, with some exceptions, the masters favored the instruction of their slaves; and the missionaries embraced the opportunity to instruct, and, when proper, to baptize, and admit them to the Lord's Supper. Few baptisms, however, are reported.

The Friends everywhere sought the overthrow of slavery; and, though it found a place among them for a time, it was at length ruled out. But this body of Christian people always endeavored to instruct the negroes, who found them to be friends indeed, wherever located, whether in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or the South.
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The Roman Catholics, who settled Maryland, made early provision for the instruction of the colored people in the churches. Bishop English of South Carolina began evangelism among the negroes of his diocese in 1820. A school for free colored girls and the instruction of female slaves was begun about 1830. A colored sisterhood has existed in Baltimore since 1828, and the Jesuits have taught the Catechism at Frederick since 1840. In 1841 an enterprise was begun for the conversion of the colored population in America through the agency of an English training-school. The report of 1877 shows that it has had 42 students, and in 1878 returns 33 students and 6 lay-brothers. Three students from this school have been laboring in Charleston, S.C., and report 196 baptisms. The Catholic Directory of 1882 reports one colored church in Baltimore, one in St. Louis, two in Charleston, and two in Florida.

The emancipation of the negroes in 1863 gave a strong impulse in the North to efforts for their evangelization. The barriers were broken down, and the call was urgent. The four millions of a strong impulse in the North to efforts for their actually church-members. The instruction they from Africa. Their churches and preachers were religiously, of their heathen ancestors when torn were heavy drawbacks. At the opening of the evangelization. The barriers were broken down, had received from the white ministers was only numerous, and the piety of the people themselves oral, and that which came from preachers of their was in many cases deep and genuine. But there was in their remodelled constitutions and laws, for popular education; all the States, except Delaware, Maryland, and Kentucky, guaranteeing equal school privileges to all children, irrespective of race. But the want of funds, existing prejudices, and the paralyzing effects of the civil war, prevented satisfactory results. Yet good progress was made. The enrolment of colored schools of all grades, in 1880, supported by the States and the religious societies, numbers 800,118 pupils. Towards the support of the public schools, the Southern States (except Delaware and Maryland) paid, in 1880, $2,370,629. Delaware and Kentucky appropriate the tax collected from the colored citizens. In the latter State it amounted, in 1880, to only forty-eight cents for each colored child. Maryland makes a biennial appropriation by the Legislature. For the higher education of the negroes, Maryland appropriates $2,000; Virginia, $10,000; South Carolina, $7,000; Georgia, $5,000; Mississippi, $10,000; Louisians, from $5,000 to $10,000; and Missouri, $5,000.

But the earliest schools for the freedmen were established by the benevolent contributions of individuals, churches, and societies in the North; and the colored schools for higher instruction were founded almost exclusively by these societies. The first school for the freedmen was established by the American Missionary Association. On the 17th of September, 1861, only five months after the beginning of the war, that school was opened at Hampton, Va., where many fugitive slaves had congregated, under the protection of the guns of Fortress Monroe. The spot overlooked the waters on which the first slave-ship entered the American continent. The Association steadily extended its work, until it had founded chartered institutions in every large Southern State,—Berea College, Berea, Ky.; Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.; Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Tou-
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galoo University, Tougaloo, Miss.; Straight University, New Orleans, La.; Tillotson College and Normal Institute, Austin, Tex. Land has also been purchased for the Edward Smith College in Little Rock, Ark. It has 49 other schools of different grades. Connected with some of its charter schools are theological, industrial, and medical departments. Those at Hampton, Taladega, and Tougaloo, have large farms. Chartered institutions, 8; normal and high schools, 11; common schools, 38; total, 57. Teachers, 241; students, 9,606. Howard University, founded by the Freedmen's Bureau, had, in 1882, 29 teachers and 319 students. Its theological department is sustained mainly by the American Missionary Association.

The Freedmen's Aid Societies were early organized. The first was formed in Boston, Feb. 7, a second in New York, Feb. 22, 1862. Others followed rapidly, — in Cincinnati, Chicago, Cleveland, and elsewhere throughout the North; and in 1865 the teachers employed by all the societies numbered 634. With a view to economy and efficiency, they were consolidated, in 1866, in the American Freedmen's Union Commission. These societies devoted themselves in large part to physical relief and the organization of labor. But ere long the education of the freedmen became their chief endeavor, and they accomplished much good in the line of secular education. But the several branches were at length abandoned, or became absorbed in the societies of the religious organizations. The Commission itself closed in 1869.

The Baptists, who conduct their work, both educational and church, among the freedmen, through their Home Missionary Society, entered early into the establishment of schools; beginning, in the spring of 1862, with schools at St. Helena and Beaufort, S.C., and afterwards adding others at Fortress Monroe, Washington, Knoxville, and New Orleans. Missionaries were appointed to preach, and to teach day schools; and assistants, both male and female, were sent out to encourage and to teach in these schools. They were taught yearly, until about 1872, when the secular or day-school system was given up, and efforts were concentrated on permanent or higher institutions, some of which had been planted in 1865. In 1882 the society has under its care twelve schools; as follows: Wayland Seminary, Washington, D.C.; Richmond Institute, Richmond, Va.; Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C.; Benedict Institute, Columbia, S.C.; Atlanta Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Nashville Institute, Nashville, Tenn.; Leland University, New Orleans, La.; Natchez Seminary, Natchez, Miss.; Alabama Normal and Theological School, Selma, Ala.; Florida Institute, Live Oak, Fla.; Bishop College, Marshall, Tex.; Louisville Normal and Theological School, Louisville, Ky. Normal instruction is given in most of the schools, industrial education in several, and biblical instruction in all. In four institutions a collegiate course is pursued; five are chartered institutions. In 1882, schools, 12; teachers, 79; pupils, 2,397.

The Freedwill Baptists have an excellent institution, Storer College, at Harper's Ferry, Va., with 5 teachers and 240 students. The Friends, true to the principles of the founder of their denomination, George Fox, entered at once the opened door for relieving the physical necessities of the freedmen, and at length established schools among them; but, when the public schools furnished the education, they gradually withdrew. They now maintain Southland College, Helena, Ark., with 277 pupils; a school in Maryville, Tenn., with 13 instructors and 211 pupils; and one in Philadelphia with 291 pupils; with 22 other schools in the South, maintained for a portion of the year. The Friends (Hicksite) entered the work in 1862; furnishing supplies at first, afterwards sustaining schools numbering at one time 25. They now have one school with 150 scholars.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church had from the first co-operated with the undenominational Aid Societies in the care of the freedmen in relieving physical suffering, and in giving instruction in primary education; but it concentrated its efforts by the organization, in Cincinnati, Aug. 6, 1866, of the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This society now reports 6 chartered institutions; viz., Central Tennessee College Nashville, Tenn.; Clark University, Atlanta, Ga.; Claffin University, Orangeburg, S.C.; New Orleans University, New Orleans, La.; Rust University, Holly Springs, Miss.; Wiley University, Marshall, Tex.; — 4 theological schools, viz., Centenary Biblical Institute, Baltimore, Md.; Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Baker Institute, Orangeburg, S.C.; and Thomson Biblical Institute, New Orleans, La.; — 1 medical college, viz., Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn.; — and 14 institutions not chartered. Total number of institutions, 25; teachers, 95; pupils, 3,506. It gives special attention to biblical instruction, and at Clark University a department of industry is established. The African Methodist-Episcopal Church founded and sustains Wilberforce University at Xenia, O., with 13 teachers and 170 students.

The Presbyterian Committee of Missions for Freedmen was organized by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1865; and its work now consists in sending preachers and teachers to the South. Its efforts thus far are confined to the two Carolinas, Virginia, and Tennessee, with a few missions and schools in Georgia, Kentucky, and Florida. It has under its care 3 chartered institutions, — Biddle University, Charlotte, N.C. (with a theological department); Wallingford Academy, Charleston, S.C.; and Scotia Seminary, Concord, N.C., — 2 normal schools, 3 graded schools, and 50 parochial schools. Total number of schools, 58; teachers, 108; scholars, 6,088. Lincoln University (Lincoln University P.O.), Oxford, Penn., has an able corps of 10 professors and 200 students, — 18 theological, 100 collegiate, and 82 preparatory.

The Protestant-Episcopal Freedmen's Commission was organized October, 1865; and in a few months it opened schools in Petersburg, Va., Wilmington and Raleigh, N.C. The first year the teachers numbered 24, and the scholars, day and night, 1,900. The Committee for Domestic Missions (under whose care this work now is) reported, in 1882, 2 normal schools with 8 teachers each, and 11 schools with 1 teacher each. The normal schools are at Raleigh, N.C., and at Petersburg, Va.
The United Presbyterians have 2 schools,—one in Abbyville, Va., with 4 teachers and 245 students; the other in Chase City, Va., with 3 teachers and 251 students.

The Catholic Directory for 1882 reports for the archdiocese of Baltimore, 1 academy for colored girls with 60 pupils, and 4 other schools with 688 pupils, total, 758; archdiocese of New Orleans, 7 schools, 335 pupils; archdiocese of St. Louis, 1 school, 120 pupils; diocese of Louisville, 6 schools, 332 pupils; diocese of Natchez, 8 schools, 80 pupils; diocese of Natchitoches, 2 schools, 40 pupils; diocese of Savannah, 2 schools, 75 pupils; diocese of St. Augustine, 6 schools, number of pupils not given. Total: schools, 30; pupils reported, 1,730.

The princely gift of $2,100,000, by the philanthropic George Peabody, to education in the archdiocese of Baltimore, 1 academy for colored girls with 60 pupils, and 4 other schools with 688 pupils, total, 758; archdiocese of New Orleans, 7 schools, 335 pupils; archdiocese of St. Louis, 1 school, 120 pupils; diocese of Louisville, 6 schools, 332 pupils; diocese of Natchez, 8 schools, 80 pupils; diocese of Natchitoches, 2 schools, 40 pupils; diocese of Savannah, 2 schools, 75 pupils; diocese of St. Augustine, 6 schools, number of pupils not given. Total: schools, 30; pupils reported, 1,730.

The principal gift of $2,100,000, by the philanthropic George Peabody, to education in the South, has yielded an annual income varying from $70,000 to $100,000. Of the money given for educational work in the South, one third is for the colored people. Mr. John F. Slater of Norwich, Conn., has enrolled his name with Mr. Peabody by giving $1,000,000, designating it specially for the colored people. Mrs. Valeria G. Stone of Malden, Mass., has recently given to the American Missionary Association $150,000, which it has used in erecting buildings in Atlanta, Nashville, Talladega, and New Orleans. She has also given to Hampton Institute, Berea College, and the theological department of Howard University, $35,000.

It is estimated that the appropriations of the American Missionary Association, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and the Presbyterian Home Missionary Society, for educational work in the South, chiefly for the negro race, together with the portion of the Peabody fund devoted to the same purpose, have amounted, since the war, to nearly $10,000,000.

The slaves emancipated by the Proclamation of 1863 numbered about 4,000,000. The census of 1870 reported the number of colored people 4,580,000. The census of 1890 reported the number, 6,577,151, an increase of thirty-three per cent. The number colored men who could not read and write in 1870 was 850,032; in 1880, 944,424,—showing an increase of illiterate voters of 94,392. Thus, in spite of all that has been done, the education of the colored people has not kept pace with their increase in population or illiteracy.

The negro is robust in body, strong to endure labor, has shown himself in the schools to be capable of mastering the higher studies, and possesses a heart peculiarly susceptible to religious impressions. Since emancipation he has proved himself to be industrious, has acquired property, has crowded the schools open to him, and has developed remarkable ability for song and eloquence. If cultured adequately, he will add a rich store of needed elements to the Anglo-Saxon civilization of America, and will give a new impulse to the work of evangelizing Africa.

NEHEMIAH.

NEHEMIAH (consolation of Jehocah), the distinguished Jewish patriot, and restorer of the walls of Jerusalem, was the son of Hachaliah. One of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia, he served as cup-bearer to King Artaxerxes Longimanus, with whom he must have stood in high favor. In the twentieth year of this sovereign (444 B.C.) he secured permission to return to Jerusalem, and restore its walls and his fathers' sepulchres. He undertook his journey, provided with letters of introduction to the governors and a body-guard (ii. 9). Arrived in Jerusalem, he was successful in rallying colaborers, and in restoring the fortifications of the city. The work, which he had undertaken, was accomplished, as well as a trowel, into every man's hand; and all the efforts of the enemies were defeated. Nehemiah was a disinterested patriot, as well as an able leader, and refused to take the salary due to a governor, on account of the poverty of the people. A hundred and fifty Jews sat down at his table every day. All our reliable information of Nehemiah's life is taken from the book bearing his name. The facts are continued down to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes' reign, or 452 B.C. He stands before us as one of the noblest and most magnanimous characters of the Old Testament. Like Joshua, he is a type of lay piety and religious activity. He was one of those ardent Jewish patriots whom the attractions of a foreign court did not make ashamed of their nationality, or indifferent to the welfare of Jerusalem. He combined the practical skill of the architect with the vigilance and foritude of the general.

Book of.—The Book of Nehemiah is valuable for the description it gives of the restoration of Jerusalem, which is our best guide in mapping out the topography of the city, the development of the enmity between the Jews and the Samaritans, and the revival of the reading of the law and the observance of the feasts. It contains an account of Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem, and reconstruction of its walls (chaps. i.—vii.), the institution of the public reading of the law and a religious feast by Ezra, and the prayer of the Levites (viii., ix.), the covenant and genealogy of the Levites, and the separation of Israel from the mixed multitude (x.—xiii. 3), and Nehemiah's reforms concerning the temple, and marriages with foreign women (xii. 4—81). It is the latest of the books of the Old Testament. The authenticity of its contents has not been a matter of dispute. There are no events of a miraculous nature to awaken suspicion. The questions of interest concern the relation of the work to Ezra and the authorship.

In the Hebrew canon, Nehemiah and Ezra were
NEHUSHTAN

NEPHSTES.

counted as one book. The LXX. and the Vulgate divided them into two books. The events which they narrate belong to the same period of restoration; but, as has already been stated in the article Ezra, they are regarded as distinct compositions. The opening clause of Nehemiah, "The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah," clearly indicates this. The author uses the first person in chaps. 1.-vii. 6, xii. 31-43, and xiii. 4-31; and it is pretty generally agreed, that Nehemiah is the author of these sections. The case is different with the intervening chapters. De Wette, Bishop Hervey, Dr. Crosby, Canon Rawlinson, and others hold that all, or a portion, of this matter, is by another hand. Keil, on the other hand, ascribes the entire composition to Nehemiah. Stress is laid upon the change from the first to the third person in the narrative; but there is danger of being deceived by this argument, as the instances cited in the article Ezra prove. The style of chaps. viii.-x. is, as Rawlinson and others have shown, different from the first seven chapters; and the list of chaps. x.-xiii. have evidently been interpolated (xii. 10-22, etc.).

Lit.—The Fathers did not give much attention to Nehemiah; and Venerable Bede was the first to give a commentary upon it in his allegorical interpretation, Allegorica Exposilio in Librum Nehemiah. Among the older commentators are Strigelius (Scholia in Nehem., 1575), Bishop Pilkington (Exposition upon Nehemiah, 1585), Crommius (Loval., 1632), Trapp (London, 1656). The more recent commentators are by Bertheau, 1802; Keil: 1870; Canon Rawlinson, in Speaker's Commentary. London and New York, 1873; Howard Crosby, in Lange, New York, 1878. See art. "Nehemiah," by Bishop Hervey, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, the vivid portraiture by Ewald, in his History of Israel, and the art. "Ezra und Nehemia," by Bishop Hervey in Herzog, SAYCE: Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, London, 1885.

Nehushtan (brazen thing) is the name which King Hezekiah of Judah gave to the brazen serpent set up in the wilderness by Moses (Num. xxii. 8). It had been preserved by the Israelites up to that time; but Hezekiah ordered it to be burnt, because the people regarded it as an idol. "Nehushtan" is rendered "novice." The term was retained by the early Christian fathers, and is used in theology to denote the introduction of new and more or less unsound doctrines.
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NEO-PLATONISM was the last of philosophy which the Greek civilization developed, and stood in a curious relation to Christianity, alternately attracting and repulsing it. When Christianity entered into history, the whole Greek-Roman civilization was falling into decay, its moral and religious foundation was decomposed and crumbling away, and the uncertainty and insufficiency of its scientific construction became apparent by the glaring contradictions of the various philosophical systems. Its inherent power was still too strong, however, to yield without making one last grand exertion for self-restoration. The history of philosophy was reassessed, and those systems which presented a combination of philosophy and religion (Pythagoras, Plato, etc.), supplemented with such Oriental ideas as were only eclectics. Their influence was merely momentary. They simply prepared the way for Neo-Platonism, which, though firmly planted on the basis of the preceding Greek philosophy, may be considered a new manifestation of the genuine creative power of the Greek spirit, distinct, both from the philosophy of Philo, with its peculiar Jewish admixtures, and from Gnosticism, with its preponderating Oriental elements. Its deepest impulse was a longing away from the finite existence in the world towards the infinity of God. Its principal object was to discover the means by which the human soul may escape from its imprisonment in matter, and return to the spiritual source from which it originates. Thus it is characterized in each of its three phases,— the Alexandrian-Roman school, 290–270 (Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus), the Syrian school, 270–400 (Porphyry and Jamblichus), and the Athenian school, 400–529 (Proclus and his disciples).

Ammonius Saccas, a native of Alexandria (d. about 250), a Christian by education, but afterwards converted to Paganism, was the founder of Neo-Platonism. He wrote nothing; but among his disciples were Origien the Neo-Platouist, Origen the Christian Father, Longinus the critic, and Plotinus (b. at Lyapopolis in Egypt, 205; d. in Campania, 270), who first gave a systematic form to the Neo-Platonic doctrines. Plotinus settled in Rome in 244, gathered a large circle of pupils, and began it: 254 to put his ideas into writing. His essays, fifty-four in number, were collected by Porphyry, and arranged, according to their contents, in four books. The first book, 142, was translated into Latin by Marcellus Flacinus, Florence, 1492, and then in Latin and Greek at Basel, 1580, in Greek, with critical apparatus by Moser, and Creuzer, Oxford, 1835, 3 vols., by Dubner, Paris, 1855, by Kirchhoff, Leipzig, 1866, and by H. F. Muller, Berlin, 1878–80. [Parts of his works were translated into English by T. A. Taylor, London, 1877, 3d ed., 1871. There is a complete French translation by Bouillet, Paris, 1857–60; also a German, Berlin, 1878–80.] Among modern works on Plotinus' philosophy are, C. H. Kirchner: Die Philosophie Plotins, Halle, 1854; A. Richter: Neu-platonische Studien, Halle, 1855. The system of Plotinus comprises three divisions,— the supersensuous world, the world of the senses, and the elevation of the soul from the latter to the former. The centre and foundation, not only of the supersensuous world, but of all that exists, is God. But God is incommensurable with reason, above reason, and can be approached by humanity standing only under three forms,— as the infinite, without limit or form, without magnitude or life, without thought or being, definable only through negations; as the one and the good, the source of all that loves, the goal of all that lives; and as the sum total of all power or force, the absolute causality: which three conceptions afterwards were introduced into the Christian dogmatics, as the three ways of knowing God, by the Christian Neo-Platonists, Dionysius Areopagita, Maximus Confessor, and Socrates Brighena. From the superabundance of this absolute causality issues forth the idea, or world of ideas (νοήμα), which, though radiating from God, "like the beams from the sun," is different from him, "like the flower from the root," and as unable to exercise any influence on him as is "the river with respect to its source." From the idea again issues forth the Soul (ατομόν), one by itself, as the All-Soul or the World-Soul, and yet comprising an innumerable multitude of individual souls. Though the Soul belongs to the supersensuous world, she has an instinctive longing towards her own creation,— the world of the senses, the world of appearances, the world of matter. This last stage in the development of the universe is as necessary, according to its inherent plan, as any of the preceding; but matter is, nevertheless, the very opposite of good,— evil by itself, and the source of all evil. The goal of all moral effort of man must consequently be to rid himself from his connections with matter. This is accomplished by turning through the Idea to God. The means by which that goal can be reached is virtue; not the simple, plain virtue by which social life is regulated and adorned, but a thorough purification of the Soul,— by which the sensuous affections are not only limited and governed, but absolutely extinguished,— and a concentration of all the powers of life upon the Idea, that is, upon the study of the sciences and the contemplation of the divine, until at last the Soul is completely absorbed in God through a holy enthusiasm, or ecstasy.

The most prominent of Plotinus' disciples, and the head of the Syrian school of Neo-Platonism, was Porphyry (b. in 235 at Tyre, or, according to another account, at Batanaea in Syria; d. in Rome, 305 or 304). He studied first under Longinus, but repaired in 268 to Rome, and entered the school of Plotinus. After a period of several years in Sicily, he returned in 271 to Rome, where he edited the works of Plotinus, and wrote most of his own books. Christian writers — Socrates (Hist. Eccl., III. 23) and Augustine (De Civit. Dei, X. 20)
— tell us that he was educated a Christian, but was converted to Paganism, and, from a feeling of revenge, became a bitter enemy of Christianity; and, indeed, one of his most famous works was his *Kata Xpatianov* ("Against the Christians").

It has perished, and so have the refutations of it by Methodius, Eusebius of Cesarea, Apollinaris, and Philostorgius; but it is often spoken of (Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.*, VI. 19; *Demonstr. Evang.*, I. 62; *Anted. 

Neo-Platonic philosophers were for some time associated even by Christian theologians (Gregory of Nyssa); and under his successors (Marinus, Sismondy, Hegiai, etc.) the system became to many the bridge between the rationalism and popularized the system, and made it fit for practice. Plotinus. Porphyry was a man of a practical turn of mind, clear, cutting, and popular; a scholar and a critic, rather than a speculative genius. He added nothing new to Neo-Platonism; but he proceeded, nevertheless, from the same historical premises, — the deep despair which had seized the peoples when they saw their political liberty, their national education, their religious institutions, tumble down into chaos; and they aimed at the same moral goal, — to give to human life a new and safe foundation by reconciling those awful contradictions which were burning in every man's heart, — God and the world, spirit and nature, mind and matter, etc. No wonder, then, that, as Augustine says in his *Epistle to Dioscorus* (Ep. 118), Neo-Platonism became to many the bridge which led them to Christianity. But, besides that, Neo-Platonism exercised a discernible influence on the historical development of Christianity. Origen, Methodius, Synoesius, the three Cappadocians in the East, Marius Victorinus, Boethius, and Augustine in the West, had frequented Neo-Platonic schools (see Leche: *Augustinus plotinianus*, Jena, 1881). The Fathers often used the expositions of Neo-Platonic writers, especially of Plotinus (see A. Jahn: *Basilius plotinianus*, Bern, 1838). Theodoret, in his *De curanda Gr. aff.*, even employs Plotinus' propositions concerning Providence, though at the same time testing that Plotinus has derived his ideas from Christian sources. But the greatest influence Neo-Platonism exercised on Christianity through the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius. According to general acceptance, that author was a Christian, who, educated in the school of Proclus, undertook to combine Christian and Neo-Platonic ideas into a system of mystical gnosia, which then was accepted by many as the genuine and original Christian doctrine, handed down from the apostles themselves as a secret but divine science. Through Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and Leo of Crete, those writings exercised a decisive influence on the scholasticism, and more especially on the mysticism, of Western theology during the middle ages.

**Lit.** — For the history of Neo-Platonism, see, besides the general histories of philosophy, *Jules Simon: Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1845; *Vacherot: Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1846-51, 3 vols. For the relation between Christianity and Neo-Platonism see, besides the general church histories, *Voigt: Neu-Platonismus*.
NEOT, St., an Anglo-Saxon monk, famous for his works and his social character. He was a nephew of King Alfred, and is said to have exercised considerable influence over the people by his counsel and his writings. He is associated with the invention of printing, and is said to have been the first to write against the book, the planet Mars is assigned to Nergal; and, as long as Heidelberg continued Lutheran, the chapter on the authority of Luther is emphasized. See F. S. G. G. S.:

Philistia was named, in 2 Kings xvi. 30, as a deity worshipped by the men of Cuth, who from Babylon were transplanted into Samaria. The name also occurs in the patronymic Nergal-sharezer, Nergal-sharezer, "Nergal protects the king." (Jer. xxxix. 3, 13); but its etymology is completely uncertain. In the Babylonian star-worship, the planet Mars is assigned to Nergal; and he is probably represented by the colossal lions at the entrance of the Assyrian palace,—a fit symbol for the deity in which the Greek-Romans recognized their Ares-Mars. By the Medes and Persians the planet Mars was called Nerig, which evidently is a corruption of Nergal. According to the Talmud and the rabbins, Nergal was worshipped under the form of the domestic cock. This statement may be due to a merely arbitrary combination of the terms Nergal and negal, the name of the god. But it is not improbable that the cock—entirely unknown to the ancient Hebrews, and never mentioned in the Old Testament, first introduced from India to the Persians, and then from the Persians to the Hebrews—may have formed one of the symbolic representations of Nergal, as it everywhere, in India, Persia, Greece, etc., was consecrated to the god of war.

NER'GAL-SHARE'ZER (Nergal-sar-usur, "Nergal protects the king") is the name of a Babylonian nobleman (Jer. xxxix. 3) entitled Rab-mag, probably as the chief of magicians, and generally identified with Nerig-lissar, the son-in-law and successor of Nebuchadnezzar. The palace built by him has been discovered among the ruins of Babylon.

NER'I, Philip (Filippo de), founder of the Congregation of the Oratory; one of the saints of the Roman-Catholic Church, perhaps the most witty of their number, and free, from all pharisaical leaven; was b. at Florence, July 22, 1515; d. at Rome, May 25, 1595. He was characterized from childhood by a cheerful and gentle disposition. Left comparatively poor by the loss of his goods by fire; his uncle, a rich merchant in St. Germano. Resisting his uncle's generous offers, he went in 1533, out of religious devotion, to Rome, where he studied philosophy and theology under the guidance of the Augustinians. He gave himself up in his spare hours to works of charity, and had no sooner concluded his studies than he sold his library, and gave the proceeds to the poor. On one occasion, in his thirtieth year, while he was engaged in prayer for the Holy Spirit, he was so overcome that he threw himself on the ground; but when he rose up, he found his chest had expanded to the extent of a fist's width. Later, at the dissection of the body, it was discovered that the heart was perfectly sound, and two of the ribs had been broken.

Neri was ordained priest in the Lateran Church, May 29, 1531. He took part in the foundation of the Society of the Holy Trinity for the care of the poor and strangers; but it is especially with the Congregation of the Oratory that his name is associated. This society grew out of evening gatherings which Neri held in a hall,—the Oratory, for prayer, readings from the Bible, the Fathers, and the martyrs' legends, song, etc. The musical treasures of the church were put under the charge of the members, and the pieces chosen were called "oratories." Down to this day such compositions are performed at the Church of the Oratory in Rome, the St. Maria in Vallicella, from All Saints' Day (Nov. 1) to Palm Sunday.

A familiar and cheerful atmosphere pervaded these gatherings. Neri was persuaded that a cheerful temper was far more in accordance with Christianity than melancholy. The most of his alleged miracles he performed with the simple words, "Be cheerful, and doubt not." This spirit he carried into his daily life; and he was full of humor in his social relations, and even engaged in games. This conduct could not escape the notice of those who sought to bring about a reformation by pharisaical seriousness. He was accused by the cardinal-vicar of Rome of having piped for his companions to dance, etc., and was suspended from the confessor's chair and the pulpit. But the cardinal-vicar died; and Neri was honored by the repeated offer of a cardinal's
hat, which he refused. Many miracles are ascribed to him. He was often, for hours at a time, in a state of ecstasy; and his body was seen, on such occasions, to sway in the air several feet from the ground. It does not seem to have been his custom to pray to Mary. Miracles are said to have followed his decease; and in 1622 he was canonized, at the consecration of Louis XIII of France.

In 1575 a papal decree was secured recognizing the Congregation of the Oratory. The principle of perfect equality prevails among its members, and even the superior takes his turn in serving at the table. The members are not monks, and do not renounce their private fortunes, or take vows. It was Neri's wish to limit their functions to prayer, the administration of the sacrament, and preaching. The Italian societies are, for the most part, independent of each other, and there is no centralization of authority and jurisdiction. The Church of St. Maria in Vallicella, Rome, belonging to the congregation was built in 1576.

Three years later, Taruccii founded societies in Naples and Milan, which were followed by others in Palermo and other cities. Neri's successor as superior of the Roman society was the church historian Baronius. In 1611 a society was opened in Paris by Berulle (afterwards cardinal), and others were founded in France. The French societies were, by reason of an inserted article of their constitution, made subject to the bishop. Bossuet passed a glowing eulogy upon the Congregation, which aroused the jealousy of the Jesuits. Jansen persuaded members of the order to settle in Flanders in order to promote the strict Augustinian doctrines of sin and grace. The order has had among its members Malebranche, Thomassin, Mazarin, and Massillon, and in 1780 had fifty-eight houses in France. The Church of the Oratory, near the Louvre in Paris, now belongs to the Reformed Church. The order decayed after the Revolution, but has since been revived [1853] under the impulse of the devout Pététot of St. Roch, and has the name of the "Oratory of Jesus and the Immaculate Mary." Gratry belonged to it. [In 1847 Cardinal Newman founded a Congregation of the Oratory in England, members of which were for the most part made up of former members of the Anglican Church. In 1819 a second Congregation was established at London, with Frederick W. Faber as the superior.]


REUCHLIN. ZÖCKLER.

NERO (Roman emperor 54-68) has made his name conspicuous in the history of the Christian Church by his persecution of the Christian congregation in Rome,—the first great persecution instituted against the Christians. In the night between July 18 and 19, 64, a fire broke out on the southern declivity of the Palatine Hill. It raged for six days and six nights, spreading far and wide, and suddenly started anew in the north-ern parts of the city, lasting for three more days, and destroying ten out of the fourteen wards of the city. The excitement in Rome was indescribable; and a rumor was abroad that the conflagration was the work of the emperor himself,—a suspicion not altogether improbable on account of his delirious craving for magnificence, and his desire to emblazon Rome with an edifice all his own. In order to avert the popular fury, which could not be appeased by lavish contributions, public processions, etc., Nero formally accused the Christians of having caused the calamity. Why he first chose the Christians is a question not easy to answer. Some have surmised that the accusation was due to the influence of the Empress Poppaea. She was on very friendly terms with the Jews; and she was excessively jealous of Acte, the mistress of Nero, and said to have been a Christian. It is more probable, however, that the emperor simply made use of the prejudice of the Romans against all Orientals and their aversion to the Jews. Though, at that time, people in general hardly made any distinction between Christians and Jews, simply considering the former a sect of the latter, there were certain Christian ideas,—the belief in the speedy return of Christ, in the destruction of the world by fire, etc.—which were well known to all who had heard any thing about the Christians, and which made it specially easy to fasten the accusation on them. The effect was fearful. In the gardens of Nero, the present St. Peter's Square, the Christians were crucified, sewn into hides of wild beasts, and thrown before the dogs, enveloped with some inflammable stuff, raised on poles, and used as torches, etc. Beyond the city of Rome the persecution did not spread, but the impression it made on the whole Christian community was visible for a long time. Hence the widely spread rumor among the early Christians that Nero would return as Antichrist. Many modern writers find his name in the mystic number of the Apocalypse (xiii. 18).


R. FÖHLMANN.

NERSES is the name of three great dignitaries of the Armenian Church, of whom Nerses I., the Great, has already been spoken of in the special article ARMENIAN CHURCH, p. 141. — Nerses Claysensis, as cathedralos. Nerses IV., b. about 1100; d. Aug. 5 or 13, 1173; belonged to the same family as Nerses the Great and Gregory Illuminator, and was catholicos from 1166 to 1173. He labored with great zeal for the establishment of a union between the Armenian and the Greek Church. At a personal meeting with Alexius, the son-in-law of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, and command-er of the garrison of Mopsuestia, he was surprised at the insignificance of the differences which separated the two churches, and sent a confession of
the creed of the Armenian Church to the emperor. Thus the negotiations were opened. Later on, the emperor sent the Greek philosopher Theorianus, and Johannes Uthman, abbot of a monastery in Philippiopolis, to Armenia; and a great disputation took place between the Greek and the Armenian theologians, the effect of which was actually to draw the two churches still nearer to each other. The protocol of this disputation was first printed in Latin and Greek by J. Leunclavius, Basel, 1577, and in Bibl. Vet. Patr., iv., then in Latin and Armenian by Clemens Galanus, in his Conciliaio Eccl. Armenae cum Romana, i. 212-222, and by Angelo Mai, in his Scriptorum Vet. Nova Collecolio, Rome, 1832, tom. iv. The emperor then sent a declaration to Nerses, setting forth nine different points which it would be necessary that the Armenian Church should accept, and they were really accepted by a local synod convened by Nerses. But, before a general synod was called, the catholicae discordeae were set down by Nerses also distinguished himself in literature, both as a poet and as a theologian. He wrote The Word of Faith, an extract from the Gospels, in thirteen hundred and fifty-nine verses; Jesus the Son, in four thousand verses, and other religious poems, printed in Venice, 1822; and, from his great love for the conquest and destruction of Edessa, printed in Paris and Madras, 1826, at Tiflis, 1859. His prose-works consist of homilies, commentaries, Prayers, printed in twenty-four languages, in Venice, 1822 and 1827, and letters, of great theological interest, printed in Constantinople, 1826, in Venice, 1858, and in a Latin translation by Cappelletti, Venice, 1833. — Nerses Lambronensis, b. in 1153; d. July 14, 1198; was a son of Prince Oshin of Lambron in Cilicia, by a niece of Nerses Clayensis. He was educated in Constantinople, understood Greek, Latin, and Coptic, and was in 1175 appointed archbishop of Tarsus and Lambron. He had a great talent as a preacher: but he loved solitude and a secluded life; and one year after his appointment, when only twenty-four years old, he resigned his office, and withdrew into the desert, where he wrote his exposition of the liturgy. The 129 hymns he wrote between 1177-1180, are among the most celebrated in all the religious poems which he composed. His orations on the clerical office. In the negotiations, however, still going on between the Greek and the Armenian Church, he took a prominent part. The Greek declaration of nine points was not accepted unconditionally by the Armenian synod, at whose opening Nerses delivered his most celebrated speech, printed, together with an Italian translation, at Venice, 1812, translated into German by Neumann, Leipzig, 1834, and still read as a specimen of marvellous eloquence. Several of the Greek demands were objected to; and, on the other hand, the Armenians also made their demands. The Greeks, however, showed themselves very obliging, and a full agreement was actually arrived at; but, before the message could reach Constantinople, the emperor died (Sept. 27, 1180), and the stormy time which then set in made all the labor done of no avail. The suspicious and jealousy of the Greek, which was again aroused by the good relation between the Armenians and the crusaders, and the embassy of Nerses to Constantinople in 1197 had no effect. Besides the works already mentioned, Nerses wrote commentaries, homilies, lives of anchorites (translated into several languages), a eulogy on Nerses Clayensis, printed in Petersburg, 1782, Moscow, 1810, Constantinople, 1826, etc. — Petermann.

NESE, Christopher, dissenting divine; b. at North Cowes, Yorkshire, Dec. 26, 1621; d. at London, Dec. 26, 1705. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; took holy orders; was settled at Cottingham; ejected for nonconformity, 1662; and for thirty years was prior to a dissenting congregation in London. He wrote many works; of which the most important are, A compleat history and mystery of the Old and New Testament logically discussed and theologically improved, London, 1690-96, 4 vols. (Matthew Henry is said to have utilized it in his Commentary); Antidote against Arminianism, 1700, 5th ed. revised 1838; and Life of Pope Innocent XI. (written for John Dunton, who sold the whole impression in a fortnight).

NESTOR, the father of Russian historiography; b. in 1656; d. about 1120; entered the Persian monastery of Kief in his seventeenth year, and spent the rest of his life there as a monk. His principal work is his Chronicle, written in Old-Russian, and opening a continuous series of similar works running through five centuries, one author taking up the thread where the other drops it. The monkish character of the work is very striking, but impresses the reader with respect. The author narrates in simple and devout manner; and, when his credulity does not lead him astray into the fabulous, he is reliable. The earliest edition is from 1707; the latest, by Miklosich, from 1860. He also wrote a Patericum Peczericum, containing lives of the abbots of the cave-monastery of Kief. See Strahl: Beiträge zur russischen Kirchengeschichte, Halle, 1827; [Stanley: Eastern Church, London, 1881.

NESTORIANS, History of the (after 489).

The Nestorians rapidly developed into a powerful ecclesiastical party, and, excluded from the empire, carried on an extensive missionary activity in Persia, India, and China. They spread at first in Persia. A letter of Ibas of Edessa to Bishop Mares of Persia, and the translations of the works of Diodorus of Tarshish, 1547, 1575, containing the language of the Persian Church (the Syrian), contributed to extend the doctrines of Nestorius in the Persian Empire. The teachers who had been expelled from Edessa also entered Persia, and settled down at Nisibis, and were strengthened by the addition to their number of Nerses the Leper. Christianity had been carried to Persia at an early period, and the bishop of Seleucia became the acknowledged head of the church. Persian bishops were present at the Council of Nicea. Babseus assumed the title of "patriarch," and, according to Assemani, was the first schismatic Nestorian bishop of Seleucia (498-503). His predecessor, Acacius, was also suspected of being a Nestorian; and Xenaias of Mabbug (i.e. Philoxenus, the translator of the Syriac New Testament) gave to him and his followers the designation "Nestorians." This is the first occurrence of this name. These distinguished themselves as "Chaldeans," or "Chaldean Christians," and affirm that Nestorius was not their patriarch, and that he followed them, not they him. The Turks of to-day call them Násran; i.e., Christians. Babseus, however, was the
NESTORIANS.

first to boldly avow himself a Nestorian. He
inaugurated his patriarchate with a synod, which
granted the privilege to the patriarch, bishops,
and priests, to marry one wife (as opposed to
polygamy), and established the primacy of the see
of Seleucia.

The successors of Babeus filled all the sees
with Nestorians, and were intent upon propagating
their form of Christianity. The principal seat of
Nestorian learning was Nisibis. The sect pro-
duced learned theologians, and also distinguished
physicians and philosophers, who translated Greek
classics,—especially Aristotle, Hippocrates, and
Gal enus,—and were the only representatives of
letters in the Orient at that time.

In Arabia the Nestorians were also successful
in propagating their doctrines. They spread in
Syria and Palestine under the caliphs; and a
bishop of the Nestorians in Egypt is mentioned
under Mar Aba II. (742–752). The bishops of
Arabia were subject to the metropolitan of Persia.
India, in which, according to a very old tradition,
the apostle Thomas introduced Christianity, also
belonged to his jurisdiction. The Nestorians like-
wise spread to China, where a Nestorian monu-
ment of the year 781 was found by the Jesuit mis-
sionaries in 1625 at Si-gan-fu. The inscription,
which is in Chinese and Syriac, gives a long list
of Nestorian clergymen. Its genuineness, once
widely disputed, is now very generally acknowl-
edged. The patriarch Salibazacha (714–726) ap-
pointed the first Nestorian metropolitan of China.
At the same time metropolitan were appointed
for Herat and Samarcund.

Early in the sixth century there was a split
amongst the Nestorians in Persia, two patriarchs
(Nerses and Eliseus) being elected by two parties;
but it was healed at the end of twelve years.
Both parties united upon Paul, who was followed
in a few months by Mar Aba I., a converted
Magian (536–562). This prelate translated the
Nestorian Liturgy from the Greek into the Syriac,
which is still in use, and displayed remarkable
energy in the government of the church. He
made tours of visitation, and in 544 held a synod,
which decreed that neither the patriarch nor the
bishops might marry,—a decree which is still
authoritative. It also established the authority
of the Nicene Creed, and of Theodore of Mop-
suestia as an expositor of the Bible. The synod
of 577, convened by patriarch Ezekiel (577–580),
pronounced against the Messallians. The Emperor
Chosroes I. is said to have become a Christian
before his death; and his successors, Hormizd IV.
and Chosroes II., greatly favored the Nestorians;
the latter forcing all other Christians to accept
their doctrines.

Under the Mohammedans, the Nestorians were
not only almost wholly free from persecutions,
but could boast of several edicts licensing their
religion, the genuineness of some of which, how-
ever, has been justly a matter of dispute. The
tradition runs, that Mohammed had the acquaint-
hance of a Nestorian monk, Sergius, and got from
him his knowledge of Christianity. The patri-
arch Jesuiahb is also reported to have gone to
Mohammed, and secured from him an edict of
toleration, which was well applied to the
prince and the hierarchy in the territories of
Seleucia. But in 1684 Innocent XI. again nominated
a patriarch, who assumed the name “Joseph;” and
ever since, this has been the name of the patri-
arch of those Nestorians or Chaldeans who ac-
knowledge the jurisdiction of Rome. The other
wing of the Nestorians also retained its organi-
sation and its patriarch, who, since the close of
the seventeenth century, has borne the name
“Simeon,” and the title “Patriarch of the Chal-
deans.” He has his residence in an inaccessible
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filled high political positions under the Moham-
medans, and acted as secretaries to the caliphs
or physicians (both of which classes stood very
high in the esteem of the Mohammedan rulers),
and took a prominent part in the appointment of
their successor, in the elections of the patriarchs. At one
time Bagdad was the patriarchal residence; and
here the patriarchs were elected, though they were
ordained at Seleucia.

Under the Mongols, likewise, the Nestorians
were favored. When Hulagu Khan captured
Bagdad, in 1298, he spared them. His successors
were likewise favorable to the sect; which may
be, at least in part, explained by the resemblances
of the Buddhistic ritual to its own. A son of
Zingis Khan is reported by Marco Polo to have
passed over to Christianity. The famous and
mythical Presbyter John was a Nestorian; and it
was among the Nestorians that John of Monte
Covino (1292) labored.

The favorable position of the Nestorians under
the Arabs and Mongols was attended with a rapid
extension of Christianity in Eastern Asia. After
the siege of Bagdad, in 1268, twenty-five metropo-
litans acknowledged the jurisdiction of the
Nestorian patriarch. The first persecutions were
inaugurated by Timur. Thenceforth their congre-
gations began to shrink up, or wither away. The
Roman-Catholic Church also contributed to this
result by undertaking active missionary opera-
tions among them. Pope Innocent IV. despatched
some bishops in 1247 with a communication to
the vicar of the Nestorian Orient, who replied by
saying a confession signed by the archbishop of
Nisibis, two other archbishops, and three bishops,
acknowledging Mary as the “ mother of Christ”
(totapetike). Nicolaus IV., in 1288, likewise com-
unicated with the Nestorians, as also did Bene-
dict XI., and received from the patriarch Jahbal-
aha, in 1304, an answer acknowledging the Roman
Church as “the mother and teacher of all the
others,” and the Pope “as the head shepherd of all
Christendom.” Aseean concludes too abruptly,
that the Nestorians at this time united with the
Roman Church: at any rate, the Nestorians under
Jahbalaha’s successors continued to be independ-
ent. In 1445, however, under Pope Eugenius IV.,
the entire Nestorian body on the Island of Cyprus
was won for the Roman Church by the efforts of
Archbishop Andrew. In the sixteenth century a
strong Catholic party was formed. At the death
of the patriarch Simeon, in 1651, a party in the
church, refusing to acknowledge his nephew, Bar
Mama, who had been elected his successor, chose
a patriarch of their own, Johannes Sulaka, who
was sent to Rome for consecration. For a hun-
dred years this succession was kept up. The
patriarch who was contemporary with Paul V.
accepted the confessions the Pope sent him in
1617; but his successors renounced the union.
But in 1684 Innocent XI. again nominated a
patriarch, who assumed the name “Joseph;” and
ever since, this has been the name of the patri-
arch of those Nestorians or Chaldeans who ac-
knowledge the jurisdiction of Rome. The other
wing of the Nestorians also retained its organi-
sation and its patriarch, who, since the close of
the seventeenth century, has borne the name
“Simeon,” and the title “Patriarch of the Chal-
deans.” He has his residence in an inaccessible
valley of the Kurd Mountains. The small residue of the once powerful Nestorian Church is confined to these hills and the plain about Oroomiah, where in 1833 numbered, according to Smith and Dwight, seventy thousand souls. The American Board sent missionaries to them in 1834, who, by their prudent and in every way much-blessed labors, have done not a little to prevent the few surviving Nestorians from being swallowed up by the Roman-Catholic Church. It was through these missionaries that the news was first brought, that the Nestorians still preserved a dialect of the old Aramaic language. They have set up their presses in Oroomiah [1840], and made this dialect the language of the Scripture translation. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress (1848), Baxter's Saints' Rest (1854), and many other books, have been published in this same tongue, especially under the distinguished guidance of Rev. Mr. Perkins. In 1853 the learned missionary, David T. Stoddard, gave the first systematic account of this dialect in his Grammar of the Modern Syrian Tongue (4th edition of the Am. Or. Soc., vol. v.). The first German treatment was that of Noldeke (Grammatik d. neusyrischen Sprache, Leipzig, 1862). All the liturgical books of the Nestorians are in the old Syriac language. They have set up their presses in Oroomiah [1840], and made this dialect the language of the Scripture translation. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress (1848), Baxter's Saints' Rest (1854), and many other books, have been published in this same tongue, especially under the distinguished guidance of Rev. Mr. Perkins. In 1853 the learned missionary, David T. Stoddard, gave the first systematic account of this dialect in his Grammar of the Modern Syrian Tongue (4th edition of the Am. Or. Soc., vol. v.). The first German treatment was that of Noldeke (Grammatik d. neusyrischen Sprache, Leipzig, 1862). All the liturgical books of the Nestorians are in the old Syriac language.

The American mission among the Nestorians was inaugurated by the appointment of Rev. Justin and Mrs. Perkins, who sailed from Boston, Sept. 21, 1833. The next important name in the history of the mission is that of Dr. Asahel Grant, a physician at Utica at the time of his deciding to become a missionary. The New Testament was printed in the modern Syriac in 1846, and the whole Bible in 1852. The American Board retained control of the mission till 1870, when it passed over to the hands of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. The present headquarters are at Oroomiah, where a most flourishing work is carried on, there being five self-supporting churches; and an important institution of learning has been established.

As regards the Nestorians, or Thomas Christians, of India, they received a metropolitan under the name of the Chaldiean archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menez, forced them to accept the decrees of a synod held in 1599; so that only a small remnant remained true to the faith of their fathers. But in 1658 the former were able to throw off the Roman yoke, which papal missionaries have since been endeavoring to restore.

Lit. — The principal source of the history of the Nestorians is, Assemani, Bibl. Orientalis (4 vols.), which contains a Dissertatio de Syrii Nestorianis, Rome, 1728, 962 pp. The author was a learned Maronite, but a zealous Roman Catholic, and wrote in the Vatican. The same is true of the Chaldean archbishop of Amadia (who was educated at Rome), G. Ebdjesu Khajjat: Syri orientales seu Chaldæi Nestoriani et Romanorum pontificum primatus, Rome, 1870. See also Doucin: Hist. du Nestorianisme, 1899; Layard: Nineveh, etc.; Smith and Dwight: Researches in Armenia with a Visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Oroomiah, etc. 2 vols., London, 1844; Badger: The Nestorians and their Rituals, London, 1852; Grant: The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, London, 1841, 3d ed., 1844; Justin Perkins: A Residence of Eight Years in Persia, Andover, 1843; Hohlenberg: De origine cum fatis et ecclesiae christi, in Iran, et voce, Providence, 1852. [See also W. Anderson: History of the Oriental Churches.]

NESTORIANS AND THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY (to 489). Nestorius (a prominent name in the history of the christological controversies of the early church), b. in the Syrian city Germanicia, and probably educated in Antioch under Theodore of Mopsuestia, won for himself, as monk and presbyter, by his ascetic life, zeal in the cause of orthodoxy, and sermons, a wide reputation in Antioch. He was consecrated bishop of Constantinople April 10, 428, and, according to Socrates (VII. 39), was a bitter enemy of the heretics. In several sermons he took the part of the presbyter Anastasius, and combated the use of the title, "Mother of God" (ευαγγελισμος), of Mary. Not God the Logos, but only the human nature, he assumed to himself, had a mother. It was not God who suffered and died. These utterances produced an intense excitement in Constantinople. Clergymen like Proclus preached against him, and laymen interrupted him in the pulpit. As soon as the matter became noised abroad, Cyril of Alexandria, a zealous representative of the Alexandrian school, and, by position, a rival of the patriarch of Constantinople, rose against Nestorius, and wrote to his followers among the clergy of Constantinople, and to the sister and wife of the emperor, to win them for his side. The emperor espoused the cause of Nestorius. Nestorius answered Cyril with not a little haughtiness. His reception of some Pelagians who had been expelled from the West, with the purpose of examining their case, afforded him an opportunity of writing to Celestine, bishop of Rome, and defining his christological views. Celestine, however, received them with disfavor; and a Roman synod in 450 declared against Nestorius, threatened him with excommunication in case he did not make a speedy retracation, and intrusted the duty of taking further measures against Nestorius to Cyril. John of Antioch sought to induce his friend Nestorius to admit the expression, "mother of God," but was referred by him to the oecumenical council about to be held. Cyril now held a synod in Alexandria, which demanded from Nestorius his signature to twelve articles. Nestorius replied only by publishing twelve articles of his own. Other representatives of the Alexandrian theology — John of Antioch, Andrew of Samosate, and especially Theodoret — raised their voices against Cyril's articles.

The theological difference between Nestorius and Cyril was this: Nestorius regarded the pet epithet of the Alexandrian teachers, "Mother of God" (ευαγγελισμος), as a heathenish mixture of the divine and earthly. "Has God a mother? The creature has not borne Him who is uncreate." The divinity of the Logos is to be distinguished from the temple of his flesh; and two natures
are to be predicated of him in order that suffering, and all that is mortal (birth, crucifixion, and death), be not ascribed to the divine nature, and that the humanity which was made subject to death be not regarded as essentially divine. Both natures in the God-man remained what they were before their union. Notwithstanding this, there is only one person in the God-man. He was God in man. Therefore it is proper to say that Mary bare the humanity of Christ, but not that she bare the Son of God. She was the "mother of Christ" (παρθένος), or the "receptive organ of God" (ἐγκυμοσύνη). In these assertions Nestorius does not lay the same stress upon the human development of Christ as the Antiochian school did. It was his aim, however, to distinguish sharply between the two natures. Cyril, on the other hand, was justified in failing to derive from the treatment of Nestorius the distinct assertion of a single divine-human personality. Nestorius did not by any means intend to predicate two persons. But Cyril starts with the emphatic affirmation, that his opponent taught a co-existence of two persons (συνόροι δύο), whereby Immanuel was split into two Christ, two Sons. The Logos, on the other hand, actually became man, and did not merely assume a human nature to himself (wherefore Cyril was accused of Apollinarianism). The human nature was made a participant (εὐσωματικός) in the divine. The Logos did not assume a human personality; nor were there two natures after the incarnation, but only the single nature of the incarnate Logos. The predicates of the human and divine natures became the common property of both. Cyril said, "Nestorius resolves Christ into two Sons, to a man filled with God." Nestorius said, "Cyril makes the Logos undergo a transmutation into flesh, ascribes to him a capacity to suffer," etc. Each drew deductions from the statements of the other which were not intended.

The Council of Ephesus was convened in 431, by order of the emperor, Theodosius II., to settle the dispute. Nestorius arrived in season, under the protection of the imperial legate, Ireneus; and another imperial legate, Candidian, was also present to watch over the proceedings. Cyril arrived with fifty bishops; but the Syrians, with John of Antioch at their head, tarried. After waiting six days, Cyril, in spite of the news that the Syrians were close by, and in spite of the protestations of Candidian, opened the council, June 22. Nestorius was treated as an accused party; and two hundred bishops voted to depose him from his episcopal office, and exclude him from all priestly communion. The Syrians, on their arrival, stormed against Cyril, and in a separate synod, under Candidian's presidency, deposed him; but the Roman delegation, on its arrival, confirmed Cyril's course. Both factions hurried to present their cause to the emperor, who summoned delegates to Constantinople, but allowed them to come no farther than Chalcedon. Nestorius, weary of the controversy, was ready to retire. The emperor ordered him to return to his convent in Antioch. The opposing party gained in influence, were permitted to follow the emperor to Constantinople, and Cyril and Memnon to return to the synod.

The emperor, however, had not abandoned the cause of Nestorius. He desired a compromise, which met with disfavor from John of Antioch, the aged Acacius of Beroea, and Theodoret. Cyril made some advances by modifying his theological definitions. He knew also how to get an influence at court. The friends of Nestorius, including John of Antioch, forsook him. The Antiochians presented a confession to the emperor, to which Cyril gave his assent. It acknowledged two natures in the one Christ, and admitted the use of the epithet, "mother of God." Cyril's acceptance of this confession was a theological inconsistency. Neither party was fully satisfied. Cyril laid to listen to the objections of fanatics belonging to his party. On the other hand, an extreme Antiochian party of bishops from Central Asia, Syria, and Thessaly, was constituted, who favored Nestorius, and strongly opposed John, the patriarch of Antioch. The effort, however, to give efficacy to the compromise, confirmed John of Antioch and the emperor as advocates of Cyril. In 435 the emperor banished Nestorius to Petra in Arabia, and ordered his writings to be burned. Nestorius probably lived in the oasis of Upper Egypt, and was there cut off by reason of his Egyptian prefects until he died. The place and time are unknown. Cyril sought to follow up his victory. Bishop Rabulas of Edessa, a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, espousing the side of Cyril, condemned the writings of his teacher, and drove away from Edessa the teachers who had taken him for their master, among whom was Ibas. Some of the teachers who had been expelled from Edessa went to Persia, where Bishop Barsumas of Nisibis advocated the doctrines of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Ibas became the successor of Rabulas at his death, and remained in close relations with these teachers. The school of Edessa, regarded by the Emperor Zeno as the last stronghold, in the Greek Empire, of Nestorianism, was destroyed in 489. Few traces of this school of opinion are found in the later history of the Greek Empire.

Lit. — Some of the numerous writings of Nestorius are preserved in the Latin translations of Marius Mercator, in Baluzius (1684), Mansi, and Assemani (Bibl. Or.). See also the so-called Synodicon of the sixth century (best edition, Voirium epp. ad Conc. Ephes. pert., Lovani, 1892), the proceedings of the synod of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii.), and the three-controversy chapter (Mansi, ix.); the works of Cyril of Alexandria in Migne's Greek Patrology (lxxv.-lxxvii.); Societies: Hist. Eccl. (vii.); Evagrius (i.7 sqq.), etc.; Jablonsky: Exercit. Hist. theolog. de Nestor., Berol, 1721; Walch: Hist. d. Ketzereien; Baur: Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeit (1.); Dorner: History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ; Hefele: Conciliengeschichte; and the Church Histories of Schröck, Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, etc. W. Möller. NETHERLANDS. See Belgium, Holland. NETHERLANDS MISSIONARY SOCIETY. See Missions. NETHINIM. See Levites. NETTER, Thomas (generally called Thomas Waldenses), b. at Walden, in the county of Essex, about 1380; d. at Rouen, on a journey to Paris.
In this controversy Mr. Nettleton was supported by Drs. Lyman Beecher, Justin Edwards, Hawes, and others. His only published work was the *Village Hymns* (1824), according to Professor Bird "one of the most influential and important of American collections." See BENT TYLER: *Memoir of Rev. A. Nettleton, D.D.*, Hartford, 1844.

NEUBRIGENSIS, William (also called Petit, or Parvus), b. at Bridlington in Yorkshire, 1136; d. as canon in the abbey of Newbury, 1208; wrote, besides a Commentary on the Song of Songs, a *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, from William I. to 1197, which occupies the first place among contemporary chronicles. The author has a fine power of observation, knows how to choose his materials, and exercises at times an acute criticism. The book was first published at Antwerp, 1667. The best edition is that by H. C. Hamilton for the English Historical Society, 1856.

C. SCHÖLL.

NEUCHATEL, The Independent Evangelical Church of. In the canton of Neuchatel, containing a population of about 110,000 inhabitants, chiefly Protestants, there was organized, A.D. 1572, a free church, and a representative assembly independent of the State, and comprising in 1882 twenty-two parishes, with a membership of about 12,000 souls, among whom 3,961 are voters. The circumstances were as follows:—

The origin of the Independent Church of Neuchatel may be said to date back to the time of the Reformation. At that time the sovereigns of the country remained attached to popery; and the governor, their representative, opposed with all his might the powerful preaching of Farel, and the reformatory impulse aroused in the people by that preaching. One day, however, the citizens gave his emissaries the following decisive answer: "Tell the governor, that, so far as God and our souls are concerned, he has nothing to command over us." Throughout the whole country the Reformation was adopted by a majority of votes, with the exception of two places, which have continued Roman Catholic up to this very day. And thus the Reformed Church was established in Neuchatel without, and even in spite of, the State; while in the other Swiss cantons the administration of the Church and that of the State were generally united in the hands of the political power, because it was the Grand Councils which placed themselves at the head of the movement, and imposed the Reformation on the country, even against opposition.

The pastors of the new church, with Farel, the Knox of Switzerland, at their head, used to meet regularly in the city of Neuchatel, and discuss the affairs of their churches. From these spontaneous re-unions originated the body called the "Company of Pastors," which continued at the head of the church of Neuchatel down to 1848, governing the Church completely, independently of the State, and maintaining with great fidelity the preaching of the pure gospel. For the material sustenance of the church a fund was provided, formed partly from old-church property, partly from private contributions. But in 1848 the revolution which dissolved the relation in which the State of Neuchatel had stood to Prussia since 1707, also overthrew the ecclesiastical sovereignty of the Company of Pastors. From the negotiations between that body and the new authorities...

NETTLETON, Asahel, a distinguished American revivalist preacher; b. at North Killingworth, Conn., April 21, 1783; d. at East Windsor, Conn., May 16, 1844. He was brought up on a farm, of which he was called upon to take the full charge in 1801. He prepared himself for college, and graduated at Yale in 1809. After studying theology under the Rev. Mr. Pinneo of Milford, he was licensed to preach by the West Association of pastors, and for the second time. In 1827 he went to Virginia for his health, spending two years there. He held meetings in New-York City in 1820 he labored in New Haven by request of the Connecticut, and New York. In the latter year he was prostrated by a severe attack of typhus-fever, from which he never fully recovered. In 1820 he labored in New Haven by request of the pastors, and for the second time. In 1827 he went to Virginia for his health, spending two years there. He held meetings in New-York City in 1830-31, and in 1831 he visited Great Britain. In 1833 he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in the recently established theological institute of East Windsor (now Hartford Seminary), but declined the appointment. Mr. Nettleton was married. He was a powerful preacher, and large accessions to the church resulted from his preaching. It was strongly doctrinal and Calvinistic. He avoided the "anxious bench and all of its kindred measures" (Tyler). He was regarded as the representative of the conservative tendency, in opposition to Mr. Finney, whose evangelistic labors aroused much criticism. Among the most prominent of these critics was Nettleton himself, who had two interviews with Mr. Finney, — at Albany in December, 1826, and January, 1827, — in which he called upon him to abandon certain practices, such as the calling upon women to pray in public, praying for individuals by name, etc. A discussion was afterwards carried on through an open correspondence.

Nov. 3, 1430; studied at Oxford; entered the order of the Carmelites; became their provincial in 1414, and confessor to Henry V. in 1420; was present at the Council of Pisa in 1469, and at the Council of Constance 1414-18; and visited Lithuania in 1419 in order to effect a reconciliation between the king of Poland and the Teutonic knights. He was a prolific writer. His principal work is *Doctorale antiquitatum fidelis ecclesiae catholicius*, in six books, on God and Christ, the church, monasticism, the mendicant orders, the sacraments, and the ritual and liturgy. In spite of its title, the book is simply an elaborate criticism of the doctrines of Wiclif; and the criticism is moderate, honest, successful in finding out the weak points of the adversary, and energetic in the attack. Thus the book came to play a conspicuous rôle in the century of the Reformation. It was thrice printed, once in Paris (1521-22, 3 vols.), once in Salamanca (1556), and once in Venice (1571). France, Spain, and Italy, the great strongholds of Romanism, drew from that work their principal weapons in their contest with the Reformation. At that time the sovereigns of observation, knows how to choose his materials, and exercises at times an acute criticism. The book was first published at Antwerp, 1667. The best edition is that by H. C. Hamilton for the English Historical Society, 1856.

G. LECHLER.
resulted a re-organization of the church, according to which its administration was confided to a synod, composed of ecclesiastics and laymen chosen by the forty churches of the country. The synod also appointed the professors of theology, without any interference from the side of the State. The former church-property was absorbed by the State treasury, which then was charged with the payment of the ecclesiastical officers.

The campaign against the church by the adherents of the former opinion, as assembled, and charged with taking the necessary measures for the organization of the new church. The synod also appointed the professors of theology from France and Holland, who publicly attacked the traditional faith. But, as the campaign did not lead to the result desired, other means were resorted to. A revision of the ecclesiastical law was decided upon in the Grand Council; and shortly after a new law was carried through by a majority of seven votes. According to Art. 4 of the new law, every citizen of the state is a member of the church by the mere fact of his birth, and has the right to vote. According to Arts. 6 and 12 every minister is eligible to an office in the church, if he only has a license to preach; and he cannot be bound in advance by any measure whatever, regulation, creed, etc. Art. 17 leaves the synod no authority outside of the administration; and an article added during the debate transfers the appointment of professors in theology from the synod to the council.

Under such circumstances, what should the pastors and the evangelical members of the church do? The question was discussed in a public assembly. Some thought that it was their duty to submit to the new law, though it was ruinous to the church, and live on under the deplorable constitution, waiting for better times. Others thought that the new establishment had nothing whatever in common with the church founded by Christ himself, and insisted upon the necessity of an organization independent of the State. As the case was one of individual conscience, no vote was taken; but on the very same day the adherents of the latter opinion assembled, and charged the members of the old synod who were present with taking the necessary measures for the organization of the new church. The professors of the theological faculty were invited to open their lectures at the ordinary term, and under the direction of the synod. Out of the forty parishes of the country, twenty-one groups of faithful were formed, which, with their pastors, declared in favor of forming the new church. The most numerous groups contained between five and six hundred voters; others, however, only about thirty. A synod was elected, consisting of all the pastors, and three laymen for each pastor. A new constitution was also drawn up, and submitted to the churches, which adopted it with a unanimous vote.

A synodical committee governs the church in the intervals between the sessions of the synod. The pastors are paid, not directly by their parishes, but from a central fund formed by voluntary gifts. The annual budget, comprising the maintenance of the theological faculty of four professors, amounts to about a hundred and ten thousand francs, each pastor being paid from twenty-five hundred to twenty-eight hundred francs a year. Thus in ten years somewhat more than a million francs has been voluntarily furnished by three thousand voting members. As the use of the church-buildings is by law guaranteed to all religious denominations, the independent congregations have in the church convened one-half of them. But the others, having met with various impediments in the exercise of their right, have built their own places of worship, and spent for that purpose a sum which amounts to another million. These sacrifices, however, are not considered a burden by those who have undertaken to maintain a Christian church in their country; and, indeed, by those sacrifices they have preserved the preaching of the pure gospel, not only for themselves and their children, but also in the State church; for the government has felt compelled to give up the introduction of rationalism in the church, feeling convinced that a number of pious persons who still cling to that institution would, in such a case, immediately enlist in the ranks of the independent church.

Thus, by giving to Cesar what belongs to Cesar, the faithful of the church of Neufchatel have attempted to give to God what belongs to God, and to follow the same course as their ancestors in the sixteenth century, when they gave the representative of the political power the above-mentioned noble answer. See the Bulletins de Synodes, especially that of 1878, and G. Godet: La Question Ecclésiastique de Neuchâtel, in the Revue Chrétienne, September, 1873-January, 1874.

F. GODET.

NEVINS, William, D.D., a distinguished Presbyterian clergyman, the youngest of twelve children, b. in Norwich, Conn., Oct. 13, 1797; d. in Baltimore, Sept. 14, 1835. He embraced the gospel while his parents were as yet not members of the church. In his fourteenth year he entered a settlement-room in New-York City. He afterwards entered Yale College, and, graduating in 1818, went to Princeton Seminary. In August, 1830, he accepted the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore. He was greatly beloved as a pastor, and excelled as a preacher. He wrote articles in the New-York Observer, on Roman Catholicism, which were published in a volume, Thoughts on Popery, New York, 1836. A posthumous volume of Sermons appeared, New York, 1837. See Select Remains of W. Nevins, D.D., with a Memoir, New York, 1836.

NEW BIRTH. See REGENERATION.

NEW-BRUNSWICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. The theological seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, founded in the beginning of its uninterrupted history in the election by the synod, in October, 1784, of Rev. Dr. John H. Livingston of New-York City (one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church) as professor of theology, and Rev. Dr. Hermanus Meyer of Pompton, N.J., as instructor in the "inspired languages." For more than a hundred and fifty years the Dutch churches in America had been subject to the classics of Amsterdam, and had no authority to educate and ordain ministers, but
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NEWCOMB, Harvey, b. at Thetford, Vt., Sept. 2, 1803; d. at Brooklyn, N., Y., Aug. 30, 1863. From 1818 to 1826 he taught school in Western New York; from 1826 to 1831 he was editor upon several journals; from the latter year, until 1840, wrote Sunday-school books; from 1840, till his death, Congregational minister in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania. He is said to have written a hundred and seventy-eight books; but most of them were children's books, and very few of them are now in print. By one book, however, he laid the religious public under heavy contribution,— A Cyclopaedia of Missions, New York, 1854, 2d rev. ed., fifth thousand, 1860. It remains the only comprehensive work of its kind, but sadly needs enlargement and revision to bring it down to date.

NEWCOME, William, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh; b. in Bedfordshire, Aug. 10, 1729; d. at Dublin, Jan. 11, 1800. He was graduated M.A. at Pembroke College, Oxford, 1753; took holy orders, and was appointed bishop of Dromore, Ireland, 1766; transferred to Ososry 1775, to Waterford 1779, and to the archbishopric of Armagh. He was the author or editor of several important and valuable works,— An Harmony of the Gospels [in Greek], Dublin, 1778, based upon Le Clerc, new eds., with Eng. trans. of text, London, 1802 and 1827; An historical view of the English Biblical translations; the expedients of revising by authority, our present translation, and the means of executing such a revision, [with] a list of the various editions of the Bible and parts thereof, in English,
NEWELL, Samuel, one of the first band of
American missionaries to foreign lands; b. on a
farm at Durham, Me., July 24, 1784; d. in Bombay,
India, March 30, 1821. Left an orphan at the age
of ten, he went four years later to Boston, and
secured a place in a family; but an interest in
books led him to prepare for college, the means
being furnished by his employer and some other
friends. He graduated at Harvard in 1807, and
went to Andover Seminary in 1809. Mr. Newell
was one of the four students who presented the
petition which contributed so much to the forma-
tion of the American Board of Commissioners for
Foreign Missions. In 1812 he married Harriet
Newell, with the help of Hall, The Con-
version of the World, or the Claims of Six Hun-
dred Millions (Andover, 1818), which aroused much
interest, and did more, by the interest it stimu-
lated, for missions, than, perhaps, a long life would
have accomplished. Her Memoirs were published
by Samuel Newell; and a Life was written by
Dr. Leonard Woods, to which her Letters were
appended and the Memorial Sermon of Dr. Woods.
The latter work has a very large circulation.

NEWELL, Harriet, one of the most attractive
female characters who have given their lives to
missionary labors among the heathen; a daughter
of Moses Atwood; b. at Haverhill, Mass., Oct.
10, 1793; d. on the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812.
She early displayed a pious disposition, and in-	erest in missions; was married in 1812 to the Rev.
Samuel Newell, and with him sailed for Calcutta
on Feb. 18, 1812. Not being allowed to remain
at Calcutta, they sailed for Mauritius, and from
there to the Isle of France. A daughter born on
the journey died, and was buried at sea. Rapid
consumption soon set in, and carried the mother
off likewise. "She is interred in a retired spot
in the burying-ground in Port Louis, under the
shadow of an evergreen." Mrs. Newell's early
death, at the age of nineteen, aroused wide sym-
pathy, and did more, by the interest it stimu-
lated, for missions, than, perhaps, a long life would
have accomplished. Her Memoirs were published
by Samuel Newell; and a Life was written by
Dr. Leonard Woods, to which her Letters were
appended and the Memorial Sermon of Dr. Woods.
The latter work has a very large circulation.

NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY. Names and
Genesis.—This system has been adopted by a
larger number of divines out of New England
than in it, but it derives its name from the fct
that the men who initiated the system were New
Englanders. One impulse moving them to the
initiation of it was given by the fact that they
were not secluded students, but were pastors and
preachers; and, as they were high Calvinists in
many of their views, they aimed to present these
views in a practical way,—a way fitted to awaken
the conscience, and to persuade the will, of their
hearers. Another impulse was given by the fact
that they deemed the system to be necessary for
reconciling apparently discordant passages of the
Bible. They were led into their views of scientific
theology by their views of the inspired Word.

In the beginning were the principles, which were called "New-Light Divinity," or "New Divinity." When a few more prin-
ciples were added to their system, it was called "%Hopkintonian," or "Hopkinoisian." As Edwards,
Hopkins, West, resided in Berkshire County,
Mass., their system was called "Berkshire Di-
vinity." When some of its tenets were advoc-
ated by Andrew Fuller, Robert Hall, and other
British divines, it was called "American Theolo-
gy." It has also been distinguished as "Ed-
wardian." This epithet was not first suggested,
but its use has been furthered, by the Remarks
of Dr. Jonathan Edwards on the Improvements
made in Theology by his Father, President Edwards.
(See Works of Jonathan Edwards, D.D., vol. i.,
pp. 481-492.) These remarks detail the improve-
ments made, not only by the president himself,
but also by his "disciples" and "followers." These "disciples" and "followers" have regarded
themselves as advancing along the line marked
out by the president, and have regarded their
system as the outgrowth of germs lying embedded in his writings. They have differed among them-
selves in relation to the premises laid down by
the president, and also in relation to the con-
cussions derivable from those premises. Some
of these divines, for one reason, and some for
another, would reject some of the principles which
are said in this article to characterize the New
England theology. At the present day, however,
a majority of the divines who defend the system,
and a majority of those who oppose it, would probably recognize the following tenets as belong-
ing to it.

The Nature of Holiness and Sin. — Holi-
ness, or true virtue, is the choice of the greater
and higher, rather than of the smaller and lower,
larger and more perfect good of sentient being. It is voluntary and im-
partial benevolence. Sin is the choice of the
smaller and lower, rather than of the greater and
higher, good of sentient being. It is the elective
preference for self or the world above God. Holi-
ness and sin, then, are not passive states, but
they are acts of the will. They are free acts,
and imply that the agent's power to render obedi-
ence, and avoid disobedience, to the moral law, is
commensurate with his obligation to render the
one, and to avoid the other. They constitute
moral agency; and this consists in the agent's
choosing the right when he had the natural ability
to choose the wrong instead of the right; or else,
in his choosing the wrong when he had the natu-
ral ability to choose the right instead of the
wrong. By natural ability is meant power in its
literal sense. This idea of power is a simple one,
and is expressed without qualification when a moral agent is defined as one who does or can choose either holiness or sin.

It is evident, that, according to the preceding
definition of holiness, the moral attributes of
God are all comprehended in general benevolence.
Distributive justice is one of his fundamental
attributes, but this is not the same as having
elective preference for the general well-being. The
original advocates of New-England theology gave an
The Will and the Natural Sensibilities. — When the New-England theologians insist that all moral character lies in the will, in choice, they do not define the will in the manner adopted by the recent philosophers of Europe. They do not admit that the will is the faculty of merely intending, purposing, resolving, determining, putting forth an exertion ab extra. These acts presuppose a choice distinct from them. They follow the choice in the order of nature, if not of time. They are the natural ability that the will itself exercises, choosing to perform executive acts, and also of choosing objects other than its own future acts. The process of choosing is unique, different from an exertive process, also from a constitutional emotion.

The earlier New-England divines made the distinction, but did not make it sharp enough nor clear enough, between the will and the sensibility. They did not anticipate the nomenclature of modern times. Often, if not commonly, they speak of moral character as inhering in the heart, the affections, the temper. They speak of desires as belonging to the will: still they distinguish between these exercises and the natural feelings. They repeat and reiterate, especially in their sermons and practical writings, that no moral quality belongs to the natural or animal feeling or affection. Their idea of it, we suffice for evils which represent God's abhorrence of sin, and signify his determination to inflict the legal penalty upon those who persevere in committing it. We, however, do not suffer a legal penalty for any sin which does not consist in our own free choice. Still, the first sin of Adam has brought us into sin, and is native depravity: others affirm that infants commit sin as soon as they are born, and this is native depravity. The term "original sin" is not a favorite one with the New-England theologians. It is entirely disapproved by one class of them, and is variously defined by other classes. Some of them make an attempt to accommodate their definition to that of the older Calvinists, and say that original sin is such a disorder or corruption of our nature as results in our actual sin, and results from the first sin of Adam. This first sin of Adam is thus the origin of our evil nature. This evil nature exists at the origin of our personal existence: it is itself the origin of our entire sinfulness.

Regeneration. — According to all advocates of New-England theology, regeneration is a change occasioned or produced by the special or supernatural interposition of the Holy Spirit. According to one class of these divines, it is the...
change of the sinner's volition from sin to holiness. According to a second class, it is the change of his nature, and precedes the change of his volition— the latter being distinguished by the term "conversion." According to a third class, it is the change of both his nature and his volition,— the two being inseparable in the logical, if not the chronological order.

On this general topic, more, perhaps, than on any other, has been illustrated the practical character of New-England theology. Many, but not all, of its more eminent advocates, have maintained that unregenerated men should be exhorted to do no act which does not involve true holiness. The unregenerated, as really as the regenerated, have natural power to choose the right; their conscience requires them to choose the right; before choosing the right, every choice exercised by them is sinful; they should be exhorted, not to perform any sinful act, but at once to make for themselves "a new heart." This theory of preaching awakened one of the earliest, as well as most prolonged and warmest, controversies in regard to the "New Divinity."

THE SOVEREIGNTY AND THE DECREES OF GOD.—Men have objected to the New-England system, that it is ethical and anthropological, rather than theological. The reverse is true. Its primary and signal aim has been to exalt God as a sovereign, and to glorify the eternal plan on which he governs the universe. He is a sovereign; that is, he does what he chooses to do, because his choice is infinite benevolence, securing the greatest and highest well being of the universe. I moreover believe that God, according to the counsel of his own will, and for his own glory, hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that all beings, actions, and events, both in the natural and moral world, are under his providential direction; that God's decrees both in the natural and moral world, are under and not theological. The reverse is true.

In executing his decrees he leaves all moral agents just as free as they would be if there were no decrees referring secondarily to them.

OPTIMISM.—The created universe is, on the whole, the best which could have been created. It is the best, viewed comprehensively, viewed in all its relations to the Creator and the creature. Although the Creator had the natural power to prevent all sin in his creatures, yet he could not prevent it wisely, could not prevent it in the best system, could not prevent it consistently with the greatest and good of the universal being. This statement is sanctioned explicitly by one class of the New-England divines; by another class it is admitted to be a logical sequence from the premises of Edwards; but a third class it is deemed either false or doubtful.

THE ATONEMENT.—The sufferings, and especially the death, of Christ, were sacrificial; were not the punishment of the law, but were equivalent in meaning to it; were representative of it, and substituted for it. The demands of the law were not satisfied by it; but the honor of the law was promoted by it as much as this honor would have been promoted by inflicting the legal penalty on the elect. The distributive justice of God was not satisfied by it, but his general justice was satisfied perfectly. The active obedience, viewed as the holiness, of Christ, was not a work of supererogation performed by our Substitute, and then "transferred" or "imputed" to us. The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith; but it did not render it obligatory on him, in distributive justice, to save them. It was designed, for the welfare of all men, to make the eternal salvation of all men possible, to remove all the obstacles which the honor of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect. The atonement does not make death consequent to sin; some men are regenerated, and others not; but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God. The atonement is useful on men's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God's account, and in order to enable him, as a consistent Ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest, sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest, favor.

VARIED TENDENCIES, OR SHADES, OF NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY. 1. The Hopkinsian System. This is largely incorporated into the present New-England system. It is distinguished, however, by giving a greater prominence than the New-England divines now give to the doctrines of divine sovereignty and decrees, to election and reprobation; also in giving a smaller prominence to the doctrines, etc. On the one hand is the agency of God, and our dependence upon it; on the other hand is the free agency of man, and the divine recognition of it. His decrees are his intentions to perform certain acts. Primarily they have regard to what he does himself; secondarily, to what his creatures do. The moral acts of men result certainly, but not inevitably, from the providential acts of God; and these result from the decrees, which, in his infinite benevolence, he formed in eternity, and executes in time. In executing his decrees he leaves all moral agents just as free as they would be if there were no decrees referring secondarily to them.

2. The System of Dr. Emmons.—This is distinguished by its peculiar use of terms. The terminology of Emmons has led to various misconceptions of his meaning. He did not believe that any moral quality belongs to the soul apart from its exercises; neither did he believe that any moral quality belongs to the exercises of the soul apart from the soul itself. His belief was, that all moral quality belongs to the soul acting, to the man himself choosing. He preferred not to speak of the nature of the soul as separable from its exercises, and he never meant to speak of the exercises of the soul as separate from its nature. In conversation he said: "I cannot form any conception of the soul's substratum as existing passively, and as having a moral character. The
cessation of the soul's activity is the cessation of its existence." He used the term "efficient" cause as synonymous with "independent" cause, but never maintained that God is the efficient cause of human actions in any sense which implies that men are forced or compelled to act as they do. He believed that justification on the ground of Christ's atonement consists in God's treating believers as forgiven, and not as positively righteous. He believed that at every single moment the renewed man is either perfectly holy or perfectly sinful, but that he does not remain perfectly holy for any considerable time in this life.

3. The "Taste" Scheme. — As Emmons believed that all moral character inheres in "exercises," some of his opponents adopted the theory that all moral character inheres in the "taste." The most noted advocate of this scheme was Rev. Assa Burton, D.D., a pupil of Dr. Levi Hart, who was a favorite pupil and son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. Dr. Burton instructed not less than sixty theological students, and published, besides various pamphlets, an octavo volume, entitled Essays on Some of the First Principles of Metaphysics, Ethics, and Theology, 1824. When he taught that all moral character lies in the moral "taste," he meant the sensibility as distinct from the will. When he taught that all moral character lies in the moral "appetites," he meant the processes of the sensibility as distinct from the acts of the will. He believed in the natural inability of the unregenerate to cease from sin, and repudiated the distinction between natural and moral power. He believed that the divine will is the foundation of virtue. He agreed with some, but radically differed from other, New-England theologians, in maintaining that "holliness is not an absolute good;" that "happiness is the only absolute good;" and he asks, "Of what value is the universe, however holy, if there be no happiness?"

— The "Taste Scheme" of Dr. Burton was ably defended by Judge Nathaniel Niles, a distinguished editor of the American Pulpit, vol. i., pp. 716-718.)

4. The System of Dr. Taylor.

"Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor was professor of theology in Yale College from 1822 to 1858 (see TAYLOR, N. W.). Among the points of doctrine on which he insisted are the following. (1) The elective preference, in which character, good or evil, consists, though beginning in an act of choice, is a permanent voluntary state, 'a ruling purpose.' (2) Natural ability involves a continued 'power of contrary choice.' There is previous 'certainty, with power to the contrary,' in regard to moral choices. (3) 'Nature,' in the phrase, 'we are sinful by nature,' includes both the subjective native condition and the outward circumstances of human life, which, as joint factors, give the certainty, but not necessity, of sin from the beginning of moral agency. (4) Regeneration is the change of the predominant elective preference from love to the world to love to God. It is effected by influences of the Holy Spirit, which give the certainty, but not the necessity, of the effect. (5) The involuntary desire of happiness, or 'self-love,' is the subjective antecedent of all choices, whether good or evil. The excellence of virtue is its tendency to produce the greatest happiness of the universe. (6) Election is founded in benevolence, which, guided by wisdom, so dispenses grace as to insure the best results. (7) Sin is not the formula of the greatest good; since it is avoidable by the creature, and yet not so good as holliness in its stead, but may not be preventible by the act of God in the best system." — Professor George P. Fisher, D.D.
NEW-HAVEN DIVINITY. 1638 NEW-JERUSALEM CHURCH.

The doctrines of the New Church teach that God is one in essence and person. He is one Divine Being, as man is one human being. This unity extends to His nature, as well as to His person. There are no conflicting elements in it. God is love. This implies much more than that He fervently loves. Love is the essence and substance of His nature. Wisdom is the form which His love assumes in going forth into creative act, and they are inseparably united in Him. He can act from no other motive than love, and in no other way than an infinitely wise and tenderly paternal one.

1. The human mind or spirit is a spiritual body in the human form, organized by the divine life for its reception and manifestation in human consciousness. This body is not regarded by those who compose it as a sect of the Christian Church, differing from it only by some special points of doctrine, as the various sects differ from one another: they believe the doctrines to be a New Dispensation of divine truth, and to constitute a distinct step in spiritual knowledge, which will lead to a new and higher spiritual life. They regard them as a spiritual science which solves the problems of theology, reconciles its contradiction, elevates the mind into a higher sphere of knowledge, and meets all man's spiritual wants. They may be briefly stated as follows: —

2. Every society is left in freedom to manage its own affairs. The number of members is not accurately known. There are many, in all churches and out of them, who are more or less acquainted with the doctrines, and believe them to be the laws of spiritual life.
5. Life is so given to man that it seems to be his own. This is of the divine love, that man may act in freedom. He and think and act in every respect as though he were an independent being. He is as free to act within the limits of his power as the Lord Himself. But still it is necessary to the integrity of his nature, that he should live in acknowledgment of his dependence upon the Lord and constantly turn to Him, and reciprocate His love. Hence arose the possibility of his fall. As life seemed to be his own, he was gradually allured by the appearance to claim it as his own. He was seduced by the senses represented by the serpent, first as to his affections represented by the woman; and then as to the understanding represented by the man: and he became in his own estimation, as God, knowing good and evil. Being a form receptive of life, his declension, which continued through many generations, consisted in the gradual closure of the higher planes of his nature against influx from the Lord, until he lived only in the merely natural plane of his faculties. This was spiritual death caused by the exclusion of life. Man lost his knowledge of God and of his spiritual nature and destiny. His whole organism became perverted, and his union with the source of his life so broken and deranged, that the Lord could only reach him by an outward way. His nature became wholly evil. The Lord never ceased to do all in His power for man during his fall. He appeared to him in the form of an angel. He gave him the Law, which contains the essential principles of spiritual life, and arranged a representative worship, which was the highest of which he was capable; and by those natural, outward means He still retained some hold upon him. But, by the accumulation of hereditary evil, man was fast closing every faculty of his nature against the Lord, and approaching the brink of destruction. Then, in the fulness of time, Jehovah took upon Himself man's nature in the way of His own order, and stood face to face with him on the plane of the senses, in a form which he could appreciate. In that way He gained recognition, and got a foothold in human history. But Jehovah was not born into this world, into this element of Him of any power. He simply clothed His divine with a human organism, and made that a medium of bringing His divine power to bear upon man. In this way He could remove obstructions to the influx of life, and, as man received it, He could conform him to Himself. The necessity for this coming lay in man's dying condition, and not in any legal difficulties.

6. The human organism which Jehovah took upon Himself was a disorderly and perverted one. It could be tempted. It was subject to all the laws of the human mind. It could learn, and increase in wisdom. It had a consciousness distinct from the divine which it clothed, and this gave rise to all those expressions which seem to indicate that Jesus Christ was a distinct person from Jehovah. But, by the constant action upon it of the divine within, the imperfect organism received by incarnation was gradually put off, and replaced by a corresponding divine nature, by a process which is called by the Lord "glorification." The Lord's real death was the laying down of this evil life, and not the crucifixion of the material body. By this process of glorification, He ascended to the Father; that is, His human nature one with His divine nature. In this glorified human nature He now dwells, and by means of it He exerts a more direct control over man. He can re-open the higher degrees of his mind, and keep him within the sphere of His divine influence. In this way He saved man from spiritual death, and renewed the broken covenant between the source of life and its recipients. The work of Redemption was consequently performed by one Being, in one person, according to the immutable laws of the divine order.

7. The spirit is the man himself clothed with a material body. The spirit is in the human form, organized of spiritual substances, and possesses all the organs, in general and particular, of the material body. It gives form and life to the body, which is merely an instrument the spirit uses to dwell in a material world, and gain material ideas, which are to serve as a basis and means for the development of man's spiritual faculties. The material body bears the same relation to the spiritual body that the husk does to the corn, and performs the same relative use. It serves only a temporary purpose. If man had never sinned, and disease had never attacked the material body, the real man would have cast it off when it had fulfilled its purpose. The death of the body is an orderly step in man's life, though, since sin entered the world, it is taken in a disorderly way. The death of the body is caused by the resurrection of man from it. As all its life was derived from the spirit, when that departs, it has no more power than the elements which compose it. By the death of the body, man is born into the spiritual world. His spiritual senses are opened, and he becomes conscious of spiritual objects, according to the same law that the material senses are opened by birth into this world.

8. The spiritual world is a substantial world in the true meaning of the word. It is composed of every class, degree, and form of substances and objects which are found in the three kingdoms of nature, and many besides, which cannot be formed out of the elements. The spiritual world is the realm of causes; and the material universe, like the material body, is cast into the mould of spiritual forms. Spiritual substances, though they have form and hold relations to one another, are not material, and have nothing but form and external appearance in common with material objects. They are not created in the same way, or subject to the laws of fixed time and space. The spiritual world has three grand divisions, heaven, the world of spirits, and hell. The world of spirits is intermediate between heaven and hell. This is the world in which all enter immediately after the death of the body, and where they are prepared for heaven or hell, according to their characters. It is a place of instruction, but not of probation, where every one who will receive it is taught the truth, and led into a heavenly life. It is also a state in which the spiritual faculties, freed from the incumbent of the material body, are brought under more potent spiritual forces, which develop the ruling love with great rapidity. Every one is left in perfect freedom to go where he pleases.
and to form such associates as he chooses, though every aid is given to lead all to heaven by means of the truth. Here parents and children, husbands and wives, and friends meet, and for while live a life similar to that which they lived on the earth. But the scene gradually changes. Those who are not of homogeneous natures separate; and each one goes his own way, and joins himself with those to whom he is akin by nature. All pretense and disguise withdrawn; and the natural or spiritual causes; and the spiritual causes are the laws of the divine order, and the embodiment of the divine character and purposes. Every natural object is consequently an exponent of some spiritual law or fact. When man had sunk into a condition which rendered it necessary that divine truth should be communicated to him by an outward way, the Lord employed those objects, relations, and human actions, which were the exponents of the truths He desired to communicate, because they were the effects of those truths, and performed the same uses on the material plane that the truths and affections were on the spiritual plane. Every natural object and act recorded in the Word corresponds to and represents some spiritual principle or fact. While the Word in the letter is written according to the laws of human language, and treats of natural events, every sentence, and word has a spiritual meaning, the natural idea represents; and this spiritual meaning is connected in the most logical manner throughout, from the beginning to the end, according to the harmonies of the Lord's nature, and the order and methods of His work. The Bible is consequently a Divine Book, written in a style imposable to a finite mind. The Lord Himself is its author; and Moses and David, the prophets and apostles, were only instruments in His hands in writing it, as the pen is an instrument in the human hand. Their minds were used, and consequently every one wrote in his own style, but stated the divine truths in correspondent natural forms. From the divine style in which the Word is written, it is adapted to all the wants of every human being in all worlds.

11. The spiritual world being the substantial world, the theatre of all causes, and the ultimate home of every human being, the Sacred Scriptures were given to man to reveal to him its laws and the principles of the divine government. They are also given according to the relation between natural and spiritual things. All material objects, natural actions, and events, are kept under constant restraint. They are not tormented by conscience, for they have none. The worm that never dies, and the fire that is never quenched, are their insane desires to subject all others to their power and their revengeful passions; and can only be imprisoned by suffering. In time their lusts become less active, though they are never destroyed. They submit to enforced order, become stupid, and lose all semblance of humanity.

12. On the contrary, all those in whom the love of the Lord and the neighbor has become the ruling motive of life are led by spiritual attractions to the society in heaven to which they specifically belong, and there they are welcomed by all: they find their home and the most ample field for the exercise of every faculty and the gratification of every pure desire. They find their place and their special function, and their happiness in the exercise of it. Heaven is not a state of idleness, but of glowing activities. Its rest is not repose after labor, but the free play of all the faculties. As every one is animated by love of others, each one is helped by all: as all the organic forms of their nature are in harmony with the divine forces which give them their life, they are constantly perfected. The perceptions grow keener, the understanding larger, the affections deeper and more varied and exquisite, and this process of perfectibility will increase forever.
closely with Him, as branches to the vine from which they derive their life.

The works of Swedenborg devoted to the exposition of the spiritual sense of the Word are Arcana Coelestia, in 12 vols. octavo, The Apocalypse Explained, in 8 vols., and The Apocalypse Revealed, in 2 vols. In these works the spiritual meaning of every word in Genesis, Exodus, and the Revelations, is given, and the interpretation demonstrated by similar passages in other parts of the Word. The most important doctrinal works by Swedenborg are Angelic Wisdom concerning Divine Love and Wisdom, Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Providence, Heaven and Hell, Conjugal Love, and The True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church. The collateral works are numerous, and constantly increasing. Among the most important are Noble’s Appeal and Plenary Inspiration, Barrett’s Lectures on the New Dispensation, Bayley’s The Divine Word opened, Bruce’s Commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John, Clissold’s Practical Nature of Swedenborg’s Theological Writings, Illustrations of the End of the Church, Clowes’s Four Gospels, Gerson’s Nature of Spirit, Houldal’s Modern Biblical Criticism, Grindon’s Life, its Nature, Varieties, and Phenomena, Hayden’s Light on the Last Things, Dangers of Modern Spiritualism, Hinde-Marsh’s Rise and Progress of the New Church, Holcombe’s Our Children in the Other Life, The Last Truths of Christianity, The End of the World, Henry James’s Secret of Swedenborg, Parson’s Essays, Three Series, Deu Homo, The Infinite and the Finite, Kendall’s Antideluvian History, The Last Judgment and Second Coming of the Lord, Silver’s The Symbolical Character of the Sacred Scriptures, The Holy Word in its own Defence, Tafel’s Documents concerning Swedenborg, Wilkin’s Human Body in its Relation to Man, On Human Science and Divine Revelation. The most important biographies of Swedenborg are, Emanuel Swedenborg, his Life and Writings, by Williams G. Ottey, J. A. James John Garth Wilkinson, Horace’s Life of Swedenborg, and Worcester’s Life of Swedenborg. Swedenborg’s theological works have been wholly or in part translated into English, French, German, Swedish, and Italian. There are many monthly journals, and one quarterly published, in advocacy and exposition of the principles of the New Church; six in America, two in England, one in German, and one in Italian. CHANCEY GILES (Pastor of the New Jerseym Church, Philadelphia).

NEW-SOUTH WALES. See AUSTRALASIA.

NEW TESTAMENT. See BIBLE TEXT, CANON.

NEWTON, Sir Isaac, b. at Woolsthorpe, Lincolnshire, Eng., Dec. 25, 1642; d. in London, March 20, 1727. He was a posthumous child, and of very feeble health; but he early evinced great passion and great talents for the study of mathematics and mechanics. In 1660 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1665 he took his degree as B.A. In 1667 he became a fellow, and in 1669 he succeeded Dr. Barrow as Lucasian professor of mathematics. In 1666 he was appointed warden of the mint, and in 1699, master; which position he filled with great ability, though his health again became very poor in the last years of his life. The magnificent discoveries, mathematical and physical, by which he entirely changed the reigning conception of the world, he seems to have made at quite an early period of his life. But he was slow in publishing. His Philosophia naturalis Principia mathematica was not given to the world until 1687, and his Analysis per Equationes numero terminorum Infinitas not until 1711. The Cartesian vortex was at that time the commonly accepted scientific theory of the world; and, though not without difficulties, it had been explained into harmony with the views of the theologians. But this theory was completely wiped out of existence by Newton’s theory of gravitation; and thus a collision with the theologians became unavoidable, the more so as Newton’s whole method with an open protest against the method of scholasticism. Observation and experience were the only scientific basis he acknowledged. Metaphysics he abhorred; hypothesis he despised. No wonder, that, under such circumstances, he found one of his most zealous and most effective disciples in Volaire. In England, however, the collision was not so very fierce. Newton’s ideas were incorporated with the official system of teaching at Cambridge in 1699, at Oxford in 1704. Personally he was not orthodox: he verged towards Arianism. But he was a pious man, and his great interest in the Bible and in Bible-studies he has shown by his Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended (1728), Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John (1733), and A Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture, 1754. See BREWER, Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton, London, 1856, 2 vols.

NEWTON, John, b. in London, July 24, 1725; d. there Dec. 31, 1807. In early life, as a sailor (according to the account he gives in his autobiography), he ran a profligate course coupled with sad impiety, which led him to call himself, in his last days, the "Bioglyph," by James John Garth Wilkinson, Hornby’s Life of Swedenborg, and Worcester’s Life of Swedenborg. Swedenborg’s theological works have been wholly or in part translated into English, French, German, Swedish, and Italian. There are many monthly journals, and one quarterly published, in advocacy and exposition of the principles of the New Church; six in America, two in England, one in German, and one in Italian. CHANCEY GILES (Pastor of the New Jerseym Church, Philadelphia).

NEW LIGHT ANTIBURGHERS. See SCHWEIZ.

NEW-LIGHT ANTIBURGHERS, BURGHERS. See SOUTH AFRICA.
He was the main pillar of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, and gathered round him at his simple re-unions in Hoxton, where he resided, Dissenting ministers as well as the Established clergy. He wrote a good deal; and, not to mention other publications included in the edition of his works (1810), his charming letters, entitled Omicron and Cordeliphonia, deserve to be, as they are, favorites with the British public and with American Christians. His contributions to the Olney Hymns (348 in number, of which 67 were Cowper's) rank high in English psalmody, and are, some of them, exceedingly touching. The epitaph on his monument, prepared by himself, is very characteristic: "John Newton, clerk, once an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa, was, by the rich mercy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, preserved, restored, pardoned, and appointed to preach the faith he had long labored to destroy."  

NEWTON, Robert, D.D., Wesleyan pulpit orator; b. at Roxby, Yorkshire, Sept. 8, 1780; d. April 30, 1854. He was received into the British Conference in 1799, and from that time on won reputation, and ultimately great fame, for his oratory. He was six times president of the British Conference, and in 1839 was sent as delegate to the Methodist-Episcopal Church of the United States. Everywhere he went, he was attended by crowds. The British and Foreign Bible Society and Foreign Missions were favorite themes. His Sermons was posthumously published, London, 1856; and his Life was written by Jackson, London, 1855.


NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION is located on the summit of a beautiful hill in Newton Centre, Mass., about seven miles west of Boston. A more convenient, healthful, and attractive site for a theological seminary, it would be difficult to find in New England. The institution was founded in 1825, and is the oldest seminary established by American Baptists for the purpose of providing graduates from college with a suitable course of theological instruction, occupying three years,—a course beginning with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, continuing with biblical theology and ecclesiastical history, and concluding with homiletics, pastoral duties, and church polity, but giving special prominence to biblical study. The privileges of the institution have also been offered, from the first, to candidates for the ministry whose education, however gained, was sufficient to enable them to take all the studies of the regular course in class-connection with graduates. Moreover, a few men, approved by the churches, have been received to a purely English course of two years, embracing such parts of the regular course as can be taken by one who does not read either Hebrew or Greek.

The work of the institution began in 1825, with a single professor, Rev. Irach Chase, D.D. In 1826 Rev. Henry J. Ripley, D.D., was associated with Dr. Chase; in 1834 Rev. James D. Knowles was added to the faculty; and in 1836 Rev. Barnas Sear, D.D., Professor Knowles died in 1838, after a short period of brilliant service; and in 1839 Rev. H. R. Bancroft, D.D., was made professor of biblical literature and interpretation. All these were eminent scholars and teachers; and the institution, though financially weak, prospered under their care. From 1839 to 1846 the number of professors was four; from 1846 to 1868 it continued the same, with an assistant instructor in Hebrew; but since 1868 there have been five regular professors—one of them president—and a teacher of elocution.

The board of instruction is now (1882) constituted as follows: Rev. Alvah Hovey, D.D., L.L.D., president, and professor of theology; Rev. Heman Lincoln, D.D., professor of church history; Rev. O. S. Stearns, D.D., professor of biblical interpretation, Old Testament; Rev. J. M. English, A.M., professor of homiletics, pastoral duties, and church polity; Rev. J. F. Moreton, A.M., professor, pro tempore, of biblical interpretation, New Testament; and Mr. L. A. Butterfield, Alva Woods Lecturer on Elucion. A Newton lecture-ship has recently been established by a friend of the institution, and it is expected that a sixth professor will soon be added to the faculty.

The institution has a well-selected library of about seventeen thousand volumes, and a commodious reading-room. The library, under the care of John B. Houser, is open to students six hours every day, except Sundays. It has the income of twelve thousand dollars for the purchase of books and reviews. To meet other expenses the institution has an endowment of more than three hundred thousand dollars, besides twenty-five scholarships of a thousand dollars each (and a bequest of ten more soon to be received) for the benefit of indigent students. It has four public buildings; viz., Colby Hall (containing chapel, reading-room, library, and parlor), on the first floor, and three lecture-rooms, with a museum, on the second), Farwell Hall and Sturtevant Hall (which are heated by steam, and have rooms, comfortably furnished, for at least sixty-eight students), and a gymnasium.

About nine hundred students have been connected with the institution, though some of them have not taken the full course. Sixty-two have gone from it to be missionaries in foreign fields. Nearly as many have been made presidents or professors in colleges or theological seminaries, but most of its graduates have become pastors in America.

The institution is controlled by a board of forty-eight trustees, a part of them ministers, and a part laymen. It has had many liberal benefactors, of whom the late Gardner Colby of Newton Centre deserves honorable mention. Also, the New England Missionary Society.

NEW-YEAR'S CELEBRATION. The Calendar Januario, that is Jan. 1, was celebrated in Rome, and, indeed, throughout the Roman Empire, as a feast of joy, just like the Saturnalia. The first day of the year should be in conjunction with these festivities, and in the shops, and in the houses, business was begun early in the New Year. In the forum, in the shops, and in the houses, business was begun early in
the morning in the usual way, but only pro forma.
The first stroke of work done, the year was con-
sidered as duly inaugurated, and people gave
themselves up to merry-making. The houses
were hung with wreaths and draperies; everybody
gave his "Happy New-Year" to everybody
else; and friends presented each other with sweet-
meats and old coins, as omens of a year full
of enjoyment and profit. In the public squares
female dancers showed their art; and the crowd
made merry with games, singing, jokes, and mas-
queradings of all kinds. Towards this Pagan
custom, and all the follies and excesses to which
it gave rise, Christianity assumed a decidedly hos-
tile attitude; and the Fathers and teachers of the
church took occasion of the debaucheries of the
feast to deliver severe penitence-sermons on that
day. (See Ambrose, *serm. 7*; Augustine, *serm. 2,
195; Petrus Chrysologus, *serm. 155*; Maximus
Turinensis, *hom. 8*; Chrysostom, and others.)
The Council of Tours (567) forbade in its four-
teenth century all merry-making on New-Year's
Day, and made the day a fast-day; and in the
tenth century Bishop Atto of Veroncelli renewed
the decree. In the fourth century, however, Dec.
25 was fixed as the birthday of Christ; and Jan. 1,
falling on the eighth day after Christmas, thus
became, in accordance with Luke ii. 21, the day
of the circumcision of Christ. When and by
whom that event first was made the occasion for
a Christian festival is not known; but the above-
mentioned Council of Tours (567) ordered that
on Jan. 1 a *missa circumcissionis* should be cele-
brated. In the beginning of the eighth century
Beda Venerabilis wrote a homily on Luke ii. 21,
for Jan. 1. In the Roman *Sacramentarium*, in the
*Nimbole*; and the Fathers and teachers of the
circumcision also was New-Year's Day was at
first completely ignored. But gradually it made
itself felt even in the proceedings of the church;
and it became customary for the priest to give
the congregation his " Happy New-Year" from the
pulpit, or even to deliver a New-Year's ora-
tion. In the *Sermones Opus Exquisitissimum*, by
Gottschalk of Osnabruck, 1517, may be found a
very curious specimen of this kind of sermons,
which, however, again went out of fashion with
the Reformation. In the Greek Church Jan. 1 is
chiefly celebrated in honor of Basil the Great.
See Alt: *Der christliche Cultus*, Berlin, 1843, ii.,
46, 205, 315.

NEW-YEAR, FEAST OF. See FESTIVALS,
YEAR.

NEW-YORK CITY, the most populous city and
chief commercial centre of the Western Hemi-
sphere, had a population, in 1880, of 1,906,299.
It was originally confined to Manhattan Island,
a body of land thirteen miles and a half long,
and two miles and a quarter wide at its widest
point. The Dutch began the settlement of the
island immediately after the discovery of Hudson,
in 1609; the town, which was built around a
fort, was called New Amsterdam. In 1664 it
passed into the hands of the British, who changed
the name to New York, in honor of the brother
of Charles II., the Duke of York. The town
remained in the hands of the British (with the
exception of a short interval when it was recaptured
by the Dutch, 1673) till after the surrender of
Yorktown in 1781.

The first and legal church was the Reformed
Church of Holland, and services were conducted
both in the Dutch and the French from the begin-
ing. The first church was organized in 1628,
with fifty members (Dutch and Walloons), by Rev.
Jonas Michaelius, who had just arrived from Hol-
land. The first edifice was built of wood, in
Pearl Street, between Whitehall and Broad.
The Dutch Reformed Church still holds a position
of high honor and influence. The British legal-
ized the Episcopal Church, but tolerated the Dutch
Reformed denomination, as also the Lutherans,
who built a church in 1629, and had for their first
pastor Rev. Jacob Fabritius. They were, how-
ever, intolerant to other denominations, Lord
Cornbury, especially, signifying his gubernatorial
term in this regard; as, for example, when in 1707
he threw into prison the Presbyterian clergy-
man, Makenie, for preaching without a license
in New York. The first Episcopal services were
held in the church at the fort. Trinity Church
was opened Feb. 6, 1697, by the Rev. William
Vesey. In 1708 the King's Farm was granted by
Queen Anne to the corporation of Trinity Church,
which was the foundation of its great wealth, and
still makes it the wealthiest religious corporation
in the land. The present edifice of Trinity Church
was erected in 1846. The first Baptist Church
was organized in 1724, but disbanded eight years
later. The so-called First Church was organized
in 1745, with Jeremiah Dodge as pastor.

The first Presbyterian Church was organized in 1716.
The first church edifice was erected in Wall
Street in 1719. The first society of the Method-
ist-Episcopal Church was organized with five
members, in October, 1766, by Philip Embury,
a local preacher; and the first church edifice, on
John Street, was dedicated Oct. 30, 1768. The
religious statistics of New York for 1886 were as
follows:—a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Type</th>
<th>Number of Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist churches and chapels</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Apostolic church (Irvingite)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples church and chapel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Christian church and mission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish synagogues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran churches and chapels</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (African) churches and chapels</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist-Episcopal churches and chapels</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (Free) church and chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian churches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Jerusalem church and chapel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian churches and chapels</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (Reformed) churches and chapels</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (United) churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (Welsh) church</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant-Episcopal churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Dutch churches and chapels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Episcopal church and chapel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed German church and chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman-Catholic churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Advent churches and chapels</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian churches and chapels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalist churches and chapels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (churches and chapels)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of the churches to the popula-
tion is as 1 to 2,468.

One hundred and twenty-seven of these organiza-
NEW-YORK CITY.

**NEW-YORK COMMITTEE.**

...individual churches, individuals, or the New-York City Mission and Tract Society (five chapels). Protestant services are held in the English, German, French, Swedish, Hungarian, Bohemian, Italian, and Chinese languages. The Protestant population of the city is estimated at about 600,000, the Jews at 70,000, and the Roman Catholics at 400,000; the average Sabbath attendance upon Protestant places of worship, at 150,000. The total church accommodations are sufficient for 375,000 persons. The Roman-Catholic churches are not sufficient to accommodate the worshippers. The number of communicants in the Protestant churches has been estimated at upwards of 80,000. There are 356 Protestant Sabbath schools, with an attendance of 88,237 scholars; and 418 Sabbath schools of all denominations, with an attendance of 115,826 scholars. The following table gives an exhibit of the relative strength of the churches in different years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATIONS</th>
<th>1820</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Evangelical Churches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Churches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarians, Universalists, etc., and Synagogues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the ratio of the churches to the population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>CHURCHES</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>153,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>313,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>813,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>943,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,206,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three theological institutions in the city.—Union Seminary (Presbyterian), with seven professors, at 1200 Park Avenue; the General Theological Seminary (Episcopal), with seven professors, at 405 West 20th Street; and St. John's College (Roman Catholic) at Fordham. There are five Young Men's Christian Associations, which include separate organizations for the Germans, colored people, and Chinese. The main organization, at the corner of 4th Avenue and 23d Street, sustains four branches. There is also an efficient Young Women's Christian Association at 7 East 15th Street.

There are seven free reading-rooms for seamen, fifteen for workingmen. Seven daily noon prayer-meetings are sustained in different portions of the city, of which the best known is the Business Men's Noon-day Prayer-Meeting, held on Fulton Street, from 12 to 1. The charitable organizations of the city are very numerous, as it is estimated that at least $4,000,000 are distributed by these bodies annually. Space permits us only to give the following figures: Hospitals, Homes, and Asylums (including 4 foundling-asylums), 92, all but 9 of which are sustained by religious denominations; Fruit-Missions, 3; Benevolent Societies (including societies for the suppression of vice, the prevention of cruelty to children, cruelty to animals, relief organizations, etc.), 41; Industrial Schools, 38; Institutions for Children (including 4 newsboys' lodging-houses, etc.), 48; Dispensaries, 90. These figures give an idea of the charitable work and the number of charitable institutions in New-York City, but do not exhaust the number. The most of the churches maintain sewing-schools, distribute alms through special committees, etc.

The American Bible Society has its headquarters in New-York City, occupying the immense building called the "Bible House." The Children's Aid Society, which gathers in destitute children, and provides homes for them in the West, etc., has, in the last twenty-eight years, provided for 56,481 children, and expended $2,958,919.

Official statements place the number of drinking-places at 9,215, the money expended in which may with safety be set down at $60,000,000 a year. There were 67,135 arrests for 1881, and 45,309 persons were held. 32,391 of these persons, or three-fourths, were of intemperate habits. Besides the work done through the churches and hospitals and temperance meetings, there is a Home for Inebriates at 45 East 7th Street.

LIT.—The history of New-York City may be found in the Histories of MARY L. BOOTH (rev. ed., New York, 1880) and MRS. LAMM (New York, 1881). For the statistics, see Report of the United States Bureau: Christian Work in New York (published annually by the New-York City Mission and Tract Society, under the editorial care of Lewis E. Jackson, treasurer, No. 50 Bible House, etc.; BRACE: Dangerous Classes in New York, and Twenty Years of Work among them, New York, 1872. NEW-YORK SABBATH COMMITTEE, The, was organized in 1857, to promote the observance of the Lord's Day, and especially to secure the enforcement of the laws which protect the quiet and order of Sunday and the right of all classes to the weekly rest. It grew out of a prevalent feeling of the need of some measure to check the growing public desecration of Sunday, and the alarming proportionate increase of drunkenness, disorder, and violent crimes, on that day. At a conference of prominent and influential citizens, after much deliberation, a permanent committee of twenty was formed, to whom the conduct of the reform was committed, with power to fill vacancies in their own number. The committee was composed of leading laymen, representing the different denominations and the various business and social interests of the community. Mr. Norman White, who had taken the chief part in initiating the movement, was made chairman, to whose eminent zeal, wisdom, and perseverance the success of the committee has been largely due; and an efficient secretary and executive officer was found in the person of Rev. R. S. Cook, who had previously been a secretary of the American Tract Society. The committee, from the beginning, secured the hearty moral and financial support of the Christian community. It adopted, and has always adhered to, these principles in its work: viz., clearly to discriminate between the Sabbath as a religious and as a civil institution,
and carefully to respect the proper limitations of civil intervention in guarding the weekly rest; to keep the one issue distinct from all other measures of reform; to avoid all impracticable measures; to recognize the controlling power of public sentiment, and to take no step until the press is prepared for it; to advance one step at a time; to work through the constituted authorities, giving as little prominence as possible to its own agency; and to conduct its work on such broad and just grounds as to secure the co-operation of the widest possible constituency. Such a city (public and private) upon the rest in New Zealand.

The committee undertook successively the suppressing of the noisy crying of newspapers on Sunday, the Sunday selling of liquor, Sunday theatrical entertainments, noisy processions and parades on Sunday, unnecessary work upon the public streets, and the encroachments incident to such a city (public and private) upon the rest and quiet of the day. To accomplish these measures new legislation has been found necessary, and has been secured from time to time; not only the Sunday Theatre Law of 1860, the Excise Law of 1866, important amendments to the Excise Law in 1873, the Procession Law of 1872, and the modification and re-enactment of the Sunday statute in the Penal Code of 1882. The committee has also successfully opposed numerous attempts to pass laws hostile to the sabbath. Beside its work in this city, the influence of the committee has been widely exerted throughout the State and in other parts of the country. It acted effectively in behalf of the sabbath during the late war, and secured the issue of President Lincoln's sabbath order to the army and navy in 1862. It aided the closing of the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia on Sundays, and has secured governmental recognition of Sunday in various instances, especially in the International Electrical Exposition at Paris in 1881. It has assisted in the formation of similar associations. In addition to the personal efforts of the officers and members of the committee, it has secured the preaching of sermons on the sabbath, by eminent clergymen, many of which have been published; it has contributed very largely to the discussion of the subject in the secular and religious journals; and especially has issued a series of carefully prepared original documents, fifty in number, discussing the various aspects of the Sunday question. Of these documents, and of occasional fly-leaves, circulars, etc., several millions of pages have been printed and distributed in English and other languages. Some of the documents have been reprinted in Europe. Six of the original members of the committee, including the chairman, Mr. Norman White, and one of its secretaries (1883) in connection with the committee, after the lapse of twenty-five years, though no longer able to participate actively in its work, Mr. Cook, on his death (1864), was succeeded in office by the Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, whose services were especially valuable in securing the sympathy and co-operation of German ministers and citizens in the work of the committee at home and abroad. Dr. Schaff resigned his position in 1869, and was followed by the Rev. W. W. Atterbury, who has since continued to hold this office.

NEW ZEALAND. The Colony of New Zealand consists of three islands, known as North, South, and Stewart's Islands, together with the small adjacent islands. The North, called by the Maoris Te Ika a Mani, is 500 miles in length and 250 miles at its greatest breadth. The South or Middle Island, called by the Maoris Te Wahi Pouamau, is the same length, but not nearly so broad. Stewart's Island, the Maori name of which is Rakirua, is 30 miles long and 25 miles broad. The area of the group is 105,000 square miles, being approximately the size of Great Britain and Ireland. It is situated in the South Pacific Ocean, 1,200 miles south-east of the Australian Continent, between 34° and 45° south latitude, and between 166° and 178° east longitude.

The earliest inhabitants of the country seem to have been the Maoris, a people believed to be of Malay origin. The first European discoverer was Abel Tasman, the Dutch navigator, who visited it in 1642, after his discovery of Tasmania; but it is not known to have been again visited till 1769, when Capt. Cook landed on it. A few years later, whaling-ships began to call occasionally; and in 1814 the Church Missionary Society established a mission at the Bay of Islands among the Ngapuhi tribe, whose chiefs in 1840 were the first to sign the treaty acknowledging British supremacy. Other missions speedily followed. The colonization of the country may be said to have begun in 1840, when Wellington was settled by the New Zealand Land Company, who had obtained authority for the purpose from the British Government. Auckland was established the same year, and the year following New Plymouth and Nelson were founded. The most important settlements politically and ecclesiastically were those of Otago and Canterbury. The former took place in 1848, under the auspices of the Free Church of Scotland; and the latter, under the auspices of the Church of England, in 1850.

The country is of volcanic origin, and very mountainous. Some of the heights are covered with perpetual snow, notably Mount Egmont in the North Island, and Mount Cook, which is the highest peak in the southern Alps, and rises to the height of 13,300 feet. The climate, while varying greatly in the different latitudes, is, on the whole, free from extremes. The climate of the North Island has been compared to that of Italy, and the South Island has been compared in this respect to Jersey. New Zealand is rich in minerals. The cereals, fruits, and flowers of temperate climes, grow in abundance, and of good quality. Neither marsupials nor snakes, both of which are common on the mainland of Australia, are found in New Zealand.

The provincial system of government was established in 1852, and continued till 1875, when it was abolished, and the country divided into counties. The constitution is substantially the same as in the other British colonies, and consists of a governor, a legislative council, and a house of representatives. In the last-mentioned body there are usually several Maori members. The system of education is regulated by the Act of 1877. It is secular and free. The University of New Zealand grants degrees.

The population, according to the census of March, 1875, was 414,412, including 4,483 Chinese, but exclusive of the Maoris. Perhaps it may now be put at approximately half a million, including

NEW ZEALAND.
all races. In 1878 the Maoris numbered 43,000. Although a powerful race physically and mentally, they are evidently passing away gradually but surely. The number was estimated at 2,000,000 in 1885. Their children are taught in native schools under the government; and the Presbyterians, Episcopalian, and other denominations, have diligently carried on mission-work among them. In 1878 the population of the principal cities of New Zealand was as follows: —

- Auckland 26,401
- Dunedin 34,674
- Christ Church 56,059
- Wellington 21,006

Wellington is the capital, and seat of government.

There is no state church in New Zealand. The Church of England has six bishops,—at Auckland, Napier, Wellington, Nelson, Christ Church, and Dunedin. In this denomination there were, by the census of 1874, 172 churches and an attendance of 10,916. The Presbyterians had at that time 125 churches and an attendance of 10,541. By the circumstances of their settlement thirty years ago (1850), the provinces of Otago and Canterbury have had a distinctive ecclesiastical character, the Presbyterians being predominant in the former, and the Episcopalians in the latter; but this is becoming gradually less marked. The other sects, at the time of the above census, were as follows: Wesleyans, 105 chapels, in attendance, 12,728; Roman Catholics, 89 chapels, in attendance, 9,110; Baptists, Free Methodists, and Congregationalists were nearly equal, with an attendance each of about 3,000.

By the census of 1878 the population was divided, according to nominal church connection, as follows:

- Episcopalians 178,784
- Presbyterians 95,105
- Methodists 37,879
- Baptists 9,126
- Congregationalists 8,544
- Roman Catholics 55,881

Then follow various smaller sects, of which the Unitarians number 492; while 10,864 do not state their religion.

R. S. DUFF.

NIBHAZ is mentioned in 2 Kings xvii. 31 as a deity worshipped by the Avites, who had been transplanted by the Assyrians, and settled in Ephraim. Whence they came is not known, but it must have been from some place in Syria or Mesopotamia. The derivation of the word "Nibhaez" is very uncertain. Whether that deity was identical with the Nebaz of the Meneans, the demon of the uttermost darkness, has not been decided. The rabbins derive the name from a Hebrew root, "to bark;" but though there was an Egyptian deity with a dog's head, Anubis, and though by the Persians the dog was represented as following Mithras, nothing is known of sacred dogs or dog's worship on Assyro-Babylonian soil.

NICEA, Councils of. I. The first council of Nicea opens the series of ecumenical councils, and defined the church doctrine of the divinity of Christ, that he is co-essential with the Father. Very properly has a world-wide importance been attached to it, both on account of the profound and metaphysical question it discussed and the influence of its decision upon the doctrinal system of many after-centuries. The council is also very important on account of its other decrees, and the epoch it marks in the relations of the State to the doctrines and polity of the Church. In contrast to many later councils, the first council of Nicea has no intricate and tedious secret history. Our sources are the creed, canons, a synodal brief, a number of imperial letters, and various accounts by members of the council or later writers. The principal description is given by Eusebius of Cesarea, in his Life of Constantine (Vita Constant., iii. 6 sqq.), which, however, seeks unduly to make prominent the services and magnanimity of the emperor. He also gives an account in his letter to the Church of Cesarea (Ep. ad Cesare., in Theodoret, I. 11). Athanasius is our next most valuable authority (De decretis synodi Nic. et Ep. ad Afron.; but, while he lacks observation, he is a partial judge. A third eye-witness of whom something is preserved is Eustathius of Antioc (see Theodoret, c. 7). The later historians, Socrates (i. 8 sqq.) and Sozomen (i. 17 sqq.), draw from Eusebius, and give credit though not detailed accounts; while the profounder account (i. 6 sqq.; compare Rufinus: Hist. Eccl., i. 1 sqq.) is quite full in his notices of the acts of the council, but admits some doubtful details. The creed is given both by him and Socrates. The Arian position is represented by Philostorgius (i. 7; ii. 14), and the work of Gelasius of Cyri- cum (ab. 478), which is of inconsiderable value. Marutha's history of the council, written near the close of the fourth century, is lost. Later documents are without value; but of interest are the two works, Analecta Nicae (fragments relating to the Council of Nice; the Syriac text from an ancient manuscript, by H. Cowper, London, 1857), and Le concile de Nice d'apres lestextes copieset les diverses collections canoniques, by E. Revillout, Paris, 1881. For the circumstances forming the occasion of the council, see ARIANISM.

After Constantine had in vain endeavored to quietly settle the doctrinal dispute at Alexandria, he summoned by letter, in the year 325, the bishops of his empire to Nicea in Bithynia [then the second city of that province, but now represented by a Turkish village, Isnik, with a population of fifteen hundred], offering them money to defray the expenses of the journey, and free conveyance. There were seventeen bishops there, and at least three hundred according to Sozomen, four hundred according to Eusebius, or six hundred according to Socrates. To this number were added many presbyters and acolyths. The delegation from the East was in an overwhelming majority. The bishop of Rome, Sylvester I., was prevented from attending by the febleness of age, and was represented by two presbyters, Vitalis and Vicentius. The more prominent members were Macarius of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Antioc, Alexander of Alexandria, and his deacon Athanasius, Spyridion of Cyprus, Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedea, Theognis of Nicea, Secundus of Polemonis, — the last four belonging to the Arian party. The bishops produced miracles, Jacob of Nisibis, was also present; and many confessors who bore in their bodies the
marks of persecution. The month of the year in
which the council met is not definitely known,
although June or July are usually agreed upon.
Some contemporaneous authors relate that the
emperor Constantine himself wished to avail
themselves of the occasion to settle private
disputes, and presented many complaints to
the emperor. Constantine, however, conducted
himself with much prudence, directed the com-
plainants to the higher and all-wise Judge, and
burned the dissidents. The bishops were
reconciled with Arius, and these revealed the elo-
quence and intellect of Athanasius. On the day
appointed for opening the convention, the bishops
received the emperor standing. He appeared
with a commanding yet humble mien, was wel-
comed by Eustathius, and, after delivering a brief
address in Latin (which was interpreted in Greek),
gave the assembly into the hands of the presidents
(σειραδεύτες). Their names are not known. The sug-
gestion of Schreck and Ernesti, who mention Eu-
stathius and Alexander, is much more worthy of
confidence than that of Hefele, who, following Ge-
asius, advocates the claims of Hosius of Cordova.

The great subject of debate in the council was
the relation of the Son to the Father. Here we
have the accounts of Athanasius, who speaks of
two sharply opposed parties, and Eusebius, who
speaks of three varieties of opinion. Combin-
ing them, we find that there were three wings in
the council and three stages in the progress of the
debate. In the first stage, the council pro-
duced to define the relation of the Son to the
Father by the simple biblical predicates, such as
πρόκλεος ("in the image of God") and ἐκ τοῦ τεκτον τίνας ("to
be or come from God"); but when the Ariantwy
assented, defining these predicates to suit
themselves, the majority of the council receded.
In the second stage, Eusebius of Cesarea and his
friends, who, without being Arians, avoided the
term of the strict trinitarian wing, ἀγαθεύς ("of
the same substance"), fearful of running into Sa-
bellianism. Their proposition met with temporary
favor, but was finally rejected, and the much-
debated word inserted in the definition. The
name of Hosius of Cordova was the first signature
appended to the confession. Arius and five others
— namely, Theonas, Maris, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of
Ptolemais — refused to sign, and were ana-
thematized. Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris changed
their minds. The first two, however, refusing to
sign the articles of condemnation, were banished
to Gaul, Arius, Theonas, and Secundus were
exiled to Illyria. Constantine sanctioned the
decisions of the council, and made the diffusion
of Arian writings a capital offense. The council
itself prepared an encyclical, communicating its
decision to the churches, and enjoining obedience.

Instead of his principal doctrinal question, the
council made delverances upon the Meletian
and Passover controversies; the latter being settled
by fixing the Roman practice (See Meletian
and Paschal Controversies.) It also passed
twenty canons. To this number were added, in
the course of time, many others, till it reached
eighty or eighty-four in the Arabic collection.
Frankfort (794), or the worship of images (not the use of them in the
council, in spite of the statement of the Trullan
Synod of 680, that Sylvester joined with Con-
stantine in calling it, and Hefele, who even dares
to hold that the proceedings of the council were
sent to Sylvester for his confirmation. See Itti-
nius: Hist. Conc. Nicei, Lips., 1712; Rich-
vius: Hist. Concil. General.; Walch: Concilien-
View of the Council of Nice, with a Translation
of Documents, New York, 1856; and the Church His-
tories of Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, etc.].

II. The second council of Nicæa, usually reck-
only as the seventh oecumenical council, decreed
the use of images in the church, and anathema-
tized all who taught otherwise. The regent Irene
favored the use of images, and with her the op-
posed party came into power. Paul, the patri-
arch of Constantinople, withdrew; and Tarasius
was put in his place. A synod met at Constan-
tinople Aug. 1, 786. It had the consent of Hadrian
I., Bishop of Rome, and two monks who were
chosen to represent the patriarchs of Jerusalem,
Antioch, and Alexandria, with whom it was not
possible to have communication; on account of the
Saracen invasion. The synod was at once inter-
terrupted by the opponents of the use of images,
many of whom were in the army, and belonged
to the guard of the palace. It was again con-
vened at Nicæa, Sept. 24, 787, and adjourned
Oct. 18, after seven sittings. The members num-
bered three hundred of Nicæa, Rome, Constantin-
ople, the nearer eastern dioceses, the southern
western dioceses, and the northern dioceses.

The third canon forbids clergymen to have
strange women in their houses, but does not for-
bid their marriage. The council wanted to pass
a law requiring the three higher orders of the
clergy to put away their wives after ordination;
but the venerable confessor Paphnutius earnestly
protested, declaring that no rule was needed which
went beyond the old custom that the clergyman
should not enter into a marriage-engagement after
his ordination. The council was brought to a
close by a magnificent entertainment by the
emperor, who distributed handsome gifts among the
bishops, the city, and the adjoining country.

It is proper to notice, that the Bishop of Rome
did not exert any considerable influence upon the
council, in spite of the statement of the Trullan
Synod of 680, that Sylvester joined with Con-
stantine in calling it, and Hefele, who even dares
to hold that the proceedings of the council were
sent to Sylvester for his confirmation. See Itti-
nius: Hist. Conc. Nicei, Lips., 1712; Rich-
vius: Hist. Concil. General.; Walch: Concilien-
View of the Council of Nice, with a Translation
of Documents, New York, 1856; and the Church His-
tories of Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, etc.].

The great subject of debate in the council was
the worship of images (not the use of them in the
churches, and demanding for them, not the worship, it is true, which
is offered to God (λατρεία), but a due reverence and
prostration of the body (ἀναληψις τὸν παντὸς). These decrees were
unanimously adopted, and at an eighth sitting in Constantin-
ople (Oct. 23) they received Irene's signature.

Hadiam, whose delegates likewise gave their
assent, lived to receive Charlemagne's sharp criti-
cism of them in the Libri Carolini, and the con-
demnation, by the Synod of Frankfurt (794), of
the worship of images (not the use of them in the
churches).
NICE\O\NO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

The twenty-two canons of the council concern the election of bishops, the convention of general provincial synods, the use of relics in the churches, etc. The first council of Nicea contributed to establish the unity of Christendom. The second belongs to a period when that unity was already threatened. It had only the semblance of an eccumenical character. Among the Greeks it is referred to as the seventh and last eccumenical council. For literature, see above. 08SS.

The Creed, used in all the Greek and Roman churches, and recognized by most of the denominations of Protestantism, is, according to the generally received opinion, a recension, made at the Council of Constantinople in 381, of the creed formulated by the Council of Nicea in 325. In the present article we shall discuss, (1) the authentic text of the Constantinopolitan (or Nicono-Constantinopolitan) Creed, (2) the Nicene Creed, (3) the origin of the Constantinopolitan and its relation to the Nicene, (4) the history of the Constantinopolitan. Some of these questions cannot be answered exhaustively as yet; but the investigations of Caspari, Lumby, Swainson, and Hort, have established the main points.

I. TEXT OF THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN. — The three principal texts of the Constantinopolitan are, (1) The Greek text as it is found in the Acts of the 2d, 4th, and 6th ecumenical councils, in the works of the later Greek Fathers, and in the liturgies; (2) The Latin texts (translation) of Dionysius Exiguus, in the Acts of the Synod of Toledo (589), and of the Synod of Forum Julii (796), and that of Paul III.; (3) The Greek text used in the West, as it is found in several manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries. In addition, we have Syriac (of the year 502, in the British Museum), Coptic, two Anglo-Saxon (eleventh and thirteenth centuries, at Cambridge and Oxford), and other translations. The Latin text differs from the Greek in three main particulars: (1) The addition of Filioque ("and the Son"); (2) The omission of the preposition et ("in"). In the clause "one Holy . . . church," (3) The substitution of the singular Credo ("I believe"). In the 2d, 4th, and 6th authentic text of the Nicene Creed excludes all Arianism, and its promulgation as a rule of faith in Christology. The expressions it omits, compared with the baptismal formula of Cesarea, are, τὸ τῶν θεοῦ λόγον ("the Word of God," τὸ νόημα τῶν θεοῦ being substituted, πρωτόκολλον πάσης κτίσεως ("the first-born of every creature"), πρὸ πάσης τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς κτισμάτων ("the forgotten of the Father before all worlds," γεννησθήναι εἰκὸς τοῦ πατρὸς being substituted). These omissions are of the greatest significance, as they prove that the triumphant Alexandrian party would allow no compromise, and was bent on avoiding all misunderstanding. The omitted clauses were biblical, but such as were in the mouths of partial or acknowledged opponents. The creed introduces the Alexandrian clauses τοῦ εὐαγγέλίου τοῦ πατρὸς; γεννησθήναι εἰκὸς πατρὸς; ὁμοοιότατος τῶν πατρῶν, and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cesarean formula are not of a theological character, and, as they agree with the phraseology of the baptismal formulas of the Jerusalem and Antiochian churches, are to be put down as due to the influence of the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch. 1 etc., for the plural. The text of Dionysius Exiguus differs in other particulars. The addition of the clause Filioque ("and the Son") was first introduced by the Council of Toledo in 589; and the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Ghost was worked out by Augustine, emphasized in Spain in opposition to the Ariasian of the West Goths, but was not yet adopted in Rome at the beginning of the ninth century, when Leo III., in answer to a request of Charlemagne (809), refused to incorporate it. The omission of the preposition in before ecclesiam (church) was not accidental, and is found in the oldest Latin texts (Dionysius Exiguus, Synod of Toledo, Mozarabic Liturgy, etc.). This variation likewise goes back to the theology of Augustine, who made a distinction between credere aliquid (believing something), aliquid (somebody), and in aliquem (in somebody). The Greek texts of the West in part contain the divergences of the Latin text; but the Greek text written in Latin letters, in the Sacramentarium Gelasianum, agrees with the Greek texts of the East.

II. NICENE CREED. — The Nicene Creed, with which the Constantinopolitan is often identified, or of which it is regarded as a recension, was formulated at the Council of Nicea as the first authoritative conclusion of the Trinitarian controversy. The events leading to the triumph of the Alexandrian party at the Council, and the formulation of the creed, are obscure. But Eusebius is certainly right when he affirms that the Nicene Creed was formulated on the basis of the baptismal formula of Cesarea, which he himself presented. This is confirmed by an investigation of the creed, and the merit of having properly apprehended this point belongs to Hort. The main points with reference to the composition of the Nicene Creed are, that it rests upon the baptismal formula of Cesarea; differs from it by, (1) omissions and small changes, (2) the introduction of Christological clauses of the Alexandrian Church, and (3) by a revision based upon a comparison with the baptismal formulas of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch; and that it was promulgated, not as a baptismal formula, but as a rule of faith in Christology. The expressions it omits, compared with the baptismal formula of Cesarea, are, τὸ τῶν θεοῦ λόγον ("the Word of God," τὸ νόημα τῶν θεοῦ being substituted, πρωτόκολλον πάσης κτίσεως ("the first-born of every creature"), πρὸ πάσης τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς κτισμάτων ("the forgotten of the Father before all worlds," γεννησθήναι εἰκὸς τοῦ πατρὸς being substituted). These omissions are of the greatest significance, as they prove that the triumphant Alexandrian party would allow no compromise, and was bent on avoiding all misunderstanding. The omitted clauses were biblical, but such as were in the mouths of partial or acknowledged opponents. The creed introduces the Alexandrian clauses τοῦ εὐαγγέλίου τοῦ πατρὸς; γεννησθήναι εἰκὸς πατρὸς; ὁμοοιότατος τῶν πατρῶν, and the six anathemas at the close. The other variations of the Nicene Creed from the Cesarean formula are not of a theological character, and, as they agree with the phraseology of the baptismal formulas of the Jerusalem and Antiochian churches, are to be put down as due to the influence of the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch. 1 etc., for the plural. The text of Dionysius Exiguus differs in other particulars. The addition of the clause Filioque ("and the Son") was first introduced by the Council of Toledo in 589; and the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Ghost was worked out by Augustine, emphasized in Spain in opposition to the Arians of the West Goths, but was not yet adopted in Rome at the beginning of the ninth century, when Leo III., in answer to a request of Charlemagne (809), refused to incorporate it. The omission of the preposition in before ecclesiam (church) was not accidental, and is found in the oldest Latin texts (Dionysius Exiguus, Synod of Toledo, Mozarabic Liturgy, etc.). This variation likewise goes back to the theology of Augustine, who made a distinction between credere aliquid (believing something), aliquid (somebody), and in aliquem (in somebody). The Greek texts of the West in part contain the divergences of the Latin text; but the Greek text written in Latin letters, in the Sacramentarium Gelasianum, agrees with the Greek texts of the East.

The proof that the Nicene Creed was not meant to be a baptismal formula is found in the abbreviation of the third article — where all mention of the church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting, is wanting — and the addition of the anathemas. If we consider the positiveness with which the Nicene Creed excludes all Arianism, and its promulgation as a rule of faith in Christology, we get some conception of the strength and energy of the Alexandrian party at the council. In the twenty or thirty years immediately succeeding its promulgation a number of creeds were issued by its opponents. The battle was about the Nicene symbol; and in the battle its advocates became attached to the very words, so that they not only refused to give up a single letter, but to add clauses explanatory of the orthodox view. (See Athanasius; Hilary,
and nrsif rolguipaioit;naitu hi Ty yy. (See Hort, p. 83, etc.) Different explanations have been given of this fact; and Hefele, following Tillemon and Ceillier (Hist, des aut. sacr., v. p. 646), has advocated the view that the Council of Constantinople adopted his creed. But there is no documentary notice that Epiphanius played an important part at the council, much less that a creed proposed by him was received. We believe the traditional view of the origin of the Constantinopolitan Creed at the Council of Constantinople untenable, for reasons independent of all considerations concerning the symbol of Epiphanius. (1) The Council of Constantinople had not an ecumenical character, the Orient alone being represented. (2) The canons of the council are not found in the oldest Greek collections, as the Ballerini have properly inferred from the oldest Latin translation (the Prisca, about 450-500), in which the canons follow those of the fourth ecumenical council. The conclusion is very properly drawn, that the decrees of 381 were not generally received in the Orient till after 451 (the date of the fourth ecumenical council). (3) The Constantinopolitan Creed is not among the documents which are preserved as the Acts of the so-called "second ecumenical Council of Constantinople" (381), but was pushed into the Acts at a later date, and stands there without any historical introduction whatever. (4) Socrates (v. 8) only states that the council, after the departure of the Macedonian bishops, confirmed the Nicene faith; and Sozomen and Theodoret know nothing different. More important is the fact, that, in his Letter to Cledonius, Gregory Nazianzen, who was present at the council, only mentions the Nicene Creed, and does not speak of any enlargement of the same, or of any new creed. This argumentum e silentio is fatal to the traditional view, from the fact that Gregory, in the same letter, speaks of the incompleteness of the Nicene Creed in its statement of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. (5) The Latin Fathers condemned some of the proceedings of the council, but do not speak either of the adoption of a new creed, or the enlargement of an old one, before the middle of the fifth century. The same is true of the East. The Council of Constantinople in 382 only refers to the Nicene Creed; and the third ecumenical council at Ephesus (431) listened to the reading of it at its first session, but is silent about a Constantinopolitan revision. Likewise the Robber Council of Ephesus (449) speaks of the Nicene Creed as the only and immutable foundation of orthodox doctrine. Following the investigations of Caspari and Hort, we may say in one word. There is no certain vestige from 381 to 451 in the synodal Acts or Church Fathers, orthodox or heterodox, in the East or the West, of the existence of the Constantinopolitan Creed; and it is impossible to adduce proof from any source, that, in this period, it was regarded as having originated in the Constantinopolitan Council, or as being the official baptismal formula. On the contrary, the Nicene Creed during this period was pushed out of doors in most churches, especially the Eastern, the old baptismal formulas, and growing, if possible, in general esteem, and every alteration was rejected with indignation. The assumption that the so-called "Constantinopolitan" was meant when the Nicene Creed was spoken of is purely arbitrary; for, in the passages where the Nicene is literally cited, the text of the so-called "Constantinopolitan" is never given. (6) There is but one reliable testimony for the so-called "Constantinopolitan", and that is the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (451), which designated it as the "Creed of the Council of Constantinople of 381," and adopted it as the title of the Nicene Creed. The internal reasons against the traditional view are still stronger. It can be shown that the Constantinopolitan is not an enlarged copy of the Nicene Creed, and that it would have been impossible for the Council of Constantinople to make such a recension as the so-called "Constantinopolitan Creed" offers. The Constantinopolitan not only differs from the Nicene Creed by the additions in the third article, but differs also in other respects, which point back to another original. This is plain from the four omissions of words, the omission of the anathemas, the addition of ten clauses, and the five differences in the location of words. In other words, a comparison of the two creeds shows (to follow Hort), that, of the hundred and seventy-eight words in the Constantinopolitan, only thirty-three, or one-fifth, are to
the year 366: and the statements concerning the Holy Ghost, have been inserted. The entire first article, and the second down to the words τῶν ἁλίτων, are identical with that baptismal formula of Jerusalem; and the skeleton of the second is found in it. The third article ran in the form of Jerusalem, and εἰς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (“And in one Holy Spirit, the para-

elete, who spoke by the prophets”). Although very considerable changes have been made in this article and in those about the church, etc., yet the foundation is the same. The new predicates of the Holy Spirit are best explained by a reference to the letters of Athanasius to Serapion, written 356–362. (See Hort, p. 85 sq.)

The Constantinopolitan symbol is, therefore, a revision of the baptismal formula of Jerusalem perfected between 380 and 381. In the latter year it was in use in Jerusalem, probably in Cyprus, and prospectively in Pamphylia. There can be little doubt that Cyril of Jerusalem (351–386) was the reviser. By a careful analysis of his theology, and a comparison of it with the new clauses in the Constantinopolitan Creed, Hort raises that hypothesis to a reasonable certainty. The revision of the baptismal formula of Jerusalem was not a solitary instance of its kind. The Anti-ochian was, as Hort has shown, also revised after the Nicene Creed as a model, and probably by Mele-

tius. The Nestorian Creed published by Caspari (i., p. 116 sq.) is a second revision of the Anti-

ochian baptismal formula made in 366; and the baptismal formula of the church at Philadelphia, presented to the Council of Ephesus, is a revision of an early one after the model of the Nicene

Creed. The Pseudo-Athanasian Επιφάνεια (Cas-

pari, i.; Hahn, § 68), the longer Ancoratus (Cas-

pari; Hahn, § 68), the Cappadocian formula of baptism (Caspari, ii.; Hahn, § 70), and the Pseudo-

Basilian Επιφάνεια (Caspari, ii.; Hahn, § 140), are all closely related, derived from one source, are furnished with phraseology from the Nicene Creed and hands who proceeded from the Father,” etc. Such epithets do not suf-

fice to express the energetic advocacy of the di-

vinity of the Spirit about 380, and point back to a date earlier than 381, and probably later than 362.

What, then, are the origin and history of the so-

called “Constantinopolitan Creed”? Thus much we can regard as established: it was prepared before the Council of Constantinople in 381, and it is found substantially in the Ancoratus of Ephiphanius, written eight years before the council. Ephiphanius did not originate the creed, as Cas-

pari has well shown. He himself speaks of it as a venerable confession, and says, αὐτή μὲν ἡ πίστις παρέδωκα ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἑπακόμων, καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς ἱεράς πέλετο ἀπὸ πάσης ὑμῶν τῶν ἁγίων ἑπακόμων ἕπεται τριεκτικῶν ἔκκινὴ τῶν ιερατῶν. Although these words are not very clear, it is evident that Ephiphanius continued the tradition of the Constanti-

nopolitan Creed, as Hort has proved against Caspari. All these seven creeds belong to the third quarter of the fourth century, as is evident from the absence of all reference to the later christological controversies, and from the fact that the growing popularity of the Nicene Creed from the beginning of the fifth century left no room for the preparation of baptismal formulas. The years between 360 and 400 form, therefore, the second period in the formation of baptismal formulas. Here the so-called “Constantinopolitan Creed,” based upon the old baptismal formula of the church at Jerusalem, belongs.

IV. HISTORY OF THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED. — This is a singularly difficult problem. 1. The creed could not be held in general regard until the council of 381, to which it was ascribed. It had come to be regarded as having an ocumeni-

cal character. Chrysostom of Pan-

phylia as the Apostolic and Nicene. Where did he get it? Gerhard Vossius long ago detected the similarity between it and the creed of the church at Jerusalem. Hort has followed up the idea, and has proved that the so-called “Constantin-
the Council of Nicea, or that of Philadelphia. This orthodoxy above the reach of reproach. This deacon, who, according to the report, read it on the side of the Nicene Creed, and so used it. (See on these points Vincenzi, Caspari, and Hort, p. 101 sq.)

2. The date of the recognition of the creed in the West can be pretty accurately established as identical with the recognition of the ecumenical character of the council of 381; that is, about 530. Perhaps Diosynus Exiguus was the first to introduce it from the East, but there is no record of its being held in esteem in the West before the middle of the sixth century. From that time onward, it was used as a formula of baptism in Rome and Spain, where, at the Council of Toledo (589), it received the fatal addition, "Filioque," and has been put on a level with the Apostles' Creeds; yet, was even designated by this name. (For proofs see Caspari, i, p. 243, etc.) The Reformers usually call it simply the Nicene Creed. The Arminians, Socinians, and Unitarians have expressly rejected it. The Roman Church confirmed it at the Council of Trent. Its later history in the churches of the Reformation begins with the Calvinistic controversies.

3. The facts just brought out indicate that the creed must have been regarded, already in 500, in a part of the East at least, as a revision of the Nicene Creed, made at Constantinople 381. But its position after the canons, instead of before, in the collection of Diosynus Exiguus, proves that it was inserted into the Acts of the council not later than the latter half of the fifth century; but it is probable, though not beyond doubt, that it was first read at the Council of Chalcedon (451) as a product of the Council of Constantinople. It was a Constantinopolitan document; but, according to the report, read in the Nicene Creed; and that the thought of passing off the so-called "Constantinopolitan " as the work of the council of 381 was not put into execution till about 450. By 500 it had secured a place at the side of the Nicene Creed, and soon after was employed as a formula of baptism, and began to supplant the Nicene.

Finally, we may mention the radical hypothesis of the Roman theologian Vincenzi (De process. Sp. Sancti, Rome, 1878), who seeks to prove that the Constantinopolitan Creed is a Greek fabrication of the seventh century, for the purpose of dating back the erroneous doctrine of the single procession of the Holy Spirit to the fourth century. It is not necessary to refute this theory; for its author not only starts out with the purpose of proving the antiquity of the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, but has overlooked many of the most important testimonies, and does violence to others.

The Constantinopolitan Creed is, therefore, an apocryphal work, introduced as a formula of baptism in Rome and Spain, where, at the Council of Toledo (589), it received the fatal addition, "Filioque," and has been put on a level with the Apostles' Creeds; yet, was even designated by this name. (For proofs see Caspari, i, p. 243, etc.) The Reformers usually call it simply the Nicene Creed. The Arminians, Socinians, and Unitarians have expressly rejected it. The Roman Church confirmed it at the Council of Trent. Its later history in the churches of the Reformation begins with the Calvinistic controversies.
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NICHOLAS.

edited by Combeia, Paris, 1604 ; Confoessio Fidei, in Baronius, Ann. ad a. 811, etc. GASS.

NICEPHORUS, Callisti, flourished about 1330, was a monk in the monastery attached to the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, and wrote a church history (ending 610), which contains some valuable information. He closes the series of medieval Greek church-historians, and is one of the best of them. His work, which exists only in one manuscript, in the Imperial Library in Vienna, was first printed in a Latin translation by Johann Lange, Basel, 1553 (often reprinted); and his Greek text was edited by Fronto Ducesus, Paris, 1630, 2 vols. GASS.


NICHOLAS is the name of five popes and an antipope. — Nicholas I. (858-867) stands in the history of the Church as a powerful representative of that tendency which developed in the Roman curia after the death of Charlemagne,— to throw off the yoke of the imperial authority. The ideas of the unity of Church and State, and of the unity of the Christianizers, and that too close an ecclesiastical connection with Rome, were vividly present. The arbitrary measures of Archbishop Johannes of Ravenna had produced much ill feeling in his diocese, and complaints were made against him in Rome. As from old the Archbishop of Ravenna was the rival of the Bishop of Rome. Nicholas seized with eagerness the opportunity of humiliating that rival, and Johannes was finally compelled to submit to the papal demands,— that no bishop should be appointed in the province of Emilia without the consent of Rome, and that every bishop should have a right to appeal to Rome. Of still greater importance was his contest with Archbishop Hilarian of Rheims. It was Hilarian's dream to elevate his see to the primacy of the entire Frankish Church; and the opposition he met with from below — as, for instance, from Rothard, bishop of Soissons — he attempted to break by means of the synod of Soissons, but in 865 he repaired to Rome. Nicholas declared in his favor, cancelled the decisions of the synod of Soissons, and re-invested him with his episcopal rights. In the same year he was formally re-installed in his office by the papal legate Arsenius. Hilarian was threatened into compliance; and the startling propositions, drawn from the Pseudo-Isidorian decreets, — that no synod could be convened except by the Pope, that every bishop had a right to appeal from his metropolitan to the Pope, etc.,— obtained, if not formal acceptance, at least practical efficiency, in the Frankish Church. Equally successful was his interference in the affairs of the Greek Church. He sided with Ignatius, whose deposition he refused to recognize; and in 863 a synod of Soissons was convened, by the pope, with Ignatius. At that very moment Christianity was successfully introduced among the Bulgarians by Greek missionaries. But Prince Bogoris, suspecting that too close an ecclesiastical connection with Constantinople might endanger the political independence of the country, opened negotiations with Rome. Nicholas immediately sent Bishop Dominicus of Trivento and Bishop Grimoald of Bomarzo to Bogoris; and in spite of the exertions of Photius and the synod of Constantinople (867), which even went so far as to depose Nicholas, the Bulgarian Church became Latin, and not Greek. The Moravians — he stood, though like them, by means of Greek missionaries (Cyrillus and Methodius), also acknowledged the authority of Rome. But the master-stroke of Nicholas's policy was his interference in the matrimonial affairs of Lothair II. A synod of Metz (892) allowed the king to send away his legitimate wife, Thietberga, and marry his mistress, Waldrada. But Nicholas, who knew that Thietberga was innocent, and the transactions of Metz fraudulent, cancelled the decrees, deposed the archbishops of Cologne and Treves, who had managed the synod, and finally compelled Lothair, supported by the moral indignation of
NICHOLAS, 1653

Nicholas found himself in a miserable plight. At last he surrendered unconditionally to John XXIII., and was kept in prison for the rest of his life. See RaynalduS: Annals eccles. ad annos 1228-80, and other sources, in Böhmer: Fontes Rec. Germ., vols. i. and iv.-Nicholas V. (March 6, 1439-March 24, 1455) distinguished himself in politics, in science, and in art. With Friedrich III. he concluded the concordat of Aschaffenburg; on Vienna, Feb. 17, 1448, by which Germany lost nearly all the advantages it might have derived from the Council of Basel. The annals, the reservations, the menses papales, were consented to by the king. He was equally successful in healing the papal schism, and winding up the affairs of the Council of Basel. April 7, 1449, Felix V. resigned the office; and in 1450 Nicholas V. could celebrate the semi-centennial in Rome with great magnificence and proper dignity. He was a scholar himself, a worthy member of the Humanist camp, and encouraged scholarship. He laid the foundation of the Vatican Library, and offered a prize of ten thousand gold-pieces for a translation of Homer into Latin verse. He restored the walls of Rome and many of her churches, and entertained an idea of rebuilding the Vatican and the Church of St. Peter. By the Romans, however, he was not appreciated. His last days were saddened by the conspiracy of Porcaro, and still more by the fall of Constantine. He formed the League of Lodi between the Italian States for the defence of Italy, but his attempt to rouse Europe to a new crusade was a failure. See his biographies by Manetti, and Vespasianus Florentinus, in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. and xxv.; Pietro de Godi: Dialogon de conjuratione Porcaria, edited by Perlbach, Greifswald, 1879.

R. ZOEPPFEL.

NICHOLAS OF BASEL. See JOHN OF CHUR, and FRIENDS OF GOD.

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Methone, the present Modon, in Messenia, flourished during the reign of Manuel Comnenus, 1143-80, and left a number of works on the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, on the use of unleavened bread, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, on the primacy of the pope, on the truth of the “Bible of Proclus,” etc., which belong to the most characteristic productions of Greek theology during the twelfth century. Printed are the work against Proclus (Ἀνατρεπτικόν), edited by J. Th. Voenel, Frascati, 1828, and two essays against trinitarian heresies (Ἀγωνίας), edited by the archimandrite Demetracopolus, Leipzig, 1866. See Ullmann: Die Dogmatik der griechischen Kirche im 12. Jahrhundert, 1883.

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Myra in Lycia, a sacred name in the tradition of the Lathu as well as the Greek Church, but hardly any more mention by any contemporary historian. By Metaphrases and the Menologium Graecum a great number of miracles are ascribed to him, — allaying storms, liberating captive soldiers, etc. Balsam flowed from his grave when he was buried, and again,
when, in the twelfth century, his remains were exhumed, and transferred to Bari in Apulia. Many churches were dedicated to him. See his Vita e Metaphraste et alia collecta, in Surius (Dec. 6), and Fabricius: Bibl. Graeca, x., and Tholosio: Memoriae vi. GASS.

NICHOLAS, Henry. See Familiats.

NICHOLAS OF STRASSBURG was lector in the Dominican monastery in Cologne in the beginning of the fourteenth century, and was in 1326 made a kind of inspector of all Dominican monasteries in Germany. Thirteen sermons by him have been published by Franz Pfeiffer in the first volume of his Deutsche Mystiker: and he is generally reckoned among the older German mystics, though his sermons show no talent for, nor any inclination towards, mystical speculation. A larger work, De adventu Christi, dedicated to John XXII., has not been published. Not to be confounded with him is another Nicholas of Strassburg, or rather Nicholas Kemp de Argentina, monk in a Carthusian monastery in Cincinnati, where he died, a centenary, in 1497. A treatise by him, Dialogus de revo studiorum fane nec ordine, has been published by Thilo in his Biblioteca exce- xive, vol. iv., Regensburg, 1724.

C. SCHMIDT.

NICODEMUS, a Pharisee, and teacher of the law, the nocturnal disciple of the Church Fathers (αναγραφος μαθητης), who became the open disciple (ζημιων), was one of the few, who, like Paul, made the transition from the Pharisaic righteousness of works to faith in Christ. We meet him three times in John's Gospel, and these three passages describe as many phases in the development of his faith. He came to Christ, in the early part of his ministry, by night (John iii. 1-21), aroused by the miracles, and seeking instruction. The conversation which ensued, upon the necessity of the new birth, is one of the richest pearls of the Gospel, full of inexhaustible spiritual import. The second meeting with Christ occurred two years and a half later, when Christ's conflict with the hostile forces was rapidly nearing its crisis (John vii. 44 sq.), and with more boldness demanded that Jesus should be accorded the privileges of the law. A half-year later he appears again, a firm and open disciple, helping Joseph of Arimathaea to bury the body of our Lord (John xix. 38-43). The crucifixion had burst the remaining ties of his heart, and led him to sacrifice all temporal interests. According to the tradition, Nicodemus was baptized by John and Peter, and excluded from the Sanhedrin. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus (see the text in Fabricius and Thilo, and a translation in Cowper's The Apocryphal Gospels), which is reported to have been written by Nicodemus in Hebrew, at least attests the high esteem in which he was held from the beginning.

GÜDER.

NICOLAI, Philip, Lutheran theologian, preacher, and hymn-writer; b. Aug. 10, 1556, in Mengershausen; d. Oct. 29, 1608, in Hamburg. His father, who was a clergyman, dedicated him early "to God and his church." After studying theology at the universities of Erfurt and Wittenberg, he became in 1583 pastor at Herdecke, Westphalia; from which he was obliged to flee at the invasion of the Spanish troops. Finding on his return that the mass had been introduced again in his church, he became pastor of a secret congregation of Lutherans in Cologne, and afterwards at Nieder-Wildungen. He was made doctor of divinity by the university of Marburg; in 1590 was called to Unna in Westphalia, where the Lutheran clergy expected him to take the lead in the discussions with the Calvinists; and in 1601 he accepted a call to Hamburg. Here he exerted an extensive influence, preaching, like "another Chrysostom," on Sundays and Thursdays to a crowded church, and commending himself as a faithful pastor and pious man.

Nicolai was a zealous Lutheran, and advocate of the doctrine of ubiquity. He entered with all his soul into the theological controversies of the day against the Calvinists, and sent forth many contributions through the press. Amongst these were the Fundamentiorum Calvinianae Sectae Detectio (Tübingen, 1590), the De Controversione ubiq- uriarum (1590), De duabus Antichristis (1600), and Kurzer Bericht von d. Calvinisten Got. u. ihrer Re- ligion (1598). The last work was one of the coarsest of all the anti-Calvinistic writings of its author, and in general one of the most notorious of the polematic writings of the sixteenth century, verging towards the coarsest of all the polemics. It is pleasant to turn away to another work, the Freudenpiegel d. ewigen Lebens (Frankfurt, 1599, 1617, 1638, etc., 1854), which was fragrant with the odor of heavenly flowers, and suggested by a terrible pestilence which raged in Unna, where he was pastor. He also published a Commentarium de regno Christi ibi II. (Frankfurt, 1597), a remarkable work, full of chiliasm and speculations, and in which he predicted the world's dissolution in 1670. His most important theological work was the Sacrosanctum omnipotentem J. Chr. mystereum libri II. solide et perspicue explicatum (1802), in which he seeks to prove the doctrine of Christ's omnipresence, both from his divine and human nature. Attention has recently been called to his Christology again by Thomasius, Dornier, and others.

That which has given Nicolai a permanent claim to honor and fame in the Protestant Church is his four hymns, especially the bridal song of the Church to her heavenly Bridegroom on Ps. xiv., Wie schön leucht' uns der Morgenstern ("How lovely shines the morning star," by Dr. H. Har- baugh), and a spirited song of the midnight voice ruft uns die Slimme ("Wake, awake, for night is flying," Miss Catherine Winkworth). These two hymns, which were written in Unna at the time of the pestilence (1599), are among the jewels of German hymnody, and mark an epoch in hymn- composition, for they are poems of personal faith and love and their poetic and musical rhythm, char- acteristics which are foreign to the hymns of the Reformation period. These wonderful songs exer- cised a powerful influence upon that generation, and were soon adopted far and near. The melody of Wacht auf, ruft uns die Stimme, was composed by Nicolai himself, and perhaps got his idea of the tune from the horn of the night watchman.

Nicolai's works were edited by Davennen, in 2 Latin and 4 German vols., Hamburg, 1611-17. For his life, see Curtze: P. Nicolai's Leben u. Lieder, Halle, 1859; Koch: Kirchenlied, ii. 324 sqq.
The Nicolaitans were, then, Gentile Christian Antinomians, who abused Paul’s doctrine of freedom, but it is not the apostle Paul and his helpers that the rebukes are directed against (Baur, Schwegler, Volkmar, Holtzmann, Renan). Those who hold this view refer to Rev. ii. 9, which speaks of those who say they are Jews, and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan; but these particulars the Nicolaitans, now a sectional party within the church, but enemies and persecutors of the Christians. They were Jews who were hostile to the gospel, and unworthy of their name. Nor can the words of Rev. ii. 2 be applied to Paul, for he was already dead, and would no longer be an object of hatred; nor did his co-laborers desire to be called “apostles.” Moreover, the vicious practices attributed to the Nicolaitans are the very ones that Paul himself likewise deprecated (1 Cor. v. 1 sqq., vi. 12 sqq., etc.). Wholly without foundation is the further opinion, recently advanced by Volter, that the false apostles (Rev. ii. 2), Balaamites (ii. 14), and Jezebel were Montanists, and the Nicolaitans (ii. 6, 15) and Gnostics (Ophites) of the year 180–170 (explanations which are then used to prove that the epistles to the seven churches were inserted in the Book of Revelation in the second part of the second century).

The Nicolaitans are not mentioned by the Church Fathers until Irenaeus, who speaks of them as the followers of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons mentioned in Acts vi. 5 (I. 26, 3). This is to be explained by the fact, that, at an earlier time, not so much stress was laid upon a complete list of the heresies, and by no means proves that the sect had grown up after Justin Martyr and Hegesippus wrote. The order in which Irenaeus treats them (I. 26, 3; comp. III. 11, 1) indicates that they flourished before Cerinthus, while they anticipated his doctrines. He, however, does not know of any Nicolaitans of his own day; for he does not bring them in connection with any of the heresies he mentions after Basilides (I. 26, 2).

What Tertullian says about them (Pros., 38; Adv. Marc., i. 29; De Pudic. 19) is evidently taken from the Apocalypse. The statements of Hippolytus (Philos., 7, 30) are based upon those of Irenaeus. He says that a similar sect of Jewish Christians such as gave Paul trouble in his congregations (Ewald, Gebhardt); but there are none of the peculiar marks of the Judaizing tendency.

The Nicolaitans are to be compared with the Antinomian libertines of the Church of Corinth. Antinomianism had spread in this congregation, in contrast to the narrow legalism of Jewish Christianity, as we learn from Paul’s Epistles to the Corinthians. They seem to have questioned the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 13 sqq.), desecrated the table of the Lord (xi. 18), grossly abused Paul’s principle, that “all things are lawful” (vi. 12, x. 23), by eating flesh offered to idols, etc. The similarity of Nicolaitanism and the Antinomianism of Corinth renders it certain that the two stand in an intimate historical relation. The difference lies here, that the Nicolaitans are, therefore, not to be explained figuratively (Herder), nor are they to be regarded merely as libertines (Vitringa), but as committing the sins attributed to the Israelites, and as holding principles justifying such practices. This conclusion puts it beyond dispute that the Nicolaitans are likewise meant in the description in the Epistle to the Church of Thyatira (ii. 20 sqq.), where fornication, and eating things sacrificed to idols, are referred to. Here the woman Jezebel does not mean a special individual in the Church of Thyatira. She is the representative of a certain school who, according to a heretical tendency, have met with less resistance at Thyatira than at Ephesus and Pergamos. It may also be regarded as certain that the “evil men” and the “false apostles” referred to in the Epistle to Ephesus (i. 3) were Nicolaitans, and not Judaizing teachers (Zwingli). One might think of some of the false teachers; but the statement of the Fathers, as well as the tradition found in the writings of the Fathers which is independent of the statements of the Apocalypse, and may well be considered historical.

The statement of the Fathers, as well as the evident presumption of the Apocalypse, that the name was well known, indicate that Nicolas was the founder of the sect, and that the name (from νικολαίς, “to rule,” and λαός, “people”) was not a symbolical imitation of the Hebrew Balaam (בָּלָאָם, “to take possession,” and בָּלָא, “people”), but as Vitringa, Herder, Hengstenberg, Diesterdieck, and others have held.


Nicolás. See preceding article.

Nicolás de Clémanges. See Clemanges.

Nicolás de Cusa. See Cusa.

Nicolé, Pierre, b. at Chartres, Oct. 13, 1625; d. in Paris, Nov. 16, 1685; received a very careful education, first at home, by his father, who was a parliamentary advocate; fell of Nicolas (the supposed founder of the sect) was occasioned by his jealousy of his beautiful wife. This is the only tradition found in the writings of the Fathers which is independent of the statements of the Apocalypse, and may well be considered unhistorical.

Finally he determined to devote himself exclusively to theology, and it was his great aim to become a doctor and professor at the Sorbonne. Meanwhile, his connections with the Port-Royal, through his aunt, Mother Marie de Saint-Anges Sireau, and the furious controversy concerning the five propositions of Jansenius, drew him away from the university. In Port-Royal he never rose above the rank of a cleric tonsure; but he soon became one of the most celebrated teachers of that institution, and one of the most promi-
NICOPOLIS. 1656

Nikon. 1656

Nikon, b. in a village near Nizhnei-Novgorod, 1605; d. Aug. 17, 1631; was educated in a monastery, and ordained priest; married (which is not against the order of the Russian Church), but separated from his wife after ten years, and lived for some time as a hermit in an island of the White Sea. Appointed archimandrite of the monastery of Novazaskoi by the Czar Alexei Michaelovitch, he was, in 1647, made metropolitan of Novgorod, and in 1652 patriarch of Moscow. He was a man of great practical ability, and occupies a prominent place in the history of the Russian Church. Among his principal reforms are the introduction of the Greek Church music, and the revision of the Russian Liturgy, Prayer-Book, and Confession of Faith. Originally adopted from the Greek Church, and simply translated into Old Russian, the very translation was not perfect; and in the course of time a great number of deviations had crept in by the carelessness of copyists, by arbitrary changes, etc. In 1654 Nikon induced the Russian clergy to undertake a revision. The learned apparatus was gathered,
A committee appointed, etc. The work, however, died without universal favor, but gave rise to the sect of the Raskolniks, or Old Believers. In 1658 Nikon fell into disgrace, and retired to the monastery of Woskresensak. In 1666 he was summoned before a synod in Moscow, and formally condemned and deposed. Shortly before his death, a new edition of his writings, called the verdict of the synod, and recalled Nikon; but he died on his way to Constantinople. See J. Backhuysen: Beiträge zur Lebensgeschichte des P. N., Riga, 1788. (See the graphic account in STANLEY: Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, London, 1861, 2d ed., 1862, pp. 457-490; also W. Palmer: The Patriarch and the Tsar; Replies of the humble Nicon, by the mercy of God, Patriarch, against the questions of the Boyar Simeon Streshnoff; and the answers of the Metropolitan of Gaza Paisius Ligardes, translated from the Russian, London, 1871-76.)

NILE. The Nile is not mentioned in the New Testament, but often in the Old Testament, though not under its native name. It is called Shihor, or Shutur, “the black stream” (Josh. xiii. 3; Isa. xxxii. 3; Jer. ii. 18; 1 Chron. xiii. 3), or Year, which is in plural form means, not only the river itself, but also its affluents, arns, canals, etc. (Ps. lxxvi. 44; Ezek. xxix. 3, xxx. 12); or “the flood of Egypt” (Amos viii. 8, ix. 5); or simply “the river” (Gen. xli. 1; Exod. i. 22, ii. 3). Though intimately connected with the earlier history of the Hebrews (Exod. ii. 3, vii. 20; Num. xi. 5; Ps. cv. 29; Jer. xlvi. 7; Zech. xiv. 17), the Nile does not seem to have made so deep an impression on them as the Euphrates.

The Nile proper is formed by the junction of the Bahr-el-Azrek, or the Blue Nile, and Bahr-el-Abiad or the White Nile, at Khartoum, in Lat. 15° 35' N., at an elevation of 1,188 feet above the level of the sea. The White Nile, which is the true Nile, comes from Victoria Nyanza, a large lake situated under the equator, at an elevation of 3,740 feet. The Blue Nile has its sources in the alpine regions of Abyssinia, at an elevation of more than 10,000 feet, and is one of the noblest rivers of the Atbara or the Black Nile, at El Damer, in Lat. 17° 45' N., the Nile descends the Nubian cataract at Assouan, in Lat. 24° 10' N., on the boundary between Nubia and Egypt. With an average fall of two inches to a mile, and a mean velocity of three miles an hour, it then flows through Egypt to the Mediterranean, separating, by water-power; represented his district in the Legislature of Connecticut, and, on removing to Vermont, became speaker of the House of Representatives in 1754; and was for many years judge of the Supreme Court of the state. He was an able metaphysician, and for many years held a preaching service in his own house. He published Discourses on Secret Prayer, 1773, Discourses on Sin and Forgiveness, 1773, Sermons—the Perfection of God, the Fountain of Good, 1777, etc.—II. Samuel, a Congregational minister; b. on Block Island, May 1, 1704; d. May 1, 1782. He graduated at Harvard, preached at Tolland, R.I., 1702-10, and was installed pastor at Braintree in 1711. He published A Brief and Sorrowful Account of the Present Churches in New England, 1745; Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin, 1757, etc.—III. Samuel, son of the former; b. at Braintree, Mass., Dec. 14, 1730; d. at Abington, Jan. 18, 1814. Graduating at Princeton in 1769, he studied theology with Rev. Ezekiel Dodge of Abington, and Dr. Bellamy of Bethlehem, Conn., and in February, 1771, was called to the Congregational Church in Abington. He was esteemed an able thinker. He published several sermons. On the Death of Washington (1800) and other topics.

NILUS is a name of frequent occurrence in the history of the Greek Church, and forms in its literature a centre around which, at various epochs, a great number of writings has agglomerated. Leo Allatius was the first to investigate the subject, in his Diatriba de Nilia et Psellis; and he distinguishes no less than twenty-one different authors of the name. Later investigations have been made by Fabricius and Harles.

The Younger Nilus, or Nilus Rossanensis, a Greek by descent, but born at Rossano in Calabria, lived in the tenth century, and represents a very severe form of asceticism. He was a friend of Archbishop Philogotus of Piacenza, the rival of Gregory V., and the victim of Otho III. A life of Nilus, written by M. Caryophillus (Rome, 1624), is found in Act. Sanct. xxvi.

Nilus the Archimandrite (surnamed Duxopatrius) lived for some time in Sicily, and wrote, at the instance of King Roger, his Synagyma de quinque patriarchibus chron., 1149, edited by
Nimbus.

Stephen le Moyne, in Var. Sacr., i. As it is written from a Greek point of view, it is, of course, offensive to Roman-Catholic critics. Nimbus, the, or Glory (sometimes a ring, and sometimes a disk, sometimes of gold and sometimes of some bright color), was placed behind the head of a person, in order to indicate symbolically that luminous irradiancy which was supposed to surround the head of the world's aboriginal master. It was used among the Hindoos and in Egypt, among the Greeks and in Rome, where it finally came to denote simple power. By the Christians it was adopted in the fifth century as a symbol of sanctity. It was first applied to Christ alone, then to the angels, and finally to Mary and the saints. In representations of God, the nimbus is sometimes made triangular, with a reference to the Trinity. The nimbus of persons still living when painted, was square. In the eighth century the appliance was universally used in Christian art.

Nimrod (טִימְרוֹד) in the Septuagint, Νίμροδ in Josephus, was, according to Gen. x. 8-12 and 1 Chron. i. 10, a son of Cush, a grandson of Ham, and a great-grandson of Noah, a mighty hunter before the Lord, and a great ruler upon the earth, the founder of an empire. The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, together with three other cities in the land of Shinar, — Erech and Accad and Calneh. Out of that land he went forth to Assyur, where he built Nineveh and three other cities, — Rehoboth and Calah and Kesen, — which finally were united to Nineveh, the whole forming one huge city. The first nine verses of the eleventh chapter of Genesis tell us how the Tower of Babel was erected, and how it was destroyed; the result of which, such as it presented itself in the time of Moses, is laid before us in the table of nations, contained in the tenth chapter. When an old Oriental tradition, which we know from fragments of Berosus, places the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues in the tenth generation from Noah, that account agrees perfectly with the chronology of Moses; and when Khesias identifies Nimrod with Ninus and Artapausos identify him with Baal, it seems quite probable that the glory which surrounded Nimrod made his name Nin, a surname or title of the prototype of the Pyramids of Egypt, such as it is still recognizable in the colossal ruins of Birs Nimrod, discovered by Niebuhr.

In order to secure the accomplishment of that gigantic undertaking, it was necessary to make an expedition to the north. There stood the Semites, the legitimate masters; but Nimrod built Nineveh and three other cities. To the west and south the natural boundaries gave safety; and to the east lived Cush, the father of Nimrod, and Chawilah, his brother. Meanwhile, block was laid upon block, and the tower began to rise high. Into heaven should it stop reach; and it should stand forever. The old tradition tells us how Nimrod himself challenged the divine judgment, shooting with arrows towards the sky when it thundered, as if he wanted to wage war against the thunderer. The judgment came. The tower was destroyed by lightning, the tongues were confounded, and the Hamites were scattered in all directions. Only a small remnant of the Hamite tribe remained in the country, which amalgamated with the advancing Semites, the Chaldeans, and formed the Chaldaean population. [For the ruins of the construction of Nimrod, see BABYLON.] PRESSEL.

Nineveh and Assyria. I. Opposite the present Mosul, on the eastern bank of the Tigris, rise two artificial hills. The northern one, partially occupied by a Turkish village, is called Kouyundjik. The southern hill is popularly called Nebi Yunus, with reference to the mosque erected on it to the prophet (Nebi) Jonah, but is known by the eustodians of the mosque as Nineveh. The distance between the two hills can be walked in a quarter of an hour. The two hills are united on the western side by a wall, which, extending beyond them, terminates at both ends at the channel of the Tigris, which in this locality bends out towards the west. The western wall is two miles and a half long; the northern wall is one mile and a third, the eastern wall three miles and a quarter, and the southern wall half a

1 The importance of the following article has seemed to justify the editors in giving it at length, in spite of some repetitions of the article Assyria, vol. i.
Long. The eastern wall is intersected by the River Chosr [Khosr], which, flowing through the ruins, passes under Kouyundjik, and empties into the Tigris. South of the Chosr, at the point where the road to Bagdad intersects the eastern wall, there are two hills, which without doubt mark the site of the east gate, and will offer a rich reward to some future investigator. Four other walls, and three water-ditches outside of the eastern wall, made that part of the city especially strong. The walls are said to be still fifty feet high in some places. Xenophon found this locality in about the same condition as Botta and clay tablets, now forming the most precious part of other walls, and three water-ditches outside of the eastern wall, made that part of the city especially strong. The walls are said to be still fifty feet high in some places. Xenophon found this locality in about the same condition as Botta and Layard. Rich, for many years the English resident of Bagdad, convinced himself, by a personal inspection in 1820, that it concealed the ruins of Nineveh. Layard and Rassam began excavations; George Smith, under the direction of Rassam, resumed them (1873-78); and Rassam himself has continued them since Smith's sudden death (1876). The excavations have been heretofore almost exclusively confined to Kouyundjik and Nebi Yunus, where the royal palaces were built.

The cuneiform inscriptions furnish us with the cuneiform inscriptions furnish us with the following results concerning Nineveh's name and history. The name of the city was Ninua, or Ninus, and was derived from the sacred non-Shemitic language of Babylonia, which the Assyrians delighted to use, down to the latest times, to designate temples and palaces. The second syllable, na or nu (lengthened forms nna or nnu), signifies resting or dwelling place. The meaning of the first, ni, is not so clear. Usually the word signifies "fattness," "abundance." At any rate, much is plain, that Ninua, or Ninus, has no etymological affinity with the Assyrian ninus ("fish"). As regards the founding of Nineveh, the cuneiform inscriptions say nothing; but it could not have happened long after that of the city of Assur. The third oldest Assyrian king of whom we know was Assur-dannin-pal. Sargon (about 177 B.C.), erected a temple in Nineveh, or rather "restored" it. A temple of Nebo and Merodach was also built at Nineveh at an ancient period, and perhaps by Ramannirari. According to Smith, Salmanasser I. (about 1300 B.C.) built a palace here, and made it the seat of government. Assurnazirpal and his son, Salmanasser II., rebuilt temple and palace; and, at the close of the latter's reign, Nineveh rose at the head of twenty-six other cities, including Assur, against him, following the lead of his son, Asur-dannin-pal. Salmanasser's other son, Samsi-Raman III., put down the rebellion, ascended the throne, and adorned the temple of Istar. His son, Ramannirari III., built a new temple for Nebo and Merodach. All these buildings were erected on the site now occupied by the hill Kouyundjik. Ramannirari III. built the first palace at Nebi Yunus. Tiglath-Pileser II. built a palace at the bend of the River Chosr. Sargon built a new royal city, but rebuilt the temple of Nebo and Merodach, as bricks bear record. Nineveh's most glorious period is associated with the name of his son, Sennacherib. In a cylinder inscription he calls Nineveh the "lofty city, the darling city of Istar, where all the precious things (? of the Lord) are kept, the continuing spot, the eternal foundation, the place adorned with art, where every kind of work of art, all that is precious and beautiful, is gathered, where, time out of mind, the kings, the ancestors of my fathers, exercised rule over Assyria, and received the annual tribute of princes from the four quarters of the globe." He continues to speak of these public works, which he began in 702 B.C., and on which he employed an immense body of prisoners of war. Tearing down the old palace, he rebuilt it on a much larger scale, with gold and silver, alabaster and ivory, palm, cedar, and cypress wood, and encompassed it with a park, with trees and fountains, and a lake. He dug canals to supply the park with water. In 681, in spite of his campaigns, he instituted water-works on a grand scale to supply the city with water. Eighteen canals were dug leading into the Chosr; so that its stream was very appreciably augmented. Sennacherib also encircled the city with high walls, "which were not before that time,"—built a second palace where Nebi Yunus now is, and another large building for his chariots, etc. Esarhaddon finished, not later than 673, a new palace, and rebuilt Sennacherib's stables. Assurbanipal, the last Assyrian king but one, enlarged and adorned the Bit rildú, or royal harem at Kouyundjik, the palace in which Esarhaddon was born, but avoided building the terrace too high, but of reverence for the temples of the gods." This sketch of the buildings of Nineveh may be closed with the mention of the great eastern city gate, through which many triumphal processions passed, and the suburb Ribiti Ninā ("city Rehoboth," Gen. x. 11) which was outside the walls.

The houses of the people were probably huts of clay covered with gypseum, such as are found now in Mosul. Clay formed the chief article in

1 Dur-Sarrukin, whose site is now occupied by the little village of Chorasan, ten miles north of Nineveh. Sargon boasts of having discovered this excellent site, which "three hundred and fifty kings, his fathers," had failed to do. Botta (1842-46) found the palace and a temple. A splendid collection of sculptures were transported (about 176 B.C.), and continuing Botta's excavations in 1862, succeeded in discovering one of the gates, etc. No doubt future excavations on this spot will be richly rewarded.
the composition of the palaces. Nineveh was also not far removed from quarries of marble and alabaster, and in this respect enjoyed a great advantage over Babylon. The architecture of Nineveh was copied after that of Babylonian. The height of her palaces has been much discussed. Rassam has recently expressed himself in favor of the view that they were stories high, and thinks the walls of the lower story were four or five feet thick, and were made of bricks plated with tablets. The inner rooms, like the library of Assurbanipal, either were destitute of windows altogether, or had them in the roof.

II. CALAH [spelt by Delitzsch, Kelach]. — This was another principal city of Assyria. It is now represented by an imposing wall, with traces of fifty-eight towers on the north side alone, and an artificial hill in the southern corner, four hundred by six hundred yards. A village in the vicinity bears the name Nimrod. The distance from Kouyunjik is twenty miles. In the northwestern corner of the hill are the ruins of the great temple tower, laid bare by the excavations of Layard. A ditch encircles the northwestern palace of Assurnazirpal, one of the most perfect of the Assyrian structures, and adorned with well-preserved sculptures, which now adorn the British Museum. The immense winged bulls and lions at the entrance, and other sculptures, were left by Layard, and may still be seen. Another palace — the central palace — is near by, and in it was found the celebrated black obelisk of Salmanassar II. Not far off is the southwest palace of Esarhaddon, which has been much injured by fire. There is also the south-east palace of the last Assyrian king, Assur-etil-ilani-akin. It is much smaller than the others. Rassam found underneath it the ruins of an older building. In 1878 the same Assyriologist discovered the temple of Assurnazirpal close by the northwestern palace, but in complete ruin. Calah (Gen. x. 11, 12) was built, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, by Salinanassar I. (1300 B.C.). His successors abandoned it until Assurnazirpal (about 880 B.C.) introduced its golden period by the construction of a temple and palaces.

III. The plain on which Nineveh and Calah are situated is sown with small hills full of ruins. The two principal villages in this locality are now called Keremlis, Birtelleh, and Bellawat. The last place, which is fifteen miles east of Mosul, and nine miles north-east of Nimrod, has sprung into importance since Rassam's excavations in 1878. An Arab found there in 1876 some bronze tablets containing Assyrian pictures and inscriptions. They contain an illustrated history of the first nine years of the reign of Salinanassar II. (860–853), which are of inestimable value for the insight they afford into the civil life, military organization, etc., of the time. They also inform us that the site of Balawat was occupied by the Assyrian city Imgur-Bel, and was founded by Assurnazirpal. The city of Resen, mentioned in Gen. x. 12 as being between Nineveh and Calah, is, in my opinion, to be identified with the hill Selamiteh. The name has not yet been discovered on the inscriptions.

IV. ASSUR. — Assyria Proper extended from the beginning farther south; and its oldest capital, Assur, was a good deal farther down the stream, about sixty English miles from Mosul, and on the right bank of the Tigris. Its site is now marked by the large hill Kalch-Shergat (Rassam, Kaal-Shergat). The ruins are in the utmost confusion, and it would require unlimited means and labor to investigate them thoroughly. English and French parties have instituted several different excavations, but Rassam (1853) is the only one who has met with success. He discovered the palace of Tiglath-Pileser (about 1120 B.C.), and three octagon clay prisms, whose inscriptions are the oldest accounts of any length, dating from early Assyrian times. The oldest temple in Assur was built by the first Assyrian king, Belkapkapu (about 1870 B.C.), as bricks from its foundation state. Samas-Raman I. built, in 1818 B.C., the Anu and Raman temple, which Tiglath-Pileser rebuilt six hundred and forty years later. Rammannirati I. and Salmanassar I. likewise built palaces there. Tiglath-Pileser's son, Assur-belkala, resided in Assur; and Assurnazirpal restored dilapidated structures of earlier kings. His son, Samass-Raman II., abandoned the city, preferring Calah. Assyria, Assur, and Babylon, was fully confirmed by the excavations of Layard. A ditch, one of the most perfect of the artificial works in the world, surrounded the town, and was one hundred and fifty miles long. Another ditch was also made by Esarhaddon and Asnapper (Ez. iv. 10 = Assurbanipal).

V. The impression which Genesis (x. 8–12) leaves, that the Assyrians were a colony from the Babylonians, is fully confirmed by the excavations. We will here give the main reasons for the assumption that the Assyrians were Semites and Babylonians. The classification of Assur as Shem's second son is corroborated by the statues and relief pictures, which represent the Assyrians with facial contour quite similar to that of the Jews and Arabs of to-day (Kiepert). A second proof is the Assyrian language, which is pure Semitic, though not Aramaic. The active commerce, from the ninth century B.C., of the Assyrians with nomadic tribes speaking Aramaic, accounts for Rabshakeh (2 Kings xviii. 26) understanding Hezekiah's commissioners; and it is expressly stated in the cuneiform inscriptions, that Assyrians high in office understood the Aramaic as well as their own tongue. The A-
NINIAN.

NITZSCHE.

Syrian characters are likewise the same as the Babylonian; not merely cuneiform, but derived from the oldest Babylonian cuneiform style, and, for the most part, wholly identical with it. The Assyrian architecture was likewise derived from the Babylonian. And, finally, one of the most important proofs is the religion. The Assyrian pantheon, Assur alone excepted, is identical with the Babylonian. The gods Bel, Dagon, Samas, with which the oldest royal Assyrian names are compounded (Belkapkapu, Išmun-Dagan, Samsi-Raman), were well known in Babylon. Raman-nirari (about 1300 B.C.) calls his helpers Anu, Assur, Samas, Raman, and Istar. Tiglath-Pileser I. invokes Assur, Bel, Sin, Samas, Raman, Adar, and Istar, “the great gods which rule heaven and earth.” Salmanasar II. glorifies, in his obelisk inscription, Assur, and then (following the Babylonian list), Anu, Bel, Aššur, Sin, Samas, Raman, Marduk, Adar, Nergal, Nusku, Beltis, and Istar. The religious customs and conceptions of the Assyrians were also substantially those of the Babylonians.

For further details and for the history, I must refer the reader to the art. SENNACHERIB. [For the lit. see Assyria.] FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH.

NINIAN, or NINYAS, the A poet of the Southern Picts; went, according to the Act. Sanct. Sept., vol. v. p. 318, to Rome in 370, and was ordained by Pope Siricius in 394. The words of Bede, however (Hist. Eccl., iii. 4), allow a somewhat later date for the activity of Ninian; and historical circumstances seem to fix it at the middle of the fifth century.

NIOBA. See Monophysites.

NIRVANA. See Buddhism.

NI'SAN. See Year, Hebrew.

NIS'ROCH (Hebrew, נישך; the Sept., Νισάρχ, 'Nisáρx, etc.; Josephus: Ant., X. 1, 5, 'Aρασίν) is mentioned in 2 Kings xix. 37 and Isa. xxxvii. 38 as a divinity worshipped at Nineveh at the time of Sennacherib. In his temple, and while praying to him, Sennacherib was killed by his own son. The derivation of the name is very uncertain. It does not occur in the cuneiform inscriptions. As a curiosity, it may be mentioned, that the rabbins know that the idol of Nisroch was a simple corruption of, or another form for, Assur. See IKEN: Dissertatio de Nisroch idolo Assyri, Bremen, 1747.

WOLK BAUDISSIN.

NITZSCHE, Karl Immanuel, one of the most distinguished representatives, in the nineteenth century, of the school of theology occupying an intermediate position between the old supernaturalism and rationalism (Vermittlungspathologie), and, next after Schleiermacher, the first (in time, at least) of the systematic writers on practical theology; was b. at Borna, Saxony, Sept. 21, 1787; d. in Berlin, Aug. 21, 1868. His theological training was secured at Wittenberg, where his father, Karl Ludwig Nitsch (see below), was professor; and he became doctor in 1810 with a dissertation, De testamentis duodecem patriarcharum, lib. vet. test., pseudepigraph., and in 1811 was ordained as assistant pastor of the Schloßkirche. He remained uninterruptedly at his post during the siege and bombardment of the town by the French in 1813. In 1817 he was appointed professor in the recently founded seminary at Wittenberg, and in 1822 accepted a call to the university of Bonn. He had received the degree of D.D. from Berlin in 1817; the occasion being his fine scholarship, and some dissertations in the Theologische Studien, which he edited (1816). In 1829 he published his System der christlichen Lehre (4th ed., 1851), of which an English translation was made by Robert Montgomery and Hennen, Edinburgh, 1849. This work defined his position towards rationalism, supernaturalism, and Schleiermacher. He said himself that he had learned more from his father, Daub, and Schleiermacher than from any other teacher, but had been obliged to draw
back from them all more or less." While he differed from Schleiermacher in the doctrine of God's relation to the world, the divine attributes, etc., he also substituted for Schleiermacher's "Christian consciousness" the Word of God itself. Notwithstanding these differences, however, he was willing to be placed at the side of Twesteu as the principal representative of Schleiermacher's theology; and he was never tired of magnifying that theologian's services in making a sharp distinction between metaphysics and theology. In this period, Nitzsch wrote his able reply to Möhler's work on symbols (Eine protestant. Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers), and made valuable and frequent contributions to the Theolog. Studien u. Kräften, under the editorial care of Ullmann and Umbreit. The most of these dissertations appeared, after the author's death, under the title Gesammelte Abhandlungen von Dr. K. I. Nitzsch, Gotha, 1870, 2 vols.

During the Bonn period (1822-47), Nitzsch also acted as university preacher, and took a very active participation in ecclesiastical affairs, such as the revision of the Liturgy, and the measures looking to the union of the Lutheran and Reformed communions. Of such an act he was heartily in favor, and in its interest wrote, among other things, Urkundenbuch d. evang. Union (Bonn, 1853) and Würdigung d. von Dr. Kuhnis gegen d. evang. Union u. deren theol. Vertreter gerichteten Angriffe (Berlin, 1854).

Nitzsch was called in 1847 to the university of Berlin, where he continued to labor as professor till his death. He was also honored with a seat in the highest ecclesiastical council (Oberconsistorium, changed in 1852 to the Oberkirchenrat), and was elected a representative to Parliament in 1849. In 1854 he was appointed provost of St. Nicolai Church, a valuable sinecure. On June 18, 1860, he was permitted to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his theological activity, and on June 24, 1868, his golden wedding. The most important literary work of the Berlin period, year of his entire life, was his Practical Theology (Praktische Theologie), begun in 1847, and finished in 1867 (second ed. 1859). The first book treats of the theory of church life; the second, of the practical at the present time. Besides these various works, volumes of sermons also appeared from his pen, a complete revised edition in 1867.

Nitzsch was a theologian "from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet." He was not brought up in Pietistic circles, and so did not develop the theory of Christianity out of his experience, but vice versa. Niebuhr once said to him, "I would willingly give all my learning if I had your faith." To this, Nitzsch replied, "To me, from the moral point of view, Thomas stands as high as Peter." See BEYSLACH: K. I. Nitzsch eine Lichtgestalt d. neueren deutsch-evang. Kirchengeschichte, Berlin, 1872.

FRIEDRICH NITZSCH.

NITZSCH, Karl Ludwig, professor of theology at Wittenberg; b. in Wittenberg, Aug. 6, 1751; d. there Dec. 5, 1831. He studied at the university of Wittenberg, and, after filling several pastorates, was appointed, in 1790, professor of theology there, and pastor of the city church. He was an ardent follower of Kant, and vigorously opposed the supernaturalists by regarding the essence of Christianity as consisting in its being a moral and rational religion, and faith in Christ as a subordinate matter. His principal treatises were collected in two volumes, De discrimine revelationis imperatoriae et didactice prolusionis academicae, Viteb., 1830.

NO (Ezek. xxx. 14), or, more completely, No-amon (Nah. iii. 9). It is the Biblical name of the old famous city of the "hundred gates" (Homer: Iliad., 9, 388), in Upper Egypt, which the Greeks called Thebes. The biblical name is formed after the Egyptian nu-amen ("the place of Amon"), the place in which Amon was worshipped, and is aptly rendered in the Septuagint by παρθήνιον, or θεσμός, as the Greeks liked to compare their Zeus with the Egyptian Amon. The Greek name is formed after the Egyptian taopo ("head"), or te-απι ("the great"). Thebes was one of the oldest cities in Egypt: its foundation is never spoken of. In the dawn of history, it was the centre of a sacerdotal kingdom. With the Theban dynasty, the first Theban, it comes to the foreground; and the twelfth dynasty, the second Theban, ruled not only in Thebes and Upper Egypt, but also in Memphis and Lower Egypt: its members were called "kings of both Egypt." During the eleventh dynasty, the Hyksos brought on a period of decay; but in the seventeenth century B.C., Amonis of Thebes, the founder of the eleventh dynasty, liberated the country from the barbarian invaders. Thebes then became the splendid centre of a magnificent kingdom. Situated on both sides of the Nile, at a point where the valley forms a plain of about ten miles breadth, it covered an area of a hundred and forty stadia in circumference, and contained a number of the most stupendous architectural constructions,—the temple of Amon, the royal tombs, the catacombs, etc. With the twenty-first dynasty, however, the royal families from Lower Egypt succeeded those from Thebes; and when, about one thousand years B.C., the residence of the Pharaohs was moved to the Delta, the splendor of the city was gone. It still continued a holy city, a city of glorious monuments and magnificent kingdoms. But its actual old. It did not begin until the days of the Persian conquest. At the time of Strabo it began to fall into ruins, and at present all that is left of it is some huge mounds of débris. See CALLIOUD: Voyage à l'Oasis de Thèbes, Paris, 1821; WILKINSON: View of Ancient Egypt and Topography of Thebes, London, 1835.

FRIEDRICH NITZSCH.

NOACHIAN PRECEPTS. See Noah.

NO'AH AND THE FLOOD. Noah, the son of Lamech (Gen. v. 28 sq.), was the tenth and last in the list of the Sthric line. His father gave him the name "Noah" because, in his actual old. It is the meaning to be put upon Gen. vi. 3. The Flood took place when Noah was six hundred years old (Gen. vii. 11); so that, at the time of receiving this revelation, he was four hundred and eighty years old. According to the Hebrew text, this event took place 1,656 years after the...
NOAH AND THE FLOOD.

creation: according to the LXX., 2,442; according to the Samaritans, 1,907. Noah was a "just man" (Gen. vi. 9), consecrated to God with his whole heart, and the fact seems to be implied in 1 Pet. iii. 20 (comp. Heb. xi. 7). The wonderful structure on which he worked was itself a sermon. If he communicated at all with his generation about the coming evil, he must have preached repentance; but his message found no reception.

The ark, which was divided into three stories, was 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, and 30 cubits high [or, allowing 21 inches for a cubit, as Professor Perowne does in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 553 feet long, 87 feet wide, and 52 feet high. The dimensions of "The Great Eastern" were 831 feet long (on deck), 83 broad, and 58 deep]. The author of his Commentary on Genesis, has calculated that the cubic contents were 3,600,000 feet, and shown, that, if nine-tenths of the space was occupied that the cubic contents might be stowed away, with 54 cubic feet high [or allowing 21 inches for a cubit].

The ark was 300 cubits long, 60 cubits broad, and 30 cubits high above the highest mountains. The design, as Delitzsch says, was not to destroy all animals in every part of the world, but to destroy the whole human race, with the exception of Noah's family. [It must be confessed that it is difficult to reconcile the language of the account of the Deluge with the supposition that it was of a merely partial. At the same time it must be allowed, that ethnological universality satisfies all the moral considerations which made the Flood necessary. Perowne and others have argued against the present Mount Ararat as the resting-place of the ark, on the ground that its summit is covered with perpetual snow and ice, which would have made the descent perilous if not impossible. The geological evidence for and against the geographical universality of the Flood has been much dwelt on. At one time the existence of shells on the tops of mountains was regarded as proof of the Flood, and Voltaire found much difficulty in setting this argument aside. Even within the last fifty years by so good an authority as Buckland, the skeletons of bears and other animals in the caves of Great Britain were looked upon in the same light. On the other hand, plausible geological evidence has been urged against the hypothesis of a universal deluge from the loose scoria on the flanks of Mount Etna, which show no marks of water action, the probability that certain classes of marine animals now living could not have continued to exist at so great a depth of water as the flood would have necessitated, etc.

The ark formed into the ark, with his wife, his three sons and their wives, on the tenth day of the second month of the sixth hundredth year of his life. On the seventeenth day of the month the "fountains of the great deep were broken up" (Gen. vii. 11). The flood had begun. The rainfall continued to fall for forty days, and the rise of the waters continued a hundred and fifty days (Gen. vii. 17-24). Noah stepped out upon the ark on the second day of the twentieth day of the second month of the following year (Gen. viii. 14). Whether the year was composed of lunar months or solar months, we have no data for deciding.

The region in which the flood occurred we can determine from our approximate knowledge of the territory inhabited by man at that time, and the place on which the ark rested. This was Mount Ararat, the well-known mountain in the Araxes Valley, Armenia, and not Dschebel Dscudi, in the Kurd Mountains, as Berosus and Abydenus (according to Josephus, Antiq., I. 8, and Eusebius), the Targums, the Peshito, the Mohammedan, and the most of the Oriental Christians, hold. This is evident from the combination of the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz, in Jer. ii. 27. The height of the great Mount Ararat above the sea, according to Parrot, 10,254 feet. It occupies a central location.

The extent of the flood seems at first sight to be defined as universal by Gen. vii. 19, which states that "all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered." It could be inferred that the meaning of this passage is that the flood covered the whole earth as that Eccles. i. 14 means that Solomon had actually "seen all the works that are done under the sun." According to Gen. vii. 20, the waters were fifteen cubits above the highest mountains. The design, as Delitzsch says, was not to destroy all animals in every part of the world, but to destroy the whole human race, with the exception of Noah's family. [It must be confessed that it is difficult to reconcile the language of the account of the Deluge with the supposition that it was of a merely partial. At the same time it must be allowed, that ethnological universality satisfies all the moral considerations which made the Flood necessary. Perowne and others have argued against the present Mount Ararat as the resting-place of the ark, on the ground that its summit is covered with perpetual snow and ice, which would have made the descent perilous if not impossible. The geological evidence for and against the geographical universality of the Flood has been much dwelt on. At one time the existence of shells on the tops of mountains was regarded as proof of the Flood, and Voltaire found much difficulty in setting this argument aside. Even within the last fifty years by so good an authority as Buckland, the skeletons of bears and other animals in the caves of Great Britain were looked upon in the same light. On the other hand, plausible geological evidence has been urged against the hypothesis of a universal deluge from the loose scoria on the flanks of Mount Etna, which show no marks of water action, the probability that certain classes of marine animals now living could not have continued to exist at so great a depth of water as the flood would have necessitated, etc.

There are other difficulties in the way of a universal flood; such as the difficulty of including all the kinds of animals now existing in the freight of the ark, the repopulation of the entire earth with animals, etc.]

On the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains became visible. Noah sent out a raven, which did not return; a dove, which found no rest for her feet; a second dove, which flew back with an olive-leaf in her mouth; and a third dove, which did not return. On the twenty-seventh day of the second month, a year and ten days after the beginning of the rain, Noah received the commandment to leave the ark. The account of the Flood in Genesis consists of an Elohistic and a Jehovistic record, but they agree perfectly with each other.

An important confirmation of the biblical record is furnished in the traditions of other nations. The most interesting of these accounts was found by George Smith, among the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the British Museum, which is much more full than the account of Berosus, and be-
trays a striking coincidence with the record of Genesis. Fragments of three copies of this original account, dating from 800 B.C., are also preserved. They belonged to the library of King Assurbanipal (9th century B.C.). The authorship of the Chaldæan inscription of Smith is assigned by this scholar to the seventeenth century B.C. Siat (Hapshadda), an old Chaldæan king, takes the place of the Xisuthros of Berosus and the Noah of Genesis. He describes the godlessness of the world, the divine command to build an ark, its construction, the flood, the resting of the ark upon a mountain, the despatch of the birds, including the raven, etc. In these points the Chaldæan account agrees with the record of Genesis. But there are certain differences which are very suggestive. Like the other accounts, the Chaldæan ascribes the scene to a locality connected with its own special habitation, and brings it into close relation with its national origin. The biblical account is in these respects more general, but, on the other hand, alone gives the indications of time, month, day, and year when it began, when it ended, etc.; and these marks of time stand in no relation whatever to the feats of the Jews. In these omissions and additions we have a strong pledge of the accuracy of the historian.

[Nägelsbach, in the first edition of Herzog, thus summarizes the traditions of the Flood, and refers to the literature. (1) The West Asian Traditions. — The Chaldæan (see above), Syrian (Lucian, De Dea Syria, xiii.), Phœnician (Sachuniathan, ed. Orelli, p. 32 sqq.), Phrygian, in the legends of Annakus (Zenob., Proc, 6, 10; Stephan. Byzant., De Urbibus), and on the celebrated coins of Apamœa. These coins have the picture of the emperor (Severus, Macrinus, or Philip) on one side, and on the other the picture of an ark or chest rocking upon the water, with the inscription N(A) ("Na"). A man and a woman are standing in the ark, and looking out of a window in the roof; on the outside, another man and woman are standing, in the attitude of having left the ark. Two birds are also depicted, — one flying towards the ark with a branch in its claw; the other resting on the ark. (2) The East Asian Traditions. — The Persian is little known. It is doubtless a later form of the Chaldæan, — a tradition of a universal flood. Some, however, recognize it in the flood of Jao. The Indian tradition is the most elaborate. The oldest form is given in the Catapathā-Bṛhadāraṇyaka. Man is saved in an ark from a flood which covers the whole earth. The Divine being, to whom he owes his escape, appears to him in the form of a fish. Later forms are found in the Mahābhārata. See Nīve: La tradition indienne du déluge dans sa forme la plus ancienne, Paris, 1831. (3) Traditions of the Classic Nations. — The Greeks knew of several great floods. Two are especially noteworthy, that of Ogyges (Varro, De rust., iii. 1; Servius, Virg. Eclog., vi. 14; Jul. Africanus, in Euseb. Prep. Ec., x. 10, etc.), and that of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Pindar, Ol., ix.; Ovid, Metam., i. 290-415, etc.). Plato, in the Timæus, speaks of the Egyptians as likewise knowing about the Flood. (4) Traditions of Other Nations. — The Celts had the tradition that all except Dwirwan and Dwirach were destroyed in a flood (Grimm: Deutsche Mythol., p. 516, etc.). The Laqs (De Serres: Cosmog., p. 191), the Greenlanders (Cranz: Hist. von Grönland, i. 292), the Mexicans, — among whom Coxet, Texpi, or Teo-Ciapactli stand for Noah, — and many tribes of Central and South America, have a similar tradition. The Semitic account of the destruction specially A. von Humboldt: Reise in d. Aequinoctialgegenden d. neuen Continents, iii. pp. 408 sqq.]

The Flood had a profound religious meaning. Its reality is assured by the relation which it is made to sustain to the great facts of salvation in the New Testament. It was a judgment upon the generation of Noah, but also a type of the final judgment (Matt. xxiv. 37 sqq.; Luke xix. 26; 2 Pet. iii. 5-7). The hope with which Lamech greeted Noah's birth was only partially fulfilled in him. The final abolition of the divine curse, and removal of human trouble, did not then occur. Noah is the first just man in the Bible who saves others from destruction; and in this respect he is a type of Him who saves the soul from destruction, and redeems it from time to eternity. Noah, having left the ark, erected an altar, and offered a burnt-offering, thus sending up to heaven, the dwelling-place of God, thanks and prayer. He received the rainbow in answer, and understood it to be a sign that the earth would not be cursed again, or all human life be destroyed. Henceforth man has authority over the life of the animals, and their flesh contributes to his nourishment. The race also has authority over the life of him who sheds his neighbor's blood (Gen. ix. 5). This authority was the beginning of human law, but also of war. On the basis of Gen. ix. 1 sqq., the Jewish rabbis built up the seven so-called "Noachian Laws:" (1) about judgments, (2) blessing God, (3) fleeing idolatry, (4) fornication, (5) effusing blood, (6) rape, (7) eating the parts of living animals.

Noah planted the vine; and on one occasion, while under the influence of wine, he was irrevocably treated by his son Ham. The curse of servitude was pronounced upon Ham's son Canaan, and his posterity. Shem and Japheth, the other two sons, who had shown proper respect for their father, were blessed, promising to dwell with Shem (for so Gen. ix. 27 is to be explained). This promise looks to the final goal of human history,— the return of God to the earth he had forsaken at the Flood. Noah lived 350 years after the Flood, and died 950 years old. Thereafter the length of human life gradually diminished. Shem was 600 years old at his death; Arphaxad, his son, who was born after the Flood, only 438. Peleg, in the fifth generation, only attained to the age of 298; and after him there is no example of any who reached a higher age than 200.

partial extent of the Flood (pp. 314-322), etc.;
Haupt: D. keilinschriftliche Sintfluthbericht, Leip-
zig, 1881; Lenormant: Beginnings of History, Eng.
trans., N. Y., 1882, pp. 582-488.) Volck.

NOAILLES, Louis Antoine de, b. May 27, 1851;
d. May 4, 1729; was educated for the church, and
made bishop of Cahors 1679, bishop of Chalons
1690, archbishop of Paris 1695, and cardinal
1700. In 1693 he accepted the Réflexions morales
of Quesnel, but in 1696 condemned the Exposition
de la foi, by Barceo. The bull Unigenitus he at
first openly opposed; and for some time he stood
as one of the leaders of the Jansenist party. But
in 1720 he assented to a compromise, and in 1728
he accepted the bull. See S. Pere Auvigny:
Mémoires chronologiques et dogmatiq., Paris, 1730;
Villefore: Anecdotes ou mémoires sur la consti-
tution Unigenitus, Paris, 1730; Baussset: Histoire
de Fénelon, Paris, 1808; Mémoires pour servir à
l'histoire ecclé. pendant le 18 siècle, 1806-15.

NOB (height), a city of the priests in Benjamin
(1 Sam. xxii. 19), north of, and so near to, Jeru-
salem, that the Holy City was visible from it (I
Kings xii. 24). It may be a confusion of the place
there, and there Ahimelech gave David the shew-
bread and the sword of Goliath. Saul was so
enraged by this conduct, that he destroyed all
the inhabitants of the city, with the exception of
Abiathar, who escaped (1 Sam. xxii., xxii.).
There were, possibly, other Nobs; but none
but the one
meant in the narrative cannot be identified with
any existing place; yet its site seems indicated
by some cisterns and old graves upon the ridge
to the north of the Upper Kidron valley. Cf.
Mühlau, in Riehm's Hanobelörerbuch.

NOBLE, Samuel, Swedenborgian, b. in London,
March 4, 1779; d. there Aug. 27, 1833. In 1810
he was one of the founders of the London society
for publishing the works of Swedenborg. In 1820
he left his profession of engraving for the Swe-
denborgian ministry in London. He issued two
noticeable original books, originally lectures—
Pienary Inspiration of the Scriptures asserted (1828),
and An Appeal in behalf of the Doctrines of the
New Church, 2d ed., 1838,— and a translation
of Swedenborg's Heaven and Hell.

NOCTURNS. See Canonical Hours.

NOD is mentioned in Gen. iv. 18 as the land
to which Cain fled after the murder of his brother.
It has proved wholly in vain to locate that land.
The name, from the root Ti3, means simply " the
land of exile;" but it is worth noticing that it
is placed to the east of Eden. Israel, and the
countries generally of Western Asia, knew, that in
East Asia there lived people who had a cer-
tain civilization, but upon whom they felt free to
look down with contempt. [See Lenormant:
Beginnings of History, New York, 1883.]

NOEL (from natais, " birthday," sc. Christ's),
a word frequently found in old Christmas carols.

NOEL, Hon. and Rev. Baptist Wriothesley
(1726), a brother of the first Earl of Gainsborough; b. at
Leithmont, Scotland, July 10, 1779; d. at Stan-
more, Middlesex, Jan. 20, 1873. Graduating at
Trinity College, Cambridge, he became a queen's
chaplain, and incumbent of St. John's, Bedford
Row, London. Leaving the Church of England,
he left his profession of engraving for the Swe-
denborgian ministry in London, lie issued two
publications in the same locality, and was eminent as a preacher and philan-
thropist. He published sermons: Notes of a Tour
in Switzerland, Essay on Christian Baptism (1849),
Letters on the Church of Rome (1851), and sundry
others, besides A Selection of Psalms and Hymns
(1852, enlarged, 1859), and Hymns about Jesus
(1869). Many of his works were his own. F. M. Bird.

NOEL, Hon. and Rev. Gerard Thomas, an
elder brother of the above; was b. Dec. 2, 1782;
and d. at Romsey, Feb. 24, 1851. He studied at
Edinburgh and Cambridge, and was settled at
Radwell, Herts; Rainham, Kent; and Richmond,
Surrey. In 1834 he was canon of Winchester, and
in 1840 vicar of Romsey. He published sundry
sermons, a hymn-book, and Aroendel, sketches
and poems. Two of his hymns are very graceful,
and have been widely used. F. M. Bird.

NOETIUS. See Monarchianism.

NOLASCUS, Petrus, b. about 1189, in Langu-
de; d. 1258, in Barcelona; founded in 1298 the
order of the Beata Maria Virgo de Mercede pro
Redempione Capiteorum, whose members consisted
of priests and knights, and whose special object
was to redeem Christian captives in Mohamme-
dan countries,— in extreme cases, when there
was danger of a conversion to Islam, even with
the sacrifice of liberty and life. The order
was confirmed by Gregory IX. in 1230, and obtained
in 1232 a magnificent home in the monastery of
St. Eulalia, in Barcelona. The order flourished
especially in Spain, but also in France and Italy.
By Benedict XIII. it was transformed into a com-
mon mendicant order (1255), and a century later
it was swept away by the revolution. See Act.
Sanct. Jan. 31; Holstenius: Codex regularum
monast., iii.; Hyelot: Histoire des ordres monas-

NOMINATIO REGIA. In the Frankish Empire
the kings acquired, even in the Merovinigan peri-
od, a decisive influence on the episcopal elections.
In the Carolingian period, and with the German
emperors, this influence grew into a formal right
of appointment ; so that the right of election,
originally belonging to the clergy and the people,
became completely lost. By the Concordat of
Worms, however, which ended the controversy of
investiture in 1122, a great change was effected
in Germany; the right of election being vested
in the chapters, while the real power of appointment
rested with the Pope. By later concordats the
kings have again obtained the right to nominate
bishops in Austria, Bavaria, France, Prussia, etc.;
but this nominatio regia does not in reality amount
to more than a presentation, as the bishop thus
ominated cannot enter into the rights and the
 duties of his office until he has been confirmed
by the Pope. Wässerschübel.

NOMOCANON. In the Greek language, κόσμος
meant the legislation by the church: νόμος, the
legislation by the secular government,— the
emperor. As the imperial legislation concerning
the church grew very large and very important, it
became necessary, or at least convenient, to com-
bine all νόμος of ecclesiastical import with the
κόσμος, thereby producing a complete collection
of ecclesiastical legislation,— a nomocanon. The
first collection of the kind was made in the six-
th century; a second was begun in the seventh, com-
pleted in the ninth by Paschasius Rophius in the
twelfth; a third, the so-called Synagigma, was made
in the fourteenth century by Matthäus Blastares.
NONCONFORMISTS. Their number included four hundred clergymen and nine bishops; —Sancroft of Canterbury, Turner of Elie, Lake of Chichester, Ken of Bath and Wells, Whitley of Peterborough, Thomas of Worcester, Lloyd of Norwich, Frampton of Gloucester, and Cartwright of Chester. Five were deprived of their sees in 1691; Thomas, Cartwright, and Lake having died in the mean time. A separate organization was formed; and nonjuring congregations continued to exist until the death of the last bishop, Boothe, in 1665. The separation introduced many changes from the usages of the Established Church. A book of Devotions for Primitive Catholics was compiled upon the basis of the Book of Common Prayer, but differing quite widely from it. See LATHBURY: History of the Nonjurores, 1845.

NONNOS, a word of Coptic derivation, and meaning "good," or "holy," and used in the early middle ages both in its masculine and feminine form, nonnus and nonna, is the name of a Greek poet who flourished at Panopolis in Upper Egypt in the fifth century. Among his works are a Άδωνισσα, a fantastic representation of the life of Dionysus, and a Μεταμορφώσει του καιρού νεωτερισμού, a paraphrase, in epic verse, of the Gospel of John. The latter, which has some interest for the critical examination of the text of the Gospel, was first printed at Venice (1501), by Aldus, and trans. into Latin by Ch. Hegendorphius in 1528. The latest and best edition is that by Aug. Scheindler, Leipzig, 1881. See A. KOECHLY: Opuscula philosophica, Leip., 1881, vol. i. CARL BERTRAU.

NON-JURORS, that is, the discharge of the duties of an office by a deputy or substitute, while the real occupants, though absent, continue enjoying the revenues, has, in the Roman-Catholic Church, been the subject of a long series of prohibitive laws, from the Council of Sardica to the Council of Trent, which finally settled the matter. In the oldest times the cause of non-residence seems generally to have been the pursuit of ambitious schemes: the bishop went to the metropolis to obtain influence at court, or he travelled in foreign dioceses to hunt out heresies, etc. Afterwards the cause was plurality of offices. The older legislation (bishop of Norwich) and Stillington condemned it. The severity of these odious laws was relaxed by James II., who was anxious to secure toleration for the Roman Catholics, William, and subsequent sovereigns. In 1667 the Declaration of Indulgence was passed, suspending the penal laws, and tests of qualification, though he dared not or cared not to repeal the Act of Uniformity was passed, requiring all clergymen to give their assent to the Book of Common Prayer. In 1664 the Convicted Act was passed, declaring it to be unlawful to be present at any religious meeting, not conducted according to the usages of the Church of England, where more than five persons in addition to the family were convened. In 1665 the most oppressive of these edicts, the Five-Mile Act, was passed, which enjoined upon nonconformists an oath against taking up arms against the king, or attempting any "alteration of government, either in Church or State," and forbade all who refused to come within five miles of any corporation represented in Parliament, or place where they had preached, on penalty of a fine of forty pounds and six months' imprisonment. The Test Act of 1673 incapacitated every person from holding any public office who had not publicly taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the usages of the Church of England. These acts occasioned great hardship. The bulk of the great livings throughout the country were in the hands of the Puritan clergy. Two thousand ministers were deprived of their benefices, and among them were some of the most pious, learned, and eminent divines of the day; such as John Howe, Baxter, Flavel, and Philip Henry. The court bishops fully sympathized with this legislation, and permitting the term during which a bishop was allowed to be absent from his see. The Council of Trent adopted a more effective measure, forfeiture of revenues. In the Church of England, non-residence caused by plurality of offices was at times very frequent. The 1 and 2 Vict. cap. 106, treats the question in a similar way as the Council of Trent.

NOPH (Isa. xix. 13; Jer. ii. 16), or Moph (Hos. ix. 6, Heb.), is the biblical name of some great Egyptian city; and according to the Septuagint, which, of course, in all Egyptian affairs, is a good authority, that city was Memphis, the celebrated metropolis of Lower Egypt. The common name of the city read in Egyptian Men-nefer, which in popular pronunciation became Men-noph; and from this latter the Greek Men-fis, the Coptic Menfis, the Arab Memfis, and the Hebrew Moph, were formed. The holy name of the city was Pu-Ptah, or Ha-Ptah, "the home of Ptah," Ptah being the principal god of the place. Herodotus ascribes its foundation to Menes, the founder of the first historical dynasty among them were some of the most pious, learned, and eminent divines of the day; such as John Howe, Baxter, Flavel, and Philip Henry. The court bishops fully sympathized with this legislation, and permitting the term during which a bishop was allowed to be absent from his see. The Council of Trent adopted a more effective measure, forfeiture of revenues. In the Church of England, non-residence caused by plurality of offices was at times very frequent. The 1 and 2 Vict. cap. 106, treats the question in a similar way as the Council of Trent.

NOPH (Isa. xix. 13; Jer. ii. 16), or Moph (Hos. ix. 6, Heb.), is the biblical name of some great Egyptian city; and according to the Septuagint, which, of course, in all Egyptian affairs, is a good authority, that city was Memphis, the celebrated metropolis of Lower Egypt. The common name of the city read in Egyptian Men-nefer, which in popular pronunciation became Men-noph; and from this latter the Greek Men-fis, the Coptic Menfis, the Arab Memfis, and the Hebrew Moph, were formed. The holy name of the city was Pu-Ptah, or Ha-Ptah, "the home of Ptah," Ptah being the principal god of the place. Herodotus ascribes its foundation to Menes, the founder of the first historical dynasty.
in Egypt; Diodorus, to the eighth king of the same dynasty. It stood on the left bank of the Nile, a few miles south of the point where the river splits, and forms the delta. The city covered an area of about a hundred and fifty stadia; it was narrow but long, stretching for several miles along the river, from whose inundation it was protected by huge dams. Containing a number of the most magnificent architectural monuments, such as the temples of Ptah and Isis, it continued a great and splendid city for many centuries, even during the period when Thebes was the residence. But, when Alexandria was founded, it lost its importance. Though Strabo mentions it as the second greatest city in Egypt, he noticed the first traces of decay; and when Cairo was founded, on the right bank of the river, and the temples and palaces of Memphis were used as convenient quarries, the city disappeared so completely, that its very site became uncertain, until fixed by the French expedition of 1798. But, though the city of the living has been so utterly destroyed, the city of the dead, the Pyramids, the great Sphinx, the Serapeon, the Apis tombs, and the numberless graves, with their inscriptions and reliefs, still remain. See LEPHUKI: Denkmäler aus Agypten, ii. 1; and EBER: Agypten, 1879-80, i. 185, ii. 172, 194, etc. KÜTSCHI.

NORBERT. See PREMONSTRANTS.

NORDHEIMER, Isaac, Ph.D., eminent Jewish scholar, b. at Memel, near Erlangen, Germany, 1809; d. in New-York City, Nov. 5, 1842. He took his degree at the University of Munich, 1834. Coming to New York, 1835, he was that year appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of New-York City; and from 1838 to 1841 was instructor in Hebrew in the Union Theological Seminary in that city, notwithstanding his persistent maintenance of his Hebrew faith. He was one of the best Hebrew scholars America ever had, as is evidenced by his works: Hebrew Grammar, New York, 1838-41, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1842; Christomathy, 1838; and pt. 2 of a Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, 1842 (in connection with Dr. S. H. Turner).

NORMAN ARCHITECTURE. See ARCHITECTURE.

NORRIS, John, a Platonic divine and poet; b. 1657; d. at Bemerton, in Wiltshire, 1711. He was a fellow of All Souls' College in Oxford. In 1692 he was rector of Newton St. Loe in Somersetshire, and, later, of Bemerton, where George Herbert had been one of his predecessors. He partly edited John Dunton's Athenian Mercury, and wrote, among other volumes, Reason and Religion, Christian Blessedness, Practical Discourses, and A Philosophical Discourse concerning the Immortality of the Soul. Of his Miscellanies, consisting of Poems, Essays, etc., the Preface is dated 1676, and nine editions appeared from 1687 to 1730. According to Mr. Catermole, "few have equalled Norris in the union of learning and sententious, metaphysical and logical, with sublime piety."

NORTH AMERICA. See CANADA, MEXICO, UNITED STATES.

NORTH, Brownlow, a distinguished evangelist of the Free Church of Scotland; the son of a clergyman of the Church of England, and grandson of Brownlow North, brother of Lord North, and Bishop of Winchester; was b. Jan. 6, 1810, at Chelsea; d. Nov. 9, 1875, at Tullichewan, near Edinburgh. He spent six years at Eton, where he was known as an acumen fellow of oration, and the most of his time was spent on the estates of relatives in Scotland. He was careless of religious duties, and known as a seeker of pleasure, until November, 1854, when, as he was visiting at Dallas Moors, Scotland, his whole spiritual nature underwent a radical change. While engaged at a game of cards, he suddenly became concerned about his spiritual welfare, and, feeling a sensation as of illness, said to his son, "I am a dead man. Take me up-stairs." The next day he announced publicly that he was a changed man. It is an interesting fact, that although he had been an inveterate smoker the year before, he had got into the habit of frequently going to sleep with a cigar in his mouth, he wholly relinquished the use of tobacco. For months Mr. North read nothing else but the Bible; and it is said, that, during the stirring events of the Crimean war, he knew nothing about them. He passed through months of temptation, but finally gained peace; and, eleven months after his conversion, began to distribute tracts among the destitute classes in Elgin, Scotland. In July, 1856, at the request of others, he began to make addresses in the churches of Dallas and Forres. He was immediately recognized as an earnest and forcible speaker, and from that time until the week before his death was an indefatigable preacher. In 1859 he was recognized by the Free Church of Scotland as an evangelist. The first ten years of his ministry he spent chiefly in Scotland. He took a prominent part in the great revivals in Ireland in 1859, and Scotland 1860, and preached in all the great cities of England and Scotland, and with conspicuous results. In 1871 he changed his residence from Elgin to London. Mr. North was a man under middle height, portly, deep-chested, broad-shouldered, of penetrating eye, and gentlemanly, dignified manners. It is said by those who knew him best, that the expression of his face changed after his conversion. His remains are preserved in the Dean Cemetery, Edinburgh. See the interesting biography by K. Moody-Stuart, London, 1878.

NORTH-WEST, Theological Seminary of the. See SEMINARIES, THEOLOGICAL.

NORTON, Andrews, D.D., Unitarian; b. at Hingham, Mass., Dec. 21, 1816; d. at Newport, R.I., Sept. 18, 1853. He was graduated from Harvard College 1834; studied theology, but was never settled; was tutor in Bowdoin College 1800-11; tutor of mathematics at Harvard 1811-13, librarian 1813-21, lecturer on biblical criticism and interpretation (succeeding Channing) 1818-19; and, on the organization of the Harvard Divinity School, was first Dexter professor of sacred literature 1819-20; after which, he still lived at Cambridge, engaged in literary labors, but in feeble health. He is recognized as one of the ablest of Unitarian scholars, radical in
his critical opinions, yet a believer in the supernatural, and an opponent of Theodore Parker. His book upon the Gospels (The Evidences of the Gospels, 2d ed., Cambridge, 1837—44, 3 vols.; 7th ed., 1857, 1 vol.) is a standard work in America and England. He demonstrates to the satisfaction of most scholars that the Gospels were written at the received dates and by their accepted authors, and therefore are trustworthy documents. Besides this work, he wrote A Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrine of Trinitarians concerning the Nature of God and the Person of Christ. Cambridge, 1833, new ed., with Memoir by Dr. W. Newell, Boston, 1856, 11th ed., 1876; On the Latest Form of Infidelity, 1839; Tracts concerning Christianity, Cambridge, 1852. Two posthumous publications deserve mention,—Internal Evidences of the Genuine Nature of the Gospels, Boston, 1855; and A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes, ed. by his son, 1855, 2 vols. (not thought successful). But these titles display only a portion of his literary activity. Sixthly, the period covered by the North American Review, Christian Examiner, and other periodicals. He was a poet of no mean order of merit; and "his few hymns, which appeared at intervals from 1809 to 1833, have been," says Professor Bird, "highly esteemed and largely used." Specimens of his poetical gifts will be found in Giswold's Poets and Poetry of America. He edited the Miscellaneous Writings of Charles Eliot, 1814, and of Levi Frisbie, with Memoir, 1823. See Memoir, in Statement of Reasons, etc., mentioned above, and art. in Allibone's Dict. Eng. Lit., vol. ii. s. v.

NORTON, John, b. at Stortford, Hertfordshire, Eng., May 6, 1806; d. in Boston, Mass., April 5, 1863. He was educated at Cambridge; took holy orders; embraced Puritanism, and emigrated to Plymouth, New England, October, 1835, and preached at Plymouth, Ipswich, and Boston. He wrote against the Quakers, The Heart of New England rent at the Blasphemies of the present generation (Cambridge, 1859), by which they were greatly exasperated.

NORWAY comprises an area of 122,279 square miles, with 1,602,172 inhabitants, of whom 1,794,781 are Lutherans, according to the last census of 1876. Christianity was introduced in the country in the tenth and eleventh centuries by Olaf Trygvason (995-1000) and St. Olaf (1014—31), both of whom had received baptism in Ireland. But, as the principal means of propaganda was the sword, the people remained pagan at heart long after they had officially become Christian. In 1152 the country obtained its own metropolitan,—the Archbishop of Nidaros (the present Trondheim), who had four suffragan bishops under him,—Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger, and Hamnem. In the twelfth century the tithe was introduced; in the thirteenth, the practice of celibacy: but the Roman-Catholic Church never became very powerful in the country. As Norway was united to Denmark from 1387 to 1814, and, during the last three centuries, governed as a Danish province, the two countries had for that period church and church history in common. The Reformation was introduced in Norway in 1536. The Norwegian Church became a State establishment, an exact copy of the Danish. A prominent feature of it was its intolerance. No other denomination than the Lutheran was tolerated. When Norway separated from Denmark, in 1814, and was formed into an independent kingdom in union with Sweden, its new constitution did not liberalize the organization of the Church. It continued to be necessary to belong to the Lutheran Church in order to hold any kind of government office; and conversion from Lutheranism to another denomination was punished with exile. Later changes, however, point a contrary moral. By a law of July 16, 1845, other Christian denominations obtained freedom of worship: by a law of July 21, 1851, the Jews were admitted, etc. The chief spiritual movements within the pale of the Norwegian Church were due to H. N. Hauge and N. F. S. Grundtvig, which articles see.

NORWICH (city of England, nine-eight miles north-east from London) became the seat of a bishopric transferred from Thetford, 1094. Its cathedral was commenced in that year by Bishop Herbert Losinga, and completed by Bishop Perry in 1856. Its tower was restored in 1866. It is chiefly of the Norman period. The present bishop of Norwich is Hon. and Rt. Rev. J. T. Pelham, D.D., who was consecrated 1857; and his stipend is £2,500.

NOSSELT, Johann August, a learned theologian; b. at Halie, May 2, 1734; d. at Halie, March 11, 1807. After studying at the university of his native town, where he came more especially under Baumgarten's influence, he travelled for two years, and, returning to Halie, he was made professor in 1760. In 1779 he was elected to preside over the theological seminary. His principal department was the New Testament. He published a defence of the truth and divinity of the Christian religion (Verheerigd. d. Wahrheit u. Göttilich. d. christl. Religion, Halle, 1766, 5th ed., 1783), but in later years withdrew from the orthodox stand-point, and denied the necessity of satisfaction. His reputation as a scholar was enhanced by the purity of his character. His modesty interfered with his becoming a prolific author. See NIEMEYER: Leben Nossels, Halle, 1809. HEINRICH DÖRING.

NOTKER, the name of several distinguished monks of the convent of St. Gall. —I. Notker Balbulus was b. about 840, in the vicinity of Thur, and not in Eng, as the untrustworthy Life of Notker (Vita s. Notkeri), by Ekkehart V., in the thirteenth century, states; d. April 6, 912, at St. Gall. He is the author of the Martyrologium which goes under his name, and which he based upon a similar work of Ado of St. Gall. His fame rests upon his Sequelae, a series of hymns of high merit, and written in a peculiar measure. Forty-one of these are found in the St. Gall Codex, No. 484, of the tenth century. Between 881 and 887 he dedicated the Sequences to Bishop Liutward of Vercelli, chancellor of Charles III., in a letter giving interesting details of their composition. A miniature portrait of Notker, dating from the tenth century, is preserved by the Zurich Antiquarian Society. He was canonized in 1513. See MEYER VON KNOHAU: Commentary to Ekkehart IV. : Canon s. Galli. The Sequences are given by PEZ: Thesaurus anecdot., i. 18—42. —II. Notker Medicus, or Pipis (in his Life, called account of his severe discipline), hospitarius in St. Gall 965; d. Nov. 12, 975. His medical attainments were so great, that he was called to the
court of Otto I. He was also known as a poet and painter, and was distinguished as "the most benign doctor" (benignissimus doctor). — III. Notker, Provost of St. Gall, Bishop of Lütich in 912, a statesman as well as a scholar; d. April 10, 1008.

— IV. Notker Labeo, the most famous teacher and scholar of the St. Gall convent; d. of the plague, June 29, 1022. He wrote the Libri expositionis, a series of expositions and translations of biblical, theological, and classical writings. Among these were the De consolatione and De trinitate of Boethius, Virgil's Bucolics, Aristotle's Categories, Job, the Psalms, etc. His translations won for him the title Transonus; and, according to Wacker-ernagel, his German style is pure and flowing.

[See Sequences.] MEYER VON KNOAUF.

NOTRE DAME. (our lady), the French designation of the Virgin Mary; and therefore a frequent name for Roman-Catholic churches in France. One of the most beautiful is the cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris.

NOTT, Eliphalet, a distinguished American clergyman and educator, president of Union College; was b. of poor parents in Ashford, Conn., June 25, 1773; d. at Schenectady, Jan. 29, 1860. His parents, who were farmers, died while he was a boy. While he lived with his brother, the Rev. Samuel Nott of Franklin, Conn., he studied the languages and mathematics, and taught school. At the age of seventeen he entered Brown University, and at twenty-two was licensed to preach. He spent the first two years of his ministry at Cherry Valley, combining the vocations of pastor, and principal in the academy, and in 1798 became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Albany. In 1804 he was elected to the presidency of Union College, an office which he filled with eminent dignity and ability. When he entered upon his duties, the institution had only fourteen students, and was in great pecuniary straits. Under his management it became one of the strongest literary institutions in the country, and thirty-seven hundred students graduated during his presidency. Drinot claims to notice by the improvements he introduced into the methods of heating; and his stoves at one time had an extensive reputation.

NOURIFF, Nicolas le, b. at Dieppe, 1647; d. in the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés, March 24, 1724; entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1665, and labored, for several years together, with Duchesne, Belliaie, etc. His chief independent work is his Apparatus ad Bibliothecam Maximam, an historical and critical treatment of the authors incorporated in the Bibl. Patrum Max., published at Lyons. Only two volumes appeared, comprising the authors of the first four centuries, Paris, 1694, and, in an enlarged form, Paris, 1703.

NOVALIS, the pseudonym of Friedrich von Hardenberg; b. at Wiedestedt, in the county of Mansfeld, near Eisleben, May 2, 1772; d. at Weissenfels, March 19, 1801. He studied jurisprudence and natural science at Jena, and held for some time a position in the Thuringien salines, but afterwards retired from practical life, partly on account of ill health, and devoted himself exclusively to literature. He was an intimate friend of Tieck and Schlegel; and his unfinished romances, — Heinrich von Ofterdingen and Die Lehrlinge zu Sais, — and his Hymnen an die Nacht, represent him a one of the extreme leaders of the Romantic school, seeing a miracle in the most common natural occurrences, while the most awful supernatural events looked quite tame in his eyes. His best works, however, are his Geistliche Lieder, in which the peculiar sweetness and tenderness of his nature, the early teachings of the Moravian Brethren, to whom he belonged, his intimate intercourse with Zinzendorf and Lavater, and the aesthetical principles and tendencies of the Romantic school, are blended into perfect harmony. They were translated into English (Spiritual Songs) by George MacDonald, London, 1876. His complete works were edited by Tieck and Schlegel, Berlin, 1862, with an addition, 1874. See CARLYLE'S ESSAY ON NOVAlis, in his Miscellaneous Writings, 1876.

NOVATIAN. The whole Latin tradition, with the exception of those theologians of the fourth century who stood under Greek influence (Damasus, Prudentius, the Deor. Gelas., etc.), calls the great schismatic Novatianus; while by Greek authors his name is generally written Novatianos. Only Dionysius of Alexandria calls him Novatianos. The party he formed is generally designated as Novatiani: only once Cyprian writes Novatianenses (Ep., 73, 2). When Epiphanius (Anclorat., 13) calls the Novatians of Rome Montenses, he probably confounds them with the Donatists.

According to Philostorgius (Hist. Eccl., viii. 16),
Novatian was a native of Phrygia. Probably, however, this notice rose from the circumstance that he afterwards found many adherents in Phrygia; or perhaps it was purposely manufactured in order to throw suspicion on a connection between him and the Montanists. With respect to his life before the schism, we depend entirely upon the spiteful and mendacious letter of Cornelius (Ep. ad Fabiam Antioch.). Cyprian, Pseudo-Cyprian, and Socrates give very little, and Eulogius is wholly unreliable. The plain facts seem to be these: during a severe illness, which even made the aid of an exorcist necessary, Novatian received the clinical baptism without any consecutive episcopal confirmation. Such a form of baptism, however, was not generally recognized as valid; and, when he was ordained a presbyter by a bishop of Rome (either Fabian or his predecessor), his ordination, we are told, met with great opposition, both among the clergy and the laity, on that account. Otherwise he enjoyed great reputation in the congregation for learning and eloquence, as may be gathered from the letters of Cyprian (55, 24; 51, 2; 60, 3; 48, 2); and his official activity, as well as his private life, must have been without blemish, since Cornelius found only one dark spot to point to. At the time, he tells us, when the persecution was at its height, Novatian kept himself shut up in his house; and, when the deacons admonished him to come to the aid of those who were in danger, he became angry, and threatened to resign his office, alleging at the same time, as an excuse for his behavior, that he belonged to "another philosophy." The story is proved false by the simple fact, that after the martyrdom of Fabian (Jan. 20, 250), Novatian took charge of the official correspondence of the congregation. And, as for the equivocal expression, "another philosophy," it later on became a favorite trick among his adversaries to represent his conceptions of sin and penance as the outcome of the Stoical philosophy, simply in order to cover up their own deviation from the principle hitherto held by the church. In reality he had as little to do with the Stoical philosophy as they themselves. The origin and further development of his views are not doubtful. Idolatry, adultery, fornication, and murder, were punished in the Catholic Church by formal excommunication. This practice was first broken by the peculiar power which was ascribed to the confessors,— in accordance with an archaic idea which lived on to the end of the third century,— and then by an edict of Pope Calixtus I., which spoke of re-admittance into the church as a possibility. The edict caused the schism of Hippolytus; but, as the schism was healed towards the middle of the third century, it seems probable that the successors of Calixtus returned to the old, more rigorous practice. At all events, it must be observed that the new and milder views were applied only to sins of the flesh. As none who in the peaceful period between 220 and 250 relapsed into Paganism was likely to ask for re-admittance into the Christian Church, idolatry was left entirely out of consideration. But, with the outbreak of the Decian persecution, a great change took place. The number of the lapsed became so great, that the very existence of the congregations was endangered.

It was, however, by no means a simple practical consideration which compelled the church to change its practice. The dogmatical development led it in the very same direction. If, namely, the church, with its hierarchical constitution, were an indispensable means of grace extra quam nulla salus, how could it be hoped that God would ever re-admit into grace a sinner to whom the church had refused absolution and reconciliation? Indeed, when individual man could enter into relation with God only through the priest, his salvation became absolutely dependent on his connection with the clergy and the church. Now, it is very true that these ideas did not reach their full development until the end of the Decian persecution (see Cyprian: De unitate ecclesiae and De lapsis); but it is also true that the whole doctrinal and constitutional development of the church had for a long time tended towards that point. The very practice (generally adopted throughout the church in 250) of absolving the penitent lapsed immediately before death was a move, perhaps unconscious, in the direction indicated: and there is absolutely nothing which indicates that originally Novatian was either theoretically or practically opposed to the movement.

After the death of Fabian, in the beginning of the Decian persecution, no new bishop was elected in Rome. As he could probably not be elected without his name being given to the police (Cyprian: Ep. 55, 9), he would be sure to be immediately put to death; and thus it happened that the see remained vacant for fifteen months. During the interval, the congregation was represented and governed by the college of presbyters and deacons, which, when complete, consisted of fifty-three persons (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 43, 11). Among those members of the college who are known to us, Novatian stands in the first rank; while the name of the later bishop, the presbyter Cornelius, is never heard of. Of special interest for the history of this interval are the three letters which the Roman clergy issued, and which have come down to us in the correspondence of Cyprian (8, 30, 36). The second of those letters is certainly written by Novatian, and it may be plausibly assumed that he also wrote the two others.

In the first, the Roman clergy state, that, though they have separated from the lapsed, they have by no means abandoned them. On the contrary, if any penitent falls sick, and wishes to enter again into communion with the church, they re-admit him. Cyprian recognized the maxim as authoritative. In Ep. 15-17 he never speaks of the dying; but in Ep. 18 he acknowledges, and quotes the letter from Rome in his support, that the dying must be re-admitted. Thus it was Rome which first turned the Bishop of Carthage in the direction of mildness and forbearance. In the second letter, the Roman clergy state, that, in agreement with other bishops present in Rome, they have adopted a middle course with respect to the lapsed, and that no new disciplinary measures will be adopted until after the election of a bishop; which implies, that, from principle, Novatian, the writer of the letter, was not opposed to the introduction of new measures. The three letters show, as does the correspondence between Cyprian and the Roman confessors Moses, Maximus, etc., that at that time there reigned perfect
agreement, both in Rome itself and between Rome and Cyprian. Indeed, down to the spring of 251, not the slightest foreboding can be found of the coming schism in Rome. But in March, 251, Cornelius was elected bishop of Rome. He was elected by a majority, and, as it would seem, in accordance with all accepted rules. Nevertheless, there was in Rome a minority, consisting of several persons, who were the most revered confessors, which was unwilling to accept the issue of the election, but put forward Novatian as anti-bishop, and had him ordained by three Italian bishops. Thus the schism began. It is evident, however, that though Cornelius represented the laxer, and Novatian the sterner, portion of the congregation, there was, in the beginning of the contest, no theoretical point of controversy, but simply a conflict between two persons. On the one side, a theoretical difference between Cornelius and Novatian is, in the correspondence between Cyprian and Cornelius (Ep., 45), even not hinted at until Ep. 54; and it is further proved by the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Novatian (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 43) and by Pseudo-Cyprian (Ad Novatianum, 14). The contest began as a merely personal conflict, and Cornelius proved the more fortunate. In the spring of 251, even before he could leave his place of refuge, and return to his congregation, Cyprian was, by the schism of Felicissimus, compelled to abate his rigor, and consent to the re-admittance of the lapsed; and this step naturally placed the emphasis of the fact of the schism, without entering upon a condemnation of the theory of the schismatics. On the other side, it has been shown above, that Novatian was not from principle opposed to the re-admittance of the lapsed; and this is further proved by the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Novatian (Eusebius: Hist. Eccl., VI. 45) and by Pseudo-Cyprian (Ad Novatianum, 14). The contest began as a merely personal conflict, and Cornelius proved the more fortunate. In the spring of 251, even before he could leave his place of refuge, and return to his congregation, Cyprian was, by the schism of Felicissimus, compelled to abate his rigor, and consent to the re-admittance of the lapsed. This step naturally placed him on the side of Cornelius, though Novatian and the confessors Maximus and Moses had hitherto been his supporters in Rome. He recognized Cornelius, though not in so precise and unequivocal terms as the latter wished. Their friendship, however, soon became firmly cemented by the arrival of Novatus in Rome. Novatus was a zealous adherent of Felicissimus, and one of the most decided party of the schismatics. On the one side, he in Rome joined Novatian, though on the point in question he held the very opposite views, cannot now be made out; but the circumstance contributed much to bring Cornelius and Cyprian nearer to one another. In the summer of 251 the confessors left Novatian, and returned to the Catholic Church; not, as Cornelius says, deceived by the cunning, lies, and perjuries of the schismatic and heretical beast Novatian, but, as they say themselves, in order to restore peace and unity to the church. The loss was, nevertheless, of great effect on the position of the schismatic community in Rome. In other countries, quite a number of bishops rejected the laxer practice. Some joined Novatian, though without breaking with the church: others simply declared in favor of him. In Fabius of Antioch he found a very warm friend; but he died just before the great Oriental synod convened at Antioch, and did not see the milder version of the theory adopted by that assembly. Nevertheless, the schism gradually assumed very dangerous proportions in the East, the views of Novatian finding many adherents in Egypt, Armenia, Fontus, Bithynia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia.

In the beginning of the controversy the question was not about the casus moris, or the sacrifice, or the relation of the bishop to the presbyters and confessors, or the efficacy of penitence, etc. It is simply a stubbornly repeated calumny, that Novatian or his party ever declared that the lapsed were to be rejected by the church, and the Catholic Church afterwards adopted the view that the excommunicated could not be saved, the calumny appears to have had its reason. Though all those questions were raised and answered during the progress of the schism, the true principle at stake in the controversy was that of the power of the keys. The great ruling party rejected its theory from Cyprian, though that theory was fully developed only in the West, and not until the time of Augustine. In a general way the party argued, that Scripture enjoined mercy and love; that the church could not abandon the lapsed to the world, to heresy, and to schism; that the confessors, including Maximus and Moses, had hitherto been his supporters in Rome. He recognized Cornelius, though not in so precise and unequivocal terms as the latter wished. Their friendship, however, soon became firmly cemented by the arrival of Novatus in Rome. Novatus was a zealous adherent of Felicissimus, and one of the most decided party of the schismatics. On the one side, he in Rome joined Novatian, though on the point in question he held the very opposite views, cannot now be made out; but the circumstance contributed much to bring Cornelius and Cyprian nearer to one another. In the summer of 251 the confessors left Novatian, and returned to the Catholic Church; not, as Cornelius says, deceived by the cunning, lies, and perjuries of the schismatic and heretical beast Novatian, but, as they say themselves, in order to restore peace and unity to the church. The loss was, nevertheless, of great effect on the position of the schismatic community in Rome. In other countries, quite a number of bishops rejected the laxer practice. Some joined Novatian, though without breaking with the church: others simply declared in favor of him. In Fabius of Antioch he found a very warm friend; but he died just before the great Oriental synod convened at Antioch, and did not see the milder version of the theory adopted by that assembly. Nevertheless, the schism gradually assumed very dangerous proportions in the East, the views of Novatian finding many adherents in Egypt, Armenia, Fontus, Bithynia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia.
either in miserable delusion, or in bursting asunder the whole existing Christendom.

According to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., IV. 28) and some later Cathari (see Eulogius in Photius: Biblioth., 208, 280), Novatian suffered martyrdom. But the report is doubtful; and the acts, dating from the sixth century, are spurious. During the next two generations, after the Decian persecution, the Church of the Cathari became consolidated. Many Montanist congregations joined it, especially in Phrygia. In constitution and doctrine the difference between the Catholic Church and the Church of the Cathari was very small. Besides the question of discipline, — which the Novatian bishop Asclepiades formulated thus, "For deadly sins the Catholics excommunicate; the Cathari for one of the most eminent ecclesiastics and preachers of the Elizabethan period; was b. at Read Hall, Whalley, County of Lancaster, 1507 or 1508; d. in London, Feb. 13, 1562. He was educated at Middleton, near Manchester, and at Brasenose College, which he entered at thirteen. He was the "chamber-fellow" of Foxe the martyrologist, and was made bachelor of arts in 1536. In 1543 he was appointed master of Westminster School, London, he being the second incumbent of that position; was licensed to preach in 1550; preached in some of the "notablest places and auditoriums of the realm;" and in 1551 received a stall at Westminster. He adopted the principles of the Reformation, and, at the accession of Mary, fled to the Continent, where he tarried at Strassburg and Frankfurt, in intimate intercourse with the exiles, who subsequently became eminent under Elizabeth. Returning to England at Elizabeth's accession, he was made archdeacon of Middlesex, and canon of Canterbury in 1560; was appointed one of the commissioners to visit several of the dioceses, and dean of St. Paul's. It was during his incumbency, on June 4, 1561, that the spire of the cathedral was burned. Nowell was henceforth regarded as one of the first scholars in the realm, and took a prominent part in all ecclesiastical matters. In 1563 he was chosen prolocutor of the convocation of Canterbury, and presided over those sessions which revised and settled the Articles of Religion in 1552, his books at the controversy with Dorman, who attacked Jewell's Apology. His services were in great demand on all public occasions and at the funerals of eminent men. He was chosen to make the first public announcement from the pulpit of the destruction of the Armada before the lord-mayor, aldermen, etc. Izaak Walton says Nowell was "noted for his meek spirit, deep learning, prudence, and piety," and mentions with sympathetic approval his devotion to angling, in which he is said to have spent one-tenth of his time. Nowell is the author of one or more catechisms, which were "allowed and approved" by Parliament. In 1563 The Catechism was presented to the upper, and a Catechismus puerorum to the lower, house of convocation. Whether these were identical, or two different catechisms (and in this case both written by Nowell), it is difficult to determine. Church holds to the latter view. In 1571 a catechism by Nowell was printed in Latin. It was prescribed by Archbishop Parker to be taught; and it heads a list of books for the extirpation of heresy, which the University of Oxford prescribed in 1570. It is also probable that Nowell was the author of The Church Catechism. See
A Catechism written in Latin by Alexander Nowell, together with the same Catechism translated into English by Thomas Norton (with an appendix containing a sermon of Nowell, preached at the opening of Parliament, 1563), edited for the Parker Society by G. E. Corrie, Cambridge, 1853. For Nowell's biography, see Fuller's Worthies of England; Churton: Life of A. Nowell, Oxford, 1849.

Nowell, Laurence, brother of the former, and Dean of Lichfield; entered Brasenose College, 1526; d. October, 1576. He was a learned Anglo-Saxon scholar, and left a dictionary of Anglo-Saxon in manuscript.

Noyes, George Rapall, D.D., Unitarian, b. in Newburyport, Mass., March 6, 1798; d. in Cambridge, Mass., June 8, 1868. He was graduated at Harvard College 1818; studied theology there, and was licensed 1822; pastor at Brookfield and Petersham, Mass.: from 1840 till his death, Hancock professor of Hebrew and other Oriental languages, and Dexter lecturer on biblical literature in Harvard University. He was a fine scholar, especially in sacred philology, and published original translations, with notes, of Job (Cambridge, 1827, 2d ed., Boston, 1838), Psalms (Boston, 1831, 2d ed., 1846), the Prophets (1833-37, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1843), Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles (1846), the New Testament, from Tischendorf's text (7th and 8th editions), 1868. The latter was complete in manuscript at the time of his death; but its publication was partly posthumous, as the proofs were read by its author only as far as Philippians. Dr. Ezra Abbot carried it through the press, and edited the remainder of the translation, appending a few notes. The text is divided into paragraphs, but not into verses, which are merely indicated by numerals upon the margin. The translation is characterized by critical exactness, good taste, and a reverent spirit.

Numbers. See Pentateuch.

Nun, Nunnery. The word "nun" is most probably derived from the Coptic nonnos ("holy"), which in early medieval Latin was applied both to monks (nonnas) and to nuns (nonna). Other appellations were mona, monacha, monialis, etc. Even in the first century of its history, the Christian Church had its female ascetics, as well as its male ones. They were called virgines Deo sacrata ("virgins consecrated to God"), and lived with their families, though in retirement, and devoting themselves to practical piety in the service of the poor and the sick. They were consecrated by the bishop, who received their vow, and presented them with their peculiar garments,—the sombre-colored mantle, the veil, and the gold-embroidered head-dress (nitreli). The transition from asceticism to monasticism took place at the same time and in the same manner among the female ascetics as among the male ones, and associations of female ascetics, or nuns, occur in the times of Jerome and Ambrose. They stood under the supervision of the bishops, from whom they also received their rules. Their daily worship they performed in a domestic oratory, and only on Sundays they visited the neighboring church. In the sixth century, however, they obtained their own cloister-churches, in which service was performed by a special priest; and absolute or almost absolute seclusion from the world gradually became one of the most prominent features of female monasticism. At the head of the nunnery stood an abbess, a prioress, or a mother-superior. See Monastery.

Nuncio. See Legate.

Nuremberg, The Religious Peace of. At the close of the diet of Augsburg (Nov. 19, 1530), it was apparent that the emperor, Charles V., had decided to regulate the religious affairs of Germany according to his own will, even though it might be necessary to use armed force. Consequently, early in 1531, the Protestant princes met at Schmalkald, and concluded there an alliance for armed defence. In a short time, however, the situation was completely changed. The Protestant princes sought and found support in France; and the Turks, under Soliman, threatened to invade Hungary and Austria. Without the aid of the Protestant princes, the emperor could not hope to make any successful defence against the Turks; and in the spring (1532), he opened negotiations with them. Those negotiations led to the so-called "religious peace of Nuremberg" (July 28, 1532), by which the status quo was confirmed and guaranteed until a general council could be convened. For the Protestant cause, this peace was a decisive victory.
OAK.

There are six Hebrew words (תָּל, תַּלֶּה, תַּלָּה, תַּלֶּנ, תַּלָּנ, תַּלְנ, from עָלָה, עָלָנ, or עָלָם, "to be strong") thus interpreted from a root which means strong. There are three species of oak in Palestine, — Quercus pseudo-cocci/era, Q. agl/ops, and Q. in/ectoria. The first is the prickly evergreen oak, of which a fine specimen is "Abraham's Oak," near Mamre, which is twenty-three feet in girth; but the tree ordinarily is not higher than twelve feet: its leaf is like the holly's in shape, but smaller. The second is the Valonia oak, with a massive trunk, and great height. Of this kind were the famous "oaks of Bashan" (Isa. ii. 12, 13; Zech. xi. 2). Its acorns are very large, and are eaten by the poor; and their cups, which are used by tanners, are exported. This oak is found only in Northern Palestine, and east of the Jordan. The third kind is found, but rarely, in Samaria and Galilee.

Oaks play a part in the religious practices of Oriental and Occidental nations. Idols were made of oak (Isa. xliii. 14), and oaks marked places of sacrifice (Hos. iv. 18; Isa. i. 29), and also of burial (Gen. xxxv. 8; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13). To-day the evergreen oak is usually found near the Welles, or prophets' tombs. In the lands of the Goths and the Cossacks the oak was venerated, and Winfred excited intense horror by cutting down an enormous oak sacred to Thor. So in early Britain the Druids venerated the oak above all other trees. Oak-groves were their temples, and indeed the very name Druid probably means "oak." The oak was the symbol of the Supreme Being,—Hesus. The mistletoe, which grew upon the oak, represented man in his dependent state; and it was cut with imposing ceremony in December of each year.

OATES, Titus, the inventor of the famous Popish Plot; b. at London about 1619; d. in London, July 23, 1705. The son of a Baptist clergyman, he studied at Merchant Taylors' school and Cambridge, and entered the Baptist ministry; afterwards took orders in the Church of England; was a chaplain in the navy; and entered the Roman-Catholic Church, tarrying for some time in the Jesuit houses of Valladolid and St. Omer. He was expelled from these institutions for misconduct: but, while he was an inmate, he had heard of a meeting of Jesuits held in London; and "on his expulsion," as Mr. Green says, "this single fact widened in his fertile brain into a plot for the subversion of Protestantism and the death of the king." About this time (1678) there was a great deal of suppressed anxiety among the Protestants of England in view of the machinations and activity of the Roman Catholics, and the well-known sympathy with them of Charles II., and especially the Duke of York, heir to the throne. Oates took advantage of this state of the public mind, and claimed to have evidence of a huge Popish Plot for the extirpation of Protestantism. He brought the matter to the notice of the king, who probably smiled at it, and made public affidavit to the alleged facts before Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, declaring he had been intrusted with letters touching the Jesuit plans. The excitement over the revelations was increased by Lord Shaftesbury, who had just been released from prison, for political reasons fell in with the popular feeling, and exclaimed "Let the treasurer cry as loud as he pleases against Popery, I will cry a note louder." The popular agitation was increased to frenzy by the murder of Godfrey, which was construed into an attempt to stifle the plot. The two houses of Parliament instituted an investigation of the matter. Five peers, including Arundel and Bellasays, were sent to the Tower. Patrols guarded the streets; chains were drawn across them; the houses supplied with arms, etc. Parliament at the end of the year (1678) passed a bill excluding Roman Catholics from both houses, which was left un-repealed for a century and a half. The excitement was beginning to subside, when one Bedloe, stimulated by the reward which had been offered, appeared on the scene, and again aroused the national frenzy to its former intensity by more circumstantial and aggravating revelations than those of Oates. He swore to a plot for the landing of an army and the massacre of the Protestants. Oates had been treated like a hero, and assigned rooms at Whitehall, with a pension of twelve hundred pounds. But a revulsion of public feeling took place after the execution of Stafford in 1680; and the Duke of York, whom he had severely accused, secured a verdict for defamation of character. Oates was condemned to pay a fine of a hundred thousand pounds, and sent to prison. On the accession of the duke to the throne, he was further punished by being put in the pillory, and whipped from Oldgate to Newgate, and from thence to Tyburn. It is said his back received seventeen hundred lashes. Taken back again to prison, he recovered; and, at the accession of William and Mary, the conviction of Oates was declared to have been illegal, and he was not only pardoned, but granted an annual pension of four hundred pounds.

There is no doubt that there was an intense activity on the part of the Roman Catholics to re-assert their supremacy in England in the latter years of the reign of Charles II. Not only the Duke of York, but Charles himself, sympathized with the movement. But that there was any well-defined conspiracy to land an army in England, and massacre the Protestants, is usually denied by historians, and Titus Oates declared a shameless impostor. But the Jesuit houses in England, especially Green: History of the English People, iii. 421 sqq.

OATH. I. In the Old Testament. — Assertions by oath of the truth of a statement, and confirmations by oath of some promise given, or duty assumed, accompanied with appeals to God, and also with curses of one's self in case of falsehood or fraud, occur frequently and at all times in the history of Israel, both in private and public life (Gen. xxiv. 37, 1. 5; Josh. ix. 15; Judg.
symbolical customs connected with the oath can hand under the thigh (Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii. 29). While in later times the Essenes refrained altogether from taking an oath, a still severer condemnation of the direct one; partly because the oath was often taken by the less respectable witnesses and pledges of the Arabs (Herodot. i. 100), and thence the phrase, "to lift the hand", gradually became synonymous with "swearing" (Exod. vi. 8). Whether the Hebrew word הָנִיךְ ("to swear") has reference to any other symbolical customs connected with the oath cannot now be made out. Its root is חָנֵךְ ("seven "), and it may refer to the peculiar sacredness of that number; notice the offering of seven animals in the patriarchal period (Gen. xxii. 28), the seven witnesses and priests of the Arabs (Herodot. 3, 8), the worship of the seven planets (Pausan., 3, 20, 9), etc. A special emphasis the oath received in the patriarchal days by placing "the hand under the thigh" (Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii. 29). While in later times the Essenes refrained altogether from swearing (Josephus: Bell. Jud. 2, 8, 6), the Pharisees seem to have treated the oath with frivolous superciliousness. In later times women were not allowed to take an oath (Philo: Op., ii. p. 274); but originally the law knew no such restriction (Num. v. 18, xxx. 4). See Staudlin: Geschichte der Vorstellungen vom Eide, 1825, ii. 539.

II. In the New Testament. — Among the subjects which Christian ethics has to treat is also the oath. It is sometimes treated in the chapter on truthfulness, as if the principal question were, whether by the oath truth was made still more obligatory to the Christian. But its proper place is in the chapter on our direct relation to God, and the principal question is, whether such a use of the name of God as is required by the oath is permitted.

James declares altogether against the use of oaths (v. 12), and a similar prohibition is given in the words of Jesus (Matt. v. 33-37). The passage has been differently interpreted; but, without destroying its true logical articulation, it can be construed only in one way. Over against the commandment of the old dispensation, not to swear falsely, Jesus places the commandment of the new dispensation, not to swear at all: and when, in his enumeration of the various formulas of oaths, he omits the direct appeal to God, he could do so without incurring the risk of being misunderstood, partly because his condemnation of all the usual indirect formulas involves a still severer condemnation of the direct one; partly because the oath was often taken by the less respectable hearers, the Jews, on account of their shyness for mentioning the name of God. If, however, the passage is thus interpreted as a definite prohibition of swearing, it comes into conflict with other passages of the New Testament. The words of Paul in Rom. i. 9, Phil. i. 8, Gal. i. 20, 1 Thess. ii. 5, and 2 Coll. i. 28, have certainly the character of the oath. And when Jesus descends to answer the question of the high priest (Matt. xxvi. 63), though it is couched in the very formulas which were employed when oaths were taken in the courts, he allows his own words to assume the same character; not to mention that the passage Heb. vi. 16 could never have been written if swearing had been absolutely prohibited among the first Christians. But how is this contradiction to be solved? In exactly the same way as the contradictions between the other prohibitions of the Sermon on the Mount, — not to be angry, not to scold, — and the very actions of Jesus himself when in holy wrath he rebukes the Pharisees. Only when issuing from the lower egotistical affections and impulses of human nature, anger and reproach, etc., are forbidden; what is, under circumstances, which, for instance, would make an oath simple profane swearing. Quite otherwise when the same act is performed for the sake of the highest ethical interests; as, for instance, when the civil authorities demand an oath in order to reach the truth, and make justice safe.

In this way the doctrine of the New Testament concerning oaths was conceived by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. In many recent Protestant systems of ethics (Wuttke, Palmer, Schmid) the oath is considered as a necessary evil, — necessary on account of the moral state of the human race. When the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Mennonites, and the Quakers absolutely reject the oath, it is not so much on account of a too literal conception of Holy Writ, as because of a shyness of conscience with respect to the awful responsibility of the act. J. KÖRTH.
means of ascertaining the truth (assertory oaths), and as a means of securing the fulfilment of duty (promissory oaths). But, on account of the religious origin and character of the institution, it was quite natural that the Church should exercise a considerable influence on its organization, and even wish to exercise a kind of control over its proceedings. Thus the medieval Church not only opposed, but, according to some, perhaps directly opposite, in accordance with some legal propositions, which from the canon law were transferred to the civil law, but she also demanded that this whole sphere should be placed under her jurisdiction. The subject is principally treated in Decretum Gratiani, Causa XXII., the collection of decreta of Gregory IX., 2, 24, the Liber Sextus, and the Clementines. Of special interest is the decretal of Innocent III. (c. 26, X. de jurur.), which, following Jerome, defines the proper use of the oath and its misuse under the three heads, — veritas in mente, iudicium in jurante, and iustitia in objecto.

Proceeding. Thus the mediaeval Church not only perhaps directly opposed, but, according to some legal propositions, which from the canon law were transferred to the civil law, but she also demanded that this whole sphere should be placed under her jurisdiction. The subject is principally treated in Decretum Gratiani, Causa XXII., the collection of decreta of Gregory IX., 2, 24, the Liber Sextus, and the Clementines. Of special interest is the decretal of Innocent III. (c. 26, X. de jurur.), which, following Jerome, defines the proper use of the oath and its misuse under the three heads, — veritas in mente, iudicium in jurante, and iustitia in objecto.

The mediaeval Church not only opposed, but, according to some legal propositions, which from the canon law were transferred to the civil law, but she also demanded that this whole sphere should be placed under her jurisdiction. The subject is principally treated in Decretum Gratiani, Causa XXII., the collection of decreta of Gregory IX., 2, 24, the Liber Sextus, and the Clementines. Of special interest is the decretal of Innocent III. (c. 26, X. de jurur.), which, following Jerome, defines the proper use of the oath and its misuse under the three heads, — veritas in mente, iudicium in jurante, and iustitia in objecto.

On the general supposition that he regarded the occupation of the city as a thing of the past, the reference can hardly be to (1) the occupation of Nebuchadnezzar, for the prophet speaks in a tone of warning (ver. 12 sq.), and was evidently used by Jeremiah (xlix. 7-22); nor (2) the occupation under Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii. 8 sq.), for it was not mentioned in the book of Kings (or mine, 18 sq.), for Obadiah speaks of foreigners as the invaders; but (4) the occupation in Jehoram's reign (2 Chron. xxii. 18, 17). Joel could only have had this event in mind when he charged the Philistines and Syrians with selling the Jewish captives to Edom, and Obadiah's language resembles Joel's (comp. Joel iii. 19, Obad. 10; Joel iii. 13, Obad. 18; Joel iii. 13, Obad. 15; Joel iii. 13, Obad. 17). Joel seems to have prophesied under Jehoshaphat (877-838 B.C.); and it is probable that Obadiah prophesied before him, but not more than twenty years earlier. Obadiah's language also favors this early date; for, as Umbreit has said, "It comes as from the clefts of the rocks. It is hard and rude. There is no refinement of expression, no ornament and figurative description. It is as if the prophet had hewn his prophecy into the rock of Selah."

OBER-AMMERGAU. A village of twelve hundred inhabitants in Upper Bavaria, forty-six miles south-west of Munich, and in the valley of the Ammer. The principal industry is wood-carving. The fame of the village is due entirely to the Passion Play, which is given there every ten years, in discharge of a vow made under these circumstances: 

"In the year 1633 there raged in the neighborhood of Ammerthal ('valley of the Ammer') a deadly plague, which threatened to depopulate the districts infected. The Ammertalers took every precaution to protect their valley from the dread contagion, but without avail. A native of Ammertal, who worked during the summer in Eschlohe [an infected place] as a day-laborer, evaded the quarantine, and entered the valley by a secret path, in order to celebrate among his friends an annual church festival. He carried the infection with him, and on the second day after his arrival he was a corpse. In three weeks of fever none of the inhabitants were carried off; and the mourning and terrified survivors, despairing of human succor, made their supplication to God, and registered a solemn vow, that if he heard their cry, and removed the plague, they would represent every ten years, 'for thankful remembrance and eternizing contemplation, and by the help of the Almighty, theAnthropos of Jesus, the Saviour of the world.' The prayer was heard; 'for not a single person died of the plague after the vow was made, though many were infected with it.' In the following year the first fulfillment of the vow was made, and the second in 1644, and so on decennially until 1674. It was then thought better to divide the representations decennially. Accordingly, the next representation was in 1680; and it has been acted regularly every ten years from that date downwards" (MacColl, pp. 42, 43, and viii.).

But the present Passion Play is very different from the rude performance once given. Down to 1830 it was always acted in the churchyard. It is now given upon a stage, in a building built especially for it, and with his forty-five hundred. The performance is introduced, and accompanied at intervals, by music, and is, on the whole, one of the most elaborate theatrical representations in existence. Every dweller in Ober-Ammergau is liable to be called upon to play; and the preparatory drilling consumes much time in the years next preceding the decennial performance. The credit of the present play is due to Ottmar Weis (d. 1843), a monk of the Ettal monastery in the neighborhood, and subsequently pastor, to his pupil Anton A. Daisenberg, and to Rochus Dedler (b. 1779, d. 1822), who for the last twenty years of his life was the schoolmaster at Ober-Ammergau. A present play is modelled upon the Greek drama, and therefore the chorus is an integral part of it. It comprehends the events of our Lord's life from Palm Sunday to Easter. The text is mainly scriptural; every word attributed to our Lord or to his disciples, friends, and foes, during the week referred to, being interwoven in the text. The principal players are persons of local consequence and of high character; and there is no doubt that the villagers themselves and the peasants around regard the Passion Play as a solemn religious rite. It is therefore introduced by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is administered to the players and to the majority of the intending spectators very early on the day of the play. The acting, considering the limited education of the players, is marvelously realistic. Of late years much money has been spent upon costumes, scenery, and stage properties. The number of players is said to be about six hundred, but this includes many children. The tableaux vivants, which are illustrations of the historical allusions in the chorus, are particularly fine, being revelations respecting the possibilities in tableaux. The interest of the play centres, of course, in the character of Christ. Shocking as the bare thought of such a representation is to the reverent mind, the dignified bearing of Joseph Maier, who played the part in 1870–71 and 1880, goes far to reconcile the spectator to the possibility of its being given without conscious blasphemy. The play was given more than thirty times from May 17 to Sept. 26, for many weeks three times. The performances last from eight to five, with an intermission of an hour and a half.

The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play has been suffered to pursue a nearly untroubled course. Permission to give it has to be obtained from the King of Bavaria, who has always readily given it. In 1780 it was the only passion play allowed in Bavaria, and in 1810 it triumphed over even ecclesiastical opposition. The profits, which are of course very large, since the wrong of visitors numbers thousands, are religiously devoted to charitable purposes after the payment of a small sum to the players. The charges of admission are very moderate, ranging from one to eight marken (twenty-five cents to two dollars). Altogether the Passion Play is a curious, and, in its way a unique, relic of the piety of the middle age. Its days are probably numbered, for a secular spirit among the players would be fatal to it, and destroy the simple piety out of which it sprang. Those who have seen it once would not care to see it in any other place.

In New York City two attempts have been made (1881 and 1882) to perform a passion play, in imitation of that given in Ober-Ammergau; but such a proceeding was severely criticised by the reputable press, and vigorously opposed by prominent citizens, and finally prohibited by the mayor.
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of the city, on the ground that it was prejudicial to good morals and obnoxious to the religious community.

Lit. — The text of the Passion Play in an English translation was published (in London, 1871) as part of a volume containing numerous photographs of the place, the players, and the play. A good description of the play is given by Rev. M. MacColl: The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play, London, 1880.

OBERLIN, Jean Frédéric, the pastor and Reformer of the Steinhthal, a "saint of the Protestant Church" (Hase); was b. at Strassburg, Aug. 31, 1740; d. at Fondy in the Steinhthal, after a pastorate of sixty years, June 1, 1826. After studying at the gymnasium and university of Strassburg, he gave private instruction for several years, and was appointed pastor of the Steinhthal in 1767. The Steinhthal (Ban-de-la-Roche) is a barren tract on the borders of Alsace and Lorraine, whose population early accepted the Reformation. Oberlin entered with enthusiasm upon his work among this poor and ignorant people, and gave himself up to elevating their condition with an unselﬁshness worthy of all admiration. He was a man of imposing and military bearing, iron health, much will-power, and a religious devotion bordering sometimes on fanaticism. He soon married Fräulein Witter, a daughter of one of the Strassburg professors, who died in 1783.

Oberlin was active in promoting both the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people. He built schoolhouses; introduced improved methods of agriculture; went at the head of the people with spade and hoe to build roads, and erect bridges; established stores, savings-banks, and agricultural associations for the distribution of prizes; induced the heads of factories to remove to the Steinhthal, etc. Liberal himself, he was very successful in exciting the liberality of others for his enterprises, even beyond the limits of his parish. In the pulpit and as a pastor his inﬂuence was patriarchal. His sermons were distinguished by unbounded sympathy for the needs of his hearers, and simplicity. Three sabbaths he shared the Lord's Table. He shared the views of Lavater and Jung-Stilling about eternity, hung up a map of heaven in his church, had much conﬁdence in the lot, and denied the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

Oberlin welcomed the French Revolution, and saw in it the little stone destined to break the power of antichrist; that is, the aristocracy and the clergy. The national festivals he celebrated with his congregation with great pomp. He declared himself an enemy of royalty, and recognized, without any limitations, the sovereignty of the people. Oberlin's church was closed for a time by the government, and a religious election generously voted for all who fled to the Steinhthal for refuge. His merit was recognized. On the 16th Fructidor, year 2, the National Assembly passed a vote of thanks. When the allied armies invaded Alsace, his name secured immunity for the Steinthal from military oppression; and in 1819 he received the medal of the Legion of Honor. Celebrated men visited him, and Lavater maintained a correspondence with him. He lies buried under the shadow of the church at Fondy, but will continue to be remembered in the Protestant Church as a man who combined humanitarian activity with mysticism, and who witnessed the omnipotence of Christ's love at a time when that love had grown cold in many hearts. He was the first foreign member of the London Bible Society, and took a deep interest in its work. See Lutteroth: Notices sur Oberlin, Paris, 1828; Schubert: Züge aus d. Leben O., 4th ed., Nurnberg, 1832; Sarah Atkins: Memoirs of Oberlin, London, 1849; Störer: Vie de Oberlin, Strassburg, 1831; Bodemann: Oberlin nach s. Leben u. Wirken, Stuttgart, 1855, 3d ed., 1879; Spach: Oberlin, Strassburg, 1860; [Mrs. Josephine Butler: Life of Jean Frederic Oberlin, London, 1882].

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY is a department of Oberlin College, supported partly from the general fund, and partly by special endowments. In the First Annual Report of the college, issued in 1834, a theological department is spoken of as a hope to be realized ultimately. During that year a large number of students in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, became dissatisﬁed, because the trustees of that institution refused them liberty to discuss the subject of slavery, and withdrew in a body. At this time Rev. Charles G. Finney was at the height of his inﬂuence in New-York City, and had just withdrawn from the presbytery to be installed pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church. Arthur Tappan proposed to Mr. Finney that he go to some point in Ohio, and take charge of the education of these students. Rev. Asa Mahan, a Presbyterian pastor of Cincinnati, and one of the trustees of Lane, was elected president of Oberlin, and Professor John Morgan of Lane was elected to the chair of New-Testament literature. These students agreed to go to Oberlin if President Finney would accept the chair of theology there. He accepted, and they went. The Campus of 1835 reports 35 theological students on the ground; in 1840 the number was 64; in 1883, 44. The number of alumni in 1882 was 570.

The seminary is provided with a commodious and elegant building, containing chapel, lecture-rooms, reference-library, and private rooms for seventy students. Members of every denomination are welcome. Applicants for admission are expected to furnish satisfactory evidence of Christian character, and of such scholarship as will enable them successfully to pursue the course. The majority of the students have always been college graduates. The Bible is studied in the original languages.

The professors are not compelled to sign a creed, but are elected by the trustees from such as are known to be in sympathy with evangelical faith, and with the traditional interest of the founders of the institution in the elevation of religion and of moral reforms. So far the professors have all been Congregationalists, and the theology taught has been New-School Calvinism of the Edwardian type. (See New-England Theology.) For details of this the-
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OCCAM, William (Guilelmus Occamus, or Ochamus), b. about 1280, in the village of Occam (Ockham, or Okaham), in the county of Surrey, Eng.; d. in Munich, April 10, 1347 (or 1349).

As the principal source to his life (the pars iii. tract. 8, of his Dialogus in tres partes distinctus) has perished, many details, especially of his earlier life, are very uncertain. He is said to have studied at Merton College, Oxford, and to have obtained in 1300 the scholarship of Stowe in Lincolnshire, besides other ecclesiastical benefices, which, however, he resigned on entering the order of the Franciscans. Shortly after, he went to Paris, where he studied under Duns Scotus, began the theological works are Quasstionesearumque decisionum, Relation of Death to Probation; Morgan's Systematic Theology, London, 1851, abridged, Oberlin, 1878; Memoirs, written by himself, Revival Lectures, and several sermons; see A. Hastings Ross, Special Lecturer on Positive Institutions, in Congregational Quarterly, April, 1876.


G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

OBERLIN THEOLOGY. See FINNEY, C. G.

OBLATION. See Offerings.
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OBERLIN THEOLOGY. See FINNEY, C. G.

OBLATION. See Offerings.

OCCAM, William (Guilelmus Occamus, or Ochamus), b. about 1280, in the village of Occam (Ockham, or Okaham), in the county of Surrey, Eng.; d. in Munich, April 10, 1347 (or 1349).

As the principal source to his life (the pars iii. tract. 8, of his Dialogus in tres partes distinctus) has perished, many details, especially of his earlier life, are very uncertain. He is said to have studied at Merton College, Oxford, and to have obtained in 1300 the scholarship of Stowe in Lincolnshire, besides other ecclesiastical benefices, which, however, he resigned on entering the order of the Franciscans. Shortly after, he went to Paris, where he studied under Duns Scotus, began the theological works are Quasstionesearumque decisionum, Relation of Death to Probation; Morgan's Systematic Theology, London, 1851, abridged, Oberlin, 1878; Memoirs, written by himself, Revival Lectures, and several sermons; see A. Hastings Ross, Special Lecturer on Positive Institutions, in Congregational Quarterly, April, 1876.
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very between the Franciscan order and the Pa-
pacy, and the contest between the emperor, Lewis
the Bavarian, and the Popes John XXII., Benedi-
cct XII., and Clement VI. The maxim resulting
from his theological criticism, that, in the Chris-
tian Church, the highest, the absolute authority is
vested in the Bible, led him to a crushing criti-
cism of the manifold pretensions, dogmatical and
political, made by the Pope. As above mentioned,
the latter exercise decisive influence in the secon-
d part of his Dialogus, Compendium errorum
Joannis XXII., Paris, 1478, Lyons, 1495, written
between 1355 and 1359, after the death of the
Pope; Epistola defensoria, Venice, 1513; Decisiones
oceo questionum, written after 1339, first printed
at Lyons, 1496, and answering the questions,
whether the highest spiritual and the highest secu-
lar power can be united in one person, whether
the secular power has its origin directly from God,
whether the Pope has the power of jurisdiction
also in secular matters, etc.; Dialogus in tres partes
distinctus, his chief work in this line, written
probably in 1342-43, first printed in Paris, 1476,
2 vols. fol., but not complete; De jurisdicetone
imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus. De electione
Caroli, etc. A collected critical edition of Occam's
works does not exist (several of them are still in
manuscript); nor has there been written any
satisfactory monograph on his life and doctrines,
though the latter exercised so decisive an influ-
ence in the period of the Reformation, especially
in England, where he preached in Venice and other
cities was attended by such large crowds, that the
churches could not hold the people. John XXII.,
Benedict XII., and Clement VI. chose him for his
confessor, and in 1538 the Capuchins at Florence elected him general of their
order. He was accused of heresy in Naples,
where he preached in 1540, — laying emphasis
upon justification, and ignoring indulgences, pur-
gatory, etc. — but was, notwithstanding, chosen
by the second time general of the Capuchins in
1541. Venice now became the scene of his labors; and
it was probably here that he wrote his Dialogi VII.
saci, dove si contiene, nel primo dell' inamorarsi di
dio, etc. (1542). He was cited to appear in Rome,
and started on the journey to obey the summons,
but at Florence was induced by Peter Martyr,
who was himself about to leave Italy, to flee the
country. Hurrying to Ferrara, he received letters
from the Duchess Renata, and speedily left the
country, arriving at Geneva in October, 1542.
He here preached to the Italian fugitives. His
life was severe and pure, and won from Calvin
(letter to Farel, October, 1548) the praise that
Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not
forgetting Italy, he published in this city six
volumes of Italian sermons (Frediche, 1542-44,
2 ed., Basel, 1552). Twenty-five of these were
published in an English translation at Ipswich,
1548. These sermons are simple, pungent, and
gospelical.

In 1545 Ochino went to Augsburg, where he
ministered to the Italian congregation. In 1547
the emperor demanded that he should be deliv-
ered up; but, with the connivance of the authori-
ties, he escaped to Strassburg, where he met Peter
Martyr, and started with him for England. He
became the pastor of the congregation of Italian
refugees in London. A work appeared under his
name in London, 1549, with the title, A tragedy
or dialogue of the unjust usurped primacy of the
Bishop of Rome. At the accession of Mary, he
left to Geneva, which he was obliged to leave on
account of public utterances in which he ex-
pressed disapproval of the execution of Servetus.
He went to Zürich. About this time he pub-
lished two volumes on the Lord's Supper, —
Sincera doctrina de eaiia Domini defensio contra libros
tres J. Wettinii, Zürich, 1556, and Disputa in-
torno alla presenza del corpo di Giesu Cristo nel
Sacro, dove sicontiene, nel prima dell'inamorarsi di
io, etc. (1542). He was cited to appear in Rome,
and started on the journey to obey the summons,
but at Florence was induced by Peter Martyr,
who was himself about to leave Italy, to flee the
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(letter to Farel, October, 1548) the praise that
Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not
forgetting Italy, he published in this city six
volumes of Italian sermons (Frediche, 1542-44,
2 ed., Basel, 1552). Twenty-five of these were
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Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not
forgetting Italy, he published in this city six
volumes of Italian sermons (Frediche, 1542-44,
2 ed., Basel, 1552). Twenty-five of these were
published in an English translation at Ipswich,
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gospelical.

Ochino was a "great man in every respect." Not
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OCTAVE. 1851

OCOLAMPADIUS.

the decree (Aug. 6, 1564) banishing all foreigners who were not Catholics from Poland, and died on his return to Germany. He was a man of splendid gifts, but died a victim of the intolerance of the day and his own brooding. Later writers, Zanetti (De tribus Idolat., Neuw., 1595) and Sandius (Bibl. Antitrinitar.), regarded him as one of the chief founders of the antitrinitarian school. Beza refuted his discussion of polygamy in his Tractatus de polygamy appended to his De repudiis (Geneva, 1667).

Among Ochino's works not already mentioned are Apologi nelli quali si scorupano gli abusi, etc., Geneva, 1544; an Italian exposition of Romans (Geneva, 1545) and Galatians (Augsburg, 1546).

For his life, see BAYLE: Dictionnaire; STRUBE: De vita ... B. Ochini, in the Observat. select. Halena, iv. 400 sqq., v. i sqq.; BÜCHERSCHÜTZ: Vie et écrits d. B. O. ; STRABMANN, 1871; BENRATH: B. Ochino von Siena, Leipzig, 1875, [Eng. trans., New York, 1877; and McCRIE: History of the Reformation in Italy].

OCTAVE, a term belonging to the Liturgy of the Roman-Catholic Church, denotes the celebration of the great Christian festivals — Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, and Epiphany — during eight consecutive days, with a special emphasis on the first and the last. The missal prescribes a special prayer for each day, and for the last a special service. The arrangement was evidently borrowed from the Jewish celebration of Easter and the Feast of Tabernacles. The English Church has retained the arrangement so far as to prescribe the "preface" proper to Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, for the seven days immediately following them.


ODIO, St., fifth abbots of Cluny; b. in Auvergne, 902; d. at Louvigny, Jan. 1, 1049. He ruled his monastery with such a success that even bishops are said to have resigned their sees in order to become monks at Cluny. He wrote a life of his predecessor, St. Moisell, and also one of St. Adelheid, the wife of Otho I., found in Bibliotheca Cluniensis. His own life was written by JOTRABAL, in Act. Sanct. Jan. x. 3.

ODO, St., second abbots of Cluny; b. in Maine, 879; d. at Tours, 942; carried through to the severest rules in all the monasteries connected with Cluny, but contributed thereby immensely to the prosperity of the institutions. He wrote, besides the aforementioned Tractatus de revoc. a. Martini, and Collationes on the sacrament of the Eucharist, found in Biblioth. Cluniensis and Bibl. Max. Patr. (Lyons, xvii., together with his own life, written by JEAN LE MOINE. His works were published also by MIGNE: Patrolo. Lat., tom. 130, reprinted, Paris, 1881.

OCOLAMPADIUS, John, the distinguished Reformer of Basel, whose real name was Husagen (Heusagen); was b. 1492, in Weinsberg, a town in the present kingdom of Württemberg; d. Nov. 24, 1531, at Basel. There are several illustrations in the period of the Reformation, that the Lord delights to send out his disciples in pairs when he has a great work to accomplish. Luther stood side by side with Melanchthon, Calvin with Beza, and Ocolampadius with Zwingli; and, although the last two belonged to different churches, they were intimately associated together as friends, and participants in a common work. The life of Ocolampadius falls into two periods — his development into the Reformer (1482-1522), his reformatory activity (1523-31).

His parents were people of means; his mother, a pious and benevolent woman. After studying at Heilbronn, he followed his father's wishes, and went to Bologna to study law. The merchant to whom his money was confided misappropriated it; and, for this and other reasons, he returned home, determining to exchange the law for theology. In 1499 he entered the university of Heidelberg; and, although he rather avoided the Scholastic theology — Sainte-Marie, Auvergne, 962; d. at Louvigny, Jan. 1, 1049; was appointed by the elector Philip tutor to his younger sons. Discontented at the electoral court, he returned to Weinsberg, where his parents, following a prevalent custom, established an ecclesiastical position for him out of their own means. It was while occupying this place that he delivered his sermons on the seven words of the cross, which were published in 1512 at Freiburg. An eager desire to become more familiar with the ancient languages induced him in 1512 to go to Tübingen, where he formed the friendship of Melanchthon, and from there to Stuttgart, where he continued the study of Greek with Reuchlin.

He was in Heidelberg again in 1514 or 1515, engaged in the study of Hebrew with a baptized Spanish Jew, Matthew Adriani. Enriched with knowledge, he returned to Weinsberg, but was soon, at Capito's suggestion, called to Basel as cathedral preacher. Erasmus, to whom he carried a letter of introduction, received him cordially, and employed him to distinguish the quotations from the LXX., and those from the Hebrew in the New Testament in his edition of the Greek New Testament. (See prefacc to the third edition, 1521.) He returned again in the same year to Weinsberg, where he employed some of his solitude in comparing Jerome's version with the Hebrew, and in connexion with Luther, Melanchthon, and especially Erasmus. In a work published in 1516 (De rieu passa), he condemned the custom, then prevalent, of amusing the hearers from the pulpit on Easter with all kinds of jokes. Urged by Erasmus, he went back to Basel. Reuchlin mentions this fact in a letter to the elector of Saxony (May 7, 1518), and says he had intended to recommend him for the Hebrew professorship at Wittenberg. In 1520 his Greek grammar (Graec. litteraturarum grammatic) appeared. In the mean time he had received the doctor's degree (1518), and accepted a call as preacher in the principal church of Augsburg. It was well that he was to be separated from Erasmus for a time. He arrived in Augsburg soon after Luther's
appearance there before the cardinal legate, Cajetan; and he at once took sides with the bold monk whose career he had been watching with deep interest. In his work Canonic indici, which appeared anonymously in 1519, he espoused the doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasized the good work Luther had done, and rebuked Eck’s presumption and pride.

On April 23, 1520, Ecolampadius surprised all his friends by entering the convent of Altenmunster, near Augsburg. He gave his reasons for this course in a letter to Erasmus, which unfortunately has been lost. But he was not contented in the convent. In 1520, shortly after Dr. Eck’s return from Rome with the bull excommuniating Luther, he passed a very favorable judgment upon Luther, in the course of which occur the words, “Luther stands nearer the truth of the gospel than his adversaries,” etc. This judgment, which Capito published, appeared first in Latin, then in German. Other favorable judgments of Luther appeared in the Latin edition, as that of Erasmus. Of more importance were two sermons published by Kratander in Basel (1521); the one denouncing the doctrine that divine honors are to be paid to Mary, the other denying the doctrine of transsubstantiation. It was, however, his work on the confessional which excited most attention (Luther to Melanchthon, July 13, 1521). He does not give it up entirely, but points out its abuses, and denies that Christ meant all special sins to be confessed to a priest. Luther, in a letter to Spalatin (June 10, 1521), thus expresses his esteem for Ecolampadius: “I am surprised at his spirit, not because he fell upon the same theme as that of Erasmus. Of more importance were two sermons published by Kratander in Basel (1521); the one denouncing the doctrine that divine honors are to be paid to Mary, the other denying the doctrine of transsubstantiation. It was, however, his work on the confessional which excited most attention (Luther to Melanchthon, July 13, 1521). He does not give it up entirely, but points out its abuses, and denies that Christ meant all special sins to be confessed to a priest. Luther, in a letter to Spalatin (June 10, 1521), thus expresses his esteem for Ecolampadius: “I am surprised at his spirit, not because he fell upon the same theme that I did, but because he has shown himself so liberal, prudent, and Christian.”

Ecolampadius left the convent in February, 1522, and went to Heidelberg, and from there to Ebernburg, near Creuznach, the refuge of several men of the new opinions, having refused in the mean time a professorship in the university of Ingolstadt, which was offered on the condition of his renouncing his Lutheran opinions, and receiving a dispensation from the Pope. At Ebernburg he acted as chaplain. On Nov. 16, 1522, he arrived in Basel, where he was probably invited by the printer Kratander, in the name of the friends of the gospel. Here the second period of his life begins.

The first and principal thing for us to notice at this point is the activity which Ecolampadius developed in Basel. This city was at this time the most important intellectual centre in Switzerland, the seat of its only university (founded 1460), and the residence of its most extensive printers. Here Erasmus lived, surrounded by a circle of learned men, to which Bishop von Uttenbach belonged. This all, however, shows that the Roman-Catholic cause was nowhere so well represented in Switzerland as here, and the university was the defender of the traditional faith and church fabric. The Reformation had made some progress among the citizens, and it was a thing of great importance that such a man as Ecolampadius should have engaged in the struggle. In 1522 he opened a correspondence and his friendship with Zwingli. He began preaching as vicar at St. Martin’s, and in 1523 was appointed by the city council reader of the Holy Scriptures at the university; the university authorities, however, refusing with deep razón to the appointment. Ecolampadius took up Isaiah, and found occasion in his lectures to condemn the prevalent ecclesiastical abuses. These lectures excited a great deal of attention, and greatly displeased Erasmus. Aroused by his Catholic opponents, he went further, and appointed a public disputation for Aug. 30, 1523, which took place at the protest of the university, and in which Ecolampadius was so successful, that Erasmus wrote to Zürich, “Ecolampadius has the upper hand among us.” In 1524 Farel arrived at Basel; and, by appointment of the city council, a public disputation was held at the close of February, Ecolampadius translating into German Farel’s address. Ecolampadius continued to preach. Some of his sermons were published, the principal of which are those on 1 John (Latin, 1524, 2nd ed., 1525). In 1526 he was appointed pastor at St. Martin’s, with the permission of introducing changes, on condition of their first being approved by the council. The cause of the Reformation was progressing, but it had by no means won the victory. A publication criticising Karlstadt’s writings was condemned by the city council (October, 1526), and Kratander forbidden to publish any more of the Reformer’s works. He became entangled with the Anabaptists, but strove to distinguish his opinions from theirs. In the disputation at Baden, although Ecolampadius showed his superiority to Eck, Zwingli and all his followers were declared heretics. But the Reformation in Basel had gone too far to be crushed by such measures. In 1527 the city council summoned Marius, a cathedral preacher, and Ecolampadius, to present the opposite views concerning the mass. The former’s defence was considered weak, even by the Catholic party. The Reformer’s tract is a model of good arrangement, clear, pungent, and scholarly treatment. The council did not dare to decide between them. Both appeared in print. At this time (January, 1528), Ecolampadius and Zwingli were invited to take the principal part in the disputation at Bern, which resulted in the adoption of the Reformation by that canton. This example had an influence upon Basel, which became more definitely divided into two camps. It was determined to decide the fate of the mass by a public disputation in the spring of 1529, and in the mean time the rite was to be celebrated in only three churches. Ecolampadius was satisfied with this compromise; but an imprudent disregard of it on the part of the Catholic party so aroused the citizens, that they called upon the Catholic members of the city council to resign. The council was finally forced to grant the demand. Ecolampadius was made superintendent (outside of the Reformed churches of the city and canton, and appointed chief pastor at the cathedral. The Anabaptists, who had a following in the city, claimed the Reformer for their views. In order to disguise their minds of the fallacy, he held a disputation with some of them, in the pastoral residence on the St. Martin’s hill (1525). Ecolampadius undoubtedly went too far on this occasion in his utterances about infant baptism, but he wrote against the Anabaptists. He also devoted him-
self to the perfection of a system of church government, differing from his friend Zwingli herein, that he advocated the principle of keeping the Church and State separate. He was opposed to confining the interests of the former wholly to the hands of the latter, and he secured the passage of a measure creating a synod which held two meetings annually.

The views of Oecolampadius on the Lord's Supper cannot be commended in every respect. In his work on the interpretation of the words, "This is my body," among the Fathers (De genuina verborum Domini: hoc est corpus meum, justa eorum descriptione expositio), he urges with a great deal of force the arguments against the literal interpretation, and in favor of the metaphor contained in the word "body" (corpus). But, in the attempt to remove the errors of the Roman-Catholic interpretation, he unfortunately went so far as to state that believers partook of the Lord's Supper more for the sake of others than for their own; so that the sacrament was turned into an object-lesson. Still, he was not able to deny the great importance of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, and, as the close, says that God accomplishes through the sacraments nearly all that he otherwise accomplishes through the Word. He saw to it, that in Basel the Lord's Supper was administered much more frequently than in any of the other Reformed churches, or diocesan synods, by being representative of the whole church. They were convened by the emperor. At the convocation of the first two oecumenical councils, no regard whatever was paid to the Bishop of Rome; and his influence on the matter does not become visible until the convocation of the fourth. They were, at least so far as the general conduct of their business was concerned, controlled by the emperor or his representative. The second and the fifth oecumenical councils, at which the emperor was not represented, were presided over, not by the Bishop of Rome, but by the Patriarch of Constantinople; though in these, as in all other similar cases, the papal legates were treated with great respect. They were finally confirmed by the emperor; that is, their resolutions or canons became imperial laws by receiving his signature: of a papal confirmation nothing is heard until after the fourth oecumenical council. There are, in this sense of the words, seven oecumenical councils recognized both by the Eastern and the Western churches, besides three councils whose claim of being oecumenical is contested either by the Eastern or by the Western Church. These seven councils were all Greek. Their business was transacted, and their canons confirmed, in the Greek language; and the persons attending them were, with very few exceptions, Greeks. The Latin Church was represented only by the papal legates and three or four bishops. They were the first and second councils of Nicaea (325 and 787), the first, second, and third councils of Constantinople (381, 553, and 881), the council of Ephesus (431), and the council of Chalcedon (451). The three contested councils are those of Sardica (344), the Trullan Council (Quinisextum) (692), and the fourth council of Constantinople (680). After the complete separation, however, between the Eastern and Western churches, and the perfect development of the Papacy, the idea of an oecumenical council received quite a different definition. The pope took the place of the emperor. The pope could have the right to convene a council, to preside over...
At Tübingen, as at Breslau, Oehler developed a wonderful industry and a most conscientious performance of the duties of his lecturership. He insisted upon a thorough training of the students, and used often to quote Luther's words: "In proportion as the gospel is dear to us, let us demand accuracy in the languages." He sought, however, to do more than quicken an interest in study in his pupils,—to impress them with a sense of the importance of the one thing needful. He lectured more particularly on the theology of the Old Testament, but also on Isaiah, Job, the Psalms, Messianic Prophecy, the Minor Prophets, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Christian Symbols. The introductory words to his lectures on Old-Testament theology (which he delivered first in Breslau in 1845, and repeated ten times in Tübingen) were concluded with the remark, "To point you to Him, the one Master, is the holiest and most responsible obligation, but also the consecration and joy, of the theological lecturer. The teacher of theology dare indulge no higher wish than that he should have scholars who say, 'This is true!'" The introductory words to his lectures: we have heard for ourselves, and confess that truly this is the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Oehler's lectures were largely attended, like those of his colleagues, Baur and Beck. They were successful in laying bare the rich contents of the Old Testament, and were intended to counteract the antipathy for the Old Testament, which was due largely to Schleiermacher. He laid his foundations in severe philological investigations. His conception of the Old Testament was that of a progressive and growing revelation towards the standard of the New Testament. The Old and New Testaments are parts of one organic history by reason of an inherent plan of the Divine Mind. The Old Testament was to him a record of revelation, in which the plan of God was realized in part, the New Testament forming the consummation. He adopted some of the results of modern criticism, and acknowledged the existence of several different hands in the composition of the Pentateuch, and two authors for Isaiah.

He died in the full hopes and peace of the gospel, and said to the attendants at his deathbed that his sickness had taught him the meaning of the Psalms and Job as he had never known it before. He chose for the inscription on his monument the words, "There remaineth a rest to the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9). Delitzsch pronounced him a "theologian after God's heart."

Oehler was not a prolific author. He was never sufficiently satisfied with his work to publish much. Most important were his articles, forty in number, written for the first edition of Herzog's Encyclopedia. [The great value of these articles is attested by the fact, that, in the second edition, his name is placed first, and his articles retained by Delitzsch and von Orelli, to whom has been intrusted the work of their revision. See Elohim, Jehovah, Messianic Prophecy, etc.] His Gesammelte Seminareden (1872), and his Theology of the Old Testament, were edited by his son, Tübingen, 1873, 1874, 2 vols. 8vo ed., 1882. Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1874, 1875, 2 vols. (Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament is the best work for...
in its department, and is characterized by thoroughness of treatment, and reverence of tone; new edition of the English trans., N.Y., 1883.)

He sought to construct a sacred philosophy, and to find out the essential features of the great biblical truths. In 1728 he travelled in Northern Germany, visited Zinzendorf and Herrnhut, giving lectures there on Hebrew, Greek, and the Song of Solomon, but without accomplishing much, and became docent at Halle. Here he found time to study medicine, which he practised for a while. Efforts to separate him from the Lutheran Church proved unavailing, and at a great age he said that his entire theology was concentrated in Luther's Catechism. Returning to Württemberg, he filled the place of repetens at Tubingen, became pastor at Hirsau, and, after occupying several other pastorates, was promoted to the dignity of a prelate at Murrhard. In the mean time he had married.

As a pastor he won universal respect. Oetinger opposed the idealistic and rationalistic tendencies of his age, and by his "biblical philosophy," as he calls it, sought to accomplish a truly reformatory work, removing all the false ideas and notions of things, and coming to the thing itself, and apprehending the life in its fulness. He complained it was the plague of the day, that Semler and his school turned the plain sense of Scripture into Asiatic figures, interpreting the words, not according to the letter, but metaphorically. He himself sought to follow the Bible closely. He was not appreciated by the reigning schools of the period; but he had his followers in his own country, and had a powerful influence upon the two philosophers Schelling and von Baader. The peasant Michael Hall was one of his most remarkable followers, and diffused his doctrines among the people; and an enthusiastic disciple arose in Switzerland in the original and talented Spelzer (d. 1854). The influence of Oetinger's theosophy has been extensive in the pietistic circles of Württemberg.

Oetinger was a prolific author, and his complete works have been edited by Ehmann (11 vols., Stuttgart, 1858-63). These include both his homiletical and theosophical writings. (Swedelborg's and Anderer irdische und himmlische Philosophie, Abhandlungen von d. letzten Dingen, etc.). His Autobiography was ed. by Hamberger, Stuttgart, 1845; Ehmann: Oetinger's Leben u. Briefe, Stuttgart, 1859; Auberlen: Oetinger's Theosophie nach ihren Grundgedanken (with an Introduction by Dr. Richard Rothe), Tübingen, 1847. [See art. on Oetinger, in Herzog, 2d ed., by Dr. Julius Hamberger.]

AUBERLEN.

OFFERINGS.

In general, sacrifice may be defined as man's devo- tion of himself to God, embodied in a visible act. The inner impulse leading men to praise, thank, and pray to God, finds an expression in language; but it is only fully uttered when it is embodied in an act of renunciation by which the individual gives up the object (Num. vii. 3 sqq., persons dedicated to the temple service, etc.), or, as is most frequently the case, by the consumption by fire of the object, or a part of it, on an altar. The latter kind of sacrifices is therefore often called in the Old Testament ishek (יְשֵׁקָה), and especially corban (כְּרוּב, see Mark vii. 11).

The sacrifice may be consummated by the simple giving away of the object (Num. vii. 3 sqq., persons dedicated to the temple service, etc.), or, as is most frequently the case, by the consumption by fire of the object, or a part of it, on an altar. The latter kind of sacrifices is therefore often called in the Old Testament ishek (יְשֵׁקָה), and especially corban (כְּרוּב, see Mark vii. 11).
fruits) taking the place of the whole class, or an individual of one class taking the place of an individual of an allied class (Exod. xii. 13, xxxiv. 20).

In the first case, the most perfect instance of substitution is that of one life for another. But the idea of substitution is embodied in every true sacrifice, the offerer being regarded as giving up a part of himself. Hence no one could offer anything that belonged to another.

The pre-Mosaic offerings afford a proof of the truth of what has just been said. In the very beginning of history, Cain and Abel made offerings. Abel's offering, of the firstlings of the flock, was well pleasing to God; Cain's, of the fruits of the ground, not. The difference in the nature of the offerings was due to the difference of the employments of the two brothers; so that the element which made the one well pleasing was not that it was a bloody sacrifice. The different reception of the sacrifices was due to the difference in the intent with which they were made. This is indicated in chap. iv. 3, where it is evident that Abel made choice of the best to express his gratitude, Cain exercised no discrimination, but offered the first came to his hand. At the very opening of the Bible, therefore, emphasis is laid upon the pious disposition of the one making the sacrifice, as the indispensable condition of its being acceptable to God. Delitzsch's idea, that Abel's sacrifice conveyed the notion of expiation, and that, when he killed the animal, Abel made a confession of criminal guilt, and his desire for the forgiveness of sins, is not implied in the text. Nevertheless both offerings were expressions of petition, as well as of gratitude. The second sacrifice in the Old Testament is that of Noah (Gen. viii. 20). In these two instances there is no hint that sacrifice rests upon a divine command. It was a voluntary act, which man performed as a creature made in the image of God, with whom he longs to be in the communion for which he was created. Sacrifices, therefore, as Neumann has well said (Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissenschaft, 1859, p. 238), are the "voluntary utterances of man's nature, which was made for God," and are no more inventions of his brain than prayer, but an instinct of his being.

The twenty-second chapter of Genesis is important in connection with the development of the notion of sacrifice in the Old Testament. There God proves Abraham's faith by calling upon him to offer up his son, in whose place he afterwards commanded him to substitute an animal. This transaction gave divine sanction to the practice of sacrifice in general as an act of devotion to God, and willingness to give up that which is dearest to God, and, on the other hand, taught that human sacrifices were to have no place in the religion of Israel, but that animals were to be used as substitutes for men. There is no hint of the idea of atonement in the sacrifice of Isaac, nor are there any expiatory sacrifices in the Old Testament before Moses. But the very sacrifice presuppose the revelation of God's holiness in the law and the entrance of the people into a covenant relation with a holy God. According to Exod. xx. 24 there are three elements which constitute the Mosaic idea of sacrifice. (1) God chooses a place to put his name there (Deut. xii. 6, 11, xiv. 29), that is, to reveal himself to his people. Henceforth there is one place of worship which he fills with his glory. (2) The people approach God in the spirit of devotion, and consecrate themselves, with all that they have, to him. In order to accomplish the people's approach to the altar, and to perpetuate the covenant which man's sins constantly threaten to interrupt, God institutes the mediatorial order of the priesthood, and an expiatory ritual, in which the thought is embodied, that man can never approach God without making expiation, and that expiation is the condition of the acceptance of his gift. (3) The divine grace is imparted through the priestly blessing (Lev. ix. 22, etc.). The Mosaic ritual was therefore not merely a body of ceremonies designed to awaken and confirm piety, but a system in which a constant and living communion was carried on between God and man.

We shall now discuss, (1) the objects, (2) the ritual, (3) the classes, of sacrifice.

I. Objects of Sacrifice.—The Hebrew sacrifices were bloody or animal, and unbloody or vegetable. The latter are designated by the term Zebah (זְבָה). There is a general term for the bloody offerings Zebah (זְבָה), which is used in the latter books as a general designation, being employed in the Pentateuch only for peace-offerings. The bloody offerings were the more important, on account of the significance of the blood. The vegetable or meat offerings might likewise be independent offerings (Lev. v. 11; Num. v. 15 sqq., etc.), but were usually connected with the bloody offerings.

(1) The bloody sacrifices were, as has already been stated, exclusively animal sacrifices. The sacrifice of children, which was practised amongst the Canaanites and other peoples, was unconditionally forbidden as an abomination (Deut. xii. 31). It may be that such sacrifices were practised in the wilderness (Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2 sqq.), or even afterwards, as is indicated by the ambiguous passages in Ezekiel (xx. 25 sq.). The Mosaic law, however, gives to man authority over the life of his fellowman, only in cases of judicial sentence for transgressions of theocratic commandments. The animals used in the bloody sacrifices were both sexes of cattle, sheep, goats. Turtle-doves and young doves were also employed. These furnished the principal animal food of the poor classes, and this explains their use in sacrifice. They might be brought as a substitute in all cases, except a few, for the larger and more expensive animals (Lev. v. 7, xii. 8). Other birds were not used; and why birds frequenting marshy ground, especially geese, which had a high place in the sacrifices of the Egyptians, were omitted, we do not know. Venison and fishes were not objects of sacrifice in the Mosaic ritual, but were so used by some of the heathen religions of Western Asia. The animals offered in sacrifice had to be free from physical blemish (Lev. xxii. 20-24, etc.), and at least eight days old, in order to make possible any creature was regarded as unclean (Lev. xxii. 27); comp. Exod. xxii. 30). In a few cases the age was more definitely fixed (Lev. ix. 3, xiv. 10, etc.).

(2) The vegetable or meat offerings were ears roasted on the fire (Lev. ii. 14), white meal, probably the finest meal (Lev. ii. 1), and unleavened bread or cakes (Lev. ii. 4 sqq.). These offerings
were therefore taken from the things contributing to man's daily nourishment, and won by his toil. The fruit of trees, such as dates and pomegranates, which required little human labor, were perhaps none at all, were excluded. The strictest injunction bearing upon the meat-offerings was, that they should be unleavened (Lev. ii. 11); and this feature seems to correspond to the unblemished character of the animal offerings. An essential of all meat-offerings was salt (Lev. ii. 13). Whether this was likewise true in the case of the animal offerings cannot be determined from Lev. ii. 13. The custom was, however, always practiced, at a later period, of salting them (Mark ix. 49). Salt was not enjoined because it made the offering palatable, but because it preserves from corruption. It was therefore a symbol of purification (Mark ix. 49) and of endurance (see Lev. ii. 13, where the expression "salt of the covenant of thy God" signifies that the covenant would be indestructible).

Three principles were made prominent in the selection of the objects of sacrifice. The objects sacrificed had to belong to the possessions of Israel. A real sacrifice could only be spoken of when the individual relinquished something that was his own property. The offerings were vegetable, and are frequently called "the bread of God" (Lev. xxii. 6, 8, 17; Num. xxviii. 2, 24). All objects used as food, however, were not sacrificed, but only those which the people toiled and labored for. Thus they laid down the confession in their sacrifices, that the earth's products and harvests were due to the divine blessing. Again: the sacrifices stood in a peculiarly intimate relation to the individual, as Kurtz has brought out. The firstlings and first-fruits, to which the heart is inclined to cling most strongly, were chosen; and, as Philo (De. Vict., 1) long ago observed, the tamest and most innocent animals were selected, and those offering the least resistance to the knife.

II. Ritual of Sacrifice. — The essential parts in the animal sacrifices were, (1) the presentation of the animal at the altar, (2) the imposition of hands, (3) the slaying, (4) the disposition of the blood, (5) the burning upon the altar. Other acts, which occurred only in the case of special kinds of sacrifices, will be spoken of at another place. The worshipper, after sanctifying himself (1 Sam. xvi. 5), brought the animal to the altar of burnt-offering, at the entrance of the tabernacle (Lev. i. 3, iv. 4). Then he placed his hands upon the head of the animal. The ceremony of the imposition of hands took place only in the case of the sin-offerings (Lev. iv. 15), when the offering was made for the congregation, and was done by the elders. In the case of sacrifices offered by individuals, it was invariably the individual, and not the priest, who performed the ceremony of imposition. The meaning of this rite, that the individual, and the spirit or soul of his own body, is offered up; and it serves to expiate for the soul, or because the soul is in it. The translation of the Authorized Version is to be ruled out, not only on account of the tautology it introduces into the sentence, but because the object of ἐξοντος is always preceded by ἀποκλίσις, never by ἀποκλίσις alone. The idea is, that, in the warm blood sprinkled upon the altar, the soul of the animal is offered up; and it serves to expiate for the human soul, or, more accurately, to cover it. The fundamental idea of ἐξοντος is, that the sin for which the atonement is rendered is concealed from the face of the Divine Being; the offering covering or hiding his face, or more definitely the guilt of the sinner, so that it is, as it were, blotted out. The sinner, therefore, becomes protected against punishment, and may approach God without fear of condemnation. The priesthood and its ordinances, the tabernacle itself, were all designed to cover or hide the sin of the people, that the holy God might have communion with them. But priesthood and sacrifices were not the only means in constant need of purification. That which really covers and atones for the souls of the
people is the soul itself. Man can offer up a gift; but the gift itself is unclean, for he who offers it is unclean and sinful. Therefore God substituted for the unclean soul of the sinner the innocent soul of the victim. It mediates between him and the holy God in the blood offered on the altar; so that God sees a pure life on the altar, which he accepts as covering the guilt of the sinner.

After the blood had been spilled, the offerer took the skin off from the animal, and divided it into pieces (Lev. i. 6, viii. 20). The inspection of the entrails, which formed such an important part in the sacrifices of several ancient peoples, especially the Phoenicians, has no place in the Mosaic ritual. The offering was then burnt upon the altar, either entire, as in the burnt-offerings, or only the fatty parts. The chief significance of the burning of the victim consisted in God's acceptance of it, as the smoke, containing the essence and flavor, ascended upwards.

The ritual of the meat-offerings was much less elaborate. The offering being brought, the priest took a handful of meal and oil, and all the incoence, and burnt them upon the altar. The rest of the offering fell to the lot of the priests, and was to be eaten in the forecourt. These rules probably only applied to the freewill offerings.

III. The Classes. — The law distinguished between four kinds of offerings, — burnt, redemption (or peace), sin, and guilt (or trespass) offerings. The regulations concerning the first two are represented as being derived from God (Lev. i. 1). The rules for the meat-offerings are inserted between them. There were two main classes of offerings: (1) Those in which the covenant relation was presupposed to be undisturbed; (2) Those which sought to restore that relation, it being disturbed.

1. The Burnt-Offerings. — The characteristics of these offerings were, that the victim had to be an unblemished male, — either a bull, ram, or goat (the gender of the doves, however, not being prescribed), — and that it was consumed entire, with the exception of the skin and the appendages. By burnt-offerings the people and individuals attested their reverence for God, and complete devotion to him. They have been aptly called sacrificia latreutica. They were adapted to secure the favor of God and to atone for sin (Lev. i. 4), but not for particular transgressions. A burnt-offering was brought every morning and evening for the people as a body (Exod. xxi. 38-42; Num. xxvii. 3-8), and consisted in each case of a lamb. A tenth of an ephah of meal and a quarter of a hin of wine were connected with each of these daily sacrifices as a meat and drink offering. Between the meat and drink offerings the high-priestly meat-offering was offered, which the Jews found prescribed in Lev. vi. 13 sqq. The morning and evening sacrifices were increased on sabbath days and festival occasions. Sometimes individuals, on special occasions, offered as many as a thousand victims to the altar (1 Kings iii. 4; 1 Chron. xxix. 21, etc.).

2. The Peace-Offerings. — Animals of both genders might be used in the peace-offerings (Lev. iii. 6). Doves are never mentioned in this connection. The ritual, as far as the sprinkling of the blood, they shared with the burnt-offerings. Only the fatty parts were burnt on the altar; not, however, the fat which was inlaid in the flesh. They were considered the richest and best portions of the animal, and for this reason they were burnt. The breast of the victim was “waved,” or swung, by the priest (Lev. vii. 30), and the shoulder “heaved” (vii. 34). The first operation of swinging, including a forward and backward motion, seems to have signified that the offering was given up to God, but that he, in return, gave it back to the priest. In the public peace-offerings, all except the fatty parts seem to have gone to the priests, although this is only expressly said of the two lambs of the Pentecost peace-offering. When individuals offered peace-offerings, only the breast and the heaved shoulder went to the priests. The rest was consumed at a joyful sacrificial meal, in which any number might participate. The chief significance of the meal was, that God himself became a guest, and imparted his blessing.

3. Sin and Guilt (or Trespass) Offerings. — These belong to the genus of expiatory sacrifices, and were designed to restore the covenant relation which had been disturbed by human transgression. The class of transgressions which they were designed to meet were the κατανόμα, sins of ignorance, or venial sins, in opposition to presumptuous sins, or those committed “with a high hand” (margin, Num. xv. 30), for which the law knew of no atonement. A confession of sins accompanied both these kinds of offerings (Lev. v. 4, xvi. 21, etc.). The difference between them has been well brought out by Riehm (Studien u. Kriti-
In the sin-offering, an innocent life was substituted on the altar of burnt-offering, but of the sin-offering, to accomplish this result of covering the guilt of the soul. It is true that every sin involves guilt; but all guilt is not the result of infidelity in the narrower sense, a real derogation of the theocratic laws. However, it is impossible to carry through a clear distinction. Guilt-offerings, in every case, concerned special transgressions. The victim (a ram) in the guilt-offering was slain on the north side of the altar: the fatty pieces were burnt.

In the case of the sin-offerings the victims were a young bull (Lev. xvi. 3, iv. 3; Exod. xix. 10, 14, etc.), a goat (Lev. iv. 23, xvi. 5; Num. xxvii. 15, etc.), a she-goat or she-lamb (Lev. iv. 28, v. 9; Num. vi. 14, etc.), a turtle-dove and young doves (Lev. v. 7, xii. 6, xiv. 22, etc.), or, to meet the ability of the very poorest, one-tenth of an ephah of white meal (Lev. v. 11). There were two characteristic features in the ritual of the sin-offering,—the disposition of the blood, and the destruction of the other parts of the victim after the fatty portions had been burnt. That the immediate object of the sin-offering was expiation is proved by the fact that the blood was not sprinkled on the altar, but applied to holy places, as on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 25, 30, 34), and on the inner veil of the temple and the horns of the altar of incense (Lev. iv. 5 sqq.). On the day of atonement (Lev. xvi.) some of the blood was sprinkled in the holy of holies. The meat of the victim in the sin-offering was either eaten in the court of the holy place (Lev. vi. 18), or burnt outside of the camp (Lev. iv. 11 sqq., vi. 23, etc.). In the sin-offering, an innocent life was substituted on the altar for a guilty one. Why a goat should have been prescribed for the most solemn sin-offerings is difficult to decide. The rabbins say that it was chosen because the Israelites had sinned most in the case of goats, or that the patriarchs killed a goat at the sale of Joseph. Bähr’s view is, that it was on account of the goat’s long hair, which symbolized grief for sin. These views are to be discarded. A better one is this, that the goat was chosen on account of its unpalatable meat, which the priests had to eat; the meaning of the imposition of hands was the same as on the horns of the altar, with which a confession was probably associated, was that the individual gave up the pure life of the animal as a substitute for his own sinful life, and as an expiation for it.

The injunctions which have been treated in the foregoing paragraphs as Mosaic have been recently assigned by some scholars to a much later date. Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, following Vatke, have put them down to the post-exilic period, and affirm that the sacrifices were not regulated by law before that time, and did not differ essentially from the heathen sacrifices, except that they were offered to Jehovah, and not to Baal or Molech. Passages from the prophets (such as Amos iv. 4 sq., v. 21 sqq.; Hos. vi. 8, viii. 11 sqq.; Isa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 19 sq., vii. 21 sqq.) are adduced to show, that, at that period, nothing was known of a ritual such as the Mosaic law provides. The change to a respect for this ritual is evident in Ezek. xi.-xlviii. for the first time. In opposition to this class of views, it is to be remarked that Moses must have regulated the ritual of sacrifice, which formed the soul of the Mosaic worship, if he was the founder of the Jehovistic religion. In the old so-called Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx., xxxii., xxxiv.) there are certain regulations for this worship (Exod. xx. 24-26, xxxii. 18 sq., xxxiv. 25 sq.), which presuppose a fuller sacrificial ritual. The passages in the prophecies noticed above do not exclude the existence of the Mosaic ritual. The prophets were only attacking religious hypocrisy, and speaking in accordance with the spirit of 1 Sam. xxv. 22. Amos v. 25 means nothing more than that another God than Jehovah was worshipped in the wilderness by the mass of the people. Jer. vii. 21 sq. cannot mean that no sacrificial ritual had been prescribed; for the prophet speaks of one in his prophecy of the future salvation (xvii. 26, xxxiii. 18); and what he meant was, that obedience to God’s commandments, and not the sacrificial ordinances, was the fundamental thing in the Mosaic system. The contrast between sacrifices and obedience is brought out here, as also in Hos. vi. 6. The prophecies introduce, in their picture of future salvation, essential elements from the ancient Mosaic ritual; but their main object was to insist upon moral laws. Recent critics have also attacked the received opinion concerning the Mosaic law on the ground of the departure from the Mosaic command that there should be one place of sacrifice. They say there is no evidence that such a rule was known in the times of the judges and the first kings, when men like Samuel sacrificed on different high places. The conclusion is drawn, that the command concerning a single altar of sacrifice dates from the time of Hezekiah or Josiah, after the erection of the temple. Wellhausen lays particular stress upon this point. It is to be remarked, in opposition to these critics, that, with reference to the Mosaic period, the only supposition offering probability is, that there was only one altar, namely, the tabernacle. Thus the command enjoining the slaying of the victim at the door of the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 1 sqq.) can only be understood of the period of the wanderings,—a command, which, in Deut. xii., is altered so as to read that the victim of atonement should be slain, but offered only at one place,—the tabernacle. The sequence is, therefore, a different one from that laid down by the recent criticism. It was natural for the people to break through this injunction when they entered the Holy Land, where they found many places consecrated by the Lord’s...
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presence in their ancient history. The evil consequences to which this practice led formed the occasion for emphasizing the Mosaic rule, centralizing the worship at one altar. The earliest prophets had no doubt as to where this was located, on Zion (Joel iii.17; Amos i.2; Isa. xxx. 9). Kings, like Asa (2 Chron. xiv. 2), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii. 6), Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 22), sought to centralize the worship at Jerusalem; but the people still continued to cling to the venerable high places. Josiah was the first to fully succeed in this movement (2 Kings xxiii. 5).


OFFERTORY, a term belonging to the Liturgy of the Roman-Catholic Church, denotes the first part of the Eucharistic service, consisting of the Dominus vobiscum, the obliteration of the bread and wine, the clasping of the oblation, the altar, etc., and the prayer.

OFFICE, Congregation of the Holy, is the name of that department of the papal government which is charged with the direction of the Roman Inquisition. It was established by Paul III. in 1542, and consists of twelve cardinals, a commissary, and a number of counsellors (theologians and canonists), etc. On solemn occasions the Pope presides in person.

OFFICES OF CHRIST. See Jesus CHRIST, Three Offices of.

OFFICE, in canon law, means an ecclesiastical judge appointed by a bishop or chapter. The office seems to have originated towards the close of the eleventh century. There were originally two kinds of officials,—officialia foranei, appointed for the diocese of an archdeacon, outside of (foras) the episcopal diocese; and officiates principales, or vicarii generales, who exercised the spiritual jurisdiction for an ecclesiastical district as the representative of the bishop. The first kind of officials have now disappeared. With respect to the second, the two names are used synonymously in Italy, Dalmatia, Hungary, and the East; while in Spain, France, Belgium, England, Poland, and Africa, the official has charge of the jurisdiction exercized by the bishop in the administration of the episcopal diocese.

OGILVIE, John, D.D., b. 1738; d. 1814; was minister of Midmar, in Aberdeenshire, from 1759 to his death. He published The Day of Judgment (1759), and Poems (2 vols., 1789), including An Essay on the Lyric Poetry of the Ancients. Each of these ventures reached a third edition within a year or two. Boswell thought more highly of his verses than more eminent authorities have done. His paraphrase of the Hundred and Forty-eighth Psalm (1759) was formerly much used as a hymn.

OIL, OLIVE-TREE. The southern boundary-line of the zone in which the olive-tree can be cultivated is the Atlas chain; the northern, the fortieth degree north latitude. The tree requires an annual mean temperature of sixty degrees Fahrenheit; and, as it can stand no very violent atmospheric changes, it succeeds best in countries with a constant climate. It requires a meagre, sandy, and stony soil, and grows most vigorously on the sunny slope of rocks, where it may form whole forests (Job xxix. 6). It is an evergreen; and it is the enormous age it may reach, and its almost inexhaustible power of regeneration, new trunks rising from the roots when the old ones have perished, which makes it such a favorite in the similes of poetical diction. It is doubtful, however, whether the seven olive-trees still standing in Gethsemane, really, as Chateaubriand and others have asserted, date back to the time of Christ; nor is there any occasion for emphasizing the Mosaic rule, concerning the number of trees in any single garden (Lev. xxvi. 39), not to speak of the time of Christ. Generally speaking, the tree succeeded exceedingly well in Palestine, especially in Persea, Galilee, along the Lake of Gennesaret, in the Decapolis, on Lebanon, etc. (Deut. xxxii. 24; Josephus: Bell. Jud., iii. 8, 5; Iii. 10, 8; Plin., 16, 9). Olive-oil is always mentioned as one of the principal products of Palestine, together with wine, wheat, honey, and figs (Deut. viii. 8, xii. 14, xxvii. 30, xxviii. 13).

Every landed proprietor among the Jews had his olive-garden or oil-plantation (Exod. xxvii. 11; Deut. vii. 1; 1 Sam. xvii. 1); and such gardens formed an important part of the royal domains (1 Chron. xxviii. 29). The fruit which the tree produces looks like a small plum. It is first green, then pallid, then purple, and finally, when fully ripe, it becomes almost black. The Jews, like the Greeks and the Romans, ate the green fruit pickled sour; but the principal use made of the olive was for the manufacture of oil. The finest oil was made from the green, still unripe fruit, picked carefully from the tree, crushed in a mortar, and then pressed through a press. The common oil was manufactured in an oil-press. The Jews used oil for the preparation of food (1 Kings xvii. 12; 1 Chron. xii. 40) just as we use butter; for the preparation of offerings (Exod. xxix. 2, 40; Lev. ii. 14, 15), for illumination (Exod. xxv. 6; Matt. xxv. 3), for healing wounds (Isa. i. 6; Mark vi. 13; Jas. v. 14; Luke x. 34), and, mixed with other odoriferous vegetable fluids, forointing the body,—a custom which in the Eastern countries is almost indispensable to the preservation of health. So important a part did the oil play in the everyday life of the Hebrews, that the failure of the harvest was considered a great calamity (Amos iv. 9; Heb. iii. 17); and the tree itself acquired a symabolical significance. Its branches were used for the festive booths (Neh. vi. 15), and carried by supplicants before the victor (2 Macc. xiv. 4). The dove of Noah came in with an olive-leaf in her mouth (Gen. viii. 11). The wild olive-tree, whose fruit is larger and more meaty, but whose oil is less valuable, and used only for ointments, has
the curious quality, that, when grafted on a cultivated tree, it bears excellent fruit, which is just the reverse of the general effect of grafting (comp. Rom. xi. 17 sqq.). LEYRER.

OINTMENT. See Oil.

OLAF, St., king of Norway 1015-30, descended from the old royal family, but was educated in exile. Though he was a Christian, he led a wild life as a viking, and fought, especially in England, against especially King Stephen (1035). Returning home in 1015, and made good his claims to the Norwegian crown, he concentrated all his energy on the establishment of Christianity in his native country. The means, however, which he employed, were violent and even cruel: those who resisted or relapsed were punished with exile, confiscation of property, torture, etc. Nevertheless, he succeeded. Churches were built, and priests appointed; the sabbath was celebrated; and the fast-days were kept. But the discontent was so intense, that, when Canute the Great invaded the country, he was joined by a large portion of the people. Olaf fled to Russia; and, when he returned, he was defeated, and killed in the battle of Stiklestad, July 29, 1030. Then a re-action set in. The Norwegians were very dissatisfied with their Danish ruler, a son of Canute. In 1031 a great assembly of clergymen and laymen declared Olaf a saint. His remains were dug up, and deposited in the cathedral of Nidaros (Trondheim); miracles took place at his grave, where crowds of pilgrims soon began to gather; and his Passio et miracula, written in the twelfth century, and recently edited by Fr. Methalfa, in Anecdota Helgener, Christiania, 1881. A. MICHIELSEN. The patron saint of Norway, and the most celebrated saint in Scandinavia. The sources of his history are the Heimskringla, and Olaf’s Saga, by Snorre Sturleesen. See Ludwig Dane Norden Helgener, Christianias, 1881. A. MICHIELSEN.

OLDCASTLE, Sir John. See Cobham, Lord. OLDCATHOLICS. The opposition to Jesuitism and Ultramontanism, which had been fomented within the very pale of the Roman-Catholic Church by the proclamation of the dogma of the immaculate conception (Dec. 8, 1854), and the issue of the Encyclical Sistabus (Dec. 8, 1864), developed into an open conflict after the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility by the council of the Vatican (July 18, 1870). The bishops, even those who had made the most strenuous resistance at the council, finally submitted, and accepted the dogma; but, immediately after its proclamation, forty-two professors of the university of Munich, with Döllinger and Friedrich at their head, issued a formal protest. Similar protests came from other German universities, — Bonn, Giessen, Breslau, and Freiburg; and in August of the same year, a considerable number of Roman-Catholic theologians from Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, assembled at Nuremberg, and published a joint declaration, that the decisions of the council of the Vatican, especially that on the question of papal infallibility, were invalid, and not binding. It was by no means the case, however, that the movement proved, to separate from the Church of Rome, or produce a schism, the less so as the whole movement did not awaken any great interest among the laity. The only lay protest of any note was that of Munich, which first introduced the name “Old-Catholics.” But, once started, the movement could not stop; and the direction in which it had to run was irresistibly prescribed by the logic of events.

The first Old-Catholic conference was held in Munich, Sept. 29-30, 1871. Döllinger was much opposed to the idea of organizing the party into an independent church; but congregations had already been formed in Munich, Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Nuremberg, Heidelberg, etc., and it was necessary to make provision for their religious wants. The conference, however, was determined that there should be no breach between the new church and the Roman-Catholic Church before 1870; that, indeed, the Old-Catholic Church which was to be organized should be the true continuation of the truly Catholic Church. But at this point a formidable difficulty presented itself: ordination and confirmation can only be performed by a bishop, and the party numbered no bishops among its members. At this juncture the Church of Utrecht came to the aid. The Church of Utrecht contains the remnant of the Jansenists, or Old-Catholics in Holland, and numbers at present one archbishopric of Utrecht, two bishoprics of Deventer and Haarlem, twenty-five congregations, and about six thousand members. It is strongly opposed to the theology and casuistry of the Jesuits; but it recognizes the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. It regularly informs the Pope of the election of a new bishop, and the Pope as regularly declares the election null and void. But in this church the apostolical succession has undeniably been preserved, and from that it was transferred to the Old-Catholic Church.

In the summer of 1872 Archbishop Loos of Utrecht made a tour of visitation among the Old-Catholic congregations in Germany, and confirmed about five hundred children; and in 1873 the bishop (Heykamp) of Deventer consecrated Professor Reinkens, who had been elected Old-Catholic bishop, in the fashion of the primitive church, by an electoral body composed of the clergy and delegates of the people.

At the third conference, held at Constance in 1873, the organization was completed, and a synodal constitution adopted. The diocesan synod, presided over by the bishop, and consisting of the clergy of the diocese, and one lay-delegate for each two hundred church-members, assembles every year, and dispatches such business as has been prepared for it by the synodal committees, — an administrative body composed of four priests and five laymen, and placed beside the bishop for his assistance. The organization was recognized everywhere in Germany by the secular government. The first synod met at Bonn in 1874. A considerable number of propositions have been gradually adopted and introduced, — the offering of the cup also to the laity in the Lord’s Supper, the use of the native tongue in the service, the abolition of compulsory celibacy, etc. A similar constitution has been adopted by the Old-Catholic Church in Switzerland, where the movement developed, independently of, but alongside with, the movement in Germany. Herzog, formerly a priest at Olten, was elected bishop, and
consecrated by Reinkens. The Swiss Constitution, however, is somewhat more democratic. In Austria the bishop does not preside over the synod, greater influence on the administration is allowed to the congregation, the bishop can be deposed by the synod, etc. In Austria the government made some difficult before recognizing the organization. In Bohemia, however, and in Austria proper, especially in Vienna, several Old-Catholic congregations have been formed. In Paris the ex-père Hyacinthe Loyson has formed an Old-Catholic congregation. In 1878 the statistics of the movement showed 122 congregations and 52,002 souls. Since that time the movement has made little or no progress.


OLDENBURG, the Grand Duchy of, consists of three parts, — the duchy of Oldenburg, the principality of Lübeck, and the principality of Birkenfeld, — whose church-establishments are entirely independent of each other, though the constitution is the same in all of them. According to the last census of 1875, the grand duchy contained 319,314 inhabitants, of whom 245,064 were Evangelical, 71,743 Roman Catholic, 1,578 Jews, 909 Christians of various denominations, and 80 of no acknowledged form of religion. The Reformation was established in the country July 13, 1573, and in 1578 the Church became a State establishment, and Lutheran, the only denomination tolerated. In 1848 this constitution was abolished, the Church separated from the State, and universal toleration made a law. In 1855, however, it was found necessary to return to the old order of things by the constitution of April 11. The Lutheran Church again became a State establishment, but religious freedom was retained.

OLDLIGHT ANTIBURGHERS. See SecedERS.

OLD TESTAMENT. See BIBLE TEXT, Canon.

OLEARIUS was the name of a German family, of which, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, produced a great number of learned theologians. — I. Johannes Olearius, b. at Wesel, Sept. 17, 1546; d. at Halle, Jan. 26, 1623; studied at Marburg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Hebrew at Königsberg in 1577, professor of theology at Helmstedt in 1578, and superintendent of Halle in 1581. He was a son-in-law of Hüssenhau, and, like him, an ardent champion of correct Lutheranism. — II. Gottfried Olearius, son of I.; b. at Halle, Jan. 1, 1604; d. there Feb. 26, 1657; studied at Jena and Wittenberg, and was in 1647 appointed superintendent of Querfurt in 1637, court-preacher to the Duke of Saxony-Weissenfels in 1648, and superintendent of the Weissenfels dominions in 1680. He published Methodus studii theologici, 1684; Oratio sacra, 1686; a number of devotional books, a hundred and forty hymns by himself, etc. — III. Johannes Olearius, son of I.; b. at Halle, Sept. 17, 1611; d. at Weinsel, April 12, 1680; studied at Wittenberg, and was appointed superintendent of Querfurt in 1637, court-preacher to the Duke of Saxony-Weissenfels in 1648, and superintendent of the Weissenfels dominions in 1680. He published Methodus studii theologici, 1684; Oratio sacra, 1686; a number of devotional books, a hundred and forty hymns by himself, etc. — IV. Johann Gottfried Olearius, son of II.; b. at Halle, Sept. 28, 1635; d. at Arnstadt, where he was superintendent, May 21, 1711; became specially noted as a hymn-writer: Poetische Erstlinge, 1694, and Geistliche Singe-Lust, 1697. His Abacius Patrologicus, Halle, 1678 (lives of ecclesiastical writers before the Reformation, alphabetically arranged), was republished in 1711, by his son, in an enlarged form, under the title of Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum. — V. Johann Christof Olearius, son of III.; b. at Halle, Sept. 17, 1660; d. at Arnstadt, where he was superintendent, March 81, 1747; was a man of vast learning and great literary activity. His works on hymnology (Entwurf einer Liederbibliothek, 1702; Evangel. Liederschatz, 1705; Jubilirende Liederfreude, 1717) are still of interest. — VI. Johannes Olearius, son of II.; b. at Halle, May 5, 1639; d. at Leipzig, Aug. 6, 1713; was appointed professor of classical languages at Leipzig in 1668, and professor of theology in 1677. In the pietist controversy he sided with Spener and Francke, though without taking active part in the contest until Carpoz's attack in 1692, which he met with an open and decided protest. Among his writings are, Exercitationes philologicae ad epistolae dominicales, 1674; De Stylo N. T., 1678; Synopsis controversiarum cum Pontificis, Calvinistis, Socinianis, etc., 1688. — VII. Gottfried Olearius, son of VI.; b. at Leipzig, July 28, 1672; d. there Nov. 10, 1714; was appointed professor of classical languages in his native city in 1699, and professor of theology in 1708. He was still more independent of the reigning orthodoxy than his father. Of his writings, mostly dissertations on exegetical and dogmatical subjects, his Jesus, der wahre Messias, Leue Liebe, 1704, attracted much attention. — VIII. Johann Christian Olearius, son of III.; b. at Halle, June 22, 1646; d. there Dec. 9, 1699; studied at Jena, Leipzig, and Kiel; visited also the Dutch universities and Strassburg; and succeeded in 1685 his uncle as superintendent of Halle. He was an open but moderate adversary of the pietist movement. He published some dissertations and sermons. More detailed information on the whole family is to be found in Leuckfeld: Historia Hesseliana und Dreyhaupt: Beschreibung des Scheltritter's.}

OLEVIANUS, Caspar, one of the fathers and founders of the Reformed Church in Germany; b. in Trèves, Aug. 10, 1530; d. at Herborn, March 15, 1587. He was made acquainted with the bearing of Christ's sacrifice on the forgiveness of sin through the teachings of a pious mother and priest. He entered in his native city. He was a very prolific writer: Aphorismi homiletici, 1658; Annotationes biblica, 1677; Idea dispositionum bibliarum, 1681; Halygraphia (an historical description of the city of Halle), etc.
the gospel. He took up the study of Calvin's works, and in 1558 went to Geneva, where he became an ardent follower of the Swiss Reformer. Returning to Trèves in 1560, he was appointed teacher of rhetoric, and in 1561 he resigned his office as pastor, in order to devote himself wholly to the seminary. His few writings are mostly of devotional character. His *Catéchisme chrétien pour la vie intérieure*, Louvain, 1686, was often republished.

OLIN, Stephen, D.D., LL.D., Methodist divine; b. at Leicester, Vt., March 3, 1797; d. at Middletown, Conn., Aug. 16, 1861. He was graduated from Middlebury College 1820; entered the ministry of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and, after several appointments, was professor of English literature in the University of Georgia 1827-44, president of Randolph Macon College, Virginia, 1834-37, president of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 1842 till his death. From 1837 to 1841 he travelled in Europe, Egypt, and Palestine, the fruits of which journey were, *Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petraea, and the Holy Land*, New York, 1843, 2 vols.; and *The Golden Horn*, New York, 1854. President Olin was renowned as a pulpit orator. His Works, consisting of sermons, etc., appeared New York, 1832, 2 vols.; and his *Life and Letters*, edited by his wife, New York, 1865, 2 vols.

OLIVA, Fernando Perez de, b. at Cordova, 1494; d. at Salamanca, 1560; studied at Salamanca, Acis, Paris, and Rome; lectured with much success on the morals of Aristotile in Paris, and received the most flattering invitations to Rome from Adrian VI., but preferred to settle on Spanish soil at Salamanca, and acquired a noted place in the history of Spanish literature by employing the Castilian tongue, instead of the Latin, in his essays: *On the Dignity of Man, On the Faculties of the Mind, etc.* See TICENOR: *History of Spanish Literature*, New York, 1849.

OLIVE. See On.

OLIVER, Thomas. b. at Tregonan, in Wales, 1725; d. in London, March, 1799. Illiterate and profligate as a youth, he was converted under Whitefield's preaching, became (1753) one of Wesley's most active preachers, and his corrector of the press (1775-88), doing much work in the Calvinistic-Armenian Controversy. He wrote an *Elegy on Wesley's death* (1791) and four hymns, whereof "The God of Abraham praise" (1772 or earlier) is generally allowed to be one of the noblest odes in the language. F. M. BIRD.

OLIVET and OLIVES, Mount of, a mountain range east of Jerusalem, called by the Arabs *Jabel el Tur" ("mount of the rock"). 1. Physical Features. — It is, properly speaking, a ridge, sloping on the west abruptly toward the Kedron Valley, by which it is separated from Jerusalem, but towards the east more gradually, breaking up into valleys. It has four distinct elevations, although the intervening depressions are very slight. (1) "Virg Galilaei" ("ye men of Galilee"), so called because there, tradition says, the angels addressed those words to the gazing disciples (Acts i. 11). It is a half-mile north of the city, and is 2,882 feet above sea-level. (2) "Mount of Ascent," 2,665 feet directly opposite the city, and properly the Mount of Olives. (3) The Pater Noster; (4) a catacomb, the "Prophets' Tombs," on its side.
This summit is south-west of the former about six hundred yards. (4) "Mount of Offence," because there Solomon set up the idol-worship. Bleak as the mountain ridge is at present, only a few scattered olive-trees being left to justify its name, there is evidence that once it really was covered with olives, myrtles, pines, and palms; and a little care and cultivation would restore its beauty.

2. The View from the Mount of Ascension is the "saddest and yet the most impressive in the world." It is the best view of Jerusalem, so full of reminiscences of former grandeur, so full of evidences of present decay. And more can be seen than the city directly in front. On the north rises Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, apparently at one's feet, but really seven hours of hard riding away, and the mountains around it; on the south is the Frank Mountain. Our Lord rises Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, and the city directly in front. On the north rises Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, apparently at one's feet, but really seven hours of hard riding away, and the mountains around it; on the south is the Frank Mountain. Our Lord rises Scopus; on the east are the Dead Sea, and the city directly in front.

3. Scripture Allusions.— Olivet is first mentioned in connection with David's flight from Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 30). It was the scene of the worship of Chemosh and Molech, set up by Solomon (1 Kings xi. 7), destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14); thence, also, the people, by order of Ezra, got the branches for the feast of tabernacles ( Neh. viii. 6). But the allusions to it in the New Testament are not only more numerous, but much more interesting. "It is very prominent in the closing scenes of our Saviour's ministry. In Bethany, on the eastern slope of Olivet, he had his most intimate friends,— Lazarus, Martha, and Mary,— and performed his last and greatest miracle (Luke x. 35-42; John xii.). From Mount Olivet he made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Luke xix. 29-38). Here he spent the nights intervening between the entry and his passion, and returned every morning to teach in the temple (Luke xx. 37). Descending from this mountain, he wept over the ungrateful city, and foretold her fearful doom (Luke xxi. 37). To it he repaired on the night of his ascension (John xviii. 1-3); from it he ascended to heaven to take possession of his throne (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 12)."— SCHAFF, Through Bible Lands, p. 355. "At Easter Olivet and Ein Karem; and upon the same mountain pressed the feet of Jesus when in the depths of his humiliation; and in the heights of his triumph.

4. Buildings on the Mount.— Tradition wrongly puts the ascension upon the so-called "Mount of Ascension." Indeed, our Lord's footstep is shown in the Mohammedan mosque which now covers the spot. There Helena, the mother of Constantine, built (325) a basilica; and other churches and convents were built there by crusaders. The patriarch Modestus, in the beginning of the seventh century, built there a rotunda, open in the middle, because that the place of the ascension must not be covered by a roof. This building was several times destroyed and rebuilt. The present Chapel of the Ascension is octagonal, and was rebuilt after the earthquake of 1694. On the spot traditionally pointed out, standing on a Mahometan mosque, rose a whose court "are ranged the altars of various Christian churches."

Besides the literature under Jerusalem, see the exhaustive monograph of Tobler: Siloachquelle u. d. Oelberg, St. Gallen, 1892.

Olivétan, Pierre Robert, b. at Noyon; a relative of Calvin; was tutor in a rich family at Geneva in 1538, but was expelled from the city for propagating the ideas of the Reformation; settled at Neufchâtel, and undertook, on the instance of the Piedmontese Waldenses, to translate the Bible into French. As he was not a great Greek or Hebrew scholar, he used a translation of Lefèvre d'Étaples as foundation for his own work. It appeared at Neufchâtel, 1538, in folio. Afterwards revived by Calvin, it was generally adopted by the French Protestants. Olivétan died at Ferrara in 1558.

Olivier, Pierre Jean, b. at Sérignan in Languedoc, towards the middle of the thirteenth century; d. at Narbonne, 1297; entered the order of the Franciscans; studied theology in Paris; became a man of great learning and severe morals, and contended for the complete fulfilment of the rules of his order, as that of absolute poverty. To these maxims he added certain apocalyptic ideas resembling those of the abbot Joachim, which he set forth in his Postilla super Apocalyp. Before his death the book does not seem to have been known outside of the narrow circle of his friends and pupils; but in 1526 Pope John XXII. condemned sixty sixty-six propositions of it, and the author's bones were dug up and burnt. See Wadding: Annales Minorum. C. SCHMIDT.

Ollivant, Alfred, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff; b. at Manchester, Eng., 1798; d. at Llandaff, Dec. 16, 1832. He was fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1821; vice-principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, 1827-43; regius professor of divinity, Cambridge, 1843-49; and bishop of Llandaff, 1849 till his death. He published An Analysis of the Text of the History of Joseph, London, 1828, 2d ed., 1833; Sermons preached in the Chapel of St. David's, Lampeter, 1881. He was a member of the O. T. Company of Revisers.

Olshausen, Hermann, a pious theologian, who participated actively in the theological movements of his day, and did excellent work in the departments of New-Testament exegesis; the son of a clergyman; was b. at Oldesloe [in Holstein], Aug. 21, 1798; he entered the university of Kiel, and two years later passed to the university of Berlin, where he came under the influence of Schleiermacher and Neander. At the festival of the Reformation in 1817, he gained the prize for the best essay upon Melanchthon as depicted in his letters (Melanchthon. Charakteristik aus seinen Briefen dargestellt, Berlin, 1818). In 1820 he became privatdocent at Berlin, in 1821 professor extraordinarius, and, 1827, ordinary professor at Königsberg. In the circle of young friends at Berlin who gathered especially about Neander, he had manifested a living faith in Christ in its full power. From that time he "desired only to be a faithful servant of the church of his Lord and Saviour." He married Agnes von Prittwitz-Gaffron, but his happiness was much interrupted by the affliction of a feeble constitution. In the hope of benefiting his health, he followed a call to Erlangen in 1834.

Olshausen's special department was New-Testament exegesis. He prepared the way for his Commentary in a work on the historical proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels in the first two centu-
ONDERDONK, Henry Ustic, D.D., L.L.D., was b. in New York, March, 1789; and d. in Philadelphia, Dec. 6, 1838. He graduated at Columbia College, 1803; studied medicine in London; M.D., Edinburgh, 1810; with Dr. V. Mott, edited New-York Medical Journal; was ordained, 1815; ministered at Canandaigua, N.Y., 1816-20; rector of St. Ann's, Brooklyn, 1820-27; assistant bishop of St. Ann's, 1827; succeeded Bishop White, etc. He was active in assisting the appointment of St. Ann's, Brooklyn, 1820-27; assistant bishop of the Episcopal Church, re-writing several hymns, and contributing ten entirely his own. Of these, The Spirit in our hearts, has been generally and several others frequently, adopted by the hymnals of other communions.

F. M. BIRD.

ONEIDA COMMUNITY, a body of so-called religious perfectionists, practising a community of wives and goods; founded by John H. Noyes, who graduated at Dartmouth College, 1830, and, after studying theology at Andover, came to New Haven, was licensed to preach in 1838. He promulgated the views on Christian perfection and the intercourse between the sexes which were sought to be carried out at two communities,—the Oneida Community (1847) in Madison County, N.Y. (three miles from the town of Oneida); and the community at Wallingford, Conn. The Oneida Community owned a fine tract of six hundred and forty acres, practised a community of goods and a community of wives. Noyes was at the head of the institution. The community occupied one large building. The people were skillful farmers, and carried on successfully the manufacture of traps and the preparation of preserved fruits. The opposition to this institution, which was based upon the very just sentiment, that the community was highly immoral in its practices, under the lead of the late Professor Mears of Hamilton College, and others, secured its dissolution in 1879.


ONKELOS, one of the principal targumists, or translators of the Hebrew Bible into Chaldee. He sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and was a fellow scholar of Paul, as the Talmud informs us (Megilla, fol. 3, col. 1; Baba Batha, fol. 134, 1). Jonathan made use of Onkelos. The Targum of Onkelos was the first work of its kind, and is a faithful translation, except in the case of figurative expressions; e.g., anthropomorphic representations of God. It comprised the Pentateuch,Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the twelve Minor Prophets. It may be found in the Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, the Biblia Complutensis, of Venice, 1526, and in Walton's Polyglot. Spells was the first work of its kind, and is a faithful translation, except in the case of figurative expressions; e.g., anthropomorphic representations of God. It comprised the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets. It may be found in the Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, the Biblia Complutensis, of Venice, 1526, and in Walton's Polyglot.


OOSTERZEE, Jan Jakob van, Dutch theologian; b. at Rotterdam, Holland, April 17, 1817; d. at Wiesbaden, Germany, July 29, 1882. He studied at the university of Utrecht, 1836-40, where he had a brilliant course. From 1840 to 1844 he was pastor at Kemenne-Binnendyck and at Alkmaar, from 1844 to 1862 pastor in the principal church of Rotterdam, from 1862 till his death ordinary professor in the university of Utrecht, where he lectured, first upon biblical, systematic, and pastoral theology and homiletics, but after 1897, upon New-Testament introduction, history of doctrines, and philosophy of religion. He was the recognized leader of the evangelical school of Holland. In learning, eloquence, and piety, he ranked as a foremost divine of his day. He was also a voluminous writer. Several of his works have been translated, and commend themselves very highly to practical and conservative religious minds in Great Britain and Amer-
dion, Edinburgh, 1874, 2 vols.; Moses, Eng. trans.,
Edinburgh, 1876; Practical Theology, Eng. trans.,
1878. He left behind him an autobiography and a
work upon apologetics. See biographical sketchs
in Zöckler's Beweis des Glaubens for 1882, and
Evans, in Catholic Presbyter for October,
1882.

O'PHIR (בַּר הָוֶֽיִר, in the Sept. Οφιρ; or יֹֽבֵי in
the Sept. עְבַר הָוֹיִר, עֵבֶֽר, etc.) is mentioned
in Gen. x. 29 as the eleventh son of Joktan, and
in 1 Kings ix. 28, x. 11, 2 Chron. viii. 18, ix. 10,
as a region from which the fleet of Solomon,
navigated by Phoenicians, brought back gold, and
that not only in immense quantities, but also of a
fineness unequalled by the product of any other
region (comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 4; Job xxvii. 16;
Ps. xlv. 9). The question where the abode of
Ophir the Shemite was to be sought for, was
pretty accurately answered at the time of Moses:
all the thirteen sons of Joktan, and the tribes
descending from them, were settled in Arabia.
But where was the Ophir of Solomon? The latter
question has puzzled a great number of the most
learned Orientalists and historians. Its theolo-
gical import is small; but, in the chain of ancient
traditions concerning commercial connections and
routes, Ophir forms a link of the greatest conse-
quence. Four different views with respect to its
location have been propounded and sustained by
reasons of weight. Some have placed it in South
Africa, others, on the eastern coast of Africa,
abla, the Egyptian ablu, the Latin ablu, "ivory;
Tukhí, "peacock," from Cithi in Sanscrit, and
Togei in Malabar, etc. It is also evident that the
Σωφίως of the Septuagint means India, as Sophir
is the Coptic name of "India and its islands;" and
Josephus says explicitly, that the fleet of Solomon
went "to India, which in old times was called
Sophira, but now is called Chryse" (x. 8, 9, 4).
But the difficulty is to designate a point in which
the gold of Himalaya and the sandal-wood of
Deccan (that is, the products of the northern and
southern parts of India) could be conveniently
gathered together for exportation. Abhira has
been pointed out, an old Arian settlement situ-
ated in lat. 20° N., between the Delta of Indus
and the Gulf of Cambay; also the Supara of Ptole-
maeus, the present Goa; and others. But in all
cases the etymology presents difficulties. The
safer is still to seek for Ophir in some place on
the south-eastern coast of Arabia, which forms a
convenient point of connection between Eastern
Africa and India, and which in olden times was
certainly inhabited by the Ophirites (Gen. x. 29),
though not neither the country, nor any single
place in it, bears the name. [See A. Soetbeek:
Das Goldland Offr, Berlin, 1860]

OPTATUS, Bishop of Mileve in Numidia. Of
his life nothing is known; but a book by hiu,
De schismate Donalistarum adversus Parnemianum,
have come down to us. According to Jerome (De
tir. ill., 110) it was written between 364 and 375;
but this statement is contradicted by a notice in
the work itself, Rosennad, appendix added to the
original text at a later
It is situated on the canal of
Mozambique, in lat. 20° S.; and two hundred
geographical miles in the interior, in the neighbor-
hood of the gold-mines of Tete, remains of walls
and masonry are found, covered with inscriptions
in unknown characters, but by a native tradition
ascribed to the Queen of Sheba. The name of
the latter place is Furah, which is declared to be
identical with Afsura (Ophir). In favor of this
hypothesis speak the great quantity and the ex-
quise fineness of the gold of Eastern Africa, in
which it surpasses that of India; the
immense amount of ivory which Africa furnishes,
and in which it also far exceeds India; and, finally,
the circumnavigation of Africa by the
Phcenicians, who, according to Herodotus,
planted a hundred stations on the western coast of
the continent. But the etymology of Furah is a
weak point; and Africa has no sandal-wood and
peacocks, both of which belong exclusively to
India. In favor of India speaks the circumstance
that the names of the products (gold excepted)
which were brought from Ophir are all of Indian
origin, such as Kopi, "ape," Kapi in Sanscrit; Shen
habim, "tooth of the elephant," from the Indian
thisa, the Egyptian ebu, the Latin ebri, "ivory;"
Tukhim, "peacock," from Cithi in Sanscrit, and
Togei in Malabar, etc. It is also evident that the
Σωφίως of the Septuagint means India, as Sophir
is the Coptic name of "India and its islands;" and
Josephus says explicitly, that the fleet of Solomon
went "to India, which in old times was called
Sophira, but now is called Chryse" (x. 8, 9, 4).
But the difficulty is to designate a point in which
the gold of Himalaya and the sandal-wood of
Deccan (that is, the products of the northern and
southern parts of India) could be conveniently
gathered together for exportation. Abhira has
been pointed out, an old Arian settlement situ-
ated in lat. 20° N., between the Delta of Indus
and the Gulf of Cambay; also the Supara of Ptole-
maeus, the present Goa; and others. But in all
cases the etymology presents difficulties. The
safer is still to seek for Ophir in some place on
the south-eastern coast of Arabia, which forms a
convenient point of connection between Eastern
Africa and India, and which in olden times was
certainly inhabited by the Ophirites (Gen. x. 29),
though not neither the country, nor any single
place in it, bears the name. [See A. Soetbeek:
Das Goldland Offr, Berlin, 1860]
OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM. When these terms are employed to denote philosophical systems, the former signifies the theory that existence is essentially good and the universe perfect; and the latter, the theory that existence is essentially evil and the universe a vanity. Neither term is old. The former only became current in the first half of the eighteenth century, when it was employed to designate the Leibnitziote doctrine of the best possible world. The latter has only come into circulation in the present century, and chiefly in consequence of the influence and celebrity acquired by the doctrine of Schopenhauer. Optimism and pessimism both existed, however, long before the terms now used to designate them. Springing more from the heart than from the head,— from moods and dispositions, than from reasons and discoveries,—they may be traced as veins of feeling and belief through poetry and religion, in almost every age and land which have had a literature, although they have only appeared in modern times as distinct philosophical theories. It is only, however, in the theoretical or philosophical stage that they deserve their name, and show their nature. Popular optimism and pessimism do not look beyond the interests of individuals or species; and yet the optimism and pessimism which do not regard the world in its entirety are manifestly both incomplete and inconsistent.

Optimism may allow that there is much pain, and pessimism may allow that there is much pleasure, in life. So far as suffering may lead to the greatest good, optimism demands it. So far as enjoyment is necessary to render an essentially evil existence endurable, pessimism requires it. Optimism denies that there is any thing really evil, if the universe be considered as a whole, but not that there are many particular evils in the universe. Pessimism denies that there is any thing really good in relation to the universe as a whole, but not that there are many things good as regards the particular interests of particular beings.

The chief classical and Christian philosophies were optimist in spirit. But optimism appeared as a distinct theory, only near the close of the seventeen century. As it was adopted about the same time by Lord Shaftesbury, Archbishop King, and Leibnitz, it is necessary to bear in mind that Shaftesbury first expounded it in his Inquiry concerning Virtue, written in 1689, and surreptitiously published in 1692; King, in his De Origine Muli, published in 1702; and Leibnitz, in his Theodicee, published in 1710. It had occurred independently to Leibnitz ; but, before he published on the subject, he had read what Shaftesbury and King had written. It is an error to represent, as Dugald Stewart and Mr. Hunt have done, Shaftesbury or King as having derived their optimism from Leibnitz. In Pope's Essay on Man, the doctrine was most skilfully advocated in verse. In Voltaire's romance of Candide, it was most ingeniously ridiculed.

What optimism teaches is, that every thing in the universe is in its place, is good relatively to the whole, is for the best; that the universe as a whole could not have been better contrived or ordered than it is; that there is nothing really evil, since, however painful and hurtful many things may be within certain limits, it is as good as the universe could be. 

The great reason, and it may almost be said, the sole reason, given for this teaching, is the Divine Perfection. As absolutely good, God can only wish what is for the best, — that than which there can be no better, if the good of the entire universe should turn to which side we please, there meets us the horn of a dilemma. If the world is not the best possible, says the optimist, God cannot be all-good. But if the world be the best possible, the best that God can make, is the inference not just as good that God cannot be all-powerful? Or, rather, is the true inference not, that we are reasoning in a region too high for us, and where our conclusions are not much worth one way or another? Then, is it clear that there can be no real evil in the world, because God is absolutely good? May it not merely be better that there should be even such evil than that God should prevent it by making men unable to do it, while yet the world might be a great deal better than it is if men did no evil? There is obviously a vast difference between the so-called evils of the physical world and the evils of the moral world. The former can be shown to be conducive to the good of the physical system as a whole, and therefore to be only seemingly evil. The latter are pronounced by conscience essentially evil, and investigation fails to prove that they have any rightful place in the world.

The dissatisfaction with life which ultimately leads to pessimism comes to light in all literatures. It found a very remarkable religious expression in Buddhism. In the present century it has appeared in a series of speculative systems. The two countries in which pessimism has chiefly flourished are India and Germany. Only in pantheistic soil can pessimism flourish. The belief that existence is essentially evil can never spring from a true theism.

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1800) was the founder of modern or German pessimism. According to him, the world is the worst possible. A worse world could not exist at all. It is representation, an illusion produced by the intellect, behind which lies will, the universal substance, the ultimate principle of all things. The world is itself a blind, unconscious striving, which only comes to consciousness in animated beings. Discontent is of its very essence; and, with every new stage
of development, it becomes increasingly wretched. The radical evil is the will to live. The great aim of life is to get rid of life through extinction of the will to live; and this must be accomplished by fastig, by voluntary poverty, by meek submission by the various exercises of asceticism. The most distinguished living representative of pessimism is Edward von Hartmann. He attempted to overcome the dualism of will and knowledge in Schopenhauer's philosophy by reducing them to a unity, which he calls the Unconscious. To the working of the irrational will of the Unconscious, he ascribes alike the origin of existence and of evil. That will has broken away from the primitive harmony of the Unconscious, and nature and life are the deplorable consequences. Reason follows after, to undo, as far as possible, the evil which has produced, and to convince it of the mischief which it has caused and is causing; but, before it succeeds, all history must be traversed, all delusions experienced, all follies committed. He will not say that the world is the worst possible; he will not deny even that it may be the best possible, since we do not know what is committed. He will not say that the world is necessarily evil, but will be eternally so; that his fellow-pessimists have no right to promise that the agony of creation will ever terminate, that the hope of the extinction of evil in a world essentially evil is an unreasonable hope, and can only be based on blind faith. Pessimism has been defended also by Frauenstädt, Taubert, Du Prél, Venetianer, Volkelt, Noire, Von Hellwald, Mainlander, and many other writers.

If there be a personal God, a moral law, and a heavenly life, pessimism must manifestly be rejected. If there be no proof of these things, it cannot be conclusively refuted. The question raised by pessimism as to the worth of life cannot be decided by mere induction from experience. Ltr. — The works of Shaftesbury, King, and Leibnitz, already mentioned. The writings of the pessimists named in this article. Gass: Optimismus und Pessimismus; Duboc: Optimismus und Pessimismus; Hübner: Pessimismus; Caro: Pessimismus aus XIX. Siecle; and Sully: Pessimismus, a very able work both as a history and a criticism. ROBERT FLINT.

OPTION (optare, "to choose"), in canon law, denotes the right to acquire an ecclesiastical benefice by simple choice. Of the prebends belonging to a cathedral, and varying somewhat in value, some are free (canonia libera); and, when such a free prebend falls vacant, the prebendary next in age can acquire it by option if he prefers it to his own. In the ecclesiastical law of England, option denoted a right, which the archbishop acquired by confirming a bishop, of filling the next vacant benefice belonging to the see according to his own choice, and, in the case of a vacant bishopric, by virtue of his office, to the see of the vacancy, if he did not acquire it by option by other means. The term was used by the Lollards, and by the Reformers. In the ecclesiastical law of the Middle Ages, the prebendary possessed only a right of option over the vacant prebend which had fallen to his see, but made no undertaking to elect the person whom he might choose to succeed to the prebend. On the other hand, if the dramatic
element becomes entirely lost in epic descriptions and lyric declamations, the oratorio shrinks into a mere cantata, as in the case of The Seven Words of Haydn. Generally it may be said that there is no Recitative in which this element becomes so closely as the antique tragedy,— that wonderful blending of religion and art, to whose full understanding we now have no other key than the oratorio.

Historically the oratorio owes its origin to St. Filippo de Neri (1515-95), the founder of the order of the Oratorians, and the confessor of Palestrina. The opera was just the rage of the day, and without hesitation Neri engaged it in the service of the church. In the oratory of his order a stage was erected, and fitted up with full decoration. On this stage an azione sacra — that is, a scene of the Bible, or of the sacred tradition of the church — was enacted by priests in costume. The style of the music was that of the opera seria with some small modifications. The bass was allowed to sing solos, the choirs more prominent, the orchestral accompaniment was less development, etc. The attempt proved eminently successful; and, from the place in which the azione sacra was performed, it received the name of an "oratorio." The next step in the development of the oratorio is marked by the appearance of Händel (1685-1759) and Bach (1685-1750); and the difference between the old Italian and the new Anglo-Germanic form of the genre is like that between a polite abbott of the period of the Renaissance and one of the four great prophets. The difference between the two great masters themselves may be thus described,— while the oratorio of Händel became a free, independent creation, though still belonging to the church, the passion-music of Bach remained a part of the service itself, and was partially destined for the use of the congregation. From the Roman-Catholic Church the Protestant churches of Germany had retained the custom of celebrating the Passion Friday by a special recital, in the Gregorian style, of the Passion; different lines being recited or sung by different voices, and sometimes repeated by the whole congregation. Under the influence of the opera, this Passion-recital had been further developed by Heinrich Schütz, chapel-master of Dresden, and Sebastiansi, chapel-master of Königsberg. The narrative was dissolved into a series of recitatives, solos, duos, and choruses. The final perfection of this development was the Passion according to Matthew, composed by Bach, and performed for the first time in the Cathedral of Leipzig on Good Friday, 1728. The last chapter of the history of the oratorio is occupied by Haydn (1732-1809) and Mendelssohn (1809-47), by whose treatment its technical form, more especially the instrumental portion, no doubt, was still further developed but who hardly can be said to have been able to keep up its spiritual standard. Haydn's excellence of graceful melody was somewhat wanting in sublimity, and Mendelssohn's compositions show a greater affinity to the salon than to the church.

ORDEAL, probably from the Anglo-Saxon Ordeald ("great judgment"), and allied to the German Urtheil ("man's judgment") and French Urteil, means a direct appeal to the judgment of God; and its use from the sixth to the thirteenth century denotes, in the history of European civilization, a transition state from the times when every man took the law in his own hand to the times when justice came to be administered by regular courts. Among the Germanic nations, decision of certain cases of strife by wager of battle or duel was a general custom; but as, in that way, justice could be only accidentally obtained, while one duel generally led to another, until whole families were covered with bloodshed, or destroyed, the custom was of course an abomination to the eyes of the Christian clergy. Unable, however, to substitute for this barbarity a regular procedure with witnesses and testimonies, the clergy themselves encouraged the appeals to the direct judgment of God; that is, the legal establishment of the ordeal. There were several kinds,— ordeal by fire or iron, which consisted in carrying red-hot iron in the hands, or walking upon it, and was much used in cases of adultery; ordeal by hot water, which consisted in thrusting the arm down into a vessel of boiling water, and fetching up some object from the bottom, and was much used in cases of theft; ordeal by cold water, which consisted in being thrown, with hands and feet tied together, into a stream of water, and was much used in cases of witchcraft; ordeal of the Eucharist, of the cormed, etc., mostly used for ecclesiastics. Gradually these ordeals were incorporated with the laws,— the Salic, Saxon, Lombardian, Visigothic, etc., and became regular institutions in the social order; but though they were introduced by the clergy, and always administered under their superintendence, which could not but add to the social importance of the church, the clergy never became the bringers of this barbarity to the point. In the beginning of the ninth century, the Council of Lyons absolutely condemned the ordeal. In the eleventh century the opposition became, if not more pronounced, at least more wide-spread; and finally the Council of Trent altogether rejected it (Sess. 25, De Reformacione, cap. 18). In Protestant countries, however, Prussia, Dated in, etc., were still tried by ordeal in the seventeenth century.
If they floated on the surface, they were declared innocent. If they sank to the bottom and were drowned, they were declared guilty, and burnt: if they sunk to the bottom and were drowned, they were declared innocent.

The ordinance of the laying-on of hands, as practiced in ancient times, was frequently referred to in the New Testament. Acts vi. 5, 6. The laying-on of hands is often associated with the laying-on of hands by a consecrated priest, or by the bishop, as a formal induction into the office and functions of the ministry. See Ordination, etc.

1. Scriptural Usage. — The rite of ordination goes back to the Old Testament, and was applied to the priests, Levites (Num. vii. 10), and kings; oil being used. The laying-on of hands was also a frequent practice attending solemn ordination to a high office, and the communication of a special spiritual endowment was connected with it. Moses adopted this practice when he blessed Joshua (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9). In the New Testament the custom of laying on of hands was perpetuated in the transmission or invocation of a blessing (Gen. xlvi. 14; Mark x. 18). Just before his ascension, our Lord, in blessing his disciples, and breathing upon them the Holy Ghost, “lifted up his hands” (Luke xxiv. 50; John xx. 22). The first ordination in the Christian Church was the ordination of the seven deacons; in which case the apostles set them apart by prayer and the laying-on of hands; the candidacy having been made known beforehand by the congregation (Acts vi. 5, 6). The laying-on of hands is frequently referred to in the Acts as accompanying baptism, etc., and sometimes preceded the descent of the Holy Ghost (Acts vii. 17, 18), but sometimes, as in the case of Cornelius, followed it. Paul, who had before been set apart and called by Christ, submitted to the rite of laying on of hands by Ananias (Acts ix. 17), but also, with Barnabas, received the imposition of the hands of “certain prophets and teachers” as they set out from Antioch on their first missionary tour (Acts xii.

2. The Greek and Roman-Catholic Churches hold ordination as one of the seven sacraments by which baptized persons are consecrated, and made competent for the duties of the several orders of the priesthood (Wetzer and Welte: Kirchen-Lexikon, vii. 810). Like baptism, it confers an indelible character, and for that reason may not be repeated. This character, or chrism, is conferred irrespective of the person and life.
of the ordinand and candidate. The Council of Trent (Sess. 23, Can. iv.-vi.) declares that the Holy Ghost is given in ordination; that the words of the ordinand, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," have efficacy; and the priest can never lose his priestly character and powers (become a layman). In one sense, as Martensen (Dogmatik) has said, ordination is the fundamental sacrament; for only those who have received it can pronounce absolution, and perform the eucharistic miracle (laymen being allowed, under certain circumstances, to administer the rite of baptism). Bishops alone are competent to administer the rite of ordination, and all bishops have the right to do so. This applies to the three higher orders of the clergy. Under certain circumstances, presbyters may ordain the lower orders. (See Orders, Holy.) On the principle once a bishop always a bishop, the ordination of a bishop is valid in all cases. Witness the ordination of the first Jan-Holy.) On the principle once a bishop always a byters may ordain the lower orders. (See Orders, Episcopacy.) But the Roman-Catholic Church, in spite of this general principle, denies the validity of the ordination of the Church of England, and holds that church to be a schismatical body. (See the subject ably discussed by Professor Fisher in the New-Englander for 1874, pp. 121-172.) Keble, in his edition of Hooker's Works (Introduction, p. xxxviii), says, "Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote (1594), numbers had been consecrated, but the profession of the church in England with no better than Presbyterian ordination." The custom now prevails universally, of re-ordaining clergymen from other Protestant denominations applying for orders, though it is dispensed with in the case of priests from the Roman-Catholic and Greek churches. Of the sixty-three ministers who in 1880 and 1881 passed from other Protestant denominations to the Episcopal Church in the United States, all were re-ordained, while the two Roman-Catholic priests who made the same change were admitted as properly ordained.

### The Episcopal Church.

3. In the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States, ordination has not the significance of a sacrament; and the view of the English Reformers was not that the laying-on of hands as such conferred any grace. Bishops alone have the right to ordain; and the generally accredited view is, that ordination not performed by episcopal hands is invalid. Presbyterial ordination was acknowledged by the Reformers of the Elizabethan period, as in the cases of Cartwright, professor of divinity at Cambridge; and Whittingham, dean of Durham, etc. (See the subject ably discussed by Professor Fisher in the New-Englander for 1874, pp. 121-172.) Keble, in his edition of Hooker's Works (Introduction, p. xxxviii), says, "Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote (1594), numbers had been consecrated, but the profession of the church in England with no better than Presbyterian ordination." The custom now prevails universally, of re-ordaining clergymen from other Protestant denominations applying for orders, though it is dispensed with in the case of priests from the Roman-Catholic and Greek churches. Of the sixty-three ministers who in 1880 and 1881 passed from other Protestant denominations to the Episcopal Church in the United States, all were re-ordained, while the two Roman-Catholic priests who made the same change were admitted as properly ordained.

4. The Other Churches of the Reformation.

There was some danger of the Reformers underestimating the significance and value of ordination, from the fact that they were called upon to give prominence to the principle that corruption and worldliness and inefficiency prevailed among priests and bishops in spite of their ordination. They laid emphasis upon the divine call or vocation through the Spirit. Hence Luther appealed to the credentials of Paul, and exclaimed, "He who is called, he is consecrated, and may preach Him who gave the call. That is our Lord's consecration, and that is the Rite of Ordination."
The Lutheran and Reformed churches have always acknowledged and practised ordination; but their confessions and theologians have justly laid stress upon the necessity of the divine call or vocation to the ministry. The Augsburg Confession says (art. 14), "No one may teach publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called (rite vocatus)." Ordination is regarded as the church's solemn approval and public attestation of this inward call. In the churches of the Reformed communion (Presbyterian, etc.) the rite is administered by presbyters, who combine in laying their hands upon the head of the candidate, and offering prayer, and thus setting him apart for the ministry. The rite as such confers no grace.

5. The Moravians confine the right to ordain to their bishops, but recognize the ordination of other Protestant bodies as valid.

6. The Disciples of Christ, Quakers, and Plymouth Brethren. These bodies do not recognize any human rite of ordination. They hold all Christians to be equal, and, while they fully accept the doctrine of a divine and inward call to preach, refuse to grant any efficacy to the human ordinance of setting apart for ministerial functions.

For further information, see Clergy, Bishop, Deacon, etc. The literature of the seventeenth century bearing on this question was extensive (e.g., see George Gillespie), and cannot be given in this place. See the art. "Ordination," the sacraments, etc. The primitive and Apostolic Ordinaries of Christ, 1840; Welles: Divine Right of Presbyterian Ordination; Archdeacon Reichel: Ordination and Confession, in Quarterly Review, October, 1877; Charles Hodge: Discussions in Church Polity, New York, 1875. See the art. "Ordination," the sacraments, etc. The primitive and Apostolic Ordinaries of Christ, 1840; Welles: Divine Right of Presbyterian Ordination; Archdeacon Reichel: Ordination and Confession, in Quarterly Review, October, 1877; Charles Hodge: Discussions in Church Polity, New York, 1875.

### ORDINES.

ORDINES, as denoting the ecclesiastical officers in contradistinction to the laity (plebs), occurs, for the first time in the works of Tertullian (De idol., 7; De exhort., cost., 7; De monog., 11), and is probably still older. In the beginning, however, no emphasis was laid either on the number, or on the distinction between ordinaries maiores [priest, deacon, and subdeacon] and minores [chantor, psalmist, ostiary, reader, exorcist, and acolyte]. In his letter to Fabius, Cornelius of Rome speaks of presbyters, diaconi, subdiaconi, acolythi, exorcista, anagnosti, and pylori (Euseb.: Hist. Eccl., VI. 43), while the Apostolical Constitutions (Lib. VIII.) treat only of the ordination of bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and anagnosti. In accordance with the wants of actual life, the ecclesiastical ordinaries developed somewhat differently in the different countries, and the subject was not brought into systematic form until the time of the schoolmen. Peter Lombardus fixes the number of ordinaries at seven, in harmony with the seven graces of the Holy Spirit, — ostiarius ("door-keepers"), lectores ("readers"), cantores ("cantors"), ordo ("acolytes"), subdiaconi ("sub-deacons"), diaconi ("deacons"), and sacerdotes ("priests"). Each
of these offices Christ himself has filled at some period of his life; that of 

cassius, when he drove the money-dealers out of the temple; that of lector, when he expounded Scripture in the syna-
gotheses (Epistola, liber i. ep. 2). Others, however, thought otherwise. A Frankish monk from the

Merovingian time reckons it one of the great triumphs of the Church of Rome, though several of the old offices have disappeared altogether. The canonists, however, reckon generally eight or nine ordines.

**ORDO ROMANUS.**

*HAUCK.*

**ORDO ROMANUS** was the original name of those rules according to which the service of the Church of Rome was regulated. The oldest *ordo* existing is that ascribed to Gelasius, who died in 496. (See Mabillon: *Antiqui libri rituales,* in *Museum Italicum,* ii.) It was very extensively used in the ninth century. In the thirteenth century the name *Ordo Romanus* was replaced by that of *Ceremoniale Romanum* (Gregory X., 1272), and this latter was again replaced by those of *Pontificale Romanum* and *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* (Clement VIII., 1596). Collections of *Ordines Romani* were published by Georg Casander, Cologne, 1559; Melchior Hintzor, Cologne, 1568; and G. Ferrarius, Rome, 1591.

**ORGAN.** The Greek word ἰσθήμων was originally used for any kind of musical instrument, but was afterwards confined to wind-instruments composed of pipes. The number of pipes was generally ten; and, in order to spare the human lungs, the pipes were sounded either from a wind-magazine, in the form of a leathern pouch, comprised by the arm (τίβια ωτικάρια), or by bellows, whose supply of wind was regulated by means of water (organum hydraulicum). The latter kind of instruments, to which the name was gradually restricted, was much used by the Greeks, the Romans, and in the Christian Orient, both at court and at private entertainments. Hence grave people objected to organ-playing as a frivolity, such as the Pagan Ammianus Marcellinus (14, 8, 18), and the Christian Sidonius Apollinaris (Epistole, liber i. ep. 2). Others, however, thought otherwise. A Frankish monk from the Merovingian time reckons it one of the great joys of future life, that there shall be perpetual organ-playing (Migne: *Patr. Lat.,* 88, p. 955); from which passage it may also be learnt, that, at that time, the organ was already used to accompany the hymn-singing of the service. It can consequently not have been something entirely new and altogether startling, when, in 1757, King Pepin received an organ as a present from the Byzantine emperor, Constantine Copronymus, or when Charlemagne ordered the organ presented to him by Michael Rhangabe placed in the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle. But the art of organ-building was, nevertheless, highly admired; and it was mentioned in 826 as a noticeable fact, that a citizen of Venice had offered to build an organ for Louis the Pious. Later on, the art was much cultivated in the north; and Pope John VIII. (872-882) asked Bishop Anno of Freising to send him an organ and an organ-player. The medie-

cval church was, consequently, highly esteemed; and required, in spite of the limited range, generally two performers at a time in order to be suitably handled. The pedal clavature was not invented until the beginning of the fifteenth century. In the Greek Church the organ never came into use. But after the Emperor Ferdinand, it would probably have been abolished by the Council of Trent. The Reformed Church discarded it; and though the Church of Basel very early re-introduced it, it was in other places admitted only sparingly, and after long hesitation. The Lutheran Church continued its use, and produced its great, hitherto unsurpassed master, Johann Sebastian Bach. See O. Wangelmann: *Geschichte der Orgel,* 2d ed., 1881; [Hopkins and Reinbault: The Organ, its History and Construction, 2d ed., 1870; also art. PSALMODY].

**ORIEL,** or **ORIOLE,** an architectural term, almost synonymous with bay or bow window, and denoting a smaller apartment, or a recess projecting from a larger room. It originated from the peculiar arrangement of the domestic oratory, which, rising through the whole height of the building, generally presented such a projection (oratorium) from the second story, in which the lord of the house and his family and guests were seated when participating in the service.

**ORIFLAMME** (coriumflamma, “a flame of gold”), a flag of flame-colored silk embroidered with gold, and carried on the point of a lance. It was originally simply the standard of the Count of Vexin as the defender of the Church of St. Denis; but, when Louis VI. acquired the county of Vexin, the oriflamme became the standard of France. In times of peace it was preserved in the Cathedral of St. Denis, and it was solemnly consecrated whenever it was brought forth to lead in battle. After the battle of Bouvines (1212), the original oriflamme seems to have been lost.

**ORIGEN,** a distinguished Christian theologian and teacher, of the early part of the third century. His name was probably derived from the name of the Egyptian divinity, Or-Hor. Eusebius gives him the surname Adamantius, which Jerome (Ep. ad Paulam) explains of his unting industry; Photius (Bibl., c. 118), of the irresistibleness of his logic.

**I. Personal History.** — Origen was probably b. in Alexandria, 185 or 186, of Christian parents; d. at Caesarea or Tyre, about 254. He was probably baptized in youth, according to the custom in Egypt. At an early age he enjoyed the catechetical instructions of Pantanass and Clemens. In the persecution of 202, his father, Leonidas, was thrown into prison, and, after suffering the confiscation of his goods, was put to death. A rich Christian lady of Alexandria took Origen into her home. When he was about eighteen years old, he began, with the permission of Bishop Demetrius, to give catechetical instruction; the catechetical school of Alexandria being closed on account of the persecutions. His first scholars were the Pagan brothers Heraclas and Paulus. He soon turned his attention exclusively to the training of catechumens, and made and sold copies of old
authors. About this time he subjected himself to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admirer of Origen, makes this statement, which is to be accepted. Sought out more and more by cultivated Pagans, trained to habits of philosophical thought, and feeling the need of systematic training for himself, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, the distinguished forerunner of the Neo-Platonists. Here he was introduced into the study of Plato, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. At a later time he took up the study of Hebrew, but never attained proficiency in it. He seems to have gone to Rome, in the first years of Caracalla's reign, to study the Roman Church, and there heard Hippolytus (Jerome: De vir. ill. 61). Origen's reputation for scholarship secured for him an invitation from a Roman official in Arabia (dux Arabia:) to become his to self-emasculation for the kingdom of heaven's sake, basing the act upon a literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12. Eusebius, an ardent admira
of the Old and New Testaments, the incarnation, etc.; (3) human freedom, temptation, universal restoration, etc.; (4) the Word of God, its divinity and exposition. Of his two books on the Resurrec-
tion of the dead, Ignatius of Antioch, who lived in the Apo-
logy of Pamphilus and in Phoebus.
3. Origen also wrote an ascetic work on martyr-
dom (εἰς μαρτρίαις προτερπτίκος), a work on prayer, and a number of letters, a hundred of which Eusebius collected. Only two are preserved.
4. The great apologetic work of the Greek Church is the treatise against Celsus, in eight books,—a work of Origen's mature years, written in the reign of Philip Arabs. Exactly who this Celsus was Origen is not sure,—whether an Epicurean of the reign of Nero, or another of the reign of Hadrian. He inclines to the latter view. (Most historians (Mosheim, Gieseler, Baur, Friedlander) assign Celsus to 150 or later; others (Tillemont, Neander, Zeller), to about 160 or 170; Keim, to 178. As the place of composition, Keim suggests Rome; others, Alexandria.) The book which he refutes is the Λόγος ὁ ἐντολή. This Celsus states that he finds in the Platonicism of his day, and brings satire to bear on Christianity, whose doctrines seem to him to be irrational. The Platonism of Celsus seems to preclude his identification with a person of the same name, at whose suggestion Lucian of Samosata wrote his Alexander, but Keim has brought forward plausible considerations in its favor. The Celsus of Origen regards the Christian Church as a secret society. The Christians do not follow reason, but blind faith, and despise learning and culture. Origen replies, that the Christians were right in following the truth which had been attested by miracles and prophecy, and that faith is a universal principle of daily life. He then refutes Celsus's objections that the Jews rejected Christ, believed him to have been the offspring of an adulterous connection, and to have learned magical arts in Egypt, and that Christ died in ignorance of his office. Origen brings out the atoning significance of the crucifixion, uses the prophecies in proof of his positions, and urges the originality of the person of Christ. In Book II. Celsus brings forward the absurdity of the incarnation of God, and the incompatibility of the three persons as one God. Origen replies by showing that the incarnation differed very widely from the myths which Celsus had referred to, in having a definite and benevolent purpose, and quotes heathen teachers to confirm the propriety of the claim, which the gospel made, to convert and change the lives of the vicious and sinful, which had drawn from Celsus a sneer. In Book III. Celsus combats special Christian doctrines as being inferior to the teaching of philosophy, and Christianity inferior to Paganism. He adduces especially Plato and his spiritualism. Origen replied by magni-
fying the gospel, just because it was designed to reach down and help the masses, as well as to delight the cultured. In Book IV. Origen proves that it is the Christians who have a spiritual worship, a spiritual conception of God, and lead virtuous lives. The great apologist wrote his work to meet the doubts of weak Christians. It is full of profound and suggestive thoughts; but the general impression is somewhat impaired by the author's plan of replying to each special objection in detail.

III. THEOLOGICAL SYSTEM. — Following the direction which Justin Martyr, and especially Clement of Alexandria, had sought to create, with the aid of the philosophy of his day, a science of Christian doctrine whose systematic structure should be equal to the systems of the philosophers. In doing this, he held very positively to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as they had been handed down and defined in opposition to the heretics, especially the Gnostic heretics. But he found truths in the philosophical systems, and tried to show that they were borrowed from the Bible, predicating, however, a general revelation of the Logos. The study of philosophy has a prophetic value; but the real source of Christian knowledge is the Bible, which is all inspired. Faith is sufficient for salvation and sanctification, without culture; but it is not mere assent, but a communion of the heart with God, which shows itself in corresponding acts of righteousness. It is the indispensable condition of salvation and true knowledge. In the interpretation of Scripture, Origen found three senses,—the somatic, psychic, and pneumatic, corresponding to the three parts of man's nature,—body, soul, and spirit. The somatic or literal sense is adapted to the mass of Christians, and is to be accepted, except where it suggests thoughts unworthy of God, and contrary to reason. The psychic sense attaches not merely to distinctly ethical passages, but also to historical and other portions of the Word. The pneumatic, allegorical, or mystical sense includes the higher speculative ideas which may be drawn from Scripture. Origen revelled in its application.

Under the influence of Philo, and especially Justin, and Clement of Alexandria, who followed Philo, Origen started with the conception of God as an unchangeable and spiritual being, who is the Creator of all things and the Author of all that is good. He was ever active, and has revealed himself from eternity through the Logos, the perfect image of himself, who bears as necessary a relation to his own existence as the light bears to the sun and the will to the mind. The Logos is Son, but of the same essence with God (ἐνόμος τοῦ Θεοῦ — Fraqm. θεόν, Ep. ad Hebr.), but also according to other according to his nature and person (ἐνόμος κατ' θεόν καὶ κόσμου), and occupies a subordinate relation. He is the mediator between the increate and created beings. His first product is the Holy Ghoat. From eternity he created a limited number of finite spirits, whose freedom of will included the possibility of evil, or departure from God. The world was created out of nothing, and all dualism is distinctly denied. Matter is not essentially evil. Man is a fallen and sinful creature, bound in the chains of carnal affections. The world is the scene of a terrific struggle of spirits, but also a school of education, in which those who have fallen lowest, including Satan and the demons, are endowed with the power of free will, and may be restored. This cosmic process is essentially nothing more than an emancipation of the soul, and its return to God. The earth was made the scene of divine revelation, which has culminated in the incarnation of the Logos and the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Logos
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ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES. Origens influence extended far beyond the confines of his school, in the narrower sense, over the Greek Church, whose intellectual activity was developed on the ground he had levelled, and, in fact, over the entire Church. But, although he had many followers, there was suspicion in some quarters, while he was yet alive, of his orthodoxy. Methodius, at the threshold of the fourth century, was not alone in his attacks. Pamphilus, on the other hand, defended him. The prominent Fathers of the fourth century likewise assumed this attitude. Athanasius claimed him for his side (De decr. Nic. Syn. 27, etc.); the Arians, on the other, appealed to his authority (Socrates, H. E., IV. 29). Eusebius of Cesarea eulogised his memory; and the three Cappadocian Fathers, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa, revered and honored him. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen collected passages from Origen's writings in a work, Philocalia. Latin Fathers like Hilary, Eusebius of Vercelli, Victorinus of Pettau, and Ambrose, began to make his theological views known in the West, as Jerome testifies. At the same time, however, we find a strong feeling developing itself among some of the monks against him. Epiphanius became a violent assailant of his theology, and placed Origen among the very heretics (Herar. 84). The feeling was different amongst a small circle of scholars in Palestine in the last years of the fourth century. Rufinus in 375 prepared a cell for himself on Mount Olivet; and in 386 his friend Jerome arrived in Palestine from Rome. The latter was a most zealous collector of Origen's works, and began to make them known in the West through translations. To equal Origen in scholarship was his high ambition. The attacks of Aterbius and Vigilantius made him cautious; and the influence of Epiphanius (who arrived in Palestine in 384, and preached against Origen) completely changed his views. John, bishop of Jerusalem, admired Origen, and Rufinus sympathized with him. Epiphanius succeeded in inducing Jerome and the monks at Bethlehem to withdraw from communion with the bishop. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, was called in as mediator, and even Rome was involved; but the question was put aside for the time. In the mean time Rufinus returned to Rome, and spoke out against those who depreciated Origen, and affirmed his own orthodoxy in regard to the Trinity and the resurrection, as well as that of John of Jerusalem. In his De adulatione librum Origenis he asserted that the works of Origen had been falsified by heretics, and in the Preface to his translation of Origen's work on the fundamental doctrines (mol apx''), written in 398 or 399, appeals to Jerome's former veneration for the Alexandrian teacher. Jerome at once made a literal translation of the same work, and denied, as far as was possible, his former regard for Origen (Ep. 40, 41). An unfortunate controversy, which Augustine deplored, between the two friends Rufinus and Jerome, and Anastasius of Rome (wholly unacquainted with Origen's works), summoned the former to Rome to answer for himself. Affairs had taken a turn adverse to the memory of Origen in Alexandria. Bishop Theophilus (385-412) in 399 opposed the Anthropomorphites among the monks of Egypt, who, in opposition to Origen, ascribed a body and a human form to God. But the monks went to Alexandria, and terrified Theophilus to such an extent, that he assented to a condemnation of Origen's writings. Acts condemning Origen were passed by a synod of Alexandria in 400, and by one assembled in the Nitrian Desert, where Origen was held in much reverence. Violent, in his zeal, Theophilus secured the passage of a similar act at Jerusalem. Anastasius of Rome signified his assent; Jerome praised the heroism of Theophilus; and Epiphanius rejoiced at the defeat of Amalek. The friends of Origen, among whom Evagrius Ponticus was prominent, were not silenced by these harsh measures. But works began to appear refuting Origen's views. He was even accused of Pelagianism. The church historians Socrates and Sozomen declare with much heat against him.

In Justinian's reign the convent of St. Sabas in Palestine became the rallying-point for the followers of Origen. Sabas himself is reported, however, before his death (about 531) to have reques-
ed the emperor to proceed against them. Bishop Ephraem of Antioch condemned Origen in a synod. Pelagius and Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, influenced Justinian to write the famous letter Ad Mennam (Mani, IX. 467-514), which ad
duces ten heretical articles from Origen's writings. Mennas was called upon to secure a synodal condemnation of the Alexandrian teacher. At the same time the controversy continued in Palestine. The Origenists were divided into two parties,—the Protoktists (so called in allusion to the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ's soul) or Tetra
drites, and the Iσochrists (so called with reference to the doctrine of the restoration of all souls, and their attainment to an absolute equality with Christ). The latter were the more powerful, and secured the promotion of Macarius to the bishopric of Jerusalem (540). But the former, combining with the orthodox party, deposed Macarius, and put Eustachius in his place (548). He opposed the Origenists. In the meantime the controversy continued in Palestine. A letter of Justinian to the fifth Ecumenical council (555) secured the condemnation of the Origenistic heresies.

The doctrines to which exception was more especially taken in Origen's system were the subordination of the Logos, the definition of the resurrection body as a spiritual body, the pre-existence of the soul, especially Christ's soul, and the universal apokatastasis, including the Devil. See, besides the works mentioned under ORIGEN, WALCH: Histor. d. Ketzererein (vii. 802-860); HEPFLER: Conciliargesch.; [and the Hist. of Doct. of HAGENBACH and SIIPEPP]. W. MÖLLER.

ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHERS, BURGHERS, AND SECEDERS. See SECEDERS. ORIGION. ORIGINES. ORLEANS, Maid of. See JOAN OF ARC.

ORME, William, a Scotch divine, b. at Falkirk, Scotland, 1787; d. 1850. Removing to Edinburgh, he was apprenticed to a wheelwright, but became a student of theology in 1805, Congregational minister of Perth, 1807, and, removing to London, was appointed pastor at Camberwell, and foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society. He wrote his principal work, Historiarum libri VII., which was much read. Manuscripts of it are very frequent, and so are the earlier editions. The best ed. is that by C. ZANGEMEISTER, in Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin, Vienna, 1882. [King Alfred made an Anglo-Saxon translation of the L. Hist. of Livy, Eutropius, Justins, Taciti, Suetonius, etc.; but it uses its sources with great arbitrariness. In the middle ages, however, it was much read. Manuscripts of it are very frequent, and so are the earlier editions. The best ed. is that by C. ZANGEMEISTER, in Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin, Vienna, 1882.]

ORTHODOXY and HETERO DOXY. These terms, which do not occur in the Bible, are derived from the Greek words ορθός ("right") and δόξα ("opinion," or "doctrine"), and they are used among Protestants in the same meaning. In the United States the term frequently applies to divergent sects, and the interest of the American people is based on the Christian Church, heterodox may be held by them as the generally accepted belief of the Christian Church, heterodox may be held by them as the generally accepted belief of the Christian Church. The Roman-Catholic Church, for instance, regards the Protestant churches as heterodox in many points; as, for example, their denial of transubstantiation, the immaculate conception, and the infallibility of the Pope. In the United States the term frequently applies to divergent views on the doctrine of the Trinity. Thus it has been common to speak of the orthodox and heterodox (Unitarian) Congregational churches, and of the orthodox and heterodox (Hickite) Friends. The term "orthodox" as it is generally used among Protestants is a summary of doctrine which has been and still is regarded as the generally accepted belief of the churches of the Reformation. Used in this wider sense, the term "orthodoxy" may become a shackle to the Church which fears the odium connected
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with the accusation of heterodoxy, and has become a standard and concealed designation of intolerance and bigotry on the part of those hostile to Christianity, and others.

A close approach to the meaning of the term “orthodoxy” is given in Gal. ii. 14, where Paul speaks of those who “walked not uprightly (προσωπέων) according to the truth of the gospel;” and 1 Tim. vi. 3: “if any man teach otherwise” (ὑποθαλάσσων), etc. There was a heterodoxy of life, as well as of teaching, in the times of the apostles.

Ignatius was the first Christian writer to use the terms “heterodox teachers” (Ad Smyr., c. 6), and “heterodoxy” (Ad Magn., c. 8). It was not, however, till a definite rule of faith became current in the Church that the terms secured a strict ecclesiastical signification; and all were called heterodox who were excluded from the communion of the Church. In the image-controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries, the Oriental Church laid special stress upon its antiquity and orthodoxy, and in 842 established the Festival of Orthodoxy, which is now celebrated on Feb. 19.

John of Damascus called his system of theology The Exposition of the Orthodox Faith (ἰσόποστετον της ἀθετομον προσωπών); and Nicetas Acominatos, with the Treasury of Orthodoxy (Χρονίκης ἀθετομον προσωπών).

In the seventeenth century the term “orthodoxy” was again frequently used, and was appropriated among the Protestants by the strict school of Lutherans who deprecated all compromise in religion, in intellectuals, may be divorced from orthodoxy of life and conduct; in other words, may exist without a living faith. The tendency of the Christian Church to-day is to emphasize the essential doctrines of Christianity and personal devotion to Christ as the Saviour of the world, and to be careful in the use of the term “heterodox” for fear of offending against the law of brotherly love.


ORTHODOXY, Festival of. See above.

ORTON, John, a distinguished Independent clergyman; b. at Shrewsbury, Sept. 4, 1717; d. at Kidderminster, July 19, 1783. In 1734 he entered Dr. Doddridge’s academy at Northampton, and in 1739 became a teacher in the same institution. Two years later (1741) he became pastor in Shrewsbury of the Presbyterian and Independent congregations, which had united on him. He retired to Kidderminster in 1766, having resigned his pulpit on account of ill health. Mr. Orton was an indefatigable literary worker. His principal writings are, Religious Exercises recommended, 1769; Discourses to the Aged, 1771; XXXVI. Discourses on Practical Subjects, 2 vols., London, 1776; Letters to a Young Clergyman, 1791; and A Short and Plain Exposition of the Old Testament, with Devotional and Practical Reflections for the Use of Families subjoined to each Chapter, edited by Robert Gentleman, Worcester, 1788-91, 3 vols., 5th ed., 1822. Mr. Orton also edited the Works of Dr. Doddridge, to which he prefixed a Life, Leeds, 1802, 10 vols.

OSCULTATORY, a representation, painted or carved, of Christ or the Virgin, which the priest kissed during the celebration of mass, and then passed to the people for the same purpose. The ceremony was probably a reminiscence of the kiss of peace with which, in ancient times, the Christians used to salute each other when meeting at the agape. See KISS OF PEACE.

OSGOOD, David, D.D., a distinguished and fearless Congregational preacher, the son of a farmer; b. at Andover, Mass., Oct. 14, 1747; d. at Medford, Dec. 12, 1822. Graduating at Harvard in 1771, he studied theology under Rev. Mr. Emerson of Hollis, and became pastor at Medford, where he continued for nearly fifty years, becoming one of the most distinguished preachers of the day. He was an unbending Federalist; and his political sermon in 1794, on Genet’s appeal to the people against the government, attracted much attention, and rapidly passed through several editions. His election sermon of 1809 was the most celebrated of his discourses. He was as thorough a Calvinist in theology as he was a Federalist in politics. A volume of his sermons appeared in Boston, 1824. See Sprague’s Annals.

OSGOOD, Samuel, D.D., LL.D., clergyman and man of letters, belonging to an old Puritan family; born in Charlestown, Mass., Aug. 30, 1812; d. in New-York City, April 14, 1880. Graduating at Harvard College in 1832, he studied theology at the Harvard Divinity School. Channing and Ware were then exercising their extensive influence, and Mr. Osgood entered the Unitarian ministry in 1835. In 1856 he was ordained pastor of the Unitarian Church, Nashua, N.H.; in 1841 became pastor in Providence; 1849, of the Church of the Messiah (34th Street and Park Avenue), New-York City. In 1869 he changed his theological views, and, after a year of travel in Europe, entered the ministry of the Episcopal Church (1870), and became rector of the Church of St. John Evangelist. In a conversation with a distinguished friend, he stated that the passage recording the baptismal formula had exerted more influence than any other in bringing about his change of views. He received the degree of doctor of divinity from Harvard, 1857, and that of doctor of laws from Hobart College, 1860. Dr. Osgood was regarded as one of the first men of letters in New-York City, and was especially known for the deep interest he took in the New-York Historical Society and other public literary institutions. Among his writings were, Studies of Christian Biography, New York, 1851; God with Men, New York, 1854; Milestones in our Life Journey, New York, 1854; Sunday Life, New York, 1890; American Leaves, New York, 1870. He was also a frequent contributor to the North-American Review and other periodicals.

OSIANDER, Andreas, b. at Gunzenhausen in Brandenburg; d. in Konigsberg, 1707.
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Oct. 17, 1552; was educated in the schools of Leip-
zig and Altenburg; studied in the university of
Ingoldstadt; was ordained a priest in 1520 at Nu-
remberg, and appointed teacher in Hebrew there,
and preacher to the Church of St. Lawrence. He
was a man of great courage and impetuosity; and,
having embraced the Reformation, he contributed
more than any one else to its establishment in
Nuremberg. In 1524 he addressed to the town-
council Ein gut Unterrichtund getreuer Ratschlag,
in 1525 he married; and in 1528 he drew up,
together with Brenz, the constitution of the Lu-
theran churches of Nuremberg and Brandenburg.

But his energy was very much mixed up with self-
will and arrogance; and even in Nuremberg his
relations to his colleagues were not pleasant. On
the establishment of the Interim, he left the city
(1528), and entered the service of Duke Albrecht
of Prussia, who appointed him pastor and professor
primarius at the theological faculty of Königsberg.
There he caused one of the most odious contro-
versies of the period of the Reformation. It
began with his introductory address, De lege et
evangelio (April 5, 1549), which was vehemently
attacked by Matthias Lauterwald, and it broke
out in full blaze at his disputation concerning justi-
fication by faith (Oct. 24, 1550), at which Martin
Chemnitz and Melchior Isidner were his oppo-
nents. Osiander held very peculiar views on this
point. Fundamentally he agreed with Luther,
and was as antagonistic to Calvinism as to Ro-
manism. But he was a mystic, and interpreted
the doctrine of justification by faith as not the
imputation but the infusion of the essential right-
eousness or divine nature of Christ. His views
may be best learned from his An filius de et
incarnatus (1550), and Von dem einigen Müller
Jesu Christo, etc. (1551). Mörlin, who first tried
to reconcile the opposing parties, soon became his
most decided adversary; and Osiander used his
influence with the duke to prevent the publication
of his opponents' works. The controversy spread
beyond Prussia. An address of Melanchthon re-
ceived a rude answer from Osiander; and the lat-
ter prepared himself for warfare on a grand scale,
when he suddenly died. The duke commanded
peace; but Mörlin was banished, and the Osian-
drists kept the field. His life has been written by
Wilken (Stralsund, 1844) and W. Müller (Eber-
feld, 1870).

OSIANDER is the name of a family of cele-
brated theologians descending from the famous
Königsberg controversialist.—I. Lukas Osiander,
son of Andreas Osiander; b. at Nuremberg, Dec.
15, 1591; d. at Stuttgart, Sept. 17, 1604; studied
at Königsberg and Tübingen, and was appointed
court-preacher in Stuttgart in 1567, and prelate
of Adlerberg in 1596. He published Biblia Latin-
a, a paraphrase of the Bible, 1573–86, 7 vols.,
translated into German by D. Förster, 1600; In-
istituo christianae religiosis, 1576; Epitomes his-
toriae ecclesiasticae, 1602–1604, often reprinted;
sermones, etc.—II. Andreas Osiander, b. in the
diocese of Auch, b. May 26, 1562, at Blaubeuren; d. Aug. 10, 1638, at Tübingen, where
he succeeded his brother as professor and chan-
cellar. He was an ardent champion of correct
Lutheran orthodoxy, and wrote Enchiridium contro-
ercens (1599), Anabaptistin (1605), and Schwenkefeldianus (1607), Pontificis (1607).

His Theologisches Bedenken (1623) against Arndt, whom he was utterly incapable of understanding, at-
tracted most attention.

OSLER, Edward, a devout physician; b. at Fal-
mouth, Eng., January, 1793; d. at Truro, March 7,
1869; was resident surgeon of the Swansea In-
firmary, 1819–25; was then, at London and Bath,
in the employ of the S. P. C. K.; and finally lived
in Cornwall, where he edited the Royal Cornwall
Gazette, 1841–63. He was an M. R. C. S., and Fel-
low of the Linnean Society. He published The
Voyage, a Poem, 1830; Life of Lord Exmouth, 1837;
and Church and King, 1837, containing seventy
hymns of his own. He also contributed largely
Concilium (1604). Morlin, who first tried
to reconcile the opposing parties, soon became his
most decided adversary; and Osiander used his
influence with the duke to prevent the publication
of his opponents' works. The controversy spread
beyond Prussia. An address of Melanchthon re-
ceived a rude answer from Osiander; and the lat-
ter prepared himself for warfare on a grand scale,
when he suddenly died. The duke commanded
peace; but Mörlin was banished, and the Osian-
drists kept the field. His life has been written by
Wilken (Stralsund, 1844) and W. Müller (Eber-
feld, 1870).

OSTERWALD, Jean Frédéric, b. at Neuchatel
in 1663; d. there April 14, 1747. He studied at
Orleans, Paris, and Geneva, and was in 1686
appointed French ambassador in Rome; and was
in 1699 made a cardinal by Clement VIII. His
letters from Rome to the French court contain
the most curious illustrations of the Papal policy
during the sixteenth century. The best edition of
them is that by AMELOT DE LA HOUSSAYE,

OSTIAR, OSTIARIUS, or JANITOR, was the
lowest of the officers of the ancient church, and
served as porter. The officewas originally per-
formed by the deacons, and strangers from entering, showing the members
of their seats, etc. The office probably originated
in the Western Church in the course of the third
century. It is not mentioned by Tertullian and
Cyprian, but in Cornelius' letter to Fabius (Euse-
bius: Hist. Eccl., 6, 43). In the Eastern Church
the officewas originally performed by the deacons

OSLIER.
and sub-deacons: afterwards, however, ἄριστος or πρώτος occur. — HAUCK.

OTTO OF BARMBERG, the Apostle of Pomerania, b. in Suabia about 1060; d. at Bamberg, June 30, 1139. He first labored as a teacher in Poland, where he gained the confidence of Duke Ladislaus; but he afterwards entered the service of Henry IV., who in 1101 made him chancellor, and in 1102 bishop of Bamberg. At the instance of Duke Bolko of Poland, he went in 1124 to Pomerania to preach Christianity among the Pagan Slavs inhabiting the country. He came in great splendor, carrying with him magnificent presents, and was received almost with humility by the Pomeranians. He labored so zealously among the Christians. After staying in the country for about a year, and founding congregations in all its principal cities,— Stettin, Julin, Cammin, etc., — he appointed his chaplain, Adalbert, bishop of Julin, and returned home. In 1127 he again visited the country, and in 1128 he was canonized by Clement III. The sources of his life are found in JAFFE: Bibliotheca Rerum Germ., Berlin, 1869, vgl. v.; Monumenta Bambergensia, containing his biography by Ebo and the Dialogue of Herhard. See GEORG HAAG: Quelle, etc., des O. v. B., Stettin, 1874; and the vivid description of him in KAHN: Das Leben der Kirche in Lebensbildern, Leipzig, 1881.

A. KOLBE.

OTHO OF FREISING, b. after 1111; d. Sept. 21, 1168. He was a grandson of Henry IV., a half-brother of Conrad III., and the uncle of Friedrich I. After studying in Paris, he entered the Cistercian monastery of Morimond in 1133, and was in 1137 appointed bishop of Freising; which position he held till his death, taking an active part in all the political and religious movements of his time. It is, however, as a historian, and not as a theologian or politician, that he has gained fame. His De duabus civitaten, or De mutatione rerum, was written between 1143 and 1146. In its first six books, down to 1106, it follows closely the Chronicon universale of Ekkehard: the seventh book (1106-46) is the only one which has any strictly historical interest. The work is, indeed, a philosophy of history, rather than a history. On the basis of Augustine and Orosius, the author will show and explain the contrast between the miseries of this world and the glory of the kingdom of heaven. The eighth book is a description of the latter. At the instance of his nephew he commenced his Gesta Friderici, a work of great historical interest; but he died before he had finished it. It was continued to 1190 by Ragewin. The best edition is that by Wilman, in Monumenta Germaniae, also published separately in 2 vols., Hanover, 1887. See WATTENBACH: Deutsche Geschichtsquellen, Berlin, 1878 (4th ed.), ii., 206-217, and 412.

JULIUS WEIZSÄCKER.

OTTOLE, Laurence, St., b. in Leinster, Ireland, 1114; d. at Augum, France, Nov. 14, 1180. After being abbot of the monastery of Glendalough, he was consecrated Archbishop of Dublin, 1162, the first one consecrated in Ireland. He was not only a devoted prelate, but a patriot, foremost in effort to ward off from his country the threatened English invasion. He was canonized by Pope Honorius III. in 1225. See TODD: Ancient Irish Church; DE VинKE: Irish Primitive Church, New York, 1870.

OTTERBEIN, Philip William, the father of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, was b. June 4, 1726, at Dillenburg, Germany; d. at Baltimore, Nov. 17, 1813. In 1762 he emigrated to America, accompanying Rev. Michael Schlatter, a clergyman of the German Reformed Church, and was settled over the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Penn., till 1768, then labored extensively in Tulpehockan, Frankstown, Md. (1768-65), and York, Penn. (1765-74), after which he organized and had charge of the Evangelical Reformed Church of Baltimore. At Lancaster he experienced what he regarded as a change of heart. He instituted prayer-meetings, trained laymen as leaders, held meetings in the open air, and was in close fellowship with ministers of other denominations, especially Böhm, a Mennonite, and Asbury and Wright,
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Methodists. In 1784 he assisted Dr. Coke in ordaining Asbury bishop. On Sept. 25, 1800, in conjunction with Böhm, he convened a conference of thirteen ministers near Frederick City, which resulted in the organization of the Church of the United Brethren. Dr. Harbaugh brings forward evidence to show that Otterbein never left the German Reformed communion, and only desired to secure a re-organization of the methods in vogue within the church. Otterbein University, at Westerville, O., under the control of the United Brethren, preserves the name of this godly man. See Harbaugh: Fathers of the German Reformed Church. Drury: Life of Otterbein, Dayton, O., 1884; and Art. United Brethren.

OUDIN, Casimir, b. at Mezieres, in the Ardenne, 1838; d. at Leyden in 1717. He entered the order of the Premonstratensians in 1656, and attracted attention, in 1678, by the ingenious manner in which he, in the absence of the abbot and prior, received and complimented Louis XIV. on his visit to the monastery of Boncilly. Charged with the examination of the archives of the Premonstratensian monasteries, he visited the Netherlands, Burgundy, and settled in Paris in 1683, where in 1686 he published his Supplementum de scriptoribus. The adverse criticism of Cave induced him to recast the whole work; and in 1722 his Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiae antiqua, 9 vols. fol., which is considered a valuable work, appeared at Leipsig. Meanwhile he had left Paris in 1690, embraced the Reformed religion, and settled at Leyden, where he was appointed librarian at the university.

OUDIN, St. (Audæus), b. at Sancy, in the department of Ainse, 606; d. Aug. 24, 689; was the chancellor of Dagobert I., and founded in 634 the abbey of Rebâé, but entered afterwards the service of the Church, and was in 640 appointed archbishop of Rouen. He wrote a Vita Eligii, which is of great interest for the history of the seventh century. It is found in D'Achery: Spicilegium, V., and in Acta Sanct. Belgii, III. There are several French translations of it.

OUR LADY OF MERCY, Sisters of. See Mercy, Sisters of.

OUSELEY, Gideon, b. at Dunmore, Galway, Ireland, 1762; d. at Dublin, May 14, 1839. He was converted in 1786 by some Wesleyan soldiers, and at once began to preach with great vigor. His career was exceptionally successful. See Arthur: Life of Rev. Gideon Ouseley, London, 1876.

OVERBERG, Bernhard, b. at Höckel, in the principality of Osnabrück, May 1, 1754; d. at Münster, Nov. 9, 1826. He was educated in the Franciscan gymnasium at Rhine-on-the-Ems, and studied theology in Münster, where he was ordained a priest in 1789, and appointed teacher in the episcopal seminary in 1788. In 1790 he entered the house of the Princess Galitzin as her confessor, and in 1809 he was made director of the royal seminary. His influence on all educational affairs of the bishopric of Münster, especially on the normal school and the education of teachers, was very great and very beneficent. He published Christkatholischen Handbuch, 1804 (7th ed., 1854); Kateschismus der christkathol. Lehre, 1814 (9th ed., 1841). His life was written by Reinkemann, Münster, 1829, and C. F. Krabbe, Münster, 1831 (2d ed., 1834). See also Josef Gallaud: Amalie von Galitzin, Cologne, 1880.

OWEN, John, D.D., b. at Statham, or Statham, in the county of Cheshire, 1615; d. at Ealing, Middlesex, May 24, 1683. His father was a clergyman of Welsh extraction, tracing a descent from Gwegan ap Ithel, Prince of Glamorgan, who, according to Welsh genealogies, was a descendant of Caractus, the illustrious Briton. The father sent his son John to Oxford when only twelve years of age, such was the youthful precocity and early academic study of those days. From that era Owen's life may be divided into five periods.

I. FROM HIS ENTERING THE UNIVERSITY TO HIS CONVERSION. — He made great progress in learning, but, according to his own account, thought of nothing beyond personal distinction. In 1632 he took the degree of bachelor, in 1635 the degree of master of arts, and in 1637 left Oxford, at which time he seems to have been under religious convictions. Laud was then powerful in the university, and endeavored there to carry out his High-Church plans, which he had no means of commended themselves to Owen's judgment. At the risk of losing worldly prospects, he refused to submit to the Laudian discipline; and, being both in spiritual and temporal difficulties, he sunk into a state of deep melancholy. Before he left college he entered into holy orders, and became chaplain to Lord Lovelace, one of the Royalist party. From him Owen separated, on account of his own sympathy with the Patriots, as the Parliamentarians were called. Going up to London, he attended worship at Aldermanbury Church, hoping to hear the famous Edmund Calamy; but a stranger occupied the pulpit, and his sermon on the words, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" led to Owen's spiritual decision of character.

II. FROM HIS CONVERSION TO HIS BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT. — Owen, soon after the incident at Aldermanbury, published a decidedly Calvinistic book, entitled Display of Arminianism, by which he publicly identified himself with the Anti-High-Church party, and presently was presented to the living of Fordham, Essex, by the Presbyterian committee for removing scandalous ministers. There he preached with much success, and shortly after his induction married a lady named Rooke. As a Presbyterian clergyman he preached before Parliament in 1646, and, rising in reputation, was promoted to the important incumbency of Coggeshall, near Fordham. He now adopted the principles of Independency; and while parish pastor, and preaching from the parish pulpit, he "gathered" an Independent Church, the members of which met together by themselves on terms of spiritual fellowship, as was the practice in many places at that period.

III. FROM HIS BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT UNTIL HE WAS DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD. — During his residence at Coggeshall he further engaged in the Calvinistic controversy, and wrote his Salus Electorum, Sanguis Jesu. He also preached and published sermons to the Parliamentarians at Colchester and Rumford, entitled A Memorial of the Proceedings of the Church Committee. Thoroughly identified with the Parl
mentarians, he was invited to preach before Parlia-
ment on the day after King Charles's execution.
When he acquitted himself with great prudence;
and, without any reference to the preceding trag-
dy, he inculcated religious lessons suitable to all
parties. Soon afterwards he met with Cromwell,
who said, "Sir, you are a person I must be ac-
quainted with;" to which Owen replied, "That
will not be your affair if you are wise, because
yours is so important a style. Owen was made vice-chancel-
or in 1652, and preached before Parliament the
next year, at the thanksgiving for a naval victory
in holding a parish benefice, and now he felt no
scruple in accepting a high university preferment.
His career at Oxford was very remarkable. The
university had fallen into great disorder during
the civil wars, and the new dean acted as a vigor-
ous and successful reformer. It has been the
fashion to represent Oxford as full of ignorance,
fanaticism, and confusion; but the history of
that period in reference to universities needs to
be rewritten. The heads of houses during Owen's
administration were men of eminent learning;
they promoted education, as well as religion; and
many distinguished persons in Church and State
occupied Presbyterian pulpits there, whilst the conflict was going on between
Parliament and the Scotch Loyalists,—a conflict
which was decided by the victory of Dunbar.
Owen returned to Coggleshall in 1651; and then
the House of Commons decreed that he should
be appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in the
room of Dr. Reynolds, the Presbyterian.

IV. FROM HIS BEING MADE DEAN TO HIS
REMOVAL FROM THAT OFFICE.—Though Owen
was an Independent, he had seen no inconsistency
in holding a parish benefice, and now he felt no
scruple in accepting a high university preferment.
His career at Oxford was very remarkable. The
university had fallen into great disorder during
the civil wars, and the new dean acted as a vigor-
ous and successful reformer. It has been the
fashion to represent Oxford as full of ignorance,
fanaticism, and confusion; but the history of
that period in reference to universities needs to
be rewritten. The heads of houses during Owen's
administration were men of eminent learning;
they promoted education, as well as religion; and
many distinguished persons in Church and State
passed through a successful training at that era.
Oxford has no reason to be ashamed of itsannals
under the Commonwealth. Certainly Owen was
one of its most distinguished ornaments; and, so
far from being a vulgar fanatic, he is acknowl-
edged, even by Anthony Wood, to have been a
Christian gentleman. It is curious to find, that,
at a time when intellectual life was acted out
in sumptuous a style. Owen was made vice-chancel-
lor in 1652, and preached before Parliament the
next year, at the thanksgiving for a naval victory
over the Dutch. In 1653 he attended a meeting of
divines in London, to devise, if possible, a scheme
of ecclesiastical union, which failed, like other
similar attempts. After the dissolution of the
Long Parliament, the university chose Owen as
its representative in the House of Commons,—
an office which he accepted, probably regarding
his position at Oxford as civil, rather than eccle-
siastical. The same year (1652) we find him on
one of the commissioners for ejecting and settling
ministers, and in 1654 one of the Tryers, as they
were called; i.e., a body of Independents, Presbyte-
rians, and Baptists, thirty-eight in number, author-
ized to inquire into the fitness of incumbents for
the posts they held. Owen behaved with wisdom
and moderation, and saved the celebrated Dr.
Reynolds, the Presbyterian.

V. FROM HIS LOSING THE DEANERY TO HIS
DEATH.—He retired to Stadham; and, though
he had been so conspicuous a person during the
Commonwealth, he does not seem to have suffered
much at the Restoration beyond the loss of his
offices. Once, in going to London, his carriage
was stopped by two informers, and a mob col-
lected; but a magistrate interfered, and the men
were reprimanded for acting illegally. He had
an interview with Lord Clarendon, in which that
influential minister of Charles II. treated him
with respect, and expressed approbation of his
services as a Protestant controversialist, saying
that he had more merit than any Protestant of
the period. Owen had nothing to do with the
Savoy Conference, in which Richard Baxter took
so active a part; nor did he engage in any of the
efforts to procure comprehension. In that
respect he did not sympathize with his Presby-
terian brethren. He remonstrated with the Congre-
gationalists of New England respecting their
intolerant proceedings, and declined the offered
presidency of Harvard College. We find him
presenting an address to Charles II. on his De-
claration of Indulgence; also he was engaged in
interviews with his Majesty and the Duke of York;
who treated him with much courtesy. Owen
was on friendly terms with many distinguished
people, and numbered some of them as members
of a church in London over which he was pastor,
—a church, which, after the death of Joseph
Caryl, was united to the flock of which the latter
had been pastor. The two congregations together
formed, perhaps, the most numerous, certainly the
most influential, Independent fellowship at that
period. Mrs. Owen died in 1676, and the follow-
ing year Owen married a second time, a wealthy
lady, who possessed an estate at Ealing, near
London, where her husband settled for the rest
of his life. Just before his death he wrote to
Charles Fleetwood, saying, "I am going to Him
whom my soul has loved, or, rather, who has
loved me with an everlasting love, — which is the
whole ground of my consolation. I am leaving
the ship of the Church in a storm; but, while
the Pilot is in it, the loss of a poor under-
rower will be inconsiderable."

There are two editions of Dr. Owen's works,
the latest edited by Dr. Goold of Edinburgh [re-
edited by Rev. Charles W. Quick, and published
in Philadelphia, 1866-69, 17 vols., with Index];
but an earlier one (1826) by Thomas Russell, is
enriched by a valuable Memoir from the pen of
William Orme,—the best life of Owen extant.
As to Owen's theological opinions on important
subjects, they will be found in the following works.
The Divine Original of the Scriptures, published in
1669, takes up the subject of Christian evidence,
chiefly with respect to what is internal,—namely,
the life and efficacy of divine truth. His book
On the Holy Spirit (1674) takes up the subject of
inspiration. The doctrines of the Trinity, and
of the eternal generation of the Son of God, are
handled in the same work on the Holy Spirit, and
in the Vindicia Evangelica (1655). The person of
Christ is the subject of the Christologia (1679).
The atonement, in connection with divine de-
crees, is the subject of Owen's Salus Eleclorum,
published in 1648. In 1677 Owen published a treatise on Justification by Faith. The
document of the Saints' Perseverance appears in
a work under that title (1654). His notions of
court government and religious liberty are ex-
pressed in his Eshcol (1647), Christ's Kingdom,
or the Magistrate's Power (1652). A Discovery of
the True Nature of Schism (1657), The Power of
the Magistrate about Religion (1658), Indulgence
and Tolerance considered (1667), Inquiry into Evg-
angelical Churches (1861). His Antipapal writings
are, The Church of Rome no Safe Guide (1769),
Union among Protestants (1860), An Account of
the Protestant Religion (1860).

Owen's works are generally valued more for
their matter than their method, more for their
substance than their style. Many of his discus-
sions are wearisome, and the diction is generally
crabbed and uninviting. He was a high Cal-
vinist, but his arguments in support of truths
believed by all evangelical Christians are very
powerful. His devotional works are more accepta-
able than the controversial, and it is very re-
freshing to read his Meditations on the Glory of
Christ. As he was dying, that book passed through the
press; and when told of this by Mr. Payne, a
nonconformist minister, he said, "I am glad to
have heard it; but, O brother Payne! the long-wished
for day is come at last, in which I shall see that
glory in another manner than I have ever done,
and was capable of doing, in this world." His piety
equalled his erudition.

JOHN STOUTGTON.

OWEN, John Jason, D.D., LL.D., an American
scholar; b. at Colebrook, Conn., Aug. 13, 1803;
graduated at Middlebury College, 1829, and An-
dover Seminary; entered the Presbyterian minis-
try, 1832; became in 1848 vice-president and
professor of Greek and Latin in the New-York
Free Academy, since 1866 the College of the City
of New York; d. in New-York City, April 18,
1889. Besides editions of classic authors, he pub-
lished A Book of the Apostles (1835), with maps;
New York, 1850, and a Commentary on the Gosp-
els, 1867 sqq., 3 vols., new edition, 1873-75.

OWEN, Robert Dale, a prominent advocate of
Spiritualism; writer and politician; the son of
the preceding; was b. in Glasgow, Scotland, Nov.
7, 1801; d. June 24, 1877. He came to the United
States in 1823 with his father, assisting him in
his efforts to found a colony at New Harmony,
Ind., and after a visit to Europe returned to the
United States, and became a citizen. In 1828 he
began, with Miss Frances Wright, the publish-
ing of the Free Enquirer, a weekly paper de-

toted to the promulgation of socialist ideas and
the denial of the supernatural origin of Chris-

March 14, 1771; d. at Newtown, Nov. 19, 1858.
The son of poor parents, he procured a situation
in London at the age of fourteen, and subsequent-
ly had charge of the Chorlton Mills, near Man-
chester, and the cotton-spinning manufactory at
New Lanark, Scotland, belonging to David Dale,
whose daughter Mr. Owen married in 1801. His
benevolent schemes secured the moral of the operatives of New Lanark, and
accomplished the education of their children.
The reputation of his success spread rapidly, and
attracted the attention of many philanthropists
and distinguished men. In 1813 Mr. Owen pub-
lished New View of Society, or Essays on the For-
mation of Human Character (London), in which
he developed a theory of modified communism.
In 1823 he visited the United States, where he
bought a tract of land on the Wabash in
Indians, and founded New Harmony. This
communistic enterprise was a complete failure.
Returning to England in 1827, Mr. Owen founded
societies at Orbiston, Lanarkshire, and Tytherley,
Hampshire, in which the principle of co-operation
was put in practice. The founder's ample means
enabled him to make these experiments on a lib-

eral scale, but both these communities were like-

cwise utter failures. In 1828 he visited Mexico
at the invitation of the government, with the view
of establishing a communistic society; but re-
turned to Europe without accomplishing any thing.
He continued to advocate his peculiar views
to the day of his death. In 1829 he held a debate
with Dr. Alexander Campbell at Cincinnati on
the evidences of Christianity (he himself being
an unbeliever), which was famous. In the latter
years of his life (and probably under the influence
of his son, Robert Dale Owen) he was a believer
in Spiritualism, having become convinced of the
immortality of the soul. Mr. Owen was a man of
remarkable energy and decided ability, but
visionary. His attempts to realize his communis-
tic theory of a society based upon the annihila-
tion of the social distinctions of birth, ability,
capital, were abortive. He and his followers, called
"Owenists," became in 1827 active in the estab-
lishment of the labor leagues, in which the Christ
movement later became involved. Mr. Owen's writings are, Discourses on a New System
of Society, with an Account of the Society at New
Lanark, Pittsburg, 1825; The Debate on the Evi-
dences of Christianity. . . between Mr. Owen and
Dr. Campbell, Bethany, 1826, 2 vols.; The Revo-
dution in the Mind and Practice of the Human
Race, London, 1849, etc. See Packard: Life of
BOOTH: R. Owen, the Founder of Socialism in
England, 1869; SARGANT: R. Owen and his Social
Philosophy.

OWEN, Robert Dale, the Founder of Socialism in
England, 1869; SARGANT: R. Owen and his Social
Philosophy.

OWEN.
tianity. It was discontinued after an existence of three years. He sat in the Indiana Legislature three terms (1835-38), and represented his district in Congress two terms (1843-47). In 1853 he was sent as chargé d'affaires to Naples, and represented the United States there till 1858. In 1860 he was called forth, perhaps, by their cries. Among his numerous publications are, Moral Physiology, New York, 1831; Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World (on Spiritualism), Philadelphia, 1889; The Wrong of Slavery, etc., Philadelphia, 1844; The Debatable Land between this World and the Next (on Spiritualistic phenomena), New York, 1872. See his autobiography, Threading my Way, New York, 1874.

OXFORD, the capital of Oxfordshire, Eng., population about 31,500, is situated on the Isis, among charming surroundings, and contains a great number of magnificent buildings, and collections of highest scientific and artistic merit.

The University.—Though not founded by Alfred the Great, it is a very old institution, and achieved very early a great fame. It probably originated from independent colleges founded in the place. The earliest that by Henry III. (thirteenth century) the actual statutes date from 1239. At present the university comprises 21 colleges, some of which are very richly endowed, and 5 halls; and, according to the Oxford Calendar of 1882, there were 10,452 members on the books. The University Library is the Bodleian, containing about 400,000 volumes and more than 30,000 manuscripts. The university of Oxford has been closely identified with the religious life of England; but, from the Restoration down to a recent period (1854), dissenters were debarred from the honors of the university. Now, however, all persons can receive its degrees, since subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is no longer required. Wiclif was professor in Oxford. There Ridley and Latimer (1558) and Cranmer (1556)—all of whom were graduated at Cambridge—were burnt. In 1606 James I. prohibited Roman Catholics from "presenting to any ecclesiastical benefice, or nominating to any free school, hospital, or donative." In the civil war the university of Oxford sided with the Stuarts, and melted down its plate to help on this side. Laud was chancellor, and Charles I. held court there. Thereafter, the Parliamentary party were indignant; and, when they took the city (1648), ejected all those who favored the king. Chief among these was Dr. Fell, dean of Christ Church, and vice-chancellor. To him succeeded Reynolds the Presbyterian, and then John Owen the Independent (1652), until 1660, when Reynolds was restored. In 1651 Cromwell was elected chancellor. During the Commonwealth, instruction was given as usual, although there was, of course, some confusion; and among the students were John Locke, Robert South, Philip Henry, Dr. Whitby, and Matthew Poole. Walton's Polyglot was carried through the press during this period (1654-58), and in it Oxford scholars took a principal part. With the Restoration (1660) a great change took place. The university became as pronouncedly loyal to the monarchy as it had been immediately before loyal to the Commonwealth, and those who had been ejected were restored. It was insulted by that tyrannical monarch James II., because it refused to countenance his Roman-Catholic and high-handed schemes. Yet, under Queen Anne, strong Jacobite sentiments prevailed in the university. Later on, in the eighteenth century, Oxford became the starting-point for the moderate and respectable reform movement in the annals of England. Methodism; for John Wesley was student and fellow there, and "father" of the famous Holy Club, and there also Whitefield studied. In the nineteenth century Oxford has also been a religious centre. It will be necessary only to name Dr. Pusey, John Henry Newman, and John Keble, to call to mind the Tractarian movement which stirred England so profoundly forty years ago. A leader in quite a different school of religious thought is Jowett, master of Balliol, who heads in a scholarly way the Broad-church party. Oxford has been successively the nursery of the Reformation, of Puritanism, Anglo-Catholicism, Ritualism, and Broad-churchism. (See arts. on the persons and parties referred to.)

Councils.—Several councils or synods have been held in Oxford. Two have especial interest; one on Nov. 18, 1382, before which Wiclif was summoned to answer for his attack upon the doctrine of transubstantiation. The council passed no condemnatory sentence, yet by royal order he was debarred from lecturing in the university. The second synod to be mentioned was presided over by Thomas Arundel, and was held in 1408. It passed thirteen decrees against the Lollards, the followers of Wiclif; of which 3, 6, and 7 may be thus summarized: Every preacher must adapt his discourse to the class immediately addressed, so that he may to the clergy speak of the faults of the clergy, and to the laity of the faults of the laity, but not vice versa. No book of Wiclif's may be read anywhere, unless it has been previously approved. The Bible must no longer appear in an English translation, and the Wiclifite translation must no longer be used.

Bishops.—The see of Oxford was established by Henry VIII. in 1549; and the cathedral was first at the abbey of Osney, but since 1546 has been Christ Church, Oxford. The episcopal stipend is £5,000. Among the eminent bishops of Oxford may be mentioned Henry Compton (1674), John Fell (1679), Thomas Seeker (1737), and Samuel Wilberforce (1846); about whom see arts. For a history of the see, consult E. Marshall: Oxford, London, 1882.

OXFORD TRACTS. See Tractarianism.

OXLEE, John, b. at Gisborough, Sept. 25, 1779; d. at Molesworth, Jan. 30, 1854. He was rector of Scravton, Yorkshire, 1816–26, and of Molesworth, Hants, 1836, till his death. He is said to have mastered without a teacher a hundred and twenty languages and dialects. He wrote many works, of which the most important is The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, London, 1815–50, 3 vols., a very learned work.

OZANAM, Antoine Frédéric, b. at Milan, April 23, 1813; d. at Marseilles, Sept. 8, 1853. Studied in Lyons and Paris, and was in 1841 appointed professor of foreign literature at the Sorbonne. He was a man of piety, learning, and great literary powers. His great aim was to write a counterpart of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and to vindicate the Roman-Catholic Church in the form of a history of the Christian civilization; but he succeeded in realizing it only in a fragmentary manner: Dante et la philosophie catholique au 18ème siècle, 1839; Histoire de la civilisation au 5ème siècle, 1845 (translated by Ashley C. Glyn, London, 1868, 2 vols.); Études germaniques, 1847–49; Les Poètes Franciscains, and Mélanges. A collected edition of his works in 11 vols. appeared in Paris, 1862–75. His life was written by Karker (Paderborn, 1897), Kathleen O'Meara (Edinburgh, 1876), and Hardy (Mayence, 1878).
PACCA, Bartolommeo, b. at Benevento, Dec. 15, 1756; d. in Rome, April 19, 1844. The Roman curia answered the Congress of Ems by sending Pacca as nuncio to Cologne in 1756. Though he was not recognized, even not received, by the prince-bishops, he carried every thing before him with a high hand, until the advance of the French armies in 1794 compelled him to leave Germany. He filled another equally successful nunciature at Lisbon, 1796-1800; and on his return to Rome he was made a cardinal. His success led him to adopt the maxim, — never to give in, never to abandon a hair's breadth of his original claim, never to compromise; and he followed it till his death. He became one of the leaders of the Zelanti; and it was he who in 1809 drew up, and induced Pius VII. to sign, the bull of excommunication against Napoleon I. He was seized, and imprisoned in the Piedmontese fortress, Fenestrelle, but was released in 1818, and took, after the restoration, an active part in the revocation of the Jesuits, the re-establishment of the Inquisition, etc. Though in the conclaves of 1829, 1830, and 1831 he failed to obtain a majority, he continued to exercise a great influence on the papal government. He wrote Mem. storiche d. Ministro e de' due Viaggi in Francia, etc., 1828, 5th ed., 1831; Memorie storiche sul soggiorno del C. B. P. in Germania, 1832; Notizie sul Portogallo, 1832, 3d ed., 1845; Relazione del Viaggio di Pio VII. a Genova, 1815, 1833; of which writings there exist both French and German translations. [See Historical Memoirs of Cardinal Pacca, Prime-Minister of Pius VII. Translated from the Italian by Sir George Head, London, 1850, 2 vols.]

PACHE, Richard, English ecclesiastic, diplomatist, and man of letters; b. at or near Winchester, Hampshire, about 1482; d. at Stepney, near London, 1532. His studies were principally conducted at Padua; and although, on his return, he entered Queen's College, Oxford, he very soon left it for the service of Cardinal Bainbridge, whom he accompanied to Rome end of 1509. In May, 1510, he became prebendary of Southwell; on May 20, 1514, archdeacon of Dorset; in October, 1519, dean of St. Paul's; and in the summer of 1522, dean of Exeter. Meanwhile he had attracted the notice of Henry VIII. and Wolsey. He was sent him as ambassador to Vienna and Venice: the latter sent him to Rome to promote his (Wolsey's) election to the Papacy. The mission was unsuccessful, and Wolsey accused him of lack of zeal in his service. Being then in diplomatic service in Europe for two years, Wolsey, out of spite, sent him no directions and no money. Pace's distress made him temporarily insane. On his recovery, Wolsey accused him of treason; and for two years he was imprisoned in the Tower of London. He resigned his prebents in 1527, and lived thenceforth in retirement. Pace was a skilful diplomatist and a man of learning. He enjoyed the friendship of Erasmus, Colet, and More. He had the courage to publish a book against Henry VIII.'s marriage with Catharine of Aragon (1527); but his most important work is De fructu qui ex doctrina percipitur, Basel, 1517.

PACHOMIUS, b. in the Egyptian province of the Thebais about 292; d. in Tabennus, an island in the Nile, in 348; a younger contemporary of St. Anthony; was the real founder of monastic life. As long as the ascetic instinct inherent in Christianity remained in a healthy condition, it found its satisfaction within the life of the congregation. But by degrees, as the church became more and more familiarized with the surrounding world, the ascetic instinct, under the influence of the dualism of the Neo-Platonizing, Alexandrian theology, and seduced by the example of the monks of the Sermipis worship, fell into extravagances; and the ascetics fled into the deserts, and became hermits. Pachomius was also swayed by this tendency; and in his twentieth year he settled in the desert to fight for the prize of asceticism under the training of Palemon, one of the most austere pupils of St. Anthony. But the movement had already reached such a speed and such a compass, that it could not go on any farther without some kind of organization; and to have effected this is the great merit of Pachomius. Something had already been done before his time. As the desert became peopled by anchorites, the laura arose; that is, a number of novices in asceticism built their cells around the cell of some hero in asceticism, in order to follow his example, and to receive his training; and thus the first trace of organization originated. Pachomius made the next step, transforming the laura into a monastery. In the island of Tabennus he founded the first cenobium (coenobium); that is, a house in which the anchorites, who had hitherto lived separately, each pursuing his own scheme of asceticism, came to live together, with common practices and exercises, according to certain fixed rules, and under the guidance or government of a director. The success of Pachomius' undertaking was enormous. Palladius states that in his time the monastery of Tabennus contained no less than fourteen hundred monks. Of the original rules of Pachomius, nothing certain is known. The Regula S. Pachomii, containing a hundred and ninety-four articles, and printed by Holstenius, in his Codex Regulorum, 1st ed., pp. 26-30, and a shorter regulative, containing fourteen articles, and printed by Gazæus as an appendix to his edition of Cassianus' De Canobiorum Instit., may contain fragments of the original rules; but their authenticity cannot be established. They present many curious features: thus, the monks are divided into twenty-four classes, named after the letters of the alphabet, the simple souls ranking in the first classes, the smart fellows in the last; but in this respect they agree very well with the writings generally ascribed by antiquity to Pachomius,—Monita ad Monachos, Verba Mystica, Letters, etc., printed by Holstenius, i.e., most of
which are entirely unintelligible. See, besides the above-mentioned writers, *Acta Sanct.* May 14; *Grenadius: De viris illius.* cap. 7. MANGOLD.

PACHYMERES, Georgius, b. at Nicea about 1292; d. in Constantinople, probably about 1310; held high offices at the Byzantine court during the reigns of Michael Palaeologus and Andronikus the Elder; took part with great energy in the negotiations for a union between the Greek and the Latin churches; and wrote a history, in thirteen books, of two reigns during which he lived. He also wrote some treatises on Aristotle, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, etc.; but only his historical work has any interest.

PACIANUS, Bishop of Barcelona; d. about 390; is spoken of by Jerome in his *De viris illius.* 106 and 132, and in his *Contra Rufin.,* 1, 24. Of his works, distinguished by the neatness of their style, but without any originality of ideas, are still extant, three letters, *Contra Novatianos,* and two minor treatises, *Parenesis ad pontifem* and *Sermo de baptismo,* which are found in *Bib. Max. Lug.,* iv., and *Migne: Patr. Lat.,* xiii. See Act. Sanct., March 9.

PACIFICATION, Edicts of, is the name generally given to those edicts which from time to time the French kings issued in order to "pacify" the Hugenots. The first of the kind was that issued by Charles IX. in 1562, which guaranteed the Reformed religion toleration within certain limits: the last of them, the famous Edict of Nantes. See NANTES.

PADUA (*Patavium*), a city of Northern Italy, stands on the Bacchiglione, an affluent of the Brenta, twenty miles west of Venice, and has about sixty-six thousand inhabitants. At the beginning of the Christian era it was the largest and most important city of Northern Italy; and very early it became the seat of a bishop, according to legend, even in the times of the apostles. Afterwards the see belonged under the metropolitan of Venetia. But during the Lombard rule the city was more than once compelled to accept an Arian bishop, and the Catholic bishop then moved his residence to Chioggia. The first cathedral of the city was built in the beginning of the fourth century by Paul, the fifteenth occupant of the episcopal chair. The present cathedral was begun in 1294, but not completed until 1754. The most magnificent church of the city is that of St. Anthony, begun in 1292, and finished in the fourteenth century. In 1797 the French carried away from that church treasures valued by some at 20,116,010 francs, by others at 38,305,446 francs; forty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the saint,—one of pure gold, weighing 5,399 ounces; fifty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the martyrs,—one of pure gold, weighing 581 ounces, the others of silver and gold, etc. Yet the greatest and most costly treasures of the church were saved by bribing the French commissioners. See BERNARDO GONZATI: *La Basilica di S. Antonio di Padova,* Padua, 1892, 2 vols. The University of Padua was founded in the twelfth century, and was for centuries the most famous school of law and medicine in Europe: it had at times twelve thousand students. Its theological faculty was founded in the middle of the fourteenth century by the Bishop Francesco Carrara. At present the university has sixty-five professors, and about eleven hundred students.

PAGANISM, from the Latin *paganus,* a "village," a peasant, or one who worships false gods, a heathen. The latter sense the word assumed in the course of the fourth century, when Christianity became the reigning religion of the Roman Empire, and could look down upon the old mythology as a superstition left lurking only in some distant, far-off places: it occurs for the first time in an edict of Valentinian (364–375) from the year 398 (*Cod. Theod.,* xvi., ii. 18). It must not be understood, however, that at that time Christianity was generally adopted throughout the empire. On the contrary, though in the minority, Paganism was still a power in the State; and it was often found difficult, not to say impossible, to enforce the repressive laws which from time to time were issued. There was in this respect a considerable difference between the East and the West. In the East, Paganism had no political significance. However firm its hold might be on the individual conscience, it was not bound up with the whole national life in such a degree as it was in Italy and Rome. Consequently, laws which could be fully enforced in the East without causing any dangerous commotion had to be managed with great caution, or left entirely unheeded, in the West.

In the East the final overthrow of Paganism was inaugurated by the laws of Theodosius I. (378–395). One, of 381, punished relapse into Paganism with forfeiture of the right to make a will; another, of 395, forbade the inspection of entrails, or the exercise of magical rites, under penalty of death; a third, of 391, ordered all sacrifices to idols to cease, and all temples to be closed. In 425 an edict of Theodosius II. (402–450) forbade Pagans to practise at the bar, to hold a military command, to first cathedral, and the city was built in the beginning of the fourth century by Paul, the fifteenth occupant of the episcopal chair. The present cathedral was begun in 1294, but not completed until 1754. The most magnificent church of the city is that of St. Anthony, begun in 1292, and finished in the fourteenth century. In 1797 the French carried away from that church treasures valued by some at 20,116,010 francs, by others at 38,305,446 francs; forty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the saint,—one of pure gold, weighing 5,399 ounces; fifty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the martyrs,—one of pure gold, weighing 581 ounces, the others of silver and gold, etc. Yet the greatest and most costly treasures of the church were saved by bribing the French commissioners. See BERNARDO GONZATI: *La Basilica di S. Antonio di Padova,* Padua, 1892, 2 vols. The University of Padua was founded in the twelfth century, and was for centuries the most famous school of law and medicine in Europe: it had at times twelve thousand students. Its theological faculty was founded in the middle of the fourteenth century by the Bishop Francesco Carrara. At present the university has sixty-five professors, and about eleven hundred students.

In the East the final overthrow of Paganism was inaugurreted by the laws of Theodosius I. (378–395). One, of 381, punished relapse into Paganism with forfeiture of the right to make a will; another, of 395, forbade the inspection of entrails, or the exercise of magical rites, under penalty of death; a third, of 391, ordered all sacrifices to idols to cease, and all temples to be closed. In 425 an edict of Theodosius II. (402–450) forbade Pagans to practise at the bar, to hold a military command, to first cathedral, and the city was built in the beginning of the fourth century by Paul, the fifteenth occupant of the episcopal chair. The present cathedral was begun in 1294, but not completed until 1754. The most magnificent church of the city is that of St. Anthony, begun in 1292, and finished in the fourteenth century. In 1797 the French carried away from that church treasures valued by some at 20,116,010 francs, by others at 38,305,446 francs; forty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the saint,—one of pure gold, weighing 5,399 ounces; fifty-two lamps belonging to the chapel of the martyrs,—one of pure gold, weighing 581 ounces, the others of silver and gold, etc. Yet the greatest and most costly treasures of the church were saved by bribing the French commissioners. See BERNARDO GONZATI: *La Basilica di S. Antonio di Padova,* Padua, 1892, 2 vols. The University of Padua was founded in the twelfth century, and was for centuries the most famous school of law and medicine in Europe: it had at times twelve thousand students. Its theological faculty was founded in the middle of the fourteenth century by the Bishop Francesco Carrara. At present the university has sixty-five professors, and about eleven hundred students.
Church, Paganism was still found in some places in the eighth century.

PAGE, Harlan, eminent American philanthropist; b. at Coventry, Conn., July 28, 1791; d. in New York, Sept. 28, 1834. From 1825 to his death he was New-York agent of the general depository of the American Tract Society. His estate was employed every agency to do good. See his Memoir by W. A. Hallock, New York, 1835 (published by the American Tract Society).

PAI, Antoine, b. at Roques in Provence, 1724; d. at Aix, 1809; entered the order of the Cordeliers, 1741; was four times elected provincial; distinguished himself as a preacher; and published Critica historico-chronologica in Annales Baronii, Paris, 1698-1705, 4 vols. fol. In the execution of that work he was helped by his nephew, François Pai, 1654-1721, who was also a Cordelier, and who wrote Pontificum et praestantium Gestis, Antwerp, 1717-27, 4 vols., in a strongly marked ultramontane spirit.

Pagoda, the name given to a certain kind of temple in India, and to a Chinese tower-like building for secular purposes, consisting of several stories, usually nine, one upon the other, each of a single room, and surrounded by a gallery. The Indian pagoda is really a group of buildings, among them being the residences of the priests, of which the pagoda proper is one, the whole surrounded by several series of walls. The most costly specimens are in Burmah, and the chief one is at Rangoon.

PAINE, Robert, D.D., a bishop of the Methodist-Episcopal Church south; was b. in Person County, N.C., Nov. 12, 1799; and d. at Aberdeen, Miss., Oct. 19, 1852, being at the time of his death the senior bishop of the church. His father, James Paine, a highly respectable farmer, moved in 1814 to Giles County, Tenn., where he reared a large family. Young Robert made the best possible use of his early educational advantages, which, though limited, were good for that early day and for that thinly settled section. He professed religion Oct. 9, 1817, at a campmeeting in Giles County, under the preaching of Francois Pai, who soon afterwards joined the church. One month later he was licensed to preach, and was immediately employed by the presiding elder to serve as junior preacher with Rev. Miles Harper on the Nashville circuit. In October, 1818, he was "admitted on trial" into the Tennessee Conference, and in due course of time was received into full connection. He continued in the pastoral work until 1830, when he was elected president of La Grange College, Alabama. He remained here sixteen years, doing a great work for the South and South-west at a time when such work was much needed. He was a member of every General Conference from 1824 to 1846, when he was elected to the episcopacy. He was chairman of the committee of nine which reported the plan of separation, on the basis of which the Methodist-Episcopal Church was divided in 1844. In all the chief councils of the conference from early day he was a prominent and influential member. Physically he was remarkably robust and active. As a preacher he was always able and instructive, and at times powerful and eloquent. His voice was musical and of great force. He had a naturally strong mind, trained to systematic study; was an able debater, and as a platform speaker he had few superiors. As a presiding officer he exhibited more than ordinary executive ability. His Life and Times of Bishop McKendree, Nashville, 1847, 2 vols., is regarded by many as the most valuable contribution to Methodist biography that has yet been made to the literature of that church.

PAINE, Thomas, political and deistic writer; b. at Thetford, Norfolk, Eng., Jan. 29, 1737; d. in Columbia Street, New-York City, June 8, 1800. His father was a Friend, who had been expelled from the society for marrying a Church-of-England woman. He received an indifferent education; left school at thirteen, and until sixteen worked at his father's trade of stay-making; then he was for a while a sailor or marine. He settled at Sandwich in 1750 as a master-stay-maker. From 1763 to 1774, with the expiration of one year, he was exciseman. In 1772 he wrote a small pamphlet, The case of the officers of excise, with remarks on the qualifications of officers and on the numerous evils arising to the revenue from the insufficiency of the present salaries. It was very able, and excited the ill will of the upper officials, so that in 1774 he was dismissed the service on charge of smuggling, occasioned by his keeping a tobacco-shop. By the advice of Benjamin Franklin, whom he met in London, he came to America (1774), where he immediately entered upon a journalistic and political career of great prominence and usefulness. He had, earlier in that year, separated from his second wife for an unknown cause. In America he was successively editor of the Philadelphia Magazine (January, 1775), secretary to the congressional Committee of Foreign Affairs (1777), but obliged to resign in 1779 (because, in the heat of a controversy in the Philadelphia Packet with Silas Deane, he divulged State secrets), and in November, 1779, clerk to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. In 1781 he negotiated a loan of ten million livres from France, and brought six million more as a present. In October, 1786, he himself received three thousand dollars from Congress in return for the papers he had brought as a present. During the Revolution, and, from the State of New York, a house and farm of three hundred acres in New Rochelle. From 1787 to 1802 he was in Europe, most of the time in France, where he was enthusiastically received as the author of The Rights of Man, naturalized, and elected to the National Assembly. He had the courage to vote against the execution of Louis XVI., and thus incurred the anger of Robespierre, who threw him into prison, January, 1794; and there he remained until Nov. 4, 1794, when, on the solicitation of James Monroe, he was released. It is related that his door in the Luxembourg was once marked, in sign that he was to be executed; but his door opened outward, and so, when it was closed, the mark was of course hidden, and he escaped. On his return to the United States he was warmly welcomed, especially by Jefferson and his party. The house and farm he had purchased for New Rochelle. A monument to him was set up (1839) near the spot, although his remains had been taken to England in 1819 by William Cobbett. On Jan. 29, 1875, there was dedicated in Boston the Paine Memorial Building.
If Paine's writings had been only political, he would be entitled to honor as a bold and vigorous friend of human liberty. To him is to be traced the common saying: “These are the times which try man's souls,” which is an opening sentence of the first number of *The Crisis* (December, 1776). His pamphlet, *Common Sense* (January, 1776), was one of the memorable writings of the day, and helped the cause of Independence. But it is as the author of *The Age of Reason*, an uncompromising, ignorant, and audacious attack on the Bible, that he is most widely known, indeed notorious. The first part of this work was handed by him, while on his way to prison in the Luxembourg, to his friend Joel Barlow, and appeared, London and Paris, March, 1794; the second part, composed while in prison, December, 1795; the third was left in manuscript.1 “His ignorance,” says Leslie Stephen, “was vast, and his language brutal; but he had the gift of a true demagogue,—the power of wielding a fine vigorous English, a fit vehicle for fanatical passion.” Paine was not an atheist, but a deist. In his will he speaks of his “reposing confidence in my Creator-God and in no other being; for I know no other, nor believe in any other.” He voiced current doubt, and is still wanting in a sense of honor, and therefore could not be said by those who hated him for his opinions, and even his friends are compelled to be fair, yet was prejudiced; Thomas Clio Rickman, London, 1814 (apologetic, but honest, a good corrective of Cheetham's exaggerations. Rickman speaks with propriety and moderation, was friendly to Paine, but is compelled to give him, on the whole, a bad character); W. T.Sherwin, London, 1819 (apologetic); J. S. Harford, Bristol, 1820; G. Vale, New York, 1841 (apologetic); Charles Blanchard, New York, 1880 (a thoroughgoing defence of Paine, written in a careless style, and interlarded with irrelevant and questionable matter; it is prefixed to the edition of Paine's *Theological Works* mentioned above). See also G. J. Holyoake: *Essay on the Character and Services of Paine*, New York, 1876; cf. Leslie Stephen: *History of English Thought*, London and New York, 2d ed., 1881, 2 vol.; vol. i. pp. 458-464, vol. ii. 260-264; McMaster: *History of the People of the United States, N.Y.,* vol. i. 1888, pp. 150-154. Samuel M. Jackson.

**PAINTING, Christian.** The first law which governed the early Christian sculptors and painters was to present Christ as the source and centre of their life, and so to represent him as that all in his last days; this is the source of all the damaging stories about Paine: Cheetham meant to be fair, yet was prejudiced; Thomas Clio Rickman, London, 1814 (apologetic, but honest, a good corrective of Cheetham's exaggerations. Rickman speaks with propriety and moderation, was friendly to Paine, but is compelled to give him, on the whole, a bad character); W. T. Sherwin, London, 1819 (apologetic); J. S. Harford, Bristol, 1820; G. Vale, New York, 1841 (apologetic); Charles Blanchard, New York, 1880 (a thoroughgoing defence of Paine, written in a careless style, and interlarded with irrelevant and questionable matter; it is prefixed to the edition of Paine's *Theological Works* mentioned above). See also G. J. Holyoake: *Essay on the Character and Services of Paine*, New York, 1876; cf. Leslie Stephen: *History of English Thought*, London and New York, 2d ed., 1881, 2 vol.; vol. i. pp. 458-464, vol. ii. 260-264; McMaster: *History of the People of the United States, N.Y.,* vol. i. 1888, pp. 150-154. Samuel M. Jackson.

The personal character of Paine has been very severely judged. Nothing too bad about him could be said by those who hated him for his opinions, and even his friends are compelled to admit that there was foundation for the damaging charges. Comparison of the contemporary biographies, both of friends and foes, seems to show that the Paine of facts (Paine himself, his unfeeling, vain, and disagreeable man. He was wanting in a sense of honor, and therefore could not be trusted. But it was not until after his return from France, when he was sixty-five years old, very much broken by his long sufferings and the strain of the great excitement in which he had lived for years, and for the first time in his life above want, that he developed those traits which rendered him in his last days such a miserable object. The charges of matrimonial infidelity and of seduction are probably unfounded; but that he was in his old age penurious, uncleanly, drunken, unscrupulous, may be accepted as true. He did a great service for the United States in her hour of peril. But alas! he has done irreparable injury ever since in turning many away from God and the religion of Jesus Christ. His complete Works have been several times published, e.g., Boston, 1856, 3 vols.; New York, 1860, London, 1861; his *Age of Reason* repeatedly, e.g., New York, 1876; and his *Theological Works* (complete), New York, 1860, 1 vol. His Life has been written by Francis Oldys (pseudonyme for George Chalmers), London, 1791, 5th ed., 1792, continued by William Cobbett, 1796 (abusive); James Crotch, New York, 1809 (written by one who knew him in his last days; this is the source of all the damaging stories about Paine: Cheetham meant to be fair, yet was prejudiced); Thomas Clio Rickman, London, 1814 (apologetic, but honest, a good corrective of Cheetham's exaggerations. Rickman speaks with propriety and moderation, was friendly to Paine, but is compelled to give him, on the whole, a bad character); W. T. Sherwin, London, 1819 (apologetic); J. S. Harford, Bristol, 1820; G. Vale, New York, 1841 (apologetic); Charles Blanchard, New York, 1880 (a thoroughgoing defence of Paine, written in a careless style, and interlarded with irrelevant and questionable matter; it is prefixed to the edition of Paine's *Theological Works* mentioned above). See also G. J. Holyoake: *Essay on the Character and Services of Paine*, New York, 1876; cf. Leslie Stephen: *History of English Thought*, London and New York, 2d ed., 1881, 2 vol.; vol. i. pp. 458-464, vol. ii. 260-264; McMaster: *History of the People of the United States, N.Y.*, vol. i. 1888, pp. 150-154. Samuel M. Jackson.

1 The so-called third part is only an extract. It bears the separate title, *Examination of the Passages in the New Testament quoted from the Old, and called Prophecies of the Coming Christ* (N.Y., 1801). In some respects it is the most powerful portion of the entire work. He pretends to expose the evangelists' so-called irrelevant quotations.
in the second third till the eighth century, art sought more and more to adapt the antique forms to the idealistic, transcendental spirit of Christianity. Principal monuments, the mosaics of St. Pudentiana and SS. Cosma e Damiano in Rome, of St. Appolinare Nuovo, St. Appolinare in Classe, and St. Vitale, at Ravenna, and some miniatures.

After the eighth century, painting, and, in fact, the entire art of early Christianity, lapsed into a continually deepening decline, till the eleventh century. Examples are seen in the mosaics of St. Prassede, St. Marco, and others in Rome, miniatures of various manuscripts, and the ICONOSTASE of Greek and Russian churches.

With the new life which awoke, after the beginning of the eleventh century, in Western Christendom, with the restoration of Church and State in the new mediæval forms, hierarchical and feudalistic, architecture reached not only the climax of its own development, but also asserted a decided preponderance over sculpture and painting. One spirit and one life prevailed in all three of the major arts. The new art impulse developed itself in Italy much later than in the North, especially in Germany. Not until the twelfth century did the earliest movement take place in Italy; and the following century had been ushered in before the first endeavors were made by single artists of lesser rank to blend the Byzantine style with the ancient Italian, and by this means to infuse new life into the old Christian types.

The Romanesque style of painting first reached completeness in Giovanni Cimabue of Florence (d. after 1300) and in Duccio di Buonisignora of Sienna (flourished about 1282). On this wise there grew up in competition with each other two separate schools of painting, — that of Florence, and that of Sienna; the Florentine, of a severer type, approaching nearer to the early Christian (Byzantine), the Siennese characterized more by tenderness and sentiment, more independent, and likewise more graceful in the rendering of form.

Closely in the footsteps of this pioneer followed the renowned Giotto di Bondone of Florence (1278-1338), known under the title of "the Father of Italian painting," but in fact only the founder of the Gothic style of painting. He was a genius of first rank, an artist of creative productivity, a bold reformer who first broke through the traditions of art, and servile adherence to the early Christian types. The best pupils of Giotto were Taddeo Gaddi, and his son Angelo Gaddi, Giotto, Orcagna, Spinello Aretino, Antonio Veneziano, and others.

In Germany the beginnings of the Romanesque style are represented in the miniatures of the eleventh century. The manuscripts from the treasures of the cathedral of Bamberg (new in Munich) evidence the desire which was already felt to breathe new life into the old Christian types, and to develop the ancient Christian symbolism through the imaginative element. An improved rendering of the human form is manifest in the twelfth century in the chief monuments of the Romanesque period, especially in the famous altar of Verdun (of the year 1186, now in the monastery of Neuburg, near Vienna), in the mural paintings of the grand hall of the monastery of Branweller, near Cologne, and the ceiling of the central aisle of St. Michael at Hildesheim.

Far more numerous and important are the works still preserved from the period of the Gothic style, in which the peculiar spirit of medievalism first attained to complete artistic expression.

The development of glass-painting must especially be noted, — probably a German invention, dating at the end of the tenth century, — examples of which are seen in the windows of St. Cunibert at Cologne, in the choir of Cologne Cathedral, in the Church of St. Catharine at Oppenheim, and in Strassburg Cathedral.

In easel pictures, which previously appear to have been very little painted, there is manifest no higher artistic endeavor until the middle of the fourteenth century. After this, however, three separate schools started forth, each on its own path: (1) The Bohemian, or school of Prague, founded by Charles IV; (2) The Nuremberg school, the chief representative monuments of which are several altar-shrines in the Frauenkirche in St. Lawrence and St. Sebald in Nuremberg; (3) The school of Cologne, by far the most important, whose chief representatives were Master Wilhelm (about 1360) and Master Stephan (about 1400), the latter the founder of the famous cathedral at Cologne.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century broke forth, in opposition to the spirit of medievalism, a decided endeavor after greater truth of expression in art, — an endeavor in light, color, drawing, and composition, to bring the spiritual import of representation into harmony with the laws and principles of nature. This naturalistic development first manifested itself in Italy in the Florentine school. Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole (1387-1455), although in other respects wholly dominated by the spirit of medievalism, was, nevertheless, the first who sought to penetrate into the psychological meaning of the human countenance. Over against him, already decidedly emancipated from medievalism, stands Tommaso di St. Giovanni da Castel, called Masaccio (1401-28), one of the greatest masters of the fifteenth century. With Fra Angelico are associated the names of Benozzo Gozzoli and Gentile da Fabriano; with Masaccio, those of Fra Filippo Lippi, his son Filippino, Domenico Ghirlandajo, and Bastiano Mainardi. Other Florentine artists, for example, Antonio Pallajulo and Andrea del Verocchio, who were also sculptors, strove by anatomical studies to transfer plastic forms to painting, in a more vigorous modeling of the human figure; while Luca Signorelli of Cortona (1440-1525), by the nobleness and artistic truth of his compositions, presents a strong contrast with the deeper sentiment of the Umbrian school. The Umbrian school, which had its chief theatre in the vicinity of Assisi (Chiesa Nuova), and the ciudad Cinabue of Florence; and its chief master was Pietro Perugino (1446-1525), the teacher of Raphael. Closely allied to its spirit was Raphael's father, Giovanni Santi (d. 1494), and Francesco Francia (d. 1617), the friend of Raphael, and one of the first masters of the fifteenth century.

The remaining schools of Italy follow the Florentine.
painter of celestial blessedness, whose Madonnas grew out of his partiality for chiaroscuro, and his distinguished was Jacopo Robusti, called Tintoretto one-sided intellectual development. His achievements in chiaroscuro were witnessed here. Nevertheless chargeable with those faults which and angels, although of surpassing loveliness, are nevertheless chargeable with those faults which grew out of his partiality for chiaroscuro, and his one-sided intellectual development.

The principal one of these was the Venetian, whose chief master in the sixteenth century was Giovanni Bellini (about 1450–1516), the teacher of the genial Giorgione and the great Titian. The schools of Upper Italy devoted themselves to the study of the antique. Chief among them was the school of Padua and Mantua, whose founder was Francesco Squarcione, and whose head was the renowned Andrea Mantegna (1431–1506).

Italian painting in the sixteenth century, as represented in its various schools, reached its highest point of development, and its complete capacity for the expression of Christian thought. This most fruitful period of Christian painting is represented by five great masters. At their head stands Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519). A master in all five of the fine arts (he was a poet of repute and an excellent musician), he united in himself all the technical and spiritual achievements of the fifteenth century. He is the founder of the modern Milanese school; and prominent among his pupils are Cesare da Sesto, Andrea Salerno, Francesco Melzi, and, especially, Luini. He exercised likewise an important influence upon Giudenzio Ferrari, Giovanni da Bazzi (Il Titone), and upon Fra Bartolomeo (1499–1517), a friend and enthusiastic follower of Savonarola.

The Venetian school of the sixteenth century sought to realize by means of color the noble results to which Leonardo had attained. In the quality of color this school achieved a supremacy over all others. Its chief master was Titian of Cadore, near Venice (1477–1576); and he concentrates all its excellences in himself as in a focal point. With him labored the distinguished pupils of Giorgione,— Fra Sebastiano del Piombo (who afterward went over to Michel Angelo), Jacopo Palma (called Palma Vecchio), and Pordenone. Among Titian’s own pupils the most distinguished was Jacopo Robusti, called Tintoretto (1512–94), almost the equal of his master in color, but his inferior in depth and spirituality.

In the renowned Paul Veronese (1538–88) we have a pupil of Titian the one in whose hands color brought about the most success, entered upon the new path, and became followers of the Italian. The chief masters of the fifteenth century are, in the school of Cologne, the painter (unknown by name) of the Death of the Virgin,— his principal work,— and Johann von Mehlem, who flourished somewhat later (about 1520); in the school of Westphalia, the master of Liesborn monastery; in the school of Ulm and Augsburg, the excellent Martin Schöner (about 1480), the somewhat younger Bartholomäus Zeißblom and his successor, Martin Schafner of Ulm, and Hans Holbein, father of the renowned Holbein the younger, of Augsburg; in the school of Nuremberg, Michael Wohlgemuth (1494–1519). The Nuremberg school produced the greatest master of German art, the only one who in spiritual depth and artistic genius approached the five great masters of Italy,— Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), in painting. He may be styled the painter of the idea of Christian sublimity, of divine energy and omnipotence. His renowned Sibyls and Prophets in the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican are brooding, not so much over thoughts of warning and teaching mankind, as over deeds which shall conquer the world; and his equally famed but less successful Last Judgment, also in the Sistine Chapel, appears like the final act in the drama of the world, the act of all acts, in which all history is reflected. In his steps followed, only, however, at a distance, Dürer’s pupil, Hans Holbein Venetian, whose chief master in the fifteenth century, was Parma, and the greatest painting of Italy after the beginning of the sixteenth century, were ruled by Michel Angelo Buonarotti (1475–1564). He was a pupil of Domenico Ghirlandajo, and one of the greatest artists of all time, the worthy rival of Raphael, a spirit of Titian power, almost as great in portrait as in the other arts. His portraits are the most perfect works of art ever produced. He was a friend and enthusiastic follower of Savonarola.

Quite similar was the career of German art during this period. The Gothic style had a long supremacy; but about the middle of the fifteenth century all the German schools, or less success, entered upon the new path, and became followers of the Italian. The chief masters of the sixteenth century are, in the school of Cologne, the painter (unknown by name) of the Death of the Virgin,— his principal work,— and Johann von Mehlem, who flourished somewhat later (about 1520); in the school of Westphalia, the master of Liesborn monastery; in the school of Ulm and Augsburg, the excellent Martin Schöner (about 1480), the somewhat younger Bartholomäus Zeißblom and his successor, Martin Schafner of Ulm, and Hans Holbein, father of the renowned Holbein the younger, of Augsburg; in the school of Nuremberg, Michael Wohlgemuth (1494–1519). The Nuremberg school produced the greatest master of German art, the only one who in spiritual depth and artistic genius approached the five great masters of Italy,— Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), in painting. He may be styled the painter of the idea of Christian sublimity, of divine energy and omnipotence. His renowned Sibyls and Prophets in the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican are brooding, not so much over thoughts of warning and teaching mankind, as over deeds which shall conquer the world; and his equally famed but less successful Last Judgment, also in the Sistine Chapel, appears like the final act in the drama of the world, the act of all acts, in which all history is reflected. In his steps followed, only, however, at a distance, Dürer’s pupil, Hans Holbein

Mention must also be made of the Saxon school, whose head was the well-known Lucas Cranach, 1720 PAINTING.
its independence by servile imitation of Italian masters. A second race of pupils became mere imitators, even exaggerating the one-sidedness of Titian, Correggio, and Michel Angelo. The best examples of these so-called "mannerists" were Fr. Salviati and Giorgio Vasari, the renowned historian of painting.

In opposition to this confusion, at the end of the century arose the Bolognese school of the Caracci, whose advent marks for Italy the commencement of the fourth period of modern painting. Ludovico Caracci (1555-1619) and his two nephews and pupils, Agostino and Annibale Caracci (1560-1609), the latter the most gifted, established a sort of eclectic system, whose purpose it was to imitate the chief distinguishing qualities of the five great masters of painting. Their best pupils were Domenichino (1581-1641), Guercino (1590-1666), Franc. Albani (1578-1680), and especially Guido Reni (1575-1642), the most distinguished of all.

A second school of Italian painting in the beginning of the seventeenth century arrayed itself in opposition to the idealism of the great masters, and developed a one-sided realism and naturalism. The principal representative of this was Mic. Angelo Amerighi da Caravaggio (1556-1609), whose pupils — the two Frenchmen, Mose Velasquez and Simon Vonet, and the eminent Spanish master Diego Velasquez, who transplanted their influence to France and Spain. Notwithstanding eminent talents were developed in Italy in both these directions, their chief representatives hold rank inferior to that of the masters of Spain and Netherlands in the seventeenth century; and in the eighteenth century Italian painting reached its lowest level of decadence.

It was in Spain that the new revival of Catholicism in art found, in the seventeenth century, its strongest support. The five great masters who represent the completest development of painting in Spain were almost all from the school of Seville. They were: 1. Gius. de Ribera, already mentioned (1588-1650), the founder of the school of Valencia; 2. Francisco Zurbaran (1598-1662); 3. Diego Velasquez da Silva (1599-1600), one of the most eminent of portrait-painters; 4. Alonso Cano (1601-81), the master of Goya; and 5. Bartolome Esteban Murillo of Seville (1618-82), a pupil of Ribera, the greatest of all, in whose paintings the peculiar excellences of Spanish art have the most brilliant illustration.

The Madonna ideal of Murillo is quite different from the Italian and the German, and is distinguished above all for the quality of religious ecstasy. In contrast with his religious paintings, Murillo developed great talent in humorous representations of street scenes among the Spanish peasantry. This flourishing period of Spanish painting was of short duration, and in the last quarter of the seventeenth century the schools of Spain degenerated into mere factories of art, such as Luca Giordano of Italy introduced.

The painting of the Netherlands maintained a certain elevation of rank for a somewhat longer period. Two distinct schools were developed out of national divisions. One had its seat in Brabant (Belgium), which, after the conflicts of the sixteenth century, returned in general adherence to Catholicism, and loyalty to monarchical institutions. The other flourished in Holland, where the freedom of Protestant faith and a moderate popular government had acquired a firm foothold. The head of the school of Brabant in historical painting, as in all other branches of art, was the distinguished Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), a star of the first magnitude. His best pupils were Jac. Jordans, Caspar de Crayer, and, above all, Anton van Dyck (1599-1641).

In the Dutch school, as in the Flemish, the most decided realism prevails. Its older masters, Theod. de Keyser, Franz Hals, Barth. van der Helst, and others, were almost exclusively portrait-painters. A far higher development was, however, reached in the famous Rembrandt van Ryn (1606-69), a master of the highest rank in color and chiaroscuro, in which latter quality even Correggio is his inferior. His most distinguished pupils and successors were Gerard van den Eeckhout, Solomon Koning, and Ferdinand Bol.

France and Germany can claim no position of importance during this period in a brief review of Christian painting. In Germany the Thirty Years' War had nearly uprooted all elements of culture; and when, in the eighteenth century, the country began to recover from these devastations, masters of only subordinate rank — for example, Balh. Denner, Dietrich, and Raphael Mengs (1728-79) — appeared on the stage.

In France the older and better masters, like Nic. Poussin, Eustache Lesueur, and others, strove in vain to make head against the theatrical style represented by Charles Lebrun, the favorite of Louis XIV.

Since the diffusion over Europe of that immoral and irreligious spirit which preceded and followed the French Revolution, Christian painting has naturally experienced a marked decline. But in Germany, France, and Belgium, individual schools have again grown up, the excellences of which, in the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In the same spirit of progress, Munich and Dusseldorf must be especially mentioned as the principal seats of revived painting, in which sacred themes occupy a not insignificant place, and these treated both in a Catholic and a Protestant spirit. As representatives of the former may be mentioned Cornelius, Ostervelch, H. Hess, Schraudolph, and others; of the latter, Lessing, Hubner, Bendemann, Deger, von Gebhardt, and others.

On the whole, however, modern religious paint-
ing, as might be expected from the religious conditions of the present time, seems partly a mere endeavor to revive a greatness and power which has perished, and partly a blind effort to reach a new goal, which is still enthralled in darkness.


PAJON., Claude, b. at Romorantin in Lower Blésois, 1629; d. at Carre, near Orleans, Sept. 27, 1665. He studied theology at Saumur, under Amyraut, a second time at Orleans, where in 1650 he was appointed minister of Machenoir, and in 1666 professor of theology at Saumur. But the sensation which his peculiar views produced led him to resign his professorships, and settle as minister in Orleans, where he spent the rest of his life. He is the father of the so-called Pajonism, a peculiar development of the doctrinal system of the French-Reformed Church. Camero introduced at Saumur the views that the will is completely governed by the intellect, and that the origin of sin is due to an obscuration of the intellect; and from these premises he inferred that the grace which works conversion is not a motus brutus, not a blind force of nature, but a moral agency. Amyraut developed these views further by distinguishing between an objective and a subjective grace, between the external means of grace, which are free to all, and the internal working of the Holy Spirit, which explains why some are converted, and others not. But this subjective grace Pajon rejected, declaring that the sum total of external circumstances is in any given case sufficient to explain the conversion or non-conversion of an individual; since God governs the world through the objective connection between cause and effect, without any concurring, direct interference of Providence. A literary exposition of his ideas he never gave. Il sExamen du livre qui porte pour titre Præfuses légitimes contre les Calcinistes (1673) is simply a refutation of Nicolii's attack on the Reformed Church; and his Poésies sur l'Avertissement pastoral (1855), a refutation of the attack of the Roman-Catholic clergy in France on the Huguenots. He simply propounded them from the cathedra and in the pulpit; but he found many and enthusiastic disciples, — Papin, Leuflant, Allix, Du Vidal, and others, — and caused great commotion. As after 1660 the king was on bad terms with the National Synod to assemble, and the National Synod was the only competent court in cases of heresy, the provincial synods took the matter in their hands, and the pupils of Pajon were everywhere excluded from the offices of the church. See JURIEU: Traité de la nature et de la grâce, etc. (Utrecht, 1687), which was very ably answered by Papin, in his Essais de théol. sur la providence et la grâce, etc., Francfort, 1687; Melchoir Leydecke: Veritas evangelica triumphans; Friedrich Spanheim: Controversiarum elenchus; Valentin Exzereti: Zicon de Pauw et Pajon., Leipzig, 1692.

PALAFOX DE MENDOZA, Juan de, b. in 1600; d. in 1659; was made bishop of Puebla de los Angeles in Mexico in 1638, and bishop of Osma in Spain in 1655. He wrote a book, Virtute del Indio, to effect another policy with respect to the natives of Spanish America; but the Jesuits compelled him to give up the cause, and return to Europe. He also wrote a history of the conquest of China by the Tartars, a history of the siege of Fontarabia, and a number of mystical and devotional books. A collected edition of his works appeared in Madrid, 1762, 15 vols. His life was written by Gonzalés de Résende, Madrid, 1666, French translation, Paris, 1890.

PALAMAS, Gregorius, the leader of the Hesychasts; was a native of Asia, and a favorite of the emperor, the son of a Greek merchant who had a career at the court, and became a monk of Mount Athos. As he was the principal defender of the ideas of the uncreated light, the mystical absorption by contemplation, etc., the attacks of Barlaam, Acindynus, and Nicephorus Gregoros, are principally directed against him. In 1349 he was made archbishop of Thessalonica by the emperor, and consecrated by the patriarch Isidorus; but the city refused to admit him within its walls, and he retired to the Island of Lemnos. He was present at the synod of Constantinople in 1351; but of his later life nothing is known. He was a very prolific writer, and left more than sixty works, most of which, however, still remain in manuscript. Printed are Prosopopenia, and two orations in Bib. Patr. Lugd., xxvi.; two Greek treatises against the Latin Church, London, 1624; Refutationes inscriptionum Johannes Becc, Rome, 1630; Encomium S. Petri Athonita, in Acta Sanctorum, Jan. ii.; CABALI, in Actus Athos., 1.

PALEARIO, Aonio (Delia Paglia, Antonio Degli Pagliaricci), b. at Veroli in 1500; burnt in Rome July 3, 1570; one of the most prominent humanists of his age. He studied in Rome, 1526–27, and settled in 1530 as a teacher at Siena, where in 1536 he published his great didactic poem, — De immortalitate animarum. In 1542 he was summoned before the Inquisition, the materials for the accusation having been derived from his newly published Delia peneezza, sufficienza e satisfazione della passion de Cristo ; but he defended himself so brilliantly, that he was acquitted. In Siena he also wrote his Actio in Pontifices Romanos et eorum asseclas, of which in 1566 he sent two copies to Germany, but which was not published until 1606, at Leipzig. In 1546 he was appointed professor at Lucca; but not feeling safe there, he went up to the papal court, and in 1555 of the Roman curia, he removed in 1555 to Milan. But he did not escape his fate. In 1567 the inquisitor of Milan, Fra Angelo, accused him of heresy, and sent him to Rome, where, after two years' imprisonment, he was convicted, and condemned to death Oct. 15, 1568. For some
unknown reason, however, the verdict was not executed until July the following year. Collected editions of his works were published at Lyons, 1552, Bremen, 1619, Amsterdam, 1696, and Jena, 1728. See GURLLT: Leben des A. P. Hamburg, 1805; Mrs. YOUNG: The Life and Times of A. P., 1821. JULES BONNER: Palaisre, Paris, 1862; to him was formerly attributed The Benefit of Christ's Death, Eng. trans., Boston, 1860.

**PALESTINE.**

*Peleseth* (פֶלֶשֶׁת, “land of wanderers”), meaning Philistia, occurs eight times in the Old Testament, and in King James's Version is rendered three times Palestine, once Palestine, three times Philistia, and once the Philistines. The Greek Παλαιστίνη, originating probably in Egypt, occurs for the first time in Herodotus [i. 105, ii. 104, iii. 5, viii. 89], who means by it only Philistia, though in one passage he appears to have carried its northern boundary as far up as Beirut. In the later Greek and Roman period the name was applied, as we apply it, to the whole country occupied by the Israelites on both sides of the Jordan. Josephus uses the word in both of these senses. In *Ant.* i. 6, 2, Philistia only is meant; in *Ant.* viii. 10, 3, it is the whole country on both sides of the river. The oldest name of the country was the Land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 31), or simply Canaan, “Lowland,” meaning only the country west of the Jordan, in contrast with the higher lands east of the river, the western territory being all that was originally promised to Abraham. Other scriptural names are Judaea, the Land of Israel, the Land of Promise, and the Holy Land (Zech. ii. 12), which last has been for centuries the most popular name. The country was preconfigured to its history. Its situation and its boundaries indicated at once opportunity and isolation. It lay between great sweeps around between it and the Euphrates. On the north a gigantic gateway opens out between the Himalyan and Anti-Lebanon. The boundaries cannot be determined exactly: approximately they are as follows,—on the west the Mediterranean; on the north a line beginning near the Promontorium Album, in lat. 33° 10', trending northward, till, near the southern base of Hermon, it strikes lat. 33° 15', and then runs straight on to the desert; on the east the Arabian Desert; and on the south the parallel of lat. 31°, a little south of Beerseba (31° 15'), curving to take in Kadesh. Within the boundaries thus roughly indicated there are about twelve thousand square miles, divided by the Jordan into two main sections. The length of this territory is about a hundred and fifty miles; the average breadth east of the Jordan about forty miles, west of the Jordan a little more than forty miles.

The country is made up of four parallel strips of territory running north and south, lowland and highland alternating. Along the Mediterranean coast is a strip of lowland: in the Phoenician section of it about twenty miles long and from four to six miles broad; in the Sharon section of it, south of Carmel, more than thirty miles long and about ten miles broad; and in the Philistine section of it, forty miles long and from ten to twenty miles broad. This strip of lowland is interrupted by the ridge of Carmel, which branches off from the mountains of Samaria, runs northward, and from twelve miles, rises about one point to the height of eighteen hundred feet, and ten feet above the sea, and thrusts out into the sea a promontory five hundred feet high. On all this coast the only bay of any importance is that of Acre, just north of Carmel. Next to this is the highland strip, some twenty-five or thirty miles in breadth, which springs from the roots of Lebanon, swells into the hills of Galilee, is interrupted by the plain of Edraaelon, as the lowland strip just referred to is interrupted by the ridge of Carmel, swells again into the hills of Samaria, reaches its greatest average height in Judaea, and then falls off into the desert south of Beerseba. This broad, high, central strip of West Jordanic territory has been likened to a ship's long-boat turned upside down. Among the highest points in Galilee are Safed (probably the “city set on a hill” of Matt. v. 14), 2,775 feet above the sea, and Jabel Jermuk, near by, which is nearly 4,000 feet high. In Samaria the highest points are Ebal, 3,077, Gerizim, 2,849, and Tell Astar (supposed to be the ancient Baal-hazor of 2 Sam. xiii. 28), nearly 3,400 feet above the sea. In Judaea the highest point in Jerusalem is 2,593, Olivet 2,692, Hebron 3,040, and Beerseba, 788 feet above the sea. The Jordan Valley, at some points quite narrow, and at others from five to ten or twelve miles broad, is one of the wonders of the world. The Jordan itself (“Descender”), from 1,080 feet above the sea at the foot of Hermon, falls in twelve miles to seven feet above the sea-level at Lake Huleh, 682.5 feet below the Mediterranean, and sixty-five miles farther down enters the Sea of Galilee, 682.5 feet below the Mediterranean, and sixty-five miles farther down empties into the Dead Sea, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean. Thus, between Hermon and the Sea of Galilee the descent is more than sixty feet to the mile, and between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, more than one foot to the mile. The fourth strip east of the Jordan is mostly high table-land, some of it 3,000 feet high, sinking away eastward into the Arabian Desert.

Of the four lakes of Palestine, the northernmost is Phiala, five miles east of Banias, nearly round, about a mile in diameter, and of unknown depth, occupying apparently the crater of an extinct volcano. It is about 3,300 feet above the Mediterranean, is not, as was anciently supposed, one of the sources of the Jordan, has, indeed, neither inlet nor outlet, and abounds in frogs and leeches. Lake Huleh (“Waters of Merom,” Josh. xi. 7), the Semechonitis of Josephus (*Ant.* v. 5, 1), some twelve miles south of Banias, in the midst of an extensive papyrus marsh, seven feet above the sea-level, is triangular in shape, with its apex pointing southward, four miles long, nearly four miles across its northern end, and fifteen feet deep. Some ten miles and a half south of Lake Huleh is Gennesaret, twelve miles and a half in length, eight miles in its greatest breadth (at Magdala), 165 feet deep, and 682.5 feet below the Mediterranean. This lake is remarkable for the abun-
dance of its fish, the suddenness and violence of its storms, and the hot-springs which drain the glass. The Dead Sea, sixty-five miles farther south, is about forty-six miles long, with an average breadth of ten miles, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean when the sea is at the fullest after the winter rains, and over 1,300 feet deep at the deepest point; the southern part, covering what used to be the Valley of Sidon, being very shallow. The extraordinary depression of the Dead Sea was never suspected till in March, 1837, it was detected and measured by Moore and Beke, experimenting by means of boiling water. They made the depression, however, only about 600 feet. Scott and Symonds, in 1840-41, made it 1,291 feet; Lynch, in 1848, made it 1,310; and Conder, in 1874, made it 1,592 feet. No fish live in the Dead Sea, the water being extremely salt and bitter, containing twenty-six per cent of solid matter. The impression generally received of the scenery is that of grandeur and desolation. But some travellers have been much impressed, also, by the singular beauty of this silent sea.

Many of the so-called rivers of Palestine are merely winter torrents, which run dry in summer. Of perennial streams, some sixteen in all, the most important is the Jordan. Its three sources are at Hasbeia, at Banias, and at Tell el-Layyin (the ancient Dan): the first of which contributes about one-seventh; the second, two-sevenths; and the third, four-sevenths of the water. Between Banias (about ten miles south of Hasbeia) and the Dead Sea, the distance is a hundred and four miles. The Jordan has four tributaries,—two from the east, and two from the west. The eastern tributaries are the Yarmuk (ancient Hieromax), which drains the Hauran, and the Zerka M'aln, in whose valley are the ancient dividing-line between Kdom and Moab. The western tributaries are the Jaulid, near Bethshean, and the Farah, where Zonon (John iii.23) has been looked for. Three permanent streams empty into the Dead Sea from the east: the northernmost of these, about ten miles down, is the Zerka Mattin, in which valley are the hot sulphur-springs of Callirhoe, a little way north of Macherus, where John the Baptist was imprisoned and murdered, and to which the Arnon, which divided Moab from the Amorites. At the southeastern corner is el-Ahsy, which Robinson identifies with Zered (Deut. ii.13), the ancient dividing-line between Edom and Moab.

Eight perennial streams flow into the Mediterranean. The northernmost of these is the Mefshuk of Upper Galilee. South of this is the Namein (ancient Belus), near Acre, celebrated for the accidental discovery of the art of making glass. Next is the Mukutta (the Kishon, "that ancient river," Judg. vi.21), which drains the large and fertile plain of Esdraelon. The plain of Sefeh is watered by the Skanderuneh, the Falik, and the 'Ajua (possibly the Me-jarkon of Josh. xix. 46) near Jaffa.

The fountains of Palestine constitute one of its most characteristic features. Many scriptural names of places, like Endor, Engannim, and Engedi, indicate the near neighborhood of fountains. They abound especially among the more hilly portions of Galilee, Samaria, and Judea. Dr. Robinson counted thirty, some of them large and copious, in a circuit of eight or ten miles around Jerusalem, not including those of the city itself. It is a mistake to suppose that the country is not, on the whole, well watered. As Moses said of it (Deut. viii.7), it is "a land of brooks of water, of fountains, and depths that spring out of valleys and hills." The largest of all the fountains is the one at Tell el-Abyad, that source of the Jordan, which is about a hundred and fifty feet in diameter, bursting from the ground with great force. Another large and famous fountain is that of Elisha, near ancient Jericho.

The geoology of the country has been studied by Seetzen (1805), by Poole (1836), by Russegger (1838-39), by Anderson (1848), by Lartet (1884), and, more recently, by Conder and others, but not yet exhaustively. The prevailing formation is that of hard crystalline limestone overlaid with chalk, which in the centre of the country, and in parts of Galilee, is, in turn, overlaid with nummulitic limestone of the term period. The limestone hills are full of grottos and caverns. The Nubian sandstone shows itself on the east side of the Dead Sea, but is not found west of the Jordan. In the Lejah district, east of the Jordan, is a rough, basaltic area of about five hundred square miles. Lava deposits are found also in the plateaus and plains west and southwest of Gennesaret. Coal has been found in Lebanon; also coal, copper, and tin, near Sidon. The deep chasm of the Jordan Valley must have been caused by some great convulsion of nature, antedating the historic period. The Dead Sea is no doubt much older than the time of Abraham, and the Cities of the Plain are not at all likely to have stood on ground now covered by the water. Hot-springs are numerous. Earthquakes are frequent and severe. In 1837 Safed and Tiberias were destroyed by a shock.

The present climate of Palestine is said by Conder to be "trying and unhealthy," but by reason of human neglect, rather than by reason of any great climatic change. The Jordan Valley is especially tropical and dangerous. The hottest month of the year is August. The best months for tourists are May and October. Rain is heavy. There are only two seasons, summer and winter; the former, from April to November, rainless, or nearly so; the latter, the rainy season, from November to April. But between the middle of December and the middle of February there is usually an intermission, separating "the former and the latter rain." The average annual rainfall at Jerusalem is sixty inches; while on our Atlantic seaboard it is forty-five, and in California, whose climate somewhat resembles that of Palestine, it is only twenty. At Jerusalem, from June, 1861, to January, 1855, according to Dr. Barclay's register, the mean precipitation was 66.5", the highest 92", and the lowest 28". In some years the mean has been 62", and the highest 86". At Khan Minieh, in 1876, Dr. Merrill encountered a sirocco heat of 130° in the sun. Hermon, 9,200 feet high, looking down upon the whole of Palestine, is covered with snow, though late in autumn only slender threads of it are left, as the Arabs say, "like the straggling locks on an old man's head." In the winter, on the plains, ice seldom makes, and the
ground is seldom frozen. With abundant rains, which may generally be counted upon, Palestine might again be fertile as it was of old. But trees should not alone be planted, and hills terraced. The products of the soil still range from pepper, beans, wheat, and barley, to grapes, figs, olives, apricots, lemons, oranges, and dates. Melons are abundant. Dr. Thomson praises the apples of Askelon, which he identifies with the "apples" of Solomon's Song. Dr. Tristram thinks that the apple-tree of Solomon was the apricot.

The flora of Palestine, unlike that of Egypt, is richly varied. Not less than a thousand species of plants have been reported, and probably another thousand might be added; but only a very small portion of these are noticed in the Bible. No tourist ever forgets the impression made upon him by the flowers of Palestine. For miles on mile, in the proper season, the ground is radiant with all the colors of the rainbow. Everywhere one sees the scarlet anemone, thought by some to be our Lord's "crown of thorns." The ranunculus and the pheasant's-eye (Adonis palustris) are also very brilliant. The narcissus, the crocus, and the mallow are all candidates for the honor of being considered "the rose of Sharon." Of shrubs, the most abundant and beautiful is the oleander. The whole country was once well timbered; and still there are groves, and even forests, of pine and of oak beyond the Jordan. On the west side of the river, all the way up from Beer-sheba to Lebanon, there are very few trees except on Tabor and Carmel. Since the time of the Crusaders the pine-forest then standing between Jerusalem and Bethlehem has disappeared. Repeated wars and conquests, and dreary centuries of bad government, have gradually reduced the country to its present naked, burnt, and desolate aspect.

Even the cedars of Lebanon are steadily disappearing. The tree now most common is the oak, of which there are three species. Most abundant of all is the prickly evergreen oak (Quercus pseudo-coccifera). The other two species are deciduous. The "oaks of Mamre" were not terebinths, the most famous specimen being the "Abraham's Oak," near Hebron, twenty-three feet in circumference. The sycamore is common, as also the ash, elder, hawthorn, willow, tamarisk, and poplar. The pods of the locust are supposed by some to have been the "husks" eaten by the prodigal (Luke xv. 16), or at least craved by him. The papyrus, now wholly extinct in Egypt, is found in two places: at Lake Huleh and at Khan Minieh. The "reed shaken with the wind" (Matt. xi. 7), Arundo donax, grows in great cane-brakes in many parts of Palestine, especially on the west side of the Dead Sea.

Our Saviour's "crown of thorns" (Matt. xxvii. 29) was probably plaited from the zizyphus, a kind of lotus, with a small white blossom and a yellow berry, found in the Kidron Valley, but growing to a much larger size in the low, warm plains. In the Jordan Valley are found the acacia ("shittim-wood" of Exod. xxxvi. 20) and the false balm-of-Gilead, a thorny shrub, whose oil was so highly prized by the Arabs. The real balm-of-Gilead, highly cultivated in the Plains of Jericho, has disappeared.

The country is rich also in its fauna. Dr. Tristram reports eighty species of mammals. Of wild animals, the lion and the "unicorn," or wild bull (Num. xxiii. 22), are extinct; and all the larger kinds are rare. But still there are wolves, bears, leopards, jackals, hyenas, wild boars, antelopes, gazelles, foxes, porcupines, rabbits, rats, mice, and wildcats. The dogs are nearly all of one breed (the shepherd), are outcasts and scavengers, and, like jackals, make night hideous by their howlings. Of strictly domesticated animals, the horse is much less used than the ass, the mule, and the camel; which last are more economical. The buffalo, said to have been introduced by the Persians, has in some sections taken the place of the ox; and the cattle of the country in general are neither so numerous nor so well cared for as in ancient times. Sheep and goats are abundant, but swine are seldom seen. Of birds, the most common are eagles, vultures, falcons, hawks, owls, storks, pelicans, ravens, doves, pigeons, partridges, quails, sparrows, and nightingales. Large birds of prey are particularly numerous. Brilliance of plumage is another striking feature. But singing-birds are few, the bulbul and nightingale being the most common. Dr. Tristram collected three hundred and twenty-two species of birds, and thinks that at least thirty other species might be added to the list. A small but fine collection, made in the Jordan Valley, and on the east side of the river, for the American Palestine Exploration Society, belongs now to the museum of the Union Theological Seminary in New-York City.

Fish are often referred to in Scripture, but no species are named. Gennesaret is still remarkable for its dense shoals of fish, frequently covering an acre or more of the surface. Dr. Tristram obtained fourteen species, and thinks there may be three times that number of species in the lake. The bream and sheat-fish, among the most abundant of all, are identical with the common species of the Nile. The coryneus of Josephus (J. W. iii. 10, 8) has at last been found. The "great fish" of Jon. i. 17, was not a "whale," as the Sept. of Matt. xii. 40 is unwarrantably rendered in our version, but may have been a specimen of the great white shark (Carcharias), still found in the Mediterranean, and sometimes twenty-five or thirty feet long.

Reptiles abound in Palestine. Serpents are very numerous, most of them harmless, and many of them brilliantly colored. Some are venomous. Of lizards there is an immense variety. Frogs are numerous, but are all of one species; and only one species of the toad is known. The crocodile (the "leviathan" of Job xli.) may still be found in the marshes of the Zerka.

Insects are abundant, especially locusts, grasshoppers, crickets, and cockroaches, also fleas, lice, and mosquitoes, the bee, the wasp, and the hornet.

The immediate predecessors of the Hebrews in Palestine were the Canaanites, of Hamitic blood. But these were preceded by an aboriginal, prehistoric population, supposed to have been Semitic. This prehistoric population probably occupied the country on both sides of the Jordan, but in the time of Abraham we find...
them mostly on the east side of the river. Chedorlaomer, King of Elam, the contemporary of Abraham, is described in Gen. xiv. as smiting these four tribes,—the Rephaim in Bashan, south of them the Ezem, still farther south the Elam, and, farthest south of all, the Horites till Edom. On the west side of the Jordan, in the neighborhood of Hebron (Num. xiii. 28), were the Anakim, who were driven out by Joshua (Josh. xii. 21, 22), only a remnant remaining in Philistia. The Acrim of Deut. ii. 23, assumed to be identical with the Arites of Josh. xiii. 3, also probably belonged to this same aboriginal Semitic population. The earliest historic occupants of Palestine, as we have said, were Hamites, descended from Canaan, the fourth and youngest son of Ham. The date of their immigration cannot be determined. Their conquest of the aboriginal Semitic tribes was evidently not yet completed when Abraham crossed the Jordan. In the original grant of territory to Abraham (Gen. xv. 19–21), ten tribes are named, the first two of which, the Keunites and Kenizzites, were on the south, towards Egypt; and the third, the Kenites, were on the southward side of the river. Usually six tribes are named, as in Exod. iii. 8 and in Josh. ix. 1; but seven is the number in Josh. xxiv. 11, where the Gergashites, usually omitted, are named as if on the west side of the Jordan. These seven were the Hittites, Gergashites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites. In the time of Moses and Joshua, the Ammon-Moab people were on the east side of the river, but had been crowded down by the Amorites, who held the whole territory from Mount Hermon to the Arnon. Reuben, Gad, and Half-Manasseh took this East-Jordan territory; the other nine tribes and a half took the West-Jordan territory. The Hebrew commonwealth reached the zenith of its prosperity and power under David and Solomon. Visible decay began about 975 B.C., with the succession of the ten tribes. Assyria crushed the northern kingdom of Israel about 720 B.C., and Babylon crushed the southern kingdom of Judah about 587 B.C. Since then the country has been almost constantly under foreign domination, with hardly more than the shadow of independence at any time. Persians, Greeks, and Romans succeeded one another in the mastery, the heroic Maccabean period lasting only about a hundred years. Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, there were four provinces,—Galilee, Samaria, and Judea on the west side of the river, and Perea on the east side. Since 637 A.D., when Palestine was conquered by the Saracens, it has, with little interruption, been under Moslem rule. The Seljuk Turks seized the country in 1073, and by their barbarous treatment of Christian pilgrims provoked the Crusades. The Latin kingdom, with its nine successive sovereigns, established in 1099, held Jerusalem till 1187, and stood in Acre till 1291. In 1517 the Ottomans came in, and made the country a part of the Turkish Empire. It was snatched from the Sultan by Mohammed Ali in 1832; but Europe intervened, and in 1841 it was given back again to Turkey. It now belongs to the pashalik of Damascus, which includes the three sub-pashaliks of Beirut, Akka, and Jerusalem. As no proper census is ever taken, the population can only be guessed at. For the whole area of ancient Palestine, Dr. Socin, in Badeker's Handbook, allows an aggregate of six hundred and fifty thousand souls,—only about a tenth part of what the country was supposed to support. The Jews, who number about twenty thousand, are comparatively recent comers, found only in the sacred places of Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias, and Safed. Jerusalem has a population of twenty-five thousand, of whom ten thousand are Jews. The Samaritans at Nablous number only about a hundred and fifty. The bulk of the people are a mixed race, descendants of the ancient Syrians and their Arab-conquerors. East of the Jordan are three important tribes dwelling permanently within recognized limits. These are, north of the Arnon, the Adwa; south of the Arnon, the Beni Sakhr; and in the Jordan Valley, the Ghawarineh. Besides these are four tribes of Bedaween Aeneesch (the Wul'd 'Ali, the Heseineh, the Ruwalia, and the Bisher), who left Arabia about 120 A.D., and are always in motion, coming northward every summer, and going southward every winter. The Turkish government has but little control of them. Dr. Merrill's East of the Jordan gives us admirable pictures of Arab life in Eastern Palestine. Pilgrimages to the Holy Land began with Helena, the mother of Constantine, in 326 A.D., and have continued ever since. What was then known of the country may be found in the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome. During the middle ages the principal topographers of Palestine were superstitious, ignorant, and careless monks, whose identifications of sacred places were largely of the legendary and childish sort. The eighteenth century contributed something towards a better knowledge of the Holy Land. Reland's learned work (1714) is still a classic. Richard Pococke was in Palestine in 1738. Korte, the German bookseller, was the first (in 1741) to question the genuineness of the traditional site of the holy sepulchre. The natural history of the country was ably treated in a posthumous work of Hasselquist, edited (1757) by Linnæus. The nineteenth century opened a new epoch in the history of biblical geography. Settezen was in the field from 1806 to 1807, Burckhardt in 1810, Irby and Mangles in 1817–1818. But no one man has ever done so much for the geography of the Holy Land as Dr. Edward Robinson. Not only was he thoroughly prepared for his task by fifteen years of special study, but he had a passion and a genius for exact and certain knowledge. During two brief journeys, in 1836 and in 1839, accompanied and aided by Dr. Eli Smith, one of the best Arabic scholars then living, he fairly swept the whole field clean of ecclesiastical traditions. He was the first to adopt and adhere persistently to the rule of looking for ancient Hebrew names under the disguise of modern Arabic names. The number of ancient places first visited or identified by him in 1835 was a hundred and sixteen. The number of identifications added in 1839 was forty-nine. And very few of these identifications have been set aside. Next in rank, with respect to the amount and quality of service rendered, is Dr. William M. Thomson, for more than forty years an American
missionary in Syria and Palestine, whose book, in two volumes, appeared in 1858, and in a new edition, in three volumes, in 1890-93. In 1848 the Lower Jordan and the Dead Sea were for the first time thoroughly explored and surveyed by Lieuts. Lynch and Dale of the United-States Navy. In 1859 Johann Gottfried Wetzstein, Prussian consul at Damascus, explored the northern section of the country east of the Jordan. In 1866 Huleh and the Upper Jordan were explored by John Macgregor of Scotland, and in the same year the Lake of Galilee was surveyed by Capt. Wilson of the English Royal Engineers. This last piece of work was done under the direction of the Palestine Exploration Fund, a society organized in 1865 for the purpose of making an exhaustive exploration and accurate survey of the Holy Land. From 1867 to 1870 Capt. Warren, under the direction of the same society, was making excavations in and around Jerusalem. In 1870 the American Palestine Exploration Society was organized to work on the east side of the Jordan. The triangulation of Western Palestine was begun in the autumn of 1871 by Capt. Stew ard of the Royal Engineers and was finished in 1877 by Lieuts. Conder and Kitchener. They have done a great work. Of 622 biblical sites in Western Palestine, they claim to have identified 172 out of the 434 in all, which they regard as now identified with reasonable certainty. Their large map, in twenty-six sheets, is on the scale of three-eighths of an inch to the mile. It was published in 1880. Seven quarto volumes go with it,—three volumes of Memoirs, one volume of Name Lists, one of Special Papers, one on the Jerusalem Work, and one on the Flora and Fauna of Western Palestine. The reduced map (on the scale of three-eighths of an inch to the mile) is in four forms,—the Modern, the Old-Testament Ancient, the New-Testament Ancient, and the Water-Basins. In 1873 the American Society sent out its first expedition under command of Lieut. Steever of the United-States army, who triangulated some five hundred square miles of the territory over against Jericho. The archaeologist of the expedition was Professor John A. Paine, who took squeezes and casts of important inscriptions (including those of Hamath), identified Mount Pisgah, and made a collection of East-Jordanic plants. The second expedition, in 1876, was under command of Col. James C. Lane, and had Dr. Selah Merrill for its archaeologist. A rapid reconnaissance survey of the whole transjordanic territory was made, about a hundred photographs of ruins and scenery were taken, several places of interest and importance (such as Succoth, Madaba, Tiberias, Gilgal, and Tiberi- bi) were identified, and in all about 230 names appeared for the first time on Meyer's map (not published). Dr. Merrill reckons about 240 biblical names east of the Jordan, besides fourteen mentioned in the Maccabees. Nearly 100 of these he thinks have been identified. At this point the work of triangulation was surrendered to the English Society, which entered the field in 1881, surveyed about five hundred square miles, and was then compelled by the unsettled condition of the country to withdraw, it is hoped only for a time. The American Society published four Statements (1871, 1875, 1879, 1877), and holds in reserve Dr. Merrill's Notes upon the Meyer map. Dr. Merrill's East of the Jordan (1881) is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. He is now (1883) American consul in Jerusalem. In 1877 a German society was organized, and is doing good work. It publishes a monthly periodical.

Lit. — The literature of the subject is vast. Tobler, in his Bibliotheca Geographica Palestinae (1867, with supplements in 1889 and 1878), enumerates more than a thousand writers. To mention only a few of the most important and useful: the Onomasticon of Eusebius (cir. 390), translated into Latin, with additions by Jerome (388), edited by Larsow and Parthey (Berlin, 1862); Descriptions Terrae Sanctae, by writers of the eighth, ninth, twelfth, and fifteenth centuries, edited by Tobler (Leipzig, 1874); Early Travels in Palestine, edited by Wright (London, 1848); the Historia Theologica, et Moralis Terrae Sanctae Elucidatio, of Quaresimus (Antwerp, 1690), valuable for the traditions; Maundrell, Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter, 1697 (Oxford, 1703); Kelland's Palaestina Illustrata (Utrecht, 1714); Hasselquist: Voyage aux lieux saints, en 1748 et 1749, in two volumes, 1749-55, edited by Linnaeus, 1757 (London, 1766); Burckhardt: Travels in Syria and the Holy Land (London, 1822); Travels in Egypt and Nubia, Syria and Asia Minor, during the Years 1817, 1818, by Irby and Mangles, printed, but not published (London, 1822); Robinson: Biblical Researches (Boston, London, and Berlin, 1841, 3 vols.), Later Researches (1856), and Physical Geography of the Holy Land (published posthumously, 1865); Williams: Holy City (1845, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1849), defending the traditional sites; Wilson: The Lands of the Bible (Edinb., 1847, 2 vols.); Lynch: Expedition to the Dead Sea and the Jordan (1849); Stanley: Sinai and Palestine (1857, 2d ed., posthumous, 1883), highly picturesque and graphic; Barclay: The City of the Great King (1858), valuable for the meteorology; Thomson: The Land and the Book (1858, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1859-60, 3 vols.); Tobler: Bethle- hem (1849), Jerusalem (1854), Nazareth (1868); Porter: Damascus (1850), Giant Cities of Bashan (1865), Handbook of Syria and Palestine (revised edition, 1875); Ritter: Geography of Palestine, translated by Gage (1866, 4 vols.); Tristram: The Land of Israel (1865), Natural History of the Bible (1867), Land of Moab (1875); Macgregor: Rob Roy on the Jordan (1870); Nutt: Samaritan Targum and History (1874); Conder: Tent-Work in Palestine (1878, 2 vols., 2d ed. 1885); Bartlett: From Egypt to Palestine (1879); Schaff: Through Bible Lands (1880); Merrill: East of the Jordan (1881), Galilee in the Time of Christ (1881). The best maps yet published are those of Van de Velde (1866), of Kiepert (1875), and of the English Exploration Fund (1880-83). The best atlases are those of Menke (1868) and of Clark (1880). Roswell D. Hitchcock, the founder of the modern style of church-music; b. at Pales- trina, in the Roman Campagna, 1824; d. in Rome, Feb. 2, 1892. He studied under Claude Goudinel and made by his first compositions—three masses dedicated to Julius III.—so favorable an impres- sion, that he was made musical director of the Julian chapel. He held similar positions at
PALLEY. 1728

various chapels and churches in Rome until his death; and by his compositions, which are very numerous, — masses, motets, hymns, etc., but of which only one-half has been published,—he produced a complete revolution in the history of church-music. As his masterpiece, is generally
described his Missa Papae Marcelli. His life was briefly as follows: His father was a canon in the cathedral; d. May 25, 1845, in Bishop-Wearmouth. As a boy he exhibited the power of close and clear reasoning which afterwards made him distinguished. Entering Christ College, Cambridge, in 1759, he left it after taking his degree, in 1763, to become teacher, and subsequently assistant preacher, in Greenwhich. In 1765 he received the prize from Cambridge for the best Latin dissertation, his theme being a comparison of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies; and in 1770 he was elected fellow of Christ College. He lectured at Cambridge with success till 1775, when he accepted the living of Musgrove, Westmoreland, with which he combined several others. In 1780 he was appointed prebendary of Carlisle, 1782 archdeacon, and in 1785 chancellor of the diocese. During this period he spent much time in the elaboration of his lectures. In 1794 he published his Evidences of Christianity, which had a cordial reception, and secured for him immediate promotion in the church. He was appointed canon of St. Paul's in 1763, made doctor of theology by Cambridge, and subdean of Lincoln, and soon after offered the rectory of Bishop-Wearmouth, where he spent the remainder of his life.

The most important of Paley's writings are the Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 1765, 2 vols., for the copyright of which he received a thousand pounds, (and which went through fifteen editions in the author's lifetime); Hora Paulina, 1790; A View of the Evidences of Christianity, 1794, 3 vols.; Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and the Attributes of the Deity, collected from the Appearances of Nature, 1802. His smaller works were his Moral and Political Philosophy, 1785, Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (German translation by Garve) was introduced as a text-book into Cambridge in 1786, where it was retained for many years. It represents the standpoint of empiricism, and called forth replies from Glabone, Pearson, and others. As late as 1850, Dr. Whately edited an edition with notes.

The Evidences of Christianity was Paley's most important work, if we judge by its influence upon English theology. Until very recently it was the principal theological text-book of Cambridge, and in 1846 the examination was extended to three hours. The author pursues the historical method. Bolingbroke and other deists had affirmed that the truth of Christianity ought to be proved by historical arguments. Paley and Lardner took the hint. In working out his plan, Paley sought to establish the two propositions, that "there is clear proof that the apostles and their successors underwent the greatest hardships rather than give up the gospel, and cease to obey its precepts," and "other miracles than those of the gospel are not satisfactorily attested." To these evidences he appends "auxiliary" arguments drawn from the "morality of the gospel," "originality of Christ's character," etc., and a consideration of some popular objections. Paley's Evidences does not touch upon the pantheistic objections to Christianity current at the present day, and is consequently not fully adapted to our present wants. The author's originality, as the substance of his arguments had been given before in Lardner's Credibility, and the Criterion of Miracles by Bishop Douglas. A German translation appeared at Leipzig, 1797.

The Hora Paulina (German translation by H. P. C. Henke) is an able presentation of the "undesigned coincidences" between the Epistles of Paul and the Acts. The Natural Theology (German translation by Hauff, Stuttgart, 1837) is a clear popular presentation of the teleological argument for God's existence.

Able as Paley was as an apologist for Christianity, we miss in his writings a deep conviction of sin, and the recognition of the central significance of the doctrines of the atonement and justification. See Meadley: Memoirs of W. Paley, Edinburgh, 1810; [and Lives by Chalmers (in an edition of the author's works, 1821)]; Edmund Paley, 1825.

PALISSY. 586. See Bible Text, p. 268.

PALISSY, Bernard, better known as Palissy the Potter, a Huguenot artisan of humble origin, who by force of natural abilities, indomitable perseverance, and rare integrity of character, has won for himself an enviable place in history. He was born about 1510, at Chapelle-Biron, on the confines of the old French provinces of Périgord and Agénos, in the modern department of Lotet-Garonne. Little is known of his youth, except that he enjoyed few opportunities for obtaining an education. When he reached manhood, he set out on his travels through France, seeking to gain a living as a painter on glass, and at the same time to satisfy the cravings of a singularly inquisitive mind. At length, about 1539, he settled at Saintes, in the present department of Charente-Inférieure, where he shortly afterward married. Published after his death under the title Sermons and Tracts. The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (German translation by Garve) was introduced as a text-book into Cambridge in 1786, where it was retained for many years. It represents the standpoint of empiricism, and called forth replies from Glabone, Pearson, and others. As late as 1850, Dr. Whately edited an edition with notes.

The Evidences of Christianity was Paley's most important work, if we judge by its influence upon English theology. Until very recently it was the principal theological text-book of Cambridge, and in 1846 the examination was extended to three hours. The author pursues the historical method. Bolingbroke and other deists had affirmed that the truth of Christianity ought to be proved by historical arguments. Paley and Lardner took the hint. In working out his plan, Paley sought to establish the two propositions, that "there is clear proof that the apostles and their successors underwent the greatest hardships rather than give up the gospel, and cease to obey its precepts," and "other miracles than those of the gospel are not satisfactorily attested." To these
the intolerant legislation of Francis I. soon put to death. From a convert, Palissy soon became a lay-preacher; and, though he never was ordained as a minister. The light of his faith was the fountain of the Protestant church of Saintes. He has himself left us an affecting description of the wonderful change produced in the course of a few years upon the morals of the people of the city and its neighborhood by the work, of which his simple reading and expounding of the Bible was the humble origin. Toward the close of the reign of Henry II. the remarkable abilities of the Huguenot potter of Saintes at last obtained recognition. Constable Anne de Montmorency became his patron, and somewhat relieved his poverty by furnishing him the means of building suitable ovens for baking his novel productions. But even the safeguard given him by the constable did not prevent Palissy from being thrown into prison as a heretic, when in 1562, during the course of the first "religious war," Saintes was the scene of a violent re-actionary movement. At the request of Montmorency, Catharine de Medici issued an order for the potter's release, and from that time forward became his protector. In 1572 he owed his safety, during the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, to the queen-mother's commands. At that time, or shortly before, Palissy with his son was employed by Catharine (through whose influence he had received the formal title of "inventeur des nistiques Jigulines clu") in decorating the gardens of the Palace of the Tuileries, then in process of construction. It was impossible, however, for so outspoken a Protestant to live in Paris unharmed during the troublous years of the close of the reign of Henry III. In 1588 Palissy was again in prison because of his faith. It was on this occasion that he is said to have been visited in the Bastille by the weak king, who in vain begged him to recant, at the same time informing him, that, should he refuse, he would be compelled to leave him to his fate. The fearless answer of the humble potter, as given by Agrippa d'Aubigné in his Confession de Sancy, has become famous in history: "Sire, you have several times told me that you pitied me; but it is I that pity you, who have uttered the words, 'I am compelled.' That was not spoken as a king. These girls my companions, and I, who have a portion in the kingdom of heaven, will teach you this royal language, that neither the Guises, nor all your people, nor you, will know how to compel a potter to bow the knee to images." There is no sufficient reason for doubting the substantial correctness of the reply, as it has been transmitted to us, although the form may be somewhat affected by the style of the epigrammatic writer to whom we are indebted for its preservation. It is certain that Palissy remained in the Bastille, together with other prisoners for the faith, until after the death of the king, and himself died there of want and treatment, in 1590, at the age of about eighty years. The transcendent merits of the Huguenot potter as an artist have long been acknowledged; and his productions, many of which occupy places of honor in the museums of the Louvre, of Cluny, and elsewhere, are greatly sought after. It is on political economy and as a writer of the French language inferior to few other men in the sixteenth century. Lamartine, no incompetent judge in such matters of judgment, it is impossible not to proclaim this poor workman in clay one of the greatest writers of the French tongue. Montaigne does not excel him in freedom, Jean Jacques Rousseau in vigor, La Fontaine in grace, Bossuet in lyric energy." It may be mentioned as an historical curiosity, that a Roman-Catholic committee erected a statue to Palissy at Saintes in 1868, and in its proceedings on the occasion made light of the Protestantism of a man with whom religious convictions always held the highest position. The secretary of that committee naturally attempted to prove Palissy's reply to Henry III. to be apocryphal. Monographs on Palissy's life and works abound in the French language. For contemporary references to him, see LESTOILE: Journal de Henri III., and AGRIFFA D'AUBIGNÉ: Confession catholique de Sancy. The Bulletin of the French Protestant Historical Society contains numerous instructive articles. O. DOUEN contributes a thorough sketch to LICHTEMBERGER: Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses. See also HENRY MORLEY: Life of Bernard Palissy, N.Y., 1852, 2 vols. HENRY M. BAIRD.

PALLADIUS, the opponent of Epiphanius and Jerome in the Origenistic controversy; b. in Galatia about 368; went, when he was twenty years old, to Egypt, to make himself acquainted with the great fathers of monasticism. Though the hermits whom he first approached, in the vicinity of Alexandria, were so severe that he did not feel strong enough to join them, he lived for a long time among the hermits of the Nitrian Mountains, the Skitic Desert, and the Thebais. From Egypt he went to Palestine, where he spent three years among the monks of Mount Olivet, and became acquainted with Rufinus. In 400 he was consecrated bishop of Hellenopolis in Bithynia by John Chrysostom, at that time patriarch of Constantinople. As an ardent adherent of Chrysostom, he became in 403 entangled in the Origenistic controversy. The reports are obscure and confused concerning this point. It is certain, however, that he went to Rome, probably in order to invoke the aid of Honorius in behalf of the exiled Chrysostom. On his return to the East he was seized, and banished to Syene in Upper Egypt. After many sufferings, he was recalled, and made bishop of Aspons in Galatia, where he died at the time of the Council of Ephesus, 431. Three works, still extant, have been ascribed to him; but only one of them, Historia Lausiaca, is of undoubted authenticity. It is a collection of lives of Egyptian and Palestinian monks, written c. 420, partly from own experience, partly from the work of Rufinus, and dedicated to Lausius, governor of Cappadocia. It is found in Migne, xxxiv.; see also WEINGARTEN: Der Ursprung des Minchusmus, Gotha, 1877, and BARING-GOULD, in
PALLADIUS.  

Contemporary Review, October, 1877. Whether the Dialogue de vita Chrysostomi, edited by E. BisSeus, Lon., 1665, is by the same author as the Historia Lausiacae, or by some other Palladius, is very questionable. ZÖCKLER.

PALLADIUS, Scottorum Episcopus. Date and place of birth are unknown. Prosper Aquitanaus says in his chronicle for A.D. 429, that Palladius, being translated through the instrumentality of Celestine, then pope, was induced upon St. Germain of Auxerre to fight against the Paganians. In the same chronicle for A.D. 431 occurs the well-known passage, "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a papa Celestino Palladius el primus episcopus mititur." None now doubts that by Scott the Irish are meant. The Irish "Lives" of St. Patrick all represent the mission of Palladius as a failure, and as lasting only a few months. Most of them say that he left the country, and died among the Britons or the Picts, although Tireehan says (and the author of the fourth "Life" of Colgan's collection countenances the tradition) that he suffered martyrdom in Ireland. This account is irreconcilable with the successes recorded in these very lives, and with the statement of Prosper, who knows nothing of St. Patrick, that Celestine had made Ireland Christian. It seems probable that the papal commission, together with the connection with St. Germain and other facts in the life of Palladius have been transferred to St. Patrick, and then the date of the death of the former made early enough to admit the possibility of his successor having a commission from Celestine, who died holding as genuine any of the writings attributed to Palladius. See Colgan: Acta sanctorum ceterae et Majoria Scottae, seu Hiberniae sanctorum insulae, Louvain, 1645, fol. ROBERT W. HALL.

PALLAVICINO or PALLAVICINI, Sforza, b. in Rome in 1607; d. there in 1697. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1637, and was appointed professor of philosophy at the Jesuit college in Rome in 1639, and professor of theology in 1643. His principal work is his history of the Council of Trent. In 1619 appeared the work of Paolo the Jesuit Terenzio Alciati was charged by Urban VIII. with collecting the necessary materials; and when he died, in 1651, the execution of the work was confided to Pallavicino. The book, written in Italian, appeared in two volumes folio, in Rome, 1656, 1657, and was received with great satisfaction by Roman-Catholic critics, though it is very far from having overthrown the censures of Sarpi. The best edition of it is that in six volumes quarto, Faenza, 1792-99. The Latin translation of it was made by the Jesuit Giattinus, Antwerp, 1659, 3 vols. In 1659 the same author was made a cardinal by Alexander VII.

PALLIUM (Latin pallium, "a cover," "a mantle"), a white woolensaved of the breadth of a hand, and adorned with six black crosses, is an ecclesiastical ornament borne by the highest officers of the Roman-Catholic Church on the most solemn occasions. Its origin is variously explained; some referring it to the head-band of the Jewish high priest, others to the mantle of the Roman emperor. Most probably, however, it is connected with the ωποσπονδυλυκαναρεια, shoulder-band of the high priest, which, by being adopted by the Church of the East, became a symbol of the Lord seeking after the lost lamb, and carrying it, when found, on his shoulder. From the East it was early transferred to the West, where it became a custom for the bishop of Rome to present it to the metropolitans connected with his diocese. The testimonies to the existence of this custom in the beginning of the sixth century are spurious; but under Gregory I. (590-604), it appears to have been firmly established; and from the time of Boniface IV. (606-615) the popes protested that it was necessary for every metropolitan or archbishop to obtain the pallium from Rome. See WURDTWEIN: Bonifaci Epistola, Mayence, 1789, Ep. 78. Though the candidate might have been confirmed and consecrated, the title of Archiepiscopus and the full pontifical authority, the plenitude pontificalis officii, still depended upon the actual possession of the pallium; before receiving that, the archbishop could, for instance, not call a synod. On its reception, the archbishop took an oath of obedience to the pope. Originally the pallium was given gratis, but later on a very high price was paid for it. With respect to the fabrication of palliums, it was enacted that the wool should be taken only from certain sheep. On Jan. 21, the Day of St. Agnes, a number of white lambs are driven by the Vatican, where the pope speaks a benediction over them, into the Church of St. Agnes. The nuns of St. Agnes then take care of the lambs, cut and spin the wool, and make up the palliums. These are laid on the altar of the Church of the Vatican, that is, on the tomb of the apostle Peter; and on June 28, the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, the palliums are blessed by the pope. In the East every bishop has his pallium; in the West, only the pope, the metropolitans, the archbishops, and such bishops as are "exempt." When, in 1753, the pallium was presented to the bishop of Würzburg, though he stood under the authority of the metropolitan of Mayence, the measure aroused considerable criticism. See CASP. BARTHEL: De pallio, Bamberg, 1753 (pro) ; and J. G. FERTSCH: De origine, usu et autoritate pallii archiepiscopalis, Helmstadt, 1754 (contra). H. F. JACOBSON.

PALMER meant originally a pilgrim who returned home from the Holy Land, having fulfilled his vow, and bringing back with him the palmbranch to be deposited on the altar of his parish church; but came afterwards to denote the perpetual pilgrim, who, without any fixed abode or any settled purpose, roved about from shrine to shrine.

PALMER, Christian David Friedrich, eminent as a pulpit orator of the evangelical church in Württemberg; b. at Wittenberg, near Stuttgart, Württemberg, Jan. 27, 1811; d. at Tübingen, May 29, 1875. He studied theology at Tübingen, 1828-33, and was appointed preacher at Marbach in 1839, and at Tübingen in 1843, and professor of practical theology in the university in 1851. He published Evangelische Homilien, Stuttgart, 1842, 5th ed.; Kirchengeschichte, Württemberg, 1842, 6th ed., 1875; Evangelische Kasualreden, 1846, 4th ed., 1865; Evangelische Predigten, 1857; Evang.
PALMER, Edward Henry, English orientalist; b. in Cambridge, Aug. 7, 1840; murdered by the Bedawin of Sinai, the Bedawin of El Till, the Desert of El Till, London, 1871; The Desert of Sinai Survey Expedition in 1868, 1869, and in 1870, in company with Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake, explored the Desert of El Thib and Moah, having acquired perfect familiarity with the language and manners of the Bedawin. On his return he was appointed Lord-Almoner's professor of Arabic at Cambridge, November, 1871. About the end of June, 1882, on the outbreak of the war between Egypt and England, he volunteered to attempt to dissuade the Bedawin from attacking the Suez Canal, to collect camels for transport, and to raise the wild men of the Thib against the rebels. For this end he landed at Jaffa, and came by the short desert route to Suez. He left Suez with two European companions, Capt. Gill and Lieut. Charrington, R.N., Aug. 8; but at midnight of Aug. 10, the little party was captured in the Wady Sudr by a large body of Tera-bin and Huwajat Bedawin, acting under the direction of the Turkish governor at Nakhl, who probably had received his orders; and the next night the three Europeans were shot. Palmer was a remarkable linguist, and performed very valuable services to literature. His works, bearing directly upon biblical and religious studies, were TheNegus, or South Country of Scripture and the Desert of El Thib, London, 1871; The Desert of the Exodus; Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wandering, 1871, 2 vols. (a valuable volume, throwing light upon the Bedawin); History of the Jewish Nation from the Earliest Times, 1874; Outline of Scripture Geography, 1874; The Quran, 1890, 2 vols., besides reports on the nomenclature of Sinai, the Bedawin of Sinai, and Lieut. Charrington, etc. See WALTHER BESANT: The Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer, London, 1883.

PALMER, Herbert, b. March 29, 1801, at Wingham, County Kent, Eng. : entered St. John's College, Cambridge, March 23, 1815 (10); took the master's degree in 1822; became fellow of Queen's College, July 17, 1823; ordained to the ministry in 1824; was made lecturer at Alphage Church, Canterbury, in 1826; removed to the vicarage of Ashwell by Archbishop Laud in 1832; and in the same year was made university preacher at Cambridge. In 1849 he was appointed a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and was chosen one of the assessors in 1846. Soon after, he became minister of Dukes-place Church, London, and was subsequently transferred to the larger field of the new church, Westminster. April 11, 1844, he was made master of Queen's College, Cambridge. He died Aug. 18, 1867, in the prime of life. He was a devout man, and was subsequently transferred to the larger field of the new church, Westminster. April 11, 1844, he was made master of Queen's College, Cambridge. He died Aug. 18, 1867, in the prime of life. He was a devout man, and was subsequently transferred to the larger field of the new church, Westminster....
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PAMPHILUS, the great patron of learned theology; descended from a distinguished family at Berytus in Phoenicia; studied at Alexandria under Hiero- 
philus. As a great admirer of Origen, he became 
entangled in the Origenistic controversy. In 
307, during the Maximinian persecution, he was 
imprisoned. During his 
imprisonment he wrote in connection with Eusebius, who (on account of the intimate relation in which he stood to him) bears the surname Pam-
philus, an apology of Origen in five books, to which Eusebius afterwards added a sixth; but only the 
first book is still extant, and that only in a not so very reliable translation by Rufinus, found in 
the editions of Origen's works by De la Rue, 
Lommatzsch, etc. For the life of Pamphilus see EUSEBIUS: Hist. Eccl., VI., 32, 33; VII., 32; 
De Mart. Pat., 11; SOCRATES, III., 7; JEROME: Cat. 75; PHOBIUS: Cod., 118. W. MÖLLER.

PAMPHYLIA, a province of Asia Minor, bounded south by the Mediterranean, east by Cilicia, north by Pisidia, and west by Lycia. Its chief 
cities were Perga and Attalia. Paul first entered Asia Minor through the city of Perga, coming from Cyprus (Acts xiii. 18); and he again visited the 
province on his return to the interior of the country (Acts xiv. 24), though he left Pamphylia through Attalia.

PÁNAQUIA (πάνακια, "all-holy"), a surname of the Holy Virgin, occurring in the later confes-
sions, but also used among the later Greeks as a 
surname for the consecrated bread and a cup of wine before the image of the Virgin. Prayers were then 
offered, incense was burned, and finally the bread and wine were distributed among those present. This rite, which was performed at the beginning of a journey, or some other important undertaking, was called πανακια υπακοης. See 
GOAIRUS: Eucholog., p. 867; CODINUS: De officiis, 7, 32.

PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD. This has become 
the popular title of certain conferences held at 
Lambeth (A.D. 1867 and 1878), to which all 
bishops in communion with the Primal See of Canterbury were invited. In 1851 Archbishop 
Sumner invited the American bishops who de-

greed their episcopate from his predecessors to unite in the celebration of the hundred and 
fifteenth anniversary of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and to the very 
cordial and fervent words in which he referred to "the close communion which binds our churches in America and England in one" must be 
attributed the awakening of a general desire for the open manifestation of this unity. Cordial 
responses were elicited, and the idea took 
root, wonder, therefore, that it made a deep impression on the imagination of the people. Thamar (palm) was a favorite name for girls (Gen. xxxviii. 6; 2 
Sam. xiii. 1, xiv. 27), and for cities, among which 
Jericho was specially called the "city of palm-
trees" (Deut. xxxiv. 3; 2 Chron. xxviii. 13; Ezek. 
xiv. 10, xlvii. 28). Palm-branches were used at 
the feast of tabernacles, in triumphal processions, etc. Palm-leaves were stamped on the Hebrew 
coins, and occur, also, as architectonic ornaments (1 Kings vi. 29, xxxii. 35).

PAMPHILUS, the great patron of learned theology; descended from a distinguished family at Berytus in Phoenicia; studied at Alexandria under Pierius, a pupil of Origen; and was or-
dained a presbyter by Bishop Agapius of Cesa-
rea. For the study of theology he did very much, — by supporting poor students; by defraying the expenses of copying the Scriptures and the works 
of the Fathers, especially those of Origen; and by enriching, if he did not found, the library of Cesa-
rea, from which not only Eusebius, but also Jerome, derived so great advantages. It con-
tained the Hexapla and Tetrapla of Origen, the I 

Five months later on, the reddish, sweet fruit is 
ripe. It is eaten fresh or dried. A kind of wine and a honey-like sirup are made from it. The 
tree is very graceful, with its slender, branchless 
trunk, between one and two feet in diameter and 
from forty to fifty, rarely eighty, feet high, and 
itself crown of from forty to eighty feather-
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ed south by the Mediterranean, east by Cilicia, 
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PANEYRICON was in the Greek Church the name of a kind of homiliary, or collection of panegyrics on the saints, arranged after the months, and destined to be used at the celebration of the respective saints' days. Manuscript collections of this kind are still current in the Greek Church, but they have no official character any more. See Leo Allatius: De libris Graecorum eclesiasticis: diss. 1.

PANIS LITERAE ("bread briefs") were letters of recommendation by which a secular lord or commander a monastery or hospital, or other institution of charity, to receive a certain person for support. The right of issuing such letters was connected with the duty, originally imposed upon such institutions, of showing hospitality to princes and other great lords when they were travelling. During the middle ages the Emperor of Germany exercised a very extensive right of this kind; but the custom existed also in other countries.

PANORANUS, the common surname of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Very little is known of him; but, as the principal teacher of Clement of Alexandria, he is, of course, of great interest. Philip of Side (fifth century) calls him an Athenian. A notice by Clement seems to indicate that he was a native of Sicily. In the first year of the reign of Commodus, when Julian was bishop of Alexandria (that is, in 180), he was already active as a teacher in the school, and during the reign of Septimius Severus he was succeeded by Clement. After the persecution of 203 he is not heard of any more. The missionary tour, which, according to Eusebius, he passed through the Platonic-Pythagorean eclectics prevalent in the second century, Christianity. As a teacher, he gave the catechetical school of Alexandria that peculiar scientific stamp which it has retained ever since. See literature under ALEXANDRIA.

PANTHEISM and PANTEIST are names of very recent origin, not yet two centuries old. In the works of Aristotle, the expression πάντην occurs, but only once, and in the sense of πάντων ἰδω, denoting a temple or holy place dedicated, like the Pantheon in Rome, to all the gods. In a similar sense, the phrase πάντης τελεῖος, translated by Scaliger pandiculare sacrum, occurs three times in the so-called "Orphic hymns," probably products of the Neo-Platonic philosophy. Otherwise the names are entirely unknown to antiquity.
PANTHEISM AND PANTHEIST. 1734 PANTHEISM AND PANTHEIST.

... nor are they found in the middle ages. Down to the eighteenth century, all pantheistic doctrines were designated with the odious name of "atheism." Even Boyle objects to Spinoza, not that he was an atheist, but that he was the first to bring atheism into system. Neither Leibnitz. Wolff, or the typical metaphysics of the seventeenth century, know the word, though several of them are adroit enough in combating the idea. The first to use it, and probably its inventor, is the English free-thinker Toland, in his Socinianism Truly Stated... recommended by a Pantheist to an Orthodox Friend, 1703. Four years later, the word "pantheism" occurs in J. Fay's Defensio religionis, 1709; and after that time both names become frequent.

On the first page of his Pantheisticum sive formula Societatis Socraticae, etc., 1720, Toland thus defines pantheism: Ex Toto quidem sunt omnia et omnia in Toto, or the world consists of all things, and from all the parts, and from all the parts comes the whole," which on p. 8 he further explains by adding, "Vis et energia Totius, creativum omnium et moderatricem ac ad optimum finem semper tendens, est Deus, quem Mentem diuus si placet et Animam Universi, unde Sodales Socratice appellantur Pantheista sunt ("To the pantheists nature and God are one and the same thing"); and this vague formula became the current definition, though Buhle, and, after that time both names become frequent.

The true meaning of the term "pantheism" is, or the world alone. See E. Böhmer: De Pantheismo nominis origine et usu et notione, Halle, 1851.

Amidst these differences of definition, what is the true meaning of the term "pantheism"? The Greek πᾶς means both "all" and "everything." In the latter sense, comprising all that exists without any exception, it is left undecided whether the "everything" is in any way held together by some sort of a unity, or whether it is split up in a mere multitude of separate things, indifferent to each other. According, however, to the general acceptance of the word, "everything" means simply the sum total of all the things that are; but as Hegel is perfectly right, when protesting that a doctrine making every single thing that is, divine, and God the mere sum total of existing things,—that is, an absolute polytheism has never been propounded,—it is necessary to refer the term "pantheism" to the other sense of πᾶς, that of "all." Now, "all" denotes, indeed, a unity of "everything," a whole, a totality; but here, again, it is left undecided whether the totality indicated is an absolute identity, excluding all but every thing depends upon in what way this "immanence" is explained. The ways are many, and the name "pantheism" might 'bus be made to cover quite enormous differences. Schleiermach-er's definition corresponds to his concept of the inseparableness of God and the world, which presupposes not only their identity and difference, but also a third something; and he protests that pantheism will always be the result whenever the idea of the identity of God and the world succeeds in throwing the idea of their difference into the shade. A new constituent was introduced in the definition of pantheism by A. Tholuck, in his Socinismus sive theosophia Persarum, 1821: Emanationismus, he says, doctrina illius antiqua vocanda est respectu ad placitum de origine mundi ex Deo, Pantheismus autem, quondam malum tollit hominemque prope modum in eurco ponit Deo: that is, the doctrine of emanation and the doctrine of pantheism are identical, with the only difference between them, that the former refers to the problem of the origin of the world, and the latter to the problem of the origin of evil; and, indeed, no pantheistic conception of the world can admit the existence of evil in the full sense of the word, nor explain creation, without employing some form of emanation. Whenever Hegel speaks of pantheism, he always returns to the distinction between πᾶς in the sense of "all," and πᾶς in the sense of "every thing," protesting that the doctrine of the absolute identity of the substance in the "all" is pure atheism, while monothelmism, which Hegel again reverts into "acosmism" by Spinoza's denial, not of the existence of God, but of the existence of the world, while the doctrine that "every thing" which exists has a substance, and that the substantiality of all those "every thing" existences of God, is an "idolatry" which no philosopher has ever taught. H. Ritter, finally, in his Die Halb-Kantianer und der Pantheismus (1827), written against G. B. Jäsche's Der Pantheismus nach seinen verschiedenhead Hauptformen (1826, 3 vols.), explains pantheism as a dissolution of the difference between God and the world, either by the immediate foundation of God into a whole consisting of all the parts ruling over them, and always leading in harmony with him, also Kant, gave him more theism, which had hitherto been left rather unexplained, — it is only concluded that the doctrine of the absolute identity of the substance in the "all" is pure atheism; and the theists." Even Boyle objects to Spinoza, not that he was an atheist, but that he was the first to bring atheism into system. Neither Leibniz, Wolff, nor the typical metaphysics of the seventeenth century, know the word, though several of them are adroit enough in combating the idea. The first to use it, and probably its inventor, is the English free-thinker Toland, in his Socinianism Truly Stated... recommended by a Pantheist to an Orthodox Friend, 1703. Four years later, the word "pantheism" occurs in J. Fay's Defensio religionis, 1709; and after that time both names become frequent.

On the first page of his Pantheisticum sive formula Societatis Socraticae, etc., 1720, Toland thus defines pantheism: Ex Toto quidem sunt omnia et omnia in Toto, or the world consists of all things, and from all the parts, and from all the parts comes the whole," which on p. 8 he further explains by adding, "Vis et energia Totius, creativum omnium et moderatricem ac ad optimum finem semper tendens, est Deus, quem Mentem diuus si placet et Animam Universi, unde Sodales Socratici appellantur Pantheista sunt ("To the pantheists nature and God are one and the same thing"); and this vague formula became the current definition, though Buhle, and, after that time both names become frequent.

The true meaning of the term "pantheism" is, or the world alone. See E. Böhmer: De Pantheismo nominis origine et usu et notione, Halle, 1851.

Amidst these differences of definition, what is the true meaning of the term "pantheism"? The Greek πᾶς means both "all" and "everything." In the latter sense, comprising all that exists without any exception, it is left undecided whether the "everything" is in any way held together by some sort of a unity, or whether it is split up in a mere multitude of separate things, indifferent to each other. According, however, to the general acceptance of the word, "everything" means simply the sum total of all the things that are; but as Hegel is perfectly right, when protesting that a doctrine making every single thing that is, divine, and God the mere sum total of existing things,—that is, an absolute polytheism has never been propounded,—it is necessary to refer the term "pantheism" to the other sense of πᾶς, that of "all." Now, "all" denotes, indeed, a unity of "everything," a whole, a totality; but here, again, it is left undecided whether the totality indicated is an absolute identity, excluding all but every thing depends upon in what way this "immanence" is explained. The ways are many, and the name "pantheism" might 'bus be made to cover quite enormous differences. Schleiermacher's definition corresponds to his concept of the inseparableness of God and the world, which presupposes not only their identity and difference, but also a third something; and he protests that pantheism will always be the result whenever the idea of the identity of God and the world succeeds in throwing the idea of their difference into the shade. A new constituent was introduced in the definition of pantheism by A. Tholuck, in his Socinismus sive theosophia Persarum, 1821: Emanationismus, he says, doctrina illius antiqua vocanda est respectu ad placitum de origine mundi ex Deo, Pantheismus autem, quondam malum tollit hominemque prope modum in eurco ponit Deo: that is, the doctrine of emanation and the doctrine of pantheism are identical, with the only difference between them, that the former refers to the problem of the origin of the world, and the latter to the problem of the origin of evil; and, indeed, no pantheistic conception of the world can admit the existence of evil in the full sense of the word, nor explain creation, without employing some form of emanation. Whenever Hegel speaks of pantheism, he always returns to the distinction between πᾶς in the sense of "all," and πᾶς in the sense of "every thing," protesting that the doctrine of the absolute identity of the substance in the "all" is pure atheism, while monothelmism, which Hegel again reverts into "acosmism" by Spinoza's denial, not of the existence of God, but of the existence of the world, while the doctrine that "every thing" which exists has a substance, and that the substantiality of all those "every thing" existences of God, is an "idolatry" which no philosopher has ever taught. H. Ritter, finally, in his Die Halb-Kantianer und der Pantheismus (1827), written against G. B. Jäsche's Der Pantheismus nach seinen verschiedenhead Hauptformen (1826, 3 vols.), explains pantheism as a dissolution of the difference between God and the world, either by the immediate foundation of God into a whole consisting of all the parts ruling over them, and always leading in harmony with him, also Kant, gave him more theism, which had hitherto been left rather unexplained, — it is only concluded that the doctrine of the absolute identity of the substance in the "all" is pure atheism; and the theists."
elaborate mythologies, all natural forms of religion started, not from the deification of some single natural or spiritual phenomenon, but from a vague and obscure idea of something abstractly divine, from an awe-inspiring feeling of a highest Being standing behind the phenomena as their true cause. Only by degrees, as knowledge of nature increased, this fundamental divinity was gradually identified with some special natural power, which, beginning as its representative, ended with superseding it. But, even in the most developed polytheism, the pantheistic foundation never fully disappeared. See A. Wuttke: Geschichte des Heidentums, Breslau, 1832; E. Burnouf: La science des religions, Paris, 1872; Max Müller: Introduction to the Science of Religion, London, 1873; Ulrici: Gott und die Natur, Leipzig, 3d ed., 1875; Réville: Procédomes de l'histoire des religions, Paris, 1881; [but see also Herbert Spencer: Sociology, i., London, 1879]. In India the idea of the Supreme Being, as the fundamental power, which, vivifying power of light and heat gradually changed under the overwhelming impression of the vegetative productivity of the soil. As the plants burst forth from the earth in astounding multitudes, only to stay a little while, and then return to the earth again, giving room for new multitudes, so gods and men, and animals and plants, issue forth from the bosom of Brahma, not to stay, and persevere in that diversity, but soon to sink back again into the Source whence they came, the one Absolute Being in which there is no form, no difference, no change. In the Persian religion a strongly marked dualism was developed; and the “all” was actually split into two halves under the rule, respectively, of Ormuzd and Ahriman. Nevertheless, the difference between the two gods was not merely a fixed contrast, but a conflict ever going on; and as the result of the conflict should be the overthrow of Ahriman by Ormuzd, and the swallowing-up of the realm of darkness by the realm of light, the pantheistic monism was still preserved. In the star-worship of the Babylonians, Phoenicians, Arabs, etc., the so-called Sabeism, the pantheistic idea of one God, seems at first glance lost in the multitude of stars, gods, etc.; but the representation of the sun as the source of light in the course of nature and history; and yet, dimly behind the iron necessity of the stars looms up the autocratic god of chance, who gives good or bad fortune arbitrarily, just as he likes. But there is here no contradiction. Necessity without reason is only another name for chance without reason: the idea is the same. The Egyptian religion was, so to speak. Based on the contrast between life and death. But death was only a transition from life in time to life in eternity; and that general power of life which manifested itself at once in time and in eternity was, indeed, the one great God of Egypt. With the conception of Godhead as the soul of the world, religious pantheism reaches its consummation; and this form was developed to perfection by the Greeks. Though so thoroughly anthropomorphitic as to become the fully adequate and perfected self of once in time and in eternity, the Greek gods were, nevertheless, not severed from nature. Each of them had his own part of nature, smaller or larger, which was his field of activity, his abode, his body; and, thus organized, the world was governed rationally and morally by the gods.

At two different points, pantheism has endeavored to domicile itself in Christianity; viz., the doctrine of the omnipresence of God and the Logos doctrine. But the omnipresence of God does not mean omnipresence of substance, but only omnipresence of activity invisibly present, acting at a distance, like gravitation, electricity, etc.; and the Logos doctrine simply proclaims that creation by God was the beginning of all things, and reconciliation to God their final goal. By its doctrine of a creation out of nothing, Christianity has placed an efficient bar against any pantheistic mixing together of God and the world. As an element of Christianity, pantheism is a foreign importation. From the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists it penetrated in antiquity into Christianity through the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius and in the form of mysticism. Thence it was brought by the Gnostics and the mystics of the middle ages; but, the sharper and more logically it was developed, the more definitely it again separated itself from Christianity.


PANTHEON (πάνθεον), a place consecrated to all the gods. The Pantheon of Rome, built on a circular foundation, surmounted by one of the largest domes in the world, was erected in 27 B.C., by Marcus Agrippa, the son-in-law of, Augustus, and originally consecrated to Jupiter Vindicator, but afterwards destined to contain statues of all the gods. Despoiled of all its treasures by the barbarian invaders, it was falling into decay, when it was saved from ruin by Boniface IV., who in 608 restored it, and transformed it into a Christian church dedicated to the Virgin and the saints, and hence called Sancta Maria ad Martyres, or Sancta Maria Rotunda.
the Romanists cannot deny, that, during the first period after the foundation of the Christian Church, the bishops of Rome exercised no primacy; but they protest, that, though not exercising it, they still possessed it.

It is true, that, as early as the second and third centuries, the congregation and the Bishop of Rome enjoyed great respect throughout the whole Occident. Not only was the Roman Church considered a foundation of Peter, but it was the only Occidental church which could boast of apostolic foundation. But though it may have tried in the third century to support its claim on precedence by an appeal to the succession from Peter, the prince of the apostles, the Council of Nicea (325) knew nothing of a primacy of Rome over the rest of the Church. The much discussed Canon 6 places the Bishop of Rome, on account of his greater power,—that is, his right to ordain all the bishops of Italy,—beside the Bishop of Alexandria, who had the right to ordain all the bishops of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis; but it does not contain the slightest hint of a primacy. It was other circumstances which proved decisive for the bishops of Rome in their endeavors to acquire a legally fixed and generally recognized primatical power: first, their riches; next, their residence in the political centre of the world, with the prestige it gave them and the immense facilities of communication it afforded; and, finally, the truly diplomatic position they assumed in the dogmatical controversies beginning with the fourth century,—cautious, persevering, always on the orthodox side. In 445 a council of Sardica allowed any bishop who had been deposed by a metropolitan synod to appeal to the Bishop of Rome, who might give a prima facie verdict, or institute a new examination of the case by his legate and a number of bishops, just as he found it necessary; and thus the see of Rome became established as a kind of supreme court. In 499, a council of Carthage, held by a metropolitan synod of Africa, suspended the bishop of Carthage from any influence from any secular royalty. This council of Carthage was not allowed to develop without interruption. The dissolution of the Frankish Empire brought confusion also into Italy. Rome was under the thumb of an aristocratic faction, which again was swayed by a number of scandalous women. Without the aid of the Frankish Church and the Church of Rome, the German emperor was the real ruler of the Church; but he ruled on another moral and legal basis than the Frankish emperor had done. He never arrogated to himself the highest judicial or legislative power in ecclesiastical affairs. If he considered himself the head of the Church, he could not have been able to raise itself from the mire. Now, it is very true, that, from the middle of the tenth century (Otho I., Roman Emperor, 962) to the middle of the eleventh century, the German emperor was the real ruler of the Church; but he ruled on another moral and legal basis than the Frankish emperor had done. He never arrogated to himself the highest judicial or legislative power in ecclesiastical affairs. If he considered himself the head of the universal State, he considered the Pope the head of the universal Church; and many of the most important branches of the Church he left entirely to the Pope, such as the foundation of new bishoprics, the enforcement of older ecclesiastical laws, the introduction of reforms, etc. Then, in the middle of the eleventh century, there arose in Rome, under the leadership of Hildebrand, a party whose settled purpose it was to free the Papacy from any influence from any secular
power, and establish the Pope as the umpire of the world, politically as well as ecclesiastically. Gregory VII. protested that he was subject to no judge on earth, that he had power to depose the emperor, that he had a right to wear the imperial insignia, that he alone could convene a general council, depose a bishop, transfer him to another see, etc.

On the question of the right of investiture, it came to a deadly contest between the Papacy and the German Empire; but the result was the complete emancipation of the Pope from the imperial power. He stood from that moment as the highest, the absolute, authority in all ecclesiastical affairs; and, in his further conflicts with the German emperor, it was political rather than ecclesiastical questions which occupied the foreground. He wanted to make himself the corner-stone of the political system of Europe; and under Innocent III. (1198–1216) the goal was reached. The Pope claimed to be the representative of Christ, of God on earth, and was considered as such. All power was consequently his, not only in spiritual matters, but also in matters of the world. His power in the latter sphere he left in charge of the princes, though under his control; but in the former sphere he exercised his power personally, and without responsibility to any judge on earth, not even to the ecumenical council. His power of legislation was not limited by the older canons or the ecumenical councils: it was only circumscribed by the dogma. His power of absolution and dispensation was absolute. He could appoint, depose, and transfer bishops ad libitum; and he could tax the clergy in general, or any individual church. Certain benefices were reserved exclusively for him, and appeals could be made to him from everywhere. Finally, he sent out his legates, to be implicitly obeyed according to his instructions; for not only was all power made to him from everywhere. Finally, he sent out his legates, to be implicitly obeyed according to his instructions; for not only was all power made to him from everywhere.

The rigid monarchical form, however, which the government of the Church had assumed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, could not fail to call forth a reaction; and in the fourteenth century the opposite tendency, leading to a more aristocratic form of government, the so-called papal system, began to develop. The episcopal system is based upon the view that Christ has conferred the power to bind and to loose on the Chair of Peter; or, the Papacy and its Benefits, of precedence only, in order to establish a visible token of unity. It is not opposed to the primacy of the Pope, or unwilling to grant him those rights and privileges without which no primacy could exist; but, considering the episcopal system as a divine institution, the Bishop of Rome can exist; but, considering the episcopal system as a divine institution, the Bishop of Rome can never be anything more than primus inter pares. In the ancient church these views were generally adopted, as may be seen, for instance, in the works of Cyprian (De unitate ecclesiae, etc.; and they were now again set forth with great force in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by Pierre d’Ailly, J. Gerson, Nicholas of Celmanges, and others, while at the same time public opinion was well prepared to accept them by the startling encroachments of the curia upon all old established rights, by the scandalous behavior of many of the popes, and more especially by the great schism. They were espoused by the councils of Pisa, Basel, and Constance; and in the course of the sixteenth century they assumed definite shape in the French Church. See Les libertés de l’Eglise Gallicane (1584), and the article “Gallicanism.” Towards the close of the eighteenth century they found in Germany a brilliant spokesman in Nikolaus of Hontheim, and an ardent champion in Joseph II.; and, though steadily denounced by the Pope, they were steadily gaining ground in the Church up to the middle of the nineteenth century. But the reaction which set in everywhere in Europe after 1848 once more gathered the bishops around the Pope; and in 1870 it was possible for Pius IX. to have the episcopal system condemned, and the papal system formally recognized by an ecumenical council. See, for list of popes, art. Popes.


PAPAL ELECTION. See Conclave.
PAPERBOECK. See Bollandists.
PAPHNUTIUS, b. 275(?); d. 350(?); Bishop of a city in the Upper Thebais; a confessor of the Diocletian persecution, in which he had lost an eye. He was one of the most prominent members of the Council of Nicaea (325), where he spoke against the proposition that all bishops, presbyters, and deacons should send away the wives they had married while they were laymen. His high character, and known absolute and inviolate continence, gave great weight to his opposition; and the status quo, according to which marriage was forbidden only after ordination, was continued. Different from him is the Paphnuitus, abbot of a monastery in the Scetic Desert, who in 399 caused a considerable commotion among the monks by adopting and supporting the views of Bishop Theophilus of Az., concerning the creation of man in the image of God. See, for the first, MACCRACKEN: Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal, pp. 57–59; and SCHAFF: History of the Christian Church, new edition, vol. ii. p. 411.
PAPIAS, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. He was born probably between 70 and 75 A.D., and died, perhaps, A.D. 163. 1 No fact save his episcopacy is definitely known about him, yet he is of great interest from his relation to the apostolic age. He was, according to Irenaeus (Adv. Hær., v. 31, 4), "a hearer of John the apostle, " a companion of Polycarp," an ancient man," i.e., a man of the primitive days of Christianity. By "John," Eusebius (Hist. Eclt., iii. 39) understands the presbyter, not the apostle, of that name, and declares that Papias had no personal acquaintance with any apostles. Papias, who was certainly acquainted with the entire New Testament, wrote in Greek, about A.D. 130, An Interpretation of the Sayings of the Lord, in five books. His work appears to have been a collection of the words and works of the Master and his disciples, with explanatory matter derived from oral testimony. It has entirely perished, with the exception of a few small fragments preserved by Irenaeus and Eusebius. The "fragments" in later writers are somewhat dubious. The first passage Eusebius quotes (i.e.) is from the preface of Papias' work, as follows: —

[...But I shall not regret to subjoin to my interpretations, also, for your benefit, whatsoever I have at any time accurately ascertained and treasured up in my memory as I have received it from the elders, and have recorded it in order to give additional commodities to my testimony. For I have never, like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that record foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord to our faith, and that came from the truth itself. But, if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders anywhere, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; what was said by Arian and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord. For I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voice of those that are still surviving."

Besides quoting this passage, Eusebius speaks of Papias' stories of the daughters of Philip, who raised one from the dead, and of Justus, surnamed Barabas, who drank poison with impunity (probably told by Papias in illustration of Mark xvi. 18), of Papias' strange accounts of the Lord's parables and doctrinal sayings, which were "rather too fabulous," and of his recital concerning a woman accused of many sins, apparently an allusion to the story of the woman taken in adultery, now found inserted in the textus receptus of those still surviving."

Eusebius mentions Papias' use of 1 John, 1 Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the first two, probably, with the intention of showing that only these Epistles were rightly attributable to John and Peter. But out of the omission to speak in any way of the third and fourth Gospels and the rest of the New Testament, nothing can be made; for the failure to speak lies to the charge of Eusebius, not of Papias; and the silence arose merely from Papias' desire to quote a few characteristic things from Papias. The attempt to prove from this silence that Papias was ignorant of the other books is vain.

Besides the quotations already given, there are several fragments of Papias of interest. [See Routh, Reliquiae sacrae, vol. 1, Eng. trans., in The Apostolical Fathers, Anti-Nicene, vol. 1, pp. 441-448.] Thus in the Scholia of Maximus Confessor on Dionysius the Areopagite's De coelesti hierarchia (c. 2, p. 82), it is stated, on the authority of Papias in the first book of his Interpretation, "The early Christian called those children who practised guilelessness towards God." 2 Georgius Hanartolos (ninth century) cites in his Chronicle the second book of Papias as authority for the incredible statement that John, the brother of James, was killed by the Jews at Ephesus. Irenaeus (Adv. Hær., v. 33, 8) quotes the fourth book of Papias as authority for our Lord's saying: —

["The days will come in which vines shall grow, having each ten twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand twigs, and in every one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and in every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes; and every grape when pressed will give twenty-five metretes (i.e., two hundred and twenty-five English gallons). And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster: take me.' Bless the Lord through me." In like manner he said that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears, and that every ear would have ten thousand grains, and every grain would yield ten pounds of clear, pure, fine flour; and that apples and seeds and grass would produce in similar proportions; and that all animals, feeding then only on the productions of the earth, would become peaceable and harmonious, and be in perfect subjection to man.

Eusebius apparently refers to this passage (Hist. Eclt., iii. 30) in proof that Papias interpreted the future millennium as a corporeal reign of Christ on this very earth, and further says that Papias misunderstood the apostolic mystical narrations. Eusebius, moreover, charges Papias with leading Irenaeus and most of the ecclesiastical writers to chiliasm notions. Another quotation from the fourth book in Ecumenius relates to the last sickness of Judas the apostate, in flat contradiction to the New-Testament account, — a proof that Papias credulously rested upon lying tradition, not that he was ignorant of Matthew and Mark. He wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but, as before said, was in company with Peter, who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses. Wherefore Mark has not erred in any thing, by writing some things as he has recorded them; for he was extremely attentive to one thing, not to pass by any thing that he heard, or to state any thing falsely in these accounts. ... Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able."

1 [But as the date of Polycarp's martyrdom has by recent research been put back to A.D. 166, the date of his contemporary friend Papias must likewise be put about ten years earlier. — Kf.]
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PAPIAS.
PARABLES.

The Acts. Other quotations show his preference for typico-allegorizing exposition. A note in a Vatican Vulgate manuscript of the ninth century speaks of Papias as the amanuensis of John. Eusebius appears to vacillate in his judgment of Papias; for whereas in iii. 36 he calls him "a man most learned in all things, and well acquainted with the Scriptures" in iii. 39 he says he had "as a man he made no mistake," and the text: "in the epistle to the church at Nismes, prepared about 1218." — Donaldson, pp. 401, 402.


The imagery, consequently, by which it images the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature; lending intelligence and speech to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to their nature; each species must seek that position, and most likely to become a cub in the house of its own species. It is to this last kind of figurative speech that the so-called parables of Jesus belong. The word "parable" from a root signifying to place things beside each other for the purpose of comparing them, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew maschal, and denotes, as a special term, a higher kind of figurative speech than the fable. The parable is inferior in dignity to the parable. It uses the image in order to inculte natural truth and practical advice, or to turn certain faults into ridicule. It can consequently allow the imagination a wide scope, putting beings into activities contrary to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to animals and plants, etc. It is play. The parable has a higher purpose. It teaching refers to the kingdom of God and the salvation of souls. The imagery, consequently, by which it images forth the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature; each action must be described accurately as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry: and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation by merely introducing into it some new elements borrowed from a different position, and most likely to become a cub in the house of its own species. It is to this last kind of figurative speech that the so-called parables of Jesus belong. The word "parable" from a root signifying to place things beside each other for the purpose of comparing them, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew maschal, and denotes, as a special term, a higher kind of figurative speech than the fable. The parable is inferior in dignity to the parable. It uses the image in order to inculte natural truth and practical advice, or to turn certain faults into ridicule. It can consequently allow the imagination a wide scope, putting beings into activities contrary to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to animals and plants, etc. It is play. The parable has a higher purpose. It teaching refers to the kingdom of God and the salvation of souls. The imagery, consequently, by which it images forth the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature; each action must be described accurately as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry: and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation by merely introducing into it some new elements borrowed from a different position, and most likely to become a cub in the house of its own species. It is to this last kind of figurative speech that the so-called parables of Jesus belong. The word "parable" from a root signifying to place things beside each other for the purpose of comparing them, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew maschal, and denotes, as a special term, a higher kind of figurative speech than the fable. The parable is inferior in dignity to the parable. It uses the image in order to inculte natural truth and practical advice, or to turn certain faults into ridicule. It can consequently allow the imagination a wide scope, putting beings into activities contrary to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to animals and plants, etc. It is play. The parable has a higher purpose. It teaching refers to the kingdom of God and the salvation of souls. The imagery, consequently, by which it images forth the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature; each action must be described accurately as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.

It appears from the Gospels that Jesus began to teach in parables at a certain given moment of his ministry: and that circumstance naturally leads us to ask why he did not do so from the very beginning. Of course, he always used images in order to express his ideas more strikingly. By the incompatibility of an old garment and a piece of undressed cloth, he demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining the old dispensation by merely introducing into it some new elements borrowed from a different position, and most likely to become a cub in the house of its own species. It is to this last kind of figurative speech that the so-called parables of Jesus belong. The word "parable" from a root signifying to place things beside each other for the purpose of comparing them, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew maschal, and denotes, as a special term, a higher kind of figurative speech than the fable. The parable is inferior in dignity to the parable. It uses the image in order to inculte natural truth and practical advice, or to turn certain faults into ridicule. It can consequently allow the imagination a wide scope, putting beings into activities contrary to their nature, lending intelligence and speech to animals and plants, etc. It is play. The parable has a higher purpose. It teaching refers to the kingdom of God and the salvation of souls. The imagery, consequently, by which it images forth the truth, must conform strictly to reality. Each being must act in accordance with its nature; each action must be described accurately as it could have occurred. The object of the representation is too sacred to allow the imagination free scope.
asked for an explanation (Matt. xiii., Mark iv., Luke viii.). The explanation, however (Matt. xiii. 10-17), is not so easy to understand. Some have found in that passage, simply the idea that Jesus cloths the truth of the kingdom of heaven with images in order to make them more intelligible, and imprint them with greater force on the mind of his hearers. At first glance the interpretation seems very natural. Nevertheless, a second reading of the words of Jesus cannot fail to show that they contain just the opposite meaning: "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; but to them it is not given. Therefore speak I to them in parables; because, seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand." How could the multitude who heard the parables of the sower and the tares, which Jesus told on that very occasion, ever understand those parables, when even the apostles themselves did not apprehend the meaning of Jesus, but were compelled to ask him about it? Was it, then, for the purpose of making his teaching unintelligible, that Jesus used the parable? There are some who think so. They consider that the moment had arrived when the people who had heard the appeals of Jesus without repentance, deserved no better than falling under that judgment of obdura- tion of which Isaiah speaks in the very words which Jesus quotes on the occasion. Of course, there is added, the parable was intended to make the divine truth clearer and more intelligible to those whose hearts had been prepared by repentance and faith; but at the same time it also served to veil the truth to the eyes of those who had not been moved by the teachings of Jesus. A kind of sorting, preparatory to judgment, was thus effected.

The latter explanation is certainly more in harmony with the words of Jesus than the former. Nevertheless, there is room for doubt whether it hits the sense exactly, and exhausts it. It seems probable that the divine truth was for Jesus not to be transformed in a moment, but in a progressive and spiritual manner; that the judgment, separating the true members from the false, would be like crying out from the roofs, that he, Jesus, was not the Messiah, and his work not the fulfillment of the prophecies. And yet the moment had arrived when it had become necessary to reveal the new order of things, of which the apostles were to take charge after his own death, and for which every faithful follower was to work. But that which it was necessary to reveal to some, it was necessary to conceal from others; and this double object could not have been attained by any other means so surely as by the parables which Jesus explained in private to those who ought to understand the secrets of God, while to others they were like a veil thrown over the truth. Compare the precept of Jesus (Matt. vii. 6).

The number of parables which have come down to us exceeds thirty, but cannot be precisely stated, as several pieces of the teaching of Jesus are by some considered parables, by others, simple metaphors; as, for instance, Luke xii. 35-40, 42-46, xiv. 34, 35, etc. Classifications of the parables have been attempted, on various principles. From an historical point of view, Goebel, in his Die Parabeln Jesu, 1880, arranges them in three groups: (1) those belonging to the stay of Jesus near Capernaum, and collected in Matt. xiii.; (2) those belonging to his journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and collected in Luke xvi-xix. ; and (3) those belonging to last days in Jerusalem. The first group refers to the kingdom of heaven as a totality; the second, to the individual members of it; and the third, to the end of the existing economy and the judgment of the members of the kingdom. These observations are all very just. Nevertheless, we propose another classification, which seems to us to be more natural. Out of the thirty parables, properly speaking, six refer to the kingdom of heaven in its preparatory existence under the old dispensation; six, to its actual realization in the form of a church, that is, to the new dispensation from its foundation to its consummation; and eighteen, finally, to the life of the individual members of the church.

The first group consists of: 1. The Vine-dresser (Matt. xxvii. 33-41), representing the criminal conduct of the Israelitish authorities against the Lord, acting through the prophets, and then through his sublimity of human teaching. 2. The Son (Matt. xxii. 14), representing the conduct of the Jewish people in response to the summons of Jesus and the apostles to enter the kingdom of heaven, then the call of the Gentiles, and, finally, the judgment which awaits them; 3. The Great Supper (Luke xiv. 18-24), which by some is considered identical with the preceding, though
it differs from it in several essential features; 4. The Strait Gate (Luke xiii. 24-30), in which Jesus preaches that the large portion of the Jewish people shall be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, because they will not enter through the strait gate of humiliation, while the Gentiles shall enter in multitudes; 5. The Barren Fig-Tree (Luke xiii. 6-9), an image of the condemnation hovering over Israel, and the interception of the Messiah, which tonot averts the fatal blow; 6. The Ten Sons (Matt. xxi. 28-32), in which Jesus places the conduct of the Pharisees (who pretend to obey God, but in reality are filled with revolt against him) over against that of the toll-gatherers, who externally refuse obedience, but at heart hesitate, and end with surrendering themselves.

The second group consists of: 1. The Sower, which seems to have been the first perfect specimen of this kind of teaching, and still stands forth as the typical parable (it describes the different reception which the Word finds in the hearts of the hearers, from complete indifference to perfect devotion; and thus it emphasizes the foundation of the kingdom of heaven by preaching the Word, and not, as the Jews expected, by a sudden intervention of the arm of God); 2. The Tares, representing the co-existence of good and bad members of the church as the true method of development in the new order of things, though so contrary to Jewish expectation; 3 and 4. The Mustard-seed and The Leaven, which form a pair of parables representing the same idea, but under two different aspects, a combination which occurs often the final victory of the kingdom of heaven is the idea common to both; but the former refers to its external extension, from its first appearance in the sole person of Jesus to its final consummation in the whole human race; and the latter, to its internal action, transforming spiritually the whole human life; 5. The Draw-net, describing the ending of the kingdom of heaven by a sorting of the good and the bad members which the preaching has brought in multitudes into the visible church. To these five parables, which are found in Matt. xiii., together with several others — The Hidden Treasure, The Pearl — belonging to the third group, may be added, 6. The Widow (Luke xviii. 1-9), representing on the one side the dangerous state of the church from the departure of its chief to its final deliverance, and on the other side the only power which still remains to her during that period — perseverance in prayer.

The last group consists of eighteen parables referring to the realization of the kingdom of heaven in individual life. 1. 2, and 3, The Lost Sheep, The Piece of Silver, and The Prodigal Son (Luke xv.), describe the entrance into the kingdom by the grace of God and the faith of man. 4 and 5, The Pharisees and the Publican and The Judge of the Unjust (Luke xvi. 1-10), set forth the indispensable conditions of effective prayer — repentance and faith. 6 and 7, The Hidden Treasure and The Goodly Pearl (Matt. xiii. 44-46), and 8 and 9, Building a Tower and Declaring War (Luke xiv. 24-33), form two pairs of parables, the former representing — the absolute decision and complete sacrifice of every thing else, without which no one can take possession of the kingdom. Properly speaking, these nine parables refer all to such as are entering the kingdom, while the rest of this group refer to those who have already become members. 10 and 11, The Chief Seat (Luke xiv. 7-11) and The Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16), inculcate humility — the former with respect to brethren, the latter with respect to God — as the true disposition of the faithful. 12 and 13, The King taking Account of his Servants (Matt. xxv. 14-30) and The Good Samaritan (Luke x. 29-35), inculcate charity: the former in spiritual things, — forgiveness of other people's faults; the latter in practical things, — pity on other people's sufferings. 14 and 15, The Unjust Steward and The Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 1-9 and 19-31), teach the right use of the good things of this world; not for the sake of a momentary and egotistic enjoyment, but in the service of charity. The same lesson is inculcated by 16, The Rich Man (Luke xii. 16-21). 17 and 18. The Talents and The Ten Virgins (Matt. xxv. 14-30 and 1-19) demand of the faithful that to the virgins God will give the kingdom (Matt. xiii. 44-46), and 19 and 20, The Unjust Judge and The Wise Man and His Servants (Luke xviii. 1-8), inculcate charity: the former in spiritual things — in the service of God; the latter with respect to man — in the service of the neighbor.

Such is the system of the parables which the Lord told at different times and on various occasions. And what a wealth of religious and moral intuitions it contains! All the stages of the history of the kingdom of heaven, from its beginning under the old dispensation to its consummation at the threshold of eternity, are spread out before us. In some of the teachings of Jesus it is the powerful popular orator we admire; in others, their profound philosophical spirit. But in the parables it is the poet, or rather the painter, who lets the creations of his genius pass before our eyes. For in Jesus all the gifts of the human soul were united, and each and every one of them was put in play for the instruction and salvation of humanity.

PARABOLANI.


PARABOLANI, from παραβάλλεται, “to expose one’s self,” was, in the congregations of the ancient church, the name of the voluntary nursers of the sick. They occurred chiefly in Egypt and Asia Minor, rarely, if ever, in the Latin West. They were rough but spirited fellows. At the robber synod in Ephesus (449), they acquired a sad celebrity. Even before that time, they had become obnoxious; and, in Alexandria, Theodosius placed them under the superintendence of the prefect.

HERZOG.

PARACELSUS, Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus, b. at Einsiedeln in Switzerland, 1493; d. at Salzburg, 1541. He studied medicine and natural science; visited all the European universities; became a furious antagonist of Galen and Aristotle; acquired great fame on account of his wonderful cures; was appointed professor of medicine at Basel in 1526, but expelled from the city two years later, probably on account of the jealousy of his colleagues; strolled about as a mountebank and charlatan, though often sought for by the highest personages on account of his great medical skill; and found finally an asylum at the court of the Archbishop of Salzburg. His collected works appeared at Strassburg, 1616-18, in three volumes folio. The second volume contains his philosophical works. His system is a combination of the theosophy of the Cabala and natural science, founded on experience and experiment,—a kind of pantheism, whose mysticism every now and then becomes supernaturalistic. His distinction, however, between faith and reason as two different organs of perception, with two different fields of activity, is not unlike modern attempts of the same tendency.

PARACLETIC. See Holy Spirit, Trinity.

PARACLETICON or PARACLETANI is, in the modern Greek Church, the name of a kind of prayer-book, containing prayers to God and the saints appropriate to the various canonical festivals. Its general plan is due to John of Damascus, though since his time it has undergone considerable modification. The first printed edition appeared in Venice, 1625.

PARADISE (OTIS, Neh. ii. 8; Ecol. ii. 5; Song iv. 19; also the Targum and the Talmud; פֶּרֶדֶס, LXX, and N. T.) means in Persian, whence the word has been adopted into all other languages in which the Bible has appeared, a wooded garden or park. But in the Bible it is used in a twofold sense: (1) for the garden of Eden; (2) for the abode of the blessed in heaven, in which are those who have overcome (Rev. ii. 7). For the determination of the word in the geographical sense, see Eden.

Attention is limited in this article to its Jewish and patristic interpretation. It was taken allegorically. The chief representatives of this interpretation were Theophilus of Antioch (Πρὸς Αὐτόλυκον περὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν σα- τείως), Tertullian (APOLOGETICUS), Ephrem Syrus, Basil (Oration de Paradiso), Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Cosmas Indicopleustes (Χα- τανίας Τομηματικός), and Moses Bar-Cepha (Tractatus de Paradiso). Those who doubted the identity of the two paradises were few, as Justin Martyr, the Gnostic Bardesanes, and Jerome. The Scriptures were not to blame for the identification,—for they clearly set forth the geographical character of the one, and the unearthly character of the other,—but the commentators themselves. Excuse for the latter is to be found in the laxness of the prevailing exegesis, in its ascetic character, in the ignorance of the times respecting geography, and in the influence of the classical mythology. In the poems of Ephrem (fourth century), which embody the speculations of Theophilus, Tertullian, and Basil, Paradise was generally conceived to have three divisions. The first begins at the edge of hell, around which flowed the ocean, and in a mountain which overtops all earthly mountains. The one river of Paradise flows from under the throne into the penitent robber, turned into four streams, which, when they have reached the border of hell upon the lowest division, sink under hell, and, through underground passages, flow to the ocean and a part of the earth, where they reappear in three different localities, forming in Armenia the Euphrates and the Tigris, in Ethiopia the Nile (representative, of its view are Philo (Νόμων ἵνων ἢλλαγμα), Origen (Hom. ad Gen., Contra Celsum, iv. Principia, iv. 2), and Ambrose (De Paradiso ad Sabinitum). To Philo, Paradise stood for virtue; its planting toward the east meant its direction toward the light; the division of the one river into four, the fourfold aspect of virtue as cleverness, thoughtfulness, courage, and righteousness. This method of allegorical interpretation came over into the Christian Church, and appears in Papias and Ireneus, Pausanias, and Clement of Alexandria; and although the sober-minded, especially from the Antiochian school, and from such scholars as Ephiphanius and Jerome, it was finally so triumphant under the lead of Origen and Ambrose, that the latter counted the majority of the Christian writers of his time as its advocates. To Origen, who in the Old Testament, and particularly in the account of the creation and the Paradise, found much that was derogatory of God. Paradise was a picture of the human soul, in which flourish the seeds of Christian virtues; or a picture of heaven, wherein the “trees” represent the angels, and the “rivers” the outgoings of wisdom and other virtues. He did not, however, deny a literal Paradise: he only sought in allegorizing the harmonization of the Mosaic and New-Testament conceptions. To Ambrose, the Pauline Paradise was the Christian soul. He also distinguished the literal and the Pauline Paradise. Many of the other Fathers trifled in similar fashion with the sacred text.

II. Paradise was interpreted mystically. The Mosaic and the New-Testament representations of Paradise were considered identical, and places was found for it in a mysterious region belonging both to earth and heaven. The chief representatives of this interpretation were Theophilus of Antioch (Πρὸς Αὐτόλυκον περὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν σα- τείως), Tertullian (APOLOGETICUS), Ephrem Syrus, Basil (Oration de Paradiso), Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Cosmas Indicopleustes (Χα- τανίας Τομηματικός), and Moses Bar-Cepha (Tractatus de Paradiso). Those who doubted the identity of the two paradises were few, as Justin Martyr, the Gnostic Bardesanes, and Jerome. The Scriptures were not to blame for the identification,—for they clearly set forth the geographical character of the one, and the unearthly character of the other,—but the commentators themselves. Excuse for the latter is to be found in the laxness of the prevailing exegesis, in its ascetic character, in the ignorance of the times respecting geography, and in the influence of the classical mythology. In the poems of Ephrem (fourth century), which embody the speculations of Theophilus, Tertullian, and Basil, Paradise was generally conceived to have three divisions. The first begins at the edge of hell, around which flowed the ocean, and in a mountain which overtops all earthly mountains. The one river of Paradise flows from under the throne into the penitent robber, turned into four streams, which, when they have reached the border of hell upon the lowest division, sink under hell, and, through underground passages, flow to the ocean and a part of the earth, where they reappear in three different localities, forming in Armenia the Euphrates and the Tigris, in Ethiopia the Nile (representative, of its view are Philo (Νόμων ἵνων ἢλλαγμα), Origen (Hom. ad Gen., Contra Celsum, iv. Principia, iv. 2), and Ambrose (De Paradiso ad Sabinitum). To Philo, Paradise stood for virtue; its planting toward the east meant its direction toward the light; the division of the one river into four, the
giving as his reason for this change of position, that he could not conceive of another earth on the hither side of the ocean.

The vague teachers, influenced first by Josephus, and later by the great mediæval Jewish exegetes, in their commentaries upon Genesis and in some dictionaries, put Paradise in the very centre of the earth, somewhere in the shadowy East, far removed from the approach of mortals. The assemblages of the Medrashim, Targums, Talmud, and Danub. “Cush” was Ethiopia, “Havilah” was India. Paradise was the intermediate home of the blessed. Islam gave the name Paradise to four regions of the known earth, famed for their beauty: (1) On the eastern spurs of Hermon; (2) Around Bavan in Persia; (3) Samarkand in the Bucharest; (4) Basra on the Shatt el Arab. The true Paradise was a future possession, on the other side of death.


It is remarkable that the word “paradise” occurs but once in the prophetic discourses, public or private. The explanation probably is, that it had become associated with sensuous ideas of mere material happiness. But in speaking to the penitent robber (Luke xxiii. 43) he uses the word, because it was the most intelligible expression for the salvation our Lord promised him. Paul only uses the word when speaking symbolically (2 Cor. xii. 4); so also John in the Revelation (ii. 7).

Paraguay, a republic of South America, situated between the Rivers Paraguay and Parana, between 27° 32’ and 22° 20’ south latitude, with a population of 293,844, according to the census of 1876. With the exception of a few immigrants, all the inhabitants belong to the Roman-Catholic Church, which has established an episcopal see at Asuncion, the capital of the republic. In the history of the country the Jesuit mission forms an interesting chapter. In 1888 the society sent its first missionaries to Paraguay. They founded stations among the Guaraní Indians, learned their language, and began to teach them, not only Christianity, but also agriculture and the simplest branches of manufacturing industry. In spite of many difficulties, they finally succeeded; but they gradually assumed the complete government of their converts, secular as well as ecclesiastical, and, in order to protect their flocks from the various vices and temptations of European civilization, they excluded from the country, not only foreign immigrants, but also visitors. Under such circumstances, nobody could vouch for the truth of the charming tales which were circulated in Europe about the Paraguayan paradise established by the Jesuits; but it was apparent to all that there reigned peace and order in the establishments, and that the Fathers grew immensely rich. But in 1768 the Jesuits were expelled from the New York Sunday-School Union, and all his life an enthusiastic and wise champion of the Sunday-school cause. He was the author of two widely used volumes, The Sunday-School Worker, and The Sunday-School Index.

The True Paradise was a future possession, on the north-eastern portion of this plateau is the Negeb (“south country”) of Scripture. The caravan-route to Egypt crossed Parän.

Pardee, Richard Gay, Sunday-school worker; b. at Sharon, Conn., Oct. 12, 1811; d. in New York City, Feb. 11, 1869. He was a Presbyterian layman, from 1853 to 1863 agent of the New York Sunday-School Union, and all his life an enthusiastic and wise champion of the Sunday-school cause. He was the author of two widely used volumes, The Sunday-School Worker, and The Sunday-School Index.

Pareus, David, b. at Frankenstein, Silesia, Dec. 30, 1549; d. at Heidelberg, June 15, 1622. He studied theology in the Collegium Sopfiente in Heidelberg, and was in 1584 appointed teacher there, and in 1588 professor of theology. His so-called Neustadter Bibel, 1587, the text of Luther’s translation, with notes of Pareus, involved him in a violent controversy with Agricola, Siegwart, and others; and his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1609, caused still more strife, and was publicly burnt in England, on the order of James I. He was, however, not a controversialist himself: on the contrary, besides his commentaries, Summarische Erklärung der wahren Katholischen Lehre, etc., his principal work is his Irenicum sive de unione et synodo evangelico- rum liber vaticus, 1614, which, however, was not well received by the orthodox Lutherans. A life of him and a complete list of his works are found in the unfinished edition of his works, by his son, Francort, 1847.

Paris, the capital of France, and, next to London, the most populous city of Europe, has for the past four or five centuries exerted an influence second to that of no other city in the world upon the destinies, civil and religious, of Christendom. In a sense in which it is true of no other capital, Paris has shaped and still shapes the prevalent sentiment of France, as it has again and again made and overturned its government. Under the name of Latetia Parisorum, a small town existed in the time of Julius Caesar, on an island in the River Seine about a half mile from the mouth, which is now known as the Ile de la Cité. This town gradually extended to the banks on either side, until, by the time of the Crusades, it had come to be regarded as one of the largest and wealthiest of European cities. Two special causes contributed to its growth,—the choice of Paris by the kings of France for their customary abode, and the possession of the most famous educational

PARIS.
establishment of the middle age. The University of Paris, under the patronage of the monarchs, and enjoying the services of such eminent teachers as Abelard and Peter Lombard, was enriched with scholars from all parts of the West, who were divided, according to their origin, into the four “nations” of France, Picardy, Normandy, and England. In the fifteenth century they are said to have numbered more than their thousand; and so important an element of the population did they constitute, that the entire southern part of Paris, commonly called, even to the present day, the “quartier Latin,” was known as the “Université.” The various disasters of pestilence, famine, and siege, that have befallen Paris, have not checked its steady growth. A hundred years or more ago the city had spread far beyond its former fortifications, of which traces remain only in the line of its razed bulwarks (boulevards), now turned into broad and stately avenues. While the increase of the population of France has of recent years been alarmingly slow, Paris has advanced from 1,525,942 in 1856, to 1,696,141 in 1861, 1,852,000 in 1873 (despite the great loss of life during the siege by the Germans and the conflict of the Commune), and 1,988,806 in 1876.

[Next lines discussing the religious landscape of Paris with specific statistics and historical events related to religious freedom and education]
of worship. The number of electors is estimated at 1,300. Of these 2,144 exercised their privilege in the election of May 14, 1882, in which the orthodox or evangelical party had a majority of 620 in all the parishes.

The “Confession d’Augsbourg” (Lutheran Church) is composed of Protestants of German origin, descendants, for the most part, of families belonging to Alsace and Lorraine. There are (1888) 21 pastors and assistants, including clergymen officiating in the German, Swedish, and Danish languages, and 16 churches and other places of worship. The number of electors is estimated at 1,300.

Belonging to the union of the free churches, there were five churches and chapels and seven ministers. The well-known Chapelle Taitbout is the principal place of worship. The Methodist Church has six places of worship, and five ministers preaching in French, besides two preaching in English. The Baptist Church has two places of worship, and four ministers.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of the Council of Worms. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church. Of the ten professors and teachers, two teach respectively the Lutheran and Reformed dogmatic theology.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of the Council of Worms. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church.

The “Confession d’Augsbourg” (Lutheran Church) is composed of Protestants of German origin, descendants, for the most part, of families belonging to Alsace and Lorraine. There are (1888) 21 pastors and assistants, including clergymen officiating in the German, Swedish, and Danish languages, and 16 churches and other places of worship. The number of electors is estimated at 1,300.

Belonging to the union of the free churches, there were five churches and chapels and seven ministers. The well-known Chapelle Taitbout is the principal place of worship. The Methodist Church has six places of worship, and five ministers preaching in French, besides two preaching in English. The Baptist Church has two places of worship, and four ministers.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of the Council of Worms. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church.

Of the ten professors and teachers, two teach respectively the Lutheran and Reformed dogmatic theology.

The government supports at Paris a theological seminary lately established, in part, to take the place of the theological school for the training of young men for the ministry of the Lutheran Church, formerly, and until the session of the Council of Worms. The new seminary (Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris) is, however, intended to meet the wants of the Reformed as well as of the Lutheran Church. Of the ten professors and teachers, two teach respectively the Lutheran and Reformed dogmatic theology.

It is not practicable here to enumerate the various missionary, educational, and benevolent institutions under Protestant control. Reference may, however, be made to the important work done by the Société de l’histoire du Protestantisme français in throwing fresh light upon the history of the Huguenots, by means of its monthly bulletin and other publications. The remarkable mission to the working-men of Paris, begun under the auspices of Rev. J. A. Dulaure, is treated in a separate article. (See Mission.)


Henry M. Baird.

Paris, Francais de, b. in Paris, June 3, 1690; d. there May 11, 1727. He studied theology, and was ordained deacon, but retired, and led, in a house of one of the suburbs of Paris, a life of seclusion and austere asceticism. He wrote some commentaries, and was a zealous opponent to the bull Unigenitus, but he is chiefly of interest to church history on account of his connection with Jansenism and the miracles which were said to take place at his tomb in the Cemetery of St. Médard. See his life, written by Barbeau de la Bruyère, by Barthélemy Doyen, and by Boyer, in 1731; also F. F. Matthieu: Histoire des Miracles et de Concupiscionnaires de Saint Médard, and the art. Jansenism.


PARISH (parochia, paroissia), the Christian congregation so far as it is represented by a territorial circumscription, the circuit of ground committed to the spiritual care of one priest, or parson, or minister. The first Christian congregations were formed in the cities, and such a city congregation was originally called a paroissia. In the Eastern Church the name was retained for a long time, even though the paroissia gradually developed, both externally and internally, so as to become what we now call an episcopal diocese (diocesis). The bishop arose above the presbyters, and became the head of the college of presbyters. Congregations were formed in the country by missionaries, and superintended, first by their founders, then by appointed presbyters, but in both cases under the authority of the city bishop. Only in his church complete divine service was celebrated. He consecrated the elements of the Lord’s Supper, and sent them to the country churches. Even in the third century, when complete service was generally celebrated also in the dependent churches, the bishop still reserved the administration of baptism to himself. But in the Eastern Church the paroissia still continued to be called paroissia.

The distinction between paroissia and diaconia was first made in the Western Church by degrees, as it developed its great missionary activity. The dioceses were so large, that a district subdivision of them became necessary for administrative purposes. Churches were built in which complete service was celebrated every Sunday, and in which baptism, burial, etc., were duly performed by the appointed presbyter. These first subdivisions, however, tituli majoris, ecclesia basilicae, were not yet the present parishes: they were still much larger, and corresponded, in many cases, to the present superintendencies in certain Protestant countries. But by degrees, as the population grew denser, a new subdivision became necessary. Oratories and chapels were built in the castles, in the monasteries, or near by; and when, in course of time, these new subdivisions, the tituli minoris, became definitely established, with well-defined boundaries and fully organized administrations, the present parish system may be said to have fairly entered into existence, though of course, it was, and still is, subject to many modifications.

At what time the development was definitely completed cannot be stated; it took place at various times in the various countries. The city of Rome had forty fully organized parish churches before the end of the third century. Parish organization is spoken of in France in the beginning of the fifth century. In England the first legislation on the subject is found in the laws of...
Edgar, about 970. Before the Reformation, however, the connection between the bishop of the diocese and the priest of the parish continued very close. The _pleniudum potestatis ecclasiasticae_ was vested solely in the bishop, and the priest was nothing but his representative. After the Reformation, the bishops in the Roman Empire, in the Protestant countries, much laxer, and in many particular points the State assumed the power of the bishop; and, in more recent times also, the connection between the State and the parish has loosened, the whole idea of a parish system, as a system of territorial circumscriptions, gradually giving way to the idea of free congregations. In the United States the Roman-Catholic and the Protestant-Episcopal churches have retained the parish system, though in a modified form, on account of the complete separation between State and Church.

PARITY, a technical term first occurring in the instrument of the peace of Westphalia, 1648, denotes equality between various religious denominations in their relation to the State. Before the Reformation, the European States recognized only one religion within their respective dominions; but by the peace of Augsburg, 1555, the old legislation of the German Empire was cancelled, and parity was established between Roman Catholics and Protestants. It must be noticed, however, that the parity thus established concerned only the empire, not the particular states of which it was made up. In each single state the territorial system, with its _cujus religio, ejus regio_, prevailed, and it was only when the states met to decide upon the affairs of the empire, that Protestants and Roman Catholics had equal rights. In the separate states of the German Empire, parity was not introduced until the beginning of the present century. Prussia took the lead by the religious edict of July 9, 1788; and, later on, the great changes which took place in the boundaries of the German States during the Napoleonic wars induced them to follow her example. See Toleration.

PARKER, Matthew, the second Protestant archbishop of Canterbury; b. in Norwich, Aug. 6, 1504; d. at Lambeth, May 17, 1575. Entering Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1522, he was made fellow in 1527, and during the succeeding five years devoted himself to the diligent study of the Church Fathers. His scholarship is attested by Wolsey's fruitless effort to secure his services for his new college at Oxford. In 1533 he publicly espoused the cause of the Reformation in a sermon preached before the university. He became quite famous as a preacher, and Anne Boleyn appointed him her chaplain. The king nominated him to the mastership of Stowe-Clare College, near Cambridge, and in 1544 to the same office at Corpus Christi. In 1545 he was chosen vice-chancellor. Parker distinguished himself at the university, and was an earnest student and admirable administrator. It would have been well for him if he had remained at the university, for he had not the administrative talents for a larger sphere. He did not hesitate to meet an opponent with the pen, but he was by nature too timid and cautious to meet him face to face. Under Edward he remained in the background, and rose no higher than the deanery of Lincoln. Under Mary he lost every thing but his life. Soon after her accession, Elizabeth appointed him Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole having died just before. He no doubt commended himself to the politic queen by the middle position he occupied between the two extreme parties in the church, and by the relation he had sustained to her mother, Anne Boleyn. The consecration took place Dec. 17, 1559. The difficult work lay before him of building up the Anglican Church at a time of ecclesiastical confusion, and under a queen whose religious purpose at least seemed to be fickle. Without himself being a Puritan, he sought to modify the severity of the measures passed by Parliament, Jan. 1, 1565, against all who refused to take the oath of supremacy. But at the queen's command he became more rigorous, and carried out the _Advertisements_ which prescribed the rules (concerning dress, etc.) which the clergy were to obey in order to secure a license to preach. The Church of England honors his memory for his having enforced the Act of Uniformity. The Puritans blame him for forcing the division in the church. Whatever may be the opinion about Parker's services to the church, there can be but one opinion about his services to letters. He was more prominent than any other single individual in arousing in England an interest in the records of antiquity, founded the Antiquarian Society, and was the instrument of rescuing a multitude of manuscripts from the ruins of the monastic establishments. The rich treasures of Corpus Christi and other colleges at Oxford are largely due to his assiduity. He was particularly interested in the antiquities of England, and had published the Chronicles of Matthew Paris, Thomas Walsingham, etc. It was with his co-operation that Ackworth wrote the _De Antiq. Britan. Eccles._, 1572. His private virtues seem to have been many. He gave much away in charity to the poor, founded hospitals, endowed colleges, etc. His body lies buried in Lambeth. [Elizabeth, on one occasion, showed her resentment against Parker for his refusal to introduce the crucifix and celibacy, by an insult to his character which is characteristic of her temper. When Mrs. Parker advanced, at an entertainment at Lambeth, to take leave of the queen, Elizabeth said, "Madam, I may not call you, and 'mistress' I am loath to call you: however, I thank you for your good cheer"; "Madam" was the title by which married ladies, and "mistress" the one by which unmarried ladies, were addressed.] See Lives of Parker by Strype and Josselyn, and Hook: _Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury_, vol. ix.

PARKER, Samuel, Bishop of Oxford; b. at Northampton, September, 1640; d. at Oxford, May 20, 1687. He was graduated B.A. from Oxford, 1659; became F.R.S., 1665; published _Tentamina physico-theologica de Deo_, which pleased Archbishop Sheldon so much that he made him one of his chaplains, 1657, and in 1670 archdeacon of Canterbury. In 1672 Parker became Bishop of the diocese of Canterbury, and in 1686 bishop of Oxford. He was a vigorous, if not formidable, defender of episcopacy, and was more than suspected of Romanism. See lists of his works in _Allibone and Darling_.

---

PARKER.
special notice, interest, and aid of several of his parents. He was old enough to assist his father in the labor of the farm and, indeed, until the final failure of his health, can have been seldom equalled, perhaps in the mass of his acquisitions and his various literary labor during his life at Cambridge. It is difficult to determine the progress of serious, anxious, and often painful inquiry, and at the same time a pervading and profound sense of religious obligation, and a deeply devotional spirit; so that, however little quarter may be given to his theology, it is impossible to doubt his integrity of aim and purpose. Early in his ministry, it became known that he was latitudinarian in his opinions and in the expression of them; and the more conservative of the Unitarian clergy, while not formally dissenting fellowship with him, were no longer ready to admit him into their pulpits. He, meanwhile, became intimate with George Ripley, Alcott, and other leaders of what was then called the "transcendental school;" and though his was a mind adapted to make, rather than to receive, strong impressions, this association undoubtedly broadened for him the field of speculation, and stimulated him on the career of free thought by the consciousness of sympathy. He cannot be said to have belonged to their school, though his philosophy was certainly transcendental in contradiction to the sensuality of Locke and his adherents. On the most fundamental of all religious truths—the personality of God, with the correlative truth, the reality of the communion of the human spirit with him in prayer—he seems never to have entertained a doubt; while in this entire region of thought they were utterly befogged and adrift, though some of them ultimately came out into clearer light, and upon solid ground.

Parker's first open and fully avowed dissent from prevailing religious beliefs was in 1841, in a sermon preached at the ordination of Rev. Charles Chauncey Shackford, at South Boston. The subject was The Transient and Permanent in Christianity. The text, "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."

In this sermon, while maintaining the identity of Christ's teachings with the absolute and eternal religion, and presenting his character as the unapproached ideal of human perfection, he put the brand of exaggeration, myth, or fable, on all that is supernatural in the Gospel narrative, the full authenticity of which was by implication denied. The alarm-note was thus struck for vehement controversy. Not only dissent, but strong dissidence was almost unanimously expressed by the Unitarian clergy. This feeling was intensified by several lectures delivered in Boston during the ensuing autumn, and afterward published, in which Parker expounded more at large, illustrated, and defended the views, which, at the first statement, had awakened such surprise and consternation. There remained very few of his clerical brethren willing to exchange pulpits with him; and those few did so at the imminent risk, and in some instances with the loss, of their professional standing. It is believed that no then settled minister avowed agreement in opinion with him, though some were disposed to regret his divinity. His ideas were at any rate in the legitimate limits of Christian speculation. The Boston Association of Ministers, to which he belonged, took prompt action of dissent and disapproval, and, without a formal vote of dismissal,
held a position which led to his virtual withdrawal from their body. But among the laity he became the minister of a congregation which this society were not numerous; but they were, assumed then the name of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society. The permanent members of every man his place, his endowments, his life-work: to some, pre-eminence; to others, subordinate offices. Jesus Christ was, like all others, a providential man, but unlike, because transcending, all others in the perfection of the divine image borne in various degrees of resemblance by all God's children. Jesus he characterizes "as the highest representation of God we know;" and thus as holding in the divine will and purpose a unique and unapproached position as a teacher of eternal truth, and "as the noblest example of morality and religion." He regards the divine inspiration as the source of all in man that is not "of the earth, earthy;" of all in philosophy, art, and literature, that can enrich and ennoble the spiritual nature; of all high aspiration, virtuous aim, and worthy endeavor; and of whatever of the true and the good there may have been in the ethnic religions. Inspiration in any given instance is a question, not of fact, but of degree. It is not the communication of truth, but the quickening and energizing of those perceptive and apprehensive powers by which truth is discerned and appropriated. There is no express revelation, nor is there need of any. There is absolute truth, in God, in nature, in the soul of man, which is perceived intuitively, and can be verified by intuition alone. Jesus Christ had a fuller, clearer, more profound intuition of absolute truth, and, during his life on earth, as much as his pre-eminent godlikeness clarified and intensified his spiritual vision. His teachings, therefore, are of inestimable worth; and on all the essentials of religion and morality they are their own sufficient proof to the recipient soul. But they have, and from their very nature could have, no other verification. Objective truth can be proved only by becoming subjective, and thus forming a part of the believer's consciousness. But, while Christ's moral perfection made him incapable of false intuitions, on matters outside of the range of spiritual consciousness he was liable to error. His predictions were mere conjectures. He had false notions as to the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures. He believed in a personal devil and in demoniacal possession. Nor was he entirely free from distinctively Hebrew prejudices.

Parker did not account miracles as impossible; but he regarded them as irrelevant and worthless as credentials of religious truth, as therefore improbable, and as resting on insufficient evidence. Nothing was more natural than that reverence for a teacher of superior sanctity and of commanding influence should surround his common
PARKHURST.

PARKHURST, John, Church-of-England lexicographer; b. at Catesby, Northamptonshire, June, 1728; d. at Epson, Surrey, March 21, 1797.

He was graduated B.A. at Cambridge, 1748; entered into orders, but soon thereafter retired to his estate at Epson, and devoted himself to bibli- cal studies. He is the author of his Hebrew and English Lexicon, without Points, with a Hebrew and Chaldee Grammar, without Points, London, 1762 (three editions in the author's lifetime, and five since; the prefixed Hebrew and Chaldee grammar was subsequently separately reprinted by James Prosser, London, 1840), and Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament, to which is prefixed a Plain and Easy Greek Grammar, 1769, last edition by Rose and Major, 1851. These works are now superseded, but they have done long and excellent service.

PARNELL, Thomas, D.D., b. at Dublin, 1679; d. at Chester, July, 1718 (or 1717); was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; ordained, 1700; archdeacon of Clogher, 1705; prebendary of Dublin, 1713; and vicar of Finglass, 1716. He frequently visited London, and was intimate with Pope and Swift. Pope published in 1722 his Poems, to later editions of which a narrative of his life by Goldsmith. Another volume appeared, 1758: its contents were chiefly on sacred themes. His authenticity has been doubted, it would seem without reason. Campbell found "a charm in the correct and equable sweetness of Parnell;" and Goldsmith considered him "the last of that great school that had modelled itself upon the ancients." To the devout reader the later book ascribed to him is the more interesting of the two.

PARESEISM was, under the Achemenides and the Sassanides, the ruling religion of Persia, but is now professed only by a few congregations, the so-called Parsees living in and around the Persian city of Yazd and in the western portion of India. To India the Parsees emigrated in the middle of the seventh century after Christ, in order to escape the persecutions of the Moslem caliphs; but very little is known of their settlement and viceroyalties there. In 1852 they numbered 50,000 souls; of whom 20,184 lived in Bombay, 10,507 in Surate, and the rest scattered around in the districts of Baroth, Balsar, Nausari, and Ahmedabad. In 1879 they numbered 8,400 in Persia.

The origin of Parseeism dates back to prehistoric times. Its fundamental ideas must have been formed at a time when the Hindus and the Persians still lived together as one people; that is, at a time when the Vedas were not yet produced, at least fifteen hundred years before Christ. The contrast between light and darkness, the most prominent characteristic of Parseeism, must have been developed by both peoples in common, as also the first outlines of certain deities which afterwards, after the separation, assumed differently specialized features. — Andra among the Persians, Indra among the Hindus. Mithra and Mitr, Nāstya and Nāonghaithya, and others. But it was only the very beginning of a religion and a civilization which was thus made. The two peoples separated, at what time and for what reason, we know not. And among the Persians the contrast between light and darkness was gradually raised to a moral contrast between good and bad, and developed into an elaborate dualism. Ormuzd, in the older idiom Ahrur-Mazda, is the cause of every thing good, and dwells in the perfect light; Ahriman, or Angra-Mainyas, is the cause of all evil, and dwells in the densest darkness. The inscriptions of Darius mention the good principle, under the name of Aura, or Auramazda: the evil principle they do not mention, but it may be that the omission is accidental. Plato and Aristotle knew both the principles, as well as several of the subordinate spirits ranging under each principle.

On the relation between those two fundamental principles, Ormuzd and Ahriman, depends the whole visible world, its origin, the course of its history, and its end. The cosmology of the Parsees is somewhat differently held by the different sects. An elaborate representation of it is found only in writings from a later period. We give
below the most common, and probably, also, the
oldest, version of it which was known to Plutarch,
at least in all its principal features.

From the very beginning, Ormuzd and Ahrim
and the great battle begins, the power of Ormuzd
will have increased so much that he will easily
overthrow Ahriman.

For twelve thousand years the world shall last.
Of this period the first quarter is taken up with
the creation; the second reaches from the com-
pletion of the creation to the appearance of
Ahriman on the earth; and the third, from that
moment to the birth of the great prophet of
Parseeism, Zarathustra, or Zoroaster. This third
quarter is the heroic or mythical age of Parsee-
ism. Serpents, dragons, and evil kings — Dahak,
Zohak, Afrasiab, and others — are poured down
upon the earth by Ahriman; and Ormuzd is
hardly able to counteract the effect by the crea-
tion of great heroes, such as Jenjib, Feridan,
Caicobad, and others. To send his great prophet
he dares not: the power of Ahriman is still too
great. Not until the opening of the third quar-
ter Zoroaster imploited him and understood the
event, and understood its importance. By the
aid of the evil spirits he first tried to prevent
the birth of Zoroaster; and, having failed in
that, he endeavored to destroy him. In his thir-
tieth year he was summoned before Ormuzd, and
received from him the necessary instructions and
commandments. He then presented himself be-
fore the king, Vishtasp; and, by the miracles
he wrought, he succeeded in gaining the king and
his court over to the new doctrine. The ac-
counts, however, of Zoroaster, are wholly legen-
dary, and give not the smallest evidence with
respect to time and place. Persian theologians
simply tell us that Zoroaster was born three
thousand years before the occurrence of the last
judgment; and when foreign historians place
him five thousand years before the Trojan War,
or six hundred years before Xerxes, they have as
little historical basis to disturb him. Vishtasp has
by some been identified with Hystaspes, the
father of Darius; but the supposition is very
little probable. The immediate result, however,
of the appearance of Zoroaster is described as
being very great; for the divine word which he
brings along with him is a weapon which has the
same effect on the supernatural adherents of Ahr
man, the Ævæs, as natural weapons have on natu-
ral bodies. After the appearance of Zoroaster,
the Ævæs are unable to assume an earthly body:
they can act only invisibly. There are now, also,
other ways in which Ormuzd can fight against
Ahriman. Every thousandth year he shall send
a new prophet, — Oshedar, Oshedar-mah, and
Sosioth; and though mankind may still have
many sore trials to go through, there can be
no doubt that in the last moment, when the
mountains sink, the ocean roars with streams of
molted metal, and the whole earth is on fire,
Ahriman will be utterly overthrown, and Ormuzd
will gather the whole human race into the eternal
light where he dwells.

The practical bearing of this theoretical con-
struction is clear and decisive. Living on the
temptation with Ahriman; or the old age of sin
and sickness, and death were the result of their fall.
Thus the earth became the true arena on which
takes place the great contest between Ormuzd
and Ahriman; but, however fearful this contest
may be, there can be no question, that when the
ten thousand years of the truce have run out,
and the great battle begins, the power of Ormuzd
will have increased so much that he will easily
overthrow Ahriman.

From the very beginning, Ormuzd and Ahrim
and the great battle begins, the power of Ormuzd
will have increased so much that he will easily
overthrow Ahriman.

For twelve thousand years the world shall last.
Of this period the first quarter is taken up with
the creation; the second reaches from the com-
pletion of the creation to the appearance of
Ahriman on the earth; and the third, from that
moment to the birth of the great prophet of
Parseeism, Zarathustra, or Zoroaster. This third
quarter is the heroic or mythical age of Parsee-
ism. Serpents, dragons, and evil kings — Dahak,
Zohak, Afrasiab, and others — are poured down
upon the earth by Ahriman; and Ormuzd is
hardly able to counteract the effect by the crea-
tion of great heroes, such as Jenjib, Feridan,
Caicobad, and others. To send his great prophet
he dares not: the power of Ahriman is still too
great. Not until the opening of the third quar-
ter Zoroaster imploited him and understood the
event, and understood its importance. By the
aid of the evil spirits he first tried to prevent
the birth of Zoroaster; and, having failed in
that, he endeavored to destroy him. In his thir-
tieth year he was summoned before Ormuzd, and
received from him the necessary instructions and
commandments. He then presented himself be-
fore the king, Vishtasp; and, by the miracles
he wrought, he succeeded in gaining the king and
his court over to the new doctrine. The ac-
counts, however, of Zoroaster, are wholly legen-
dary, and give not the smallest evidence with
respect to time and place. Persian theologians
simply tell us that Zoroaster was born three
thousand years before the occurrence of the last
judgment; and when foreign historians place
him five thousand years before the Trojan War,
or six hundred years before Xerxes, they have as
little historical basis to disturb him. Vishtasp has
by some been identified with Hystaspes, the
father of Darius; but the supposition is very
little probable. The immediate result, however,
of the appearance of Zoroaster is described as
being very great; for the divine word which he
brings along with him is a weapon which has the
same effect on the supernatural adherents of Ahr
man, the Ævæs, as natural weapons have on natu-
ral bodies. After the appearance of Zoroaster,
the Ævæs are unable to assume an earthly body:
they can act only invisibly. There are now, also,
other ways in which Ormuzd can fight against
Ahriman. Every thousandth year he shall send
a new prophet, — Oshedar, Oshedar-mah, and
Sosioth; and though mankind may still have
many sore trials to go through, there can be
no doubt that in the last moment, when the
mountains sink, the ocean roars with streams of
molted metal, and the whole earth is on fire,
Ahriman will be utterly overthrown, and Ormuzd
will gather the whole human race into the eternal
light where he dwells.

The practical bearing of this theoretical con-
struction is clear and decisive. Living on the
temptation with Ahriman; or the old age of sin
and sickness, and death were the result of their fall.
Thus the earth became the true arena on which

be chooses Ormuzd, it is not impossible that it may become very unhappy in life, for Ahriman's power on earth is very great; and for the very same reason he may become very happy in life, though he chooses Ahriman. But the end of life is not the end of him. Three days after his death, Jinnvad will be sent by Ormuzd, by maintaining slander, all unchastity, magic, and vice of any kind, avoiding all arrogance and envy, all lying and earth. His good and evil deeds will be weighed down into the depths of darkness, where Ahriman and the Dēs will receive him with laughter and scorn, and torture him until the day of the final judgment comes.

In his choice, however, the Parsee is not left without the necessary guidance. His sacred book, Avesta, contains the commandments of Ormuzd, by obedience to which he will soon find himself on the right path. First, he must believe in Ormuzd; and he must prove his belief, not only by his words, but also by his thoughts and actions, avoiding all arrogance and envy, all lying and slander, all unchastity, magic, and vice of any kind. Next, he must show his reverence for the Amsharshands by protecting those creations in which they live,—Bahman, by keeping sacred all clean living beings; Ardishihst, by maintaining the fire; Sharevār, by preserving the metals pure; Chordad and Amerdad, by taking care of the trees and the waters. Nor must he neglect the still more subordinate spirits, but aid them in their working by his own doing. To gather a fortune by useful activity, to raise cattle, to make waste land fertile, to destroy serpents and weeds, and other vicious animals and plants, are meritorious works, which contribute to the extension of the realm of Ormuzd. But more especially he must always keep himself clean. Of all uncleanness, contamination by a corpse is the worst. As soon as the soul has left the body, evil spirits take possession of it; and any one who comes in contact with it can be polluted, and his soul accordingly consisting simply in ablutions, but sometimes requiring ceremonies which cannot be properly performed without the assistance of a priest. It is, however, not enough to keep the body clean: also the soul must be preserved pure. Evil thoughts and passions are, indeed, nothing more or less than Drujas, a sort of evil spirits, less powerful than the seven Dēs, which Ahriman has succeeded in introducing in the human soul. The way by which they enter is always some evil action; and the only means by which they may be expelled are free and open confession to a priest of the sin committed, and proper fulfilment of the penance he enjoins, which often consists in killing a certain number of vicious animals, but often, also, in saying a certain number of prayers. The Avesta, however, does not simply give a system of personal morals: it contains a complex code of civil law, based upon the two fundamental ordinances, to tell the truth, and to keep one's word. To tell a lie, and to break a promise, are still, in our times, by the Parsees considered as almost inexorable crimes. Hence the reason why they everywhere occupy so respected and so influential a position in society. Of all contracts, marriage is considered the most sacred; and, probably on account of the great pride of the ancient Persian families, the best form of marriage is that between very near relatives. For the dead it is the duty of the Parsee to pray during the three days intervening between the death and the judgment. General prayers are also offered up for the dead during the last ten days of the year, as it is generally believed, that during that term the dead are allowed to revisit the earth.

Between Ormuzd and the spirit-world on the one side, and man on the other, the priest acts as a kind of mediator. Formerly the priesthood most probably belonged to one certain tribe; but at present it is not inherited, but acquired. The priest shall know the law by heart. He is ordained with many ceremonies, and his principal duty is to celebrate service every day. The service begins at midnight, the moment at which the spirits of darkness exercise their highest power, and lasts until morning. It consists of three parts: first, hymns, and offering of sacrifices; then hymns, and recitation of portions of the law; and, finally, hymns and prayers. As sacrifices are offered small breads, called Darun, of the size of a dollar, and covered with a piece of meat, incense, and Haoma or Hom, the juice of a plant unknown to strangers. The Darun and the Hom are afterwards eaten by the priests. Besides celebrating service, it is also the duty of the priest to confess his flock. It is, indeed, the duty of each Parsee family to have a confessor among the priests, to whom one-tenth of the income of the family shall be paid. The young Parsee becomes a member of the congregation when he is fifteen years old: after a preparatory instruction by the priests, he undergoes an examination, performs certain ceremonies, and then receives the sacred cord, the so-called Costi, which he never puts off any more.

The Parsees acknowledge that their sacred books such as they now exist are not complete. The teachings they contain were in old times rarely put down in writing, but simply confided to the memory; and as a result, there were sometimes put together in parts, such as they are used in the divine service, and sometimes separately, each provided with a translation, and with glosses, called Zend. The proper name of the book would consequently be Avesta and Zend, and not Zendavesta. The younger group contains, besides the older books translated into Pehlevi, a Persian dialect spoken under the Sasanides, the Bundehesh, a treatise on the creation, the Bahmanyascht, a treatise on the resurrection, the Minokhired, a dialogue on moral questions, and the Arda-Viraf-name, a Persian transcription of the apocryphal ascension of Isaiah. The oldest translations of the Avesta are the French by Anquetildu Perron, Paris, 1771, and the German by Kleuker, Riga, 1776. The latest translations are the German by Spiegel (Leipzig, 1892–92.

PARSONS, Robert. See Persons, Robert.

PARSONS, Levi, Congregational missionary; b. in Goshen, Mass., July 18, 1782; d. at Alexandria, Egypt, Feb. 22, 1829. He was graduated at Middlebury College, 1814; sailed Nov. 3, 1819, with Pliny Fisk, for the East, under commission of the American Board. They landed at Smyrna; and on Feb. 12, 1820, Mr. Parsons arrived at Jerusalem, the first Protestant missionary to enter that city. He left it May 8. On his journey to Smyrna, where he arrived Dec. 3, he was detained by severe illness on the island of Syra, and shortly thereafter died. See his biography by D. V. Morton, Boston, 1824, also Sprague's Annals, ii. 644-648.

PARTICULAR AND GENERAL BAPTISTS.

Among the Baptists of England are the General Baptists and Particular Baptists; the former being Arminian in theology, and holding to a "general" atonement; and the latter Calvinistic, holding to a "particular" atonement. The General Baptists are descended from the company, which, having embraced Baptist doctrines, withdrew from the main body of the Separatist exiles in Holland, and afterwards returned to England in 1612, under the lead of Thomas Helwys. The Particular Baptists are descended from the company, which, under the lead of John Spilsbury, withdrew in 1633 from Henry Jacobs's Independent congregation at Southwark. See J. Clifford: The Origin and Growth of the English Baptists, London, n.d., and arts. Baptists and General Baptists, p. 2202.

PASAGIANS, The (Pasagii, Passagingi), were a sect which we first hear of in the latter part of the twelfth century, and were condemned at the Council of Verona in 1184. We learn something of their doctrines from Bonacurso (Manifestatio hær. Catharorum, in d'Archery, Spicilegium L., 212) and Bergamensis (Specimen opusc. c. Catharos et Pasagios, in Muratori, Antiq. Ital. med. antiq., v. 152). Both say that the Pasagians taught that the Mosaic law was still in force, the offerings only excepted, and denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Frederick II., in his law against heretics (1224), calls them "the Circumcised." According to Landalbe (Hist. Medielon. 41), the excommunication which the archbishop of Milan pronounced upon the opponents of Pope Anacletus in 1133 was the occasion of many Christians falling away to Judaism. A more probable explanation of the origin of the sect may be found with Noadier in the intercourse of the Cathar priests of the Altar. It is, however, best to look to Palestine for their origin; the term passagium ("passage") pointing to pilgrimages. Du Cange falsely derived the name from πάσας γοναθες ("all holy"). Erroneous is also the view that Pasagians was another designation for the Cathari. The sect seems to have shown itself principally in Italy. C. Schmidt.

PASCAL, Blaise, one of the greatest thinkers of the seventeenth century; a master of French prose above all his contemporaries; an original investigator in the physical sciences and mathematics; prominent as a philosopher and theologian, and one of the most conscientious, pious, and noble sons of the Catholic Church; was b. at Clermont, June 19, 1623; d. at Paris, Aug. 19, 1662. He came from an old and respected family, and was one of three children. His sister Gilberte (b. Jan. 7, 1620), who married her cousin Florin Perrier, became his biographer. His younger sister, Jacqueline (b. at Clermont, Oct. 4, 1625; d. at Port Royal, where she was sub-prioress, Oct. 4, 1661), was endowed with the gifts of genius, as well as the graces of womanhood, developed her remarkable powers at an early age, and became one of the principal figures at Port Royal. In 1626 the mother died; and in 1631 the father went to Paris in order to devote himself wholly to the education of Blaise, whose fine talents he had already discerned. The son made excellent progress in the classics, and was to be kept for the time being from mathematics. But his mathematical genius burst forth naturally by expression, and the boy was found to have discovered several of Euclid's propositions before he was twelve years old. In 1640 his father was sent to Rouen by Richelieu, and Blaise invented the counting-machine as a help for him in his duties. He spent five years upon its perfection. The years 1647, 1648, he devoted to investigations about atmospheric pressure, confirmed Toricelli's law, and discovered the principle of barometric measurements. These are only examples of his investigations in the department of natural science. In 1646 the Pascal family became acquainted, through some friends, with the writings of Arnauld, St. Cyran, Jansen, etc., and the Jansenist pastor, Guillebert. Jacqueline, at the death of her father (1651), who had opposed it, took the vows of a nun at Port Royal. Blaise, on the other hand, seemed to lose his religious disposition. He indulged in play, and even flirted, his vocation was the contemplative life. The author was the sceptical Montaigne. But he was not satisfied. An unrequited affection for a lady of high rank increased his dissatisfaction, and the evangelical piety of Port Royal won his admiration. The poorly accredited accident on the bridge of Neuilly, when the horses ran over into the river, and the carriage was left behind on the bridge, is not to be regarded as having had much influence on his conversion. The strange document which was found, after his death, carefully wrapped up, and sewed in his coat, dated his conversion on Nov. 23, 1654. The document was designed to keep him always mindful of the divine grace which had impressed him so powerfully that night. A sermon by Singlin (Dec. 8) confirmed him in his new purpose; and at his advice Pascal retired to the quiet of Port Royal, where De Sacy became his confessor. His remarkable conversion is thus described by Montaigne and Epictetus proves how difficult it was for him to crush his doubts, and shows that he was determined to secure peace of heart by a severe ascetic discipline. Without assuming monastic vows, he resided at Port Royal, renoun-
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cising the world, practising a strict discipline of fasting, nocturnal church attendance, wearing a girdle of thorns, etc., and observing the respect of all.

In the contest against Port Royal, which broke out after the Pope's condemnation, on May 31, 1653, of the five articles of Jansenism, Pascal took the side of Port Royal, and became its bold and unflinching advocate. On June 23, 1656, his first Provincial letter (Lettre écrite à un Provincial par un de ses amis) appeared, and was followed by seventeen others. They were, in the best sense of the word, tracts for the times; for, when Pascal was writing the first, he did not think of any others. Put in the form of a dialogue, and written in a lively style, they unmasked to the public the inconsistencies and weakness of the Jesuits' code of ethics. They were earnest in tone, and free from all scruality, and in this particular furnish contrast to the famous Epistola obscurorum virorum. The author of the letters bore the name of the pseudonym of Montale. The letters were scattered far and wide. Their publication was forbidden, but the police strove in vain to stop the circulation. In the first three letters, Pascal defended the theological tenets of Arnauld; but in the fourth, reminded by a friend that a severe theological controversy did not seem to be of much interest to the reader, he passed over to a tilt with Jansenism, and struck it at its most vulnerable point,—its moral principles, and their danger to the state. He showed up with wonderful skill the laxity of their ethical maxims and practices. In the last letters he seeks to exonerate Port Royal from the charge of heresy, and to show that Jansenism is in accord with the Universal Church. These letters are the most able and powerful condemnation that Jansenism has ever received from the Catholic side. They did not secure very visible results at the time, because court and clergy were in favor of the Jesuits; but the wound was a deadly one, nevertheless. In 1700 a synod of French clergy condemned Jesuitical casuistry, and they prepared the way more than anything else for the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1764. In spite of these several attacks, Pascal found himself able to resist all scurrility, and in this particular furnish materials for an immediate and effective refutation.

From 1656 Pascal spent most of his time in Paris. His health, always poor, declined very perceptibly after 1658; but he continued to devote himself to a severe ascetic discipline and works of charity. His last years were made peaceful by the measures of the court and Rome (1660) for the suppression of Port Royal, and by the concession of Arnauld, Nicole, and the nuns in agreeing to the pastoral letter. (See Port Royal.) He received the sacrament from his confessor.

In 1728 Pascal's conversations with De Sacy about Montaigne and Epictetus were published in the much praised Pensées. From 1656 Pascal was deeply impressed with the holy thorn occurred. On March 24, 1656, a girdle of thorns, etc., and enjoying the respect of the children was passing by, she took the thorn, and touched it to the diseased eye of Pascal's niece, Margaret Perier. In the evening it was suddenly discovered that the eye was healed. This rendered the proposed operation unnecessary; and, eight days subsequently, the physician affirmed that the cure was a miracle. Other miracles were also worked at the hands of the holy thorn. Pascal was deeply impressed with the miraculous cure of his niece, and determined to make much of the proof from miracles in his Apology for Christianity. He never succeeded in carrying out his plan, but left behind those thoughts and reflections which after his death were published in the much praised Pensées.
PASCAL CONTROVERSIES.

1. The Celebration of the Passover in the First Three Centuries. — There is no doubt that Jesus was crucified during the week of the Jewish passover. According to the synoptists, Jesus ate the regular Paschal meal on the 14th, and died on the 13th, of Nisan. According to John, he died on the 14th, "the preparation of the pas- over" (John xix. 14, 31). The attempts to reconcile this difference have proved unsatisfactory for the unprejudiced exegete. [Some of the most eminent commentators and chronologists deny, and justly, that an irreconcilable difference exists between John and the synoptists. Among these critics are Lightfoot, Wickele, Robinson (Harms, of the Gospels, pp. 212–223), Lange, Ebrard, Westcott, Milligan, Plumptre, and Schaff.]

It is difficult to determine when the celebration of the passover originated in the Christian Church. There is no doubt that the Jewish Christians continued to observe the Jewish feasts, associating with them Christian ideas. It may be that the reference in I Cor. v. 7, 8, justifies the assumption that the feast was celebrated with Christian rites at Corinth. The Christian festivals are not mentioned, either by the apostolic Fathers or Justin Martyr, and are not noticed till the second half of the second century. These considerations, and the evident connection in which they stood to the weekly festivals, have made Neander's view the prevailing one,—that the Christian festivals of the early church were developed out of the weekly festivals. The resurrection gave to the first day of the week a joyous character; and the memories of Christ's passion must have given to Friday an impressive and solemn significance. According to Hermas, Friday was passed in fasting, and the Lord's Supper was generally regarded as inappropriate to it. Every week was made to bear the impress of the week in which the Saviour was crucified. At the annual anniversary of the passion, these two days, Friday and Sunday, would have an augmented significance, and the solemnity of the former, and the joyousness of the latter, be intensified. The Christian celebration of the passover did not assume this double character in the second century, as Neander and Hilgenfeld suppose. The two features referred to were associated with the passover and Pentecost. In the wider application of the term, Pentecost covered fifty days, and commemorated the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit; and was a period of joyous festivity. The passover, in the second and third centuries, was exclusively a memorial of the passion and crucifixion, as is apparent from the following considerations: (1) All the oldest Fathers agree that Christ was the true Paschal lamb, and that the symbols of the passover and the Paschet ("to suffer") as related terms (Justin: Dial., 40; Iren., IV. 10; Tertul.: Adv. Jud., 10). Augustine was the first to declare definitely against this relation. Starting with this assumption, they concluded that Christ's offering of himself could only have occurred on the day of the passover offering, the 14th of Nisan. (2) Tertullian (De bapt., 19) speaks of the passion of the Lord and Pentecost as proper times for baptism: on the former we are baptized into Christ's death; on the latter, into his resurrection. Origen (c. Celsus, VIII. 22) speaks of those who are risen with Christ as continually walking in the days of Pentecost; and, as he contrasts the passover with Pentecost, he cannot have associated the resurrection with the passover. According to Hippolytus, the annual Christian passover, as late as the third century, was celebrated on the Friday which fell on the 14th of Nisan, or the one next following it. It was marked by fasting, which, as Tertullian states, was continued through Saturday (De jejun., 14), or even to Sunday morning (Ad exier., II. 4). Some fasted forty hours. The Roman Christians prolonged the fast till the cock-crowing on Sunday morning. In the fifth book of the Apostolic Constitutions the rules are further elaborated. "The fast of the forty days" preceded Paschal Week, and lasted each week five days. During Paschal Week, only bread, salt, and vegetable tables could be eaten. The congregations were assembled in the vigil preceding the sabbath for the baptism of catechumens, and the reading and preaching of the gospel. At the cock-crowing the Eucharist was observed, and the evidences of joy substituted for the signs of mourning.

2. The Celebration of Passover in the Church of Asia Minor, and the Paschal Controversy. — The Church of Asia Minor differed from the Roman Church in regard to the observance of the passover. In the second century this difference was the occasion of a protracted controversy which agitated all Christendom, and remained for the historian, for a long time, one of the darkest pages in the history of early Christianity. The Church of Asia Minor celebrated the passover on the 14th of Nisan. The older theologians supposed it was the festival of the resurrection. Herrmann (Enea descriptio prisci contentiones . . . de paschate, 1745) properly looked upon it as the festival of the Lord's passion. But Neander, in 1823, made the assertion that these churches, following the Jewish custom, partook of a lamb on the 14th of Nisan, commemorating thereby the Last Supper. The Tübingen school developed this idea more fully, using it as a proof against the genuineness of John's Gospel. Baur urged, that if this Gospel was designed to represent Christ as the fourth passover lamb, and prove that the 14th of Nisan was the day of the crucifixion, it could not have been written by John; for the churches of Asia Minor based their practice upon his testimony, but, notwithstanding, must have regarded the 15th as the day of the crucifixion, and it was a period of mourning, of his Church History, proved that the churches of Asia Minor looked upon the 14th as the day
on which Christ died, because the Paschal lamb was the type of Christ's sacrifice.

Between 150 and 170, in the controversy between Rome and the churches of Asia Minor, the question of the passover was discussed. The churches of Asia Minor, with the exception of those of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Asia Minor, declared that the Passover was to be kept on the 14th of Nisan, and that the day of the Paschal lamb was to be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the month of the Jewish passover. This controversy divided the church and was a passing act in the development of Christian doctrine.

The synods of the church in Asia Minor, with the exception of that of Asia Minor, declared that the festival of the resurrection was only to be kept on a Sunday, and that not till that day was the Paschal fasting to be concluded. From the above it is evident, that as the churches of Asia Minor concluded their fasting on the 14th of Nisan, this day was regarded as the anniversary of the Lord's death. This conclusion is confirmed by the later accounts of the Quartodecimans (the Fourteenth's; that is, those who commemorated the Lord's death on the 14th). Epiphanius states further (Her. L. 1), that the whole Easter was celebrated in Asia Minor, excepting only the day of the crucifixion, which was celebrated on the 15th. The majority of the synods fixed the celebration of the Passover on the 15th of Nisan (Friday), on which the crucifixion occurred; the churches of Asia Minor, by the day of the month of the Jewish passover.

The case was different with the Laodicean controversy of 170. Apollinaris, Clement, and Hippolytus opposed a party, which, proceeding upon the assumption that Jesus ate the Paschal lamb on the 14th, and was crucified on the 15th, celebrated a feast on the 14th in commemoration of the last passover. These Quartodecimans, these three fathers agree in opposing; in the ground that the true Paschal lamb suffered on the 14th. This party, although orthodox, had Jewish sympathies, and referred more especially to the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel which the Ebionites used. It aroused the heated controversy at Laodicea, in which Melito of Sardis, and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, took part. A certain Blasites, who, Tertullian says (De praescr., 53), wanted to smuggle in Judaistic practices, transplanted the party to Rome, and secured a following (Eus., V. 15).

The increase of these schismatic Quartodecimans undoubtedly formed the occasion of Hippolytus' treatment of them in his Refutation of all heretics, and others falsely assert that the distinction between Christian and Judaizing Quartodecimans is an arbitrary one. The Laodicean discussion was only a passing act in the great passover controversy, and the Roman Church succeeded in securing a representative for its views. The churches of Asia Minor continued to cling to the Old Christian Paschal celebration as it had been introduced by John. It must be remarked (1) That every attempt to reconcile the fragments of the Paschal writings which have been preserved, and the notices about the practice of the churches of Asia Minor, has failed, so that the Laodicean discussion was not a mere passing act; (2) The Tubingen school goes upon the false assumption, that John, after Paul's death, and in a hostile spirit, introduced the Judaistic practice; and (3) That the celebration of the Eucharist in Asia Minor was marked by features which distinguished it from the usual celebration in the church, and was more nearly like the celebration in the church of the first days, etc.

The church at large, appealing to the testimony of Peter and Paul, saw an approach to the Judaistic mode of observance in the practice of the churches of Asia Minor. The more intense conflict of the Gentile churches was with Ebionism, the more keen was its vision to spy out Judaizing tendencies. The observance of the 14th of Nisan was beyond dispute the only ground of this charge; and historians failed to observe that the spirit of the Paschal celebration in Asia Minor was as much at variance with Judaizing Christianity as was that of Rome. In consequence of this divergence, and other differences in the time of observing the passover feast (the Romans putting the 15th of Nisan, the Jews the 14th), the Jews and Gentiles were divided into two parties, the Quartodecimans (of Nisan) on March 18; the Alexandrians, on March 21).
tice. The synod of Antioch (381) punished its advocates with excommunication. In the canons of the councils of Laodicea (364) and Constantinople (381) they were called τσαροσαρακεστατις, or Quartodeciman ("Fourteeners"). In the fifth century, Peter, bishop of Alexandria (d. 311), had a controversy with the Quartodecimans. The latter rejected the accusation of Judaistic leanings when he said, "We intend nothing else than to commemorate the passion of our Lord, and at the very time which the early eye-witnesses have handed down." Epiphanius distinguished three factions. Theodore, in the fifth century (Herz. Fabul., III. 4), states that the Quartodecimans "say that John the evangelist, when he was preaching in Asia Minor, taught them to observe the 14th; but, as they misunderstood the apostolic tradition, they do not wait for the day of the resurrection, but commemorate the Lord's passion on Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday, or any other day on which the 14th of Nisan might fall. The Quartodecimans seem to have completely disappeared in the sixth century.

For the further history and celebration, see EASTER.


G. E. Steitz. (Wagenmann.)
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PASCHALIS.

PASCHALIS is the name of two popes and two antipopes. Paschalis, antipope, is ignored as a schismatic in the lists of popes, but was chosen bishop of Rome in September, 687. Knowing that the infirmities of Pope Conon indicated the speedy termination of his life, he prevailed, by a bribe upon John, Exarch of Ravenna, to instruct his officials at Rome to vote for him as Conon's successor. A second candidate, Theodorus, was elected at the same time. The majority of the clergy finally agreed upon Sergius I., who was consecrated Dec. 15, 687; and Paschalis was shut up in a cloister, where he is said to have survived five years. See Muratori: Reg. Ital. sc., iii. p. 147 sqq.; Jaffé: Reg. Pontif. Rom., pp. 170 sqq.

— Paschalis I., pope (Jan. 25, 687-924), was abbot of the convent of St. Stephen when he was elevated to the chair of St. Peter. When Ludwig I., in 817, nominated Lothaire at Aix-la-Chapelle to share his imperial throne, Paschalis summoned Lothaire to Rome to receive the crown at his hands, as the答应. The latter refused the right to confer the imperial dignity. Lothaire obeyed, and was crowned at Rome, April 23, 823. Paschalis had made himself so unpopular among the Romans by his administration, that after his death they refused to allow his remains to be buried in the Lateran. He has, however, been canonized. If fame he has, he owes it to his reconstruction of the churches of St. Cecilia in Trastavara, St. Prasde on the Esquiline, etc. See Muratori: Reg. Ital. sc., iii. 213 sqq.

— Paschalis II., pope (Aug. 13, 1099-Jan. 21, 1118), whose family name was Rainer, was b. in Bieda, Tuscany, probably; became a Cluny monk, fully sympathized with Gregory VII. in all his movements looking to church reforms, and was by him made cardinal. The security of his power as pope was assured by the death or silencing of three rival claimants,—Clement III., who died 1100; Theodoric of St. Rufina, who was imprisoned; and Maginulf, who was declared pope Nov. 18, 1105, under the name of Sixtus IV., and was pillaged and driven from the Lateran, but was compelled in 1111 by Henry V. to submit to Paschalis. In France, Paschalis confirmed his authority by compelling Philip I., who had separated from his wife in 1092, and was living with Bertrade of Montfort (the wife of Fulk, Count of Anjou), to give up the adulterous connection. Very different was the result of his efforts to extend his authority in England and Germany. In the appeal of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry I. of England, to the papal chair, Paschalis decided, in favor of the former, that the right of investing bishops with a ring and sword; but after the Council of Troyes (1107), at which the Pope asserted his sole right of investiture, he found in Paschalis his most dangerous enemy. When, in 1110, Henry marched upon Rome with the purpose of demanding the crown, and settling the question of investiture, Paschalis determined to make a treaty on the basis of the principles he had learned as a Cluny monk. He proposed, in lieu of the right of investiture, that the German bishops should renounce all their rights as temporal princes, and depend upon voluntary gifts and tithes for their support. As an idealist, he never dreamed of opposition. Henry V. agreed to the stipulations on Feb. 9, 1111; but when they were made public, three days subsequently, on the occasion of Henry's coronation, the German bishops refused to accept them, and demanded the Peter's Pence. The next morning, the chief of the reneging firm, was taken prisoner by Henry, was forced to put the crown on his head April 13, 1111, and to acknowledge his authority of investiture. These concessions aroused a tumult in Italy and France; and even such temperate ecclesiastics as Ivo of
PASCHASIIUS. 1757

PASCHASIIUS. Radbertus. See Radbertus.

PASQUALIS, Martinez, b. in Provence in 1715; d. in St. Domingo in 1779. He was of Jewish origin, and the Cabala was the source from which he drew his ideas. He introduced cabalistic rites in several of the Masonic lodges in France, and finally developed them into a kind of theology, by the aid of which he pretended to be able to work miracles. He staid in Paris from 1768 to 1778, and formed a kind of sect called the "Martinista." One of his principal disciples, Louis Claude de St. Martin, was a quite prolific author. Perhaps the most characteristic of his works are Des erreurs et de la vérité, Lyons, 1782; L'esprit des choses, Paris, 1800, 2 vols.; L'homme de désir, new edition, Metz, 1802.


PASION-PLAYS. See Religious Dramas.

PASION-WEEK. See Holy Week.

PASSIONEII, Dominic, b. at Fossombrone, Dec. 2, 1682; d. near Rome, July 5, 1761. He entered the service of the church; was used in various diplomatic missions, and was in 1738 made a cardinal, and librarian of the Vatican. He published Acta apostolica legationis Helvetiae, Zug, 1724; and after his death his letters and his collection of inscriptions were published. — Inscrip. Antiq., Luca, 1785.

PASSIONISTS, The, or members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross and Passion of the Saviour (Congregatio clericorum excelectorum SS. Crucis et Passionis), are an order of the Roman-Catholic Church, dating from the eighteenth century. The founder, Paolo della Croce (b. at Ovada in Piedmont, Jan. 3, 1694, d. in Rome, Oct. 3, 1753), received his education at the University of Pisa. At first fired with enthusiasm for military pursuits, he devoted himself to a religious life, and, with the sanction of the bishop of Alexandria, founded in 1729 the Order of the Cross, and in 1727 was consecrated priest. The first establishment of the new order was founded on Monte Argentario: the second, at Orbitello in Tuscany, etc. Benedict XIV., in 1741, sanctioned the order; and Clement XIV., in 1769, sanctioned it again. The latter pope sent a special letter to the founder, whose zealous missionary labors and penitential severity had won for him the fame of unusual sanctity. The object of the order is to preserve and propagate the memory of Christ's atoning passion and death. The members wear a black robe with the name of Christ printed on the left side, and a small heart, over which is a white cross. — Pius IX. canonized Paolo della Croce on May 1, 1867. See D. M. Paul v. Kreuze Leben, Regensb., 1846; Pius a Spiritu Sancto: Life of St. Paul of the Cross, Dublin, 1868. ZÖCKLER.

PASSOVER, The, one of the three principal festivals of the Jews, is designated by the Hebrew word Pessah (πεσα), which was also used of the lamb offered, and is derived from a verb meaning "to pass by." "To pass by" the Bible connects it with the exodus of Israel from Egypt. At the command of the Lord the people on that occasion killed and ate a lamb, striking the blood on the doorposts as a protection against the destroying angel (Exod. xii. 3-10). At that time the annual repetition of the custom was instituted. The laws governing its observance are preserved by the Elohist writer in Exod. xii. 1-20, 42-51; Lev. xxiii. 5-14; Num. ix. 10-14; xxvii. 16-25.

Celebration. — The celebration of the passover was put in the month of the exodus (Nisan). Every head of a family was commanded to choose, on the 10th of the month, a male lamb or goat, without blemish, and to kill it on the 14th, "between the two evenings" (Exod. xii. 6, margin). The Karaites and Samaritans explain the last expression to mean between sunset and darkness; the Pharisees, between three o'clock and sunset; Raschi and Kimchi, of the time just before and after sunset. The lamb was roasted, and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. No bone was to be broken, and no parts were either to be removed from the house, or left over to the next day. The meal was to be taken in haste, the partakers having their loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staff in their hand (Exod. xii. 11). Only the circumcised could partake of the meal. This meal introduced the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. From the 15th to the 21st, leavened bread was forbidden, on penalty of extermination. The first and last days were great holidays, on which no work was done, and people gathered for worship. Connected with this feast was the offering of the sheaf of the first-fruits (Lev. xxiii. 10 sqq.), which does not mean crushed grains of wheat, as Josephus supposes (Ant., III. 10, 5). The use of the harvest was after this offering had been made. The Jehovist document contains accounts of the passover in Exod. xii. 21-39, xiii. 3-16. Here, likewise, the institution of the feast is connected with the exodus; and the failure to leaven the bread is explained as a result of the haste. Deuteronomy also gives an account of the passover (xvi. 1 sqq.), which is shorter than that of the Elohist, but presupposes more extensive regul
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[The Samaritans still celebrate the passover at the same time as the Jews did; namely, on the full moon of Nisan. Dean Stanley, who witnessed the rites in 1862, describes the scene in a note appended to vol. i. of his Jewish Church. The community of Nablab, numbering a hundred and fifty-two individuals, gathered on Mount Gerizim, a few hundred feet below its summit. At sunset the meal was spread out. Dean Stanley, and, after the chanting of some praises and prayers, six sheep were driven into their midst. The history of the exodus was then recited, after which the sheep were killed, and the noses and foreheads of the children touched with the blood. The parties then all saluted one another with a kiss, and the sheep were fleeced, and roasted in holes dug in the ground.

After midnight the feast began, and proceeded in silence, and as if in haste. In ten minutes all was consumed but a few remnants, which were thrown into the fire, care being taken that none should be left.]


PASTORAL LETTERS are letters addressed by the pastor, the shepherd, to his flock, generally by the bishop to the clergy under his jurisdiction, or to the laity of his diocese, or to both parties at once. At various times and in various places the secular government has claimed the right of exercising a kind of censure over such letters; but the claims have always been met with the most decided protest from the side of the clergy. The term also applies to letters issued by ecclesiastical bodies to the pastors under their jurisdiction, e.g., by a Presbyterian synod.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. Theology is divided into two parts. — Theoretical and Practical. Under the second division are included Homiletics, Catechetics, Liturgics, and Poimencis. Of these subdivisions the first three are treated in other articles under their respective headings: the fourth, Poimencis, is the one to be considered here.

The qualifications and the call of the ministry are themes incidental and introductory, and may be passed without discussion, as the proper limits of this article demand. We have to do rather with the practical work of the pastor.

A presbyter, or other ecclesiastical body, in licensing a candidate for the ministry, passes its verdict upon his fitness for the service. That verdict is to be confirmed by the call of a church and congregation to the licentiate to become their pastor: without such a call, or its equivalent in a missionary appointment, the licensure is not to be consummated by ordination. The call of a candidate for the ministry is a contract, and accepted, it is a contract, and accepted, involves reciprocal obligations. These obligations are represented, but cannot be fully expressed, much less can they be limited by the terms of the call.

For the church and congregation owe the pastor, and the pastor owes them, more than can be put into any writing. This mutual obligation is a contract, but it is more than that. Not only must it be fulfilled on both sides with business-like fidelity, but it must be fulfilled in the large-ness of the spirit of unselfish Christian love.

The true minister will never be a place-seeker. In the spirit of the saying of Confucius, — "I am not concerned that I have no place, I am concerned how I may fit myself for one," — the true-hearted minister, having done his work of preparation with fidelity, will trust the Great Head of the church to find him a place; and the old proverb will hold good, "A stone that is fit for the wall will not be left in the roadway." Absolute personal consecration to Christ and to his kingdom is fundamental to the true idea of an evangelical ministry. Considerations of adaptation and of family ties must have weight; but always should predominate the question, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

Once settled in a parish, the pastor needs, not only power in the pulpit, but also power to reach and sway men by personal contact and influence. Preaching prepares the way for pastoral work; and pastoral work inspires and guides and warms the preaching, and gives it practical adaptation and power. The true pastor finds the themes of his sermons among his people, rather than in his own tastes and tendencies; and so he preaches, not for himself, but for his hearers. If for preaching, talent is first, and tact is second, for pastoral work, tact is first, and talent is second; piety being equally necessary in both relations. Tact is defined as "a finer love:" it is of the heart; and, other things being equal, the heart is that the warmest will have the most of that address, facility, and skill which we call tact. The large and general relation of the preacher to his congregation as a whole becomes in the pastor a personal and an individual relation to each member of the flock, without regard to condition or character. This involves the dealing with a great variety of natures, each one of whom is a separate and a sacred responsibility to the pastor. The work is endless. There are always some souls in need of personal ministrations. Men are reached and saved one by one, and not in mass. The preacher must be a pastor to gather in one by one the souls to whom he has spoken from the pulpit the words of truth.

As the pastor goes among the people, what he is will condition what he says: his character and life will help or hinder his work. "The visible rhetoric" of the minister's daily conduct is more decisive in influence than the audible rhetoric of his sermons. Clerical affectations and assumptions can no longer deceive or awe the people: there must be in the pastor a simple, transparent manliness sanctified by the love of Christ, and yet only the more intensely human because Christly.

Once the minister was first, and the man second: now the man is first, or the minister has no place or power. In St. Paul's Epistle to Titus (i. 7-9), there are thirteen virtues enjoined as conditions— one thing, —moral duties, for the sake of which the minister is to show that character is to pulpit-power as thirteen to one.

Scholarly tastes and habits must be watched,
lest they disqualify for genial and effective converse with the common people. The scholarly must be qualified by the christly, then the small courtesies, which are of such value in the commerce of society, will not be neglected, and love will make the pastor a gentleman, welcome to every household and heart.

There is an old saying, as trite as true, “A house-going minister makes a church-going people.” The work of pastoral visitation must be systematized. A “calling-book” should be kept, in which, with the name of each family, the names of the children should be recorded. The date of each call should be noted, so that the pastor can learn at any time where his next calls should be made. Only in this way can thoroughness, regularity, and impartiality be secured in the visitation of the people. The pastor in these calls should not be alway preaching; for a minister who is alway preaching, never really preaches. The aim should be to enter into the sympathies of the people, to know their home-life, and to win their confidence and affection.

Besides this general visitation there should be some time set apart for the study of the word, and the afflicted. The tenderness and the sympathy of Christ as toward the suffering, and the words of promise, of counsel, and of comfort with which the Bible abounds, will suggest to the true pastor how he should minister among the sick and the sorrowing. Such calls should be short and frequent, and the words spoken should be few and careful.

Other special calls must be made to reach particular cases of spiritual need. As soon as may be, the pastor should inform himself concerning the spiritual condition of every member of his congregation. His work should begin with the officers of the church, to enlist them in active co-operation; then the membership of the church should be roused to prayer and labor; then Christians outside of the church should be urged no longer to delay confessing Christ. By this method of working from the centre outward, by the time he comes to seek those who are without Christ (beginning with the thoughtful, then approaching the careless, and then the sceptical), the pastor will find that the way has been prepared for him.

Meanwhile the course of preaching should correspond with the course of pastoral labor, beginning at the centre of the church, and working outwards toward those who are farthest from the truth. There will be morbid Christians, given to too much introspection, who make the radical mistake which Hamman has characterized as “the attempt to feel thought, and to comprehend feeling.” Such spiritual egotism can be cured only by Christian work. The morbid Christian must stop feeling his own pulse, and go out into the vineyard, and try to win souls for Christ: there can be no spiritual health and vigor without such work. Hence that pastor will be the most successful, who, instead of trying to do all the experience, will confine himself to study, and stimulate the members of the church to work with him as their appointed leader.

There are such varieties of temperament, disposition, character, and condition, that the pastor must break from bondage to himself and to his experience, and learn just how, and in what degree and form, to use himself, but in themselves, making large and generous allowances for differences that come of nature or of education, of antecedent or of present circumstances. In order to this, he must be a manly-sided man, always studying in a docile way the endlessly varied manifestations of human nature. He must be stimulated and sustained in his systematic pastoral work, not by natural personal attractions, but by divine motives. He should school himself to see in each soul a special responsibility, for which he must account to Christ. He should see men, not in the common human way, but as made in the image of God, and as redeemed by the blood of the Son of God. This will make the pastor impartial, and faithful to all; and so his parochial work will not depend upon fitful impulses, but will be sustained by the deepest and divinest principles.

There are special relations which the pastor sustains to the officers of the church and congregation and to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the parish. The trustees, or those in charge of the secular interests of the congregation, may ask counsel of him, and then he should give it; but he should not interfere with them, always recognizing the principle that business men should manage the business interests of the parish. The pastor’s relations to the spiritual officers of the church should be cordial and confidential. He should not dictate to them, but rather counsel with them, treating them with studied respect and consideration, while maintaining his personal independence.

As to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the church, the general rule is, that the pastor should be loyal to their leadership, and should show respect for the positions they have been appointed to occupy. The sabbath-school should be under the care of the spiritual officers of the church, and the same may be said of the choir, or the conductors of the music. It may be remarked, however, in passing, that it would be an inexcusable egotism in the pastor to demand that the devotional music in the sabbath worship should be adapted only to his individual taste and culture, and not rather to the average taste and culture of the whole congregation. And of the other relation it may be said, that, for the sabbath-school, teachers should be selected, not primarily with reference to the good they may get by having such work to do, but rather with reference to their competency to do the children good. The sabbath-school is not a gymnasium for feeble Christians, but rather is it the institution for the religious education of the children of the congregation. Not all good people will make good teachers. The pastor should visit both the choir and the sabbath-school in the spirit of courteous Christian sympathy with the departments of church life there represented.

There may be within the church, organizations for varied Christian work; such as young people’s associations, young men’s Christian associations, Dorchas or itself, students to learned and stimulate the members of the church to work with him as their appointed leader.

There are such varieties of temperament, disposition, character, and condition, that the pastor must break from bondage to himself and to his experience, and learn just how, and in what degree and form, to use himself, but in themselves, making large and generous allowances for differences that come of nature or of education, of antecedent or of present circumstances. In order to this, he must be a many-sided man, always studying in a docile way the endlessly varied manifestations of human nature. He must be stimulated and sustained in his systematic pastoral work, not by natural personal attractions, but by divine motives. He should school himself to see in each soul a special responsibility, for which he must account to Christ. He should see men, not in the common human way, but as made in the image of God, and as redeemed by the blood of the Son of God. This will make the pastor impartial, and faithful to all; and so his parochial work will not depend upon fitful impulses, but will be sustained by the deepest and divinest principles.

There are special relations which the pastor sustains to the officers of the church and congregation and to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the parish. The trustees, or those in charge of the secular interests of the congregation, may ask counsel of him, and then he should give it; but he should not interfere with them, always recognizing the principle that business men should manage the business interests of the parish. The pastor’s relations to the spiritual officers of the church should be cordial and confidential. He should not dictate to them, but rather counsel with them, treating them with studied respect and consideration, while maintaining his personal independence.

As to the heads or leaders in the organized work of the church, the general rule is, that the pastor should be loyal to their leadership, and should show respect for the positions they have been appointed to occupy. The sabbath-school should be under the care of the spiritual officers of the church, and the same may be said of the choir, or the conductors of the music. It may be remarked, however, in passing, that it would be an inexcusable egotism in the pastor to demand that the devotional music in the sabbath worship should be adapted only to his individual taste and culture, and not rather to the average taste and culture of the whole congregation. And of the other relation it may be said, that, for the sabbath-school, teachers should be selected, not primarily with reference to the good they may get by having such work to do, but rather with reference to their competency to do the children good. The sabbath-school is not a gymnasium for feeble Christians, but rather is it the institution for the religious education of the children of the congregation. Not all good people will make good teachers. The pastor should visit both the choir and the sabbath-school in the spirit of courteous Christian sympathy with the departments of church life there represented.

There may be within the church, organizations for varied Christian work; such as young people’s associations, young men’s Christian associations, Dorchas or itself, students to learned and stimulate the members of the church to work with him as their appointed leader.

There are such varieties of temperament, disposition, character, and condition, that the pastor must break from bondage to himself and to his experience, and learn just how, and in what degree and form, to use himself, but in themselves, making large and generous allowances for differences that come of nature or of education, of antecedent or of present circumstances. In order to this, he must be a many-sided man, always studying in a docile way the endlessly varied manifestations of human nature. He must be stimulated and sustained in his systematic pastoral work, not by natural personal attractions, but by divine motives. He should school himself to see in each soul a special responsibility, for which he must account to Christ. He should see men, not in the common human way, but as made in the image of God, and as redeemed by the blood of the Son of God. This will make the pastor impartial, and faithful to all; and so his parochial work will not depend upon fitful impulses, but will be sustained by the deepest and divinest principles.
Some things must be said with reference to the pastor in his relations to the ordinances of public worship. Here we must not trespass upon the subject of homiletics, elsewhere treated. There is a danger in almost every parish, that the people will demand more frequent calls on the sin and sin the pastor can make consistently with what he owes to his study and pulpit. There should be a careful division of time between the claims of the study and the demands for household visitation. Five hours a day at least should be kept sacred for reading, study, and writing. During these hours, besides what is required for the preparations for the sabbath, some portion of time should be given to systematic courses of study. The time thus devoted should be protected in all possible ways from unnecessary interruptions. To be a good pastor, a minister must be a good preacher; and the converse is equally true,—to be a good preacher, a minister must be a good pastor. Nothing in the way of activity and zeal can take the place of systematic, close, sustained study; and no amount of study can take the place of systematic, house-to-house visitation. The two departments of work, pulpit and paro chial, must not conflict, but be proportionate, harmonious, and mutually subsidiary. There should be preparation in the study, not only for preaching, but also for the other parts of public worship. The Scripture-reading should be, in spirit and manner, instructive and interesting. Regular courses of reading, continued from sabbath to sabbath, with brief expository hints, may be profitable to both preacher and hearer. The hymns should be selected with care, not merely to enforce the lesson of the sermon, but mainly to kindle and express the devotions of the people. There should be thoughtful preparation for leading the people in prayer, so that the actual condition of the congregation and of the country may be represented in the thanksgivings and supplications of the sanctuary.

The benevolences of the church constitute an important part of public worship. The pastor should not only keep himself informed concerning all the aggressive work of the church, so that he can inform his people, but he should study methods of reaching their hearts, so as to make them feel the claims of Christ in all departments of his work. They should be taught, not only that giving is worship, but that, under existing conditions, it is doubtful whether there can be true and acceptable worship unless the offerings of the hearth and the lips are accompanied, sometimes at least, by the generous offerings of the hand.

The sacraments of the church involve some special pastoral obligations. As to baptism, the pastor should know the condition and habits of his people. He should know what parents have had their children baptized, and he should kindly and faithfully instruct such parents as to their covenant privileges and obligations. And, with those parents who are neglecting this ordinance for themselves and for their children, he should remonstrate, urging them to the performance of their duty.

As to the Lord's Supper, the pastor should exercise the greatest care, lest, on the one hand, he may be the means of admitting to the ordi

nance those who are not truly regenerated; or, on the other hand, he may repel or restrain those timid and doubting Christians who need that spiritual refreshment which Christ gives only at His table. The celebration of the sacramental feast should be made bright and hopeful, both and in the ascendency of the exalted Christ.

The prayer-meeting, or, as it is sometimes called, the conference-meeting, under the sole conduct of the pastor, it is to be feared is fast changing into a mere lecture, and so is losing its social character. It is a question whether it is better that the prayer-meeting should be conducted by the pastor, or by such of the officers and members of the church as have the spirituality, the tact and skill, to make this social service both interesting and profitable. No one method should constrain the liberty of the pastor in this relation: a variety of methods is more conducive to the freshness and effectiveness of this important service. A schedule of topics may be prepared, printed, and distributed, so that the people will know from week to week the theme to be considered. Questions may be asked in to the pastor to be answered in the prayer-meeting. A course of familiar exposition, if not too long or labored, may be tried with profit. The pastor should be bound by no method, but should impress his people with the deep significance, sacredness, and power of united prayer.

Unselfish consecration, the love of men for Christ's sake, power in the pulpit, tact, tenderness, a profound knowledge of human nature, and a Christlike manliness, are the fundamental necessities to success in pastoral work.

PASTORELLS.  1762  PATIENCE.


PASTORELLS. Those risings of the lower classes, which, under the name of pastorales or pastorales, took place several times in France, were no doubt chiefly caused by the excitement produced by the Crusades; but it is apparent that also other causes, such as hatred to the clergy, despair of the miserable state of affairs in general, etc., were at work. When, in 1251, the report reached France that Louis IX. had been taken a prisoner, a former Cistercian, Jacob of Hungary, announced that he was called by God to liberate the king, and placed himself at the head of swarms of peasants and shepherds, boys and girls, whose number soon swelled into several thousands. At first the queen looked with favor upon the movement; but when the swarms began to maltreat the priests, the monks, and the Jews, she was compelled to use armed force against them. Jacob was defeated at Bourges, his adherents were dispersed, and all the leaders decapitated. Half a century later on, in 1320, it was again the report of a new crusade which caused a similar rising in Southern France, under the lead of a deposed priest and a runaway monk. The Jews were massacred, the monasteries were robbed, and at last the swarms began to threaten Avignon, where the Pope and the cardinals promised rich spoil; but then the movement was put down with military force. C. Schmidt.

Patarenes (Patarini, Patereni, Patereni, etc.), a name given in the eleventh century to the deacons of Aries, a bath from patres ("lector of rags"); a low quarter of the city of Milan, where the followers of Arialdus were wont to gather in 1058. Early in the thirteenth century the Cathari appropriated the name, erroneously affirming that it came from pater ("to suffer"). Their conduct was condemned because they were called upon to suffer for their faith. C. Schmidt.

Paten (patena, doceo), the wide, shallow plate on which the sacramental bread is put and consecrated. In the primitive church, the bread for the Eucharist was supplied by the members of the congregation, and the paten was an oblong plate; but, in course of time, wafers expressly prepared took the place of bread, and the paten became an ecclesiastical vessel. Patens are and were most commonly made of silver; but they are found in glass, gold, alabaster, agate, and other substances. In shape they are commonly round, but oblong and octagonal patens exist. They have always been appropriately decorated to indicate their sacred use. By law, in the Roman-Catholic Church the paten must be of the same material as the accompanying chalice, and both must be blessed by the bishop. Pater-noster ("Our Father"), the name by which is generally designated the Latin translation of the Lord's Prayer, especially in the Roman-Catholic Church. As in the rosary of the Virgin Mary the Pater-noster is generally combined with the Ave Maria, the rosary itself is often called a Pater-noster.

Patience is that moral power by which the soul preserves its equanimity under all exciting and oppressive circumstances, and freely submits to the unavoidable, with the presentiment that it is a divine dispensation. In the most general sense, patience is the soul's dependence upon itself over against opposing elements from without, in contrast to the soul's active effort to overcome this opposition. God's whole government of the world is from this stand-point, and, in view of the opposition of men and demons, brings out the divine, patient, long-suffering gentleness and mercy. The real kernel of the work of salvation was in the patience of Christ, his patient endurance underneath the oppression of the curse which had gone forth upon the world (Heb. xii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 21); and the fundamental principle in the Christian's temper is patience, which continues faithful unto the end (2 Tim. ii. 13). Adam's fall was an act of selfish anticipation, and therefore an act of impatience, which is a prominent element in all sin and crime. Despair is the culmination of impatience. From this general conception we derive the special Christian grace of patience. Pagan ethics as little reached to the full idea of patience as to the idea of an atoning cross. It has no place among the virtues of the Platonic and Aristotelian systems. The Stoics seem to have recognized it; but the patience of Stoicism is only a dogged submission, which seeks to build itself up on an unfeeling, impassive indifference (pateiτικα πατινα). We have an exemplification of the clerical marriages, and, later, to the Cathari, who condemned marriage altogether. The name does not come, as Du Cange supposes, from a certain Paternus Romanus, who spread the heresy of the Cathari in Italy and Bosnia; for then one would have expected Paternus ("collector of rags"), a low quarter of the city of Milan, where the followers of Arialdus were wont.
however, in the middle ages, regarded it as a constituent of courage (Corint.). Protestant system of ethics should properly honor it upon the basis of such passages as Rom. ii. 7, v. 3, viii. 25; Col. iii. 12; 2 Pet. i. 6; Heb. x. 38, xii. 1. As a fruit of Christian faith, patience is the persistence of the believer in a state of sanctification in spite of temptations. Born of Christian love, it is recognized as a mark of spiritual ladder (2 Pet. i. 6), and therefore of the dignity of the other three sees, and they were put under the authority of Constantinople by the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451, Mansi, vii. 309). To the three remaining patriarchates—Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople—Jerusalem was added. An abortive attempt to give it the patriarchal dignity was made at the Council of Ephesus in 431. Theodosius II. assured it by the subordination of the three eparchies of Palestine. This action was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii. 176 sqq.). This same council gave to Constantinople the primary authority (iii. 51), and the title "patriarch," but derive no special ecclesiastical prerogatives from it. [There are eleven patriarchs in the Roman-Catholic Church. Nine were present at the Vatican Council.]

See Bingham: Orig., i. 232 sqq. 
Augusti: 
Denkwürdigkeiten, xi. 148 sqq. 
Hinschius: 
System d. kathol. Kirchenrechts, i. 593 sqq. 
Hefele: 
Concilienrecht, i. ii. 
HAUCK.

PATRICK, St., Apostle of Ireland. The early references to St. Patrick are few. The first is made by Cummianus in A.D. 634; Adamnan, in the same century, also makes reference to the saint; and of later authorities there is no lack. Prosper of Aquitania, the Venerable Bede, Columban, and others are silent on the subject: the remoteness of Ireland is sufficient to account for this.

Our chief sources of information are two writings which seem undoubtedly to be the work of St. Patrick. The Confrontation of St. Patrick, and the Confessions of St. Patrick. The former is found in the Book of Armagh, an Irish manuscript of about the year 800; and both, in later but independent manuscripts. The Armagh copy professes to be transcribed from an original in the handwriting of the saint. The earliest lives extant from the Conference, showing that at an early date the work was considered genuine; so the external evidence is not without value. The internal evidence is so overwhelming that the two treatises are accepted practically universally as authentic.

The poem known as The Hymn or Loricum of St. Patrick has been considered genuine. It is in very ancient Irish, gives no facts, and, whether genuine or not, is valuable as showing the simplicity of doctrine of the early Patrician Church.

The secondary sources of information are (1) The Hymn of Secundinus. This dates probably about A.D. 500, gives no facts, and has only the same value as the Loricum. (2) The Hymn of Faec. This bears internal evidence of being later than A.D. 554. It gives only a few names, and already the miraculous and legendary has
crept in. (3) The Acts of St. Patrick, by Muirchu Maccumachthenni. This life is found in the Book of Armagh, belongs to about A.D. 700, and is probably the oldest life of St. Patrick. The author admits that even then the facts of the saint's life were hopelessly obscured, and we see legend already gathered about it. (4) The Acts of St. Patrick; by Muirchu by Jocelyn in the twelfth century. It is possible that the tradition ascribes extreme old age to the saint. There he was set to watch cattle, and the religious teaching of his life. Nicholson labors to show that his work belongs to the third, instead of to the fifth century, but brings forward little in support of his plan of preaching to the Irish himself, that he formed desire to see arranged in the Confession or Epistle, is, perhaps, taken from some Acts of Palladius, now lost: it is repeated, with additions, in successive lives, and culminates in that by Jocelyn in the twelfth century. It is possible that the Annals of Connaught make the year of St. Patrick's birth 386; Ússher, Tillemont, and Petrie, 372; Lannigan, 387; the Bollandists, 378. The year of his death is equally uncertain. Tillemont gives it as late as the Bollandists, 492; Ússher, 493; Lannigan, and many following him, 465; Ússher, Petrie, and Todd, 492 or 493. Lannigan's date (465), which is the favorite with recent writers, rests on the assumptions of the commission from Celestine and of a regular succession of bishops, such as prevailed at later dates, at Armagh, of which St. Patrick was the first. There is nothing against the ordinary date of 492, and all tradition ascribes extreme old age to the saint.

From the Confession we learn that St. Patrick was carried away captive at sixteen from Bonavent of Taberniae in the British; and it is usually assumed that he was born there. His father, Calpurnius, was a deacon, and at the same time a Roman civil officer: his grandfather, Potitus, was a priest. The fact that a priest and deacon were married men does not seem to St. Patrick to have needed any explanation. Research has failed to identify Bonavent of Taberniae. The authorities are divided between some point on the coast of Armorica Gaul, possibly Bologne-sur-Mer, and the place since called Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, in Scotland. The probabilities are in favor of Gaul; the strongest argument against the supposition, namely, that the Confession distinguishes between Gaul and Britain, being explicable. But it is quite possible that neither of these places is the right one.

The young Patrick, being carried away with many others, was sold in Ireland, Tirechan tells us, to a chieftain called Milcho. There he was set to watch cattle, and the religious teaching of his life. He seems merely to have been ignorant of them. The church he founded was monastic, ascetic, and sacramental. To represent St. Patrick as a proselyte against the special doctrines of the Roman-Catholic Church is not less absurd than to represent him as a Roman bishop, teaching the doctrine and practices of the twelfth century.

of 1688, how Dr. Jenison called on him in the people at Hastings were frightened out of their him of the intention which the Prince of Orange had of coming over to England in the autumn conversation with him on the subject, and how the Westminster cloisters to have some private con-

sideration immediately after the Revolution, and with the consideration of a scheme for compre-
touched in language unsuited to devotional ser-

onic tincture from his philosophical reading; but from the bolder spirit of inquiry cultivated in his day he was an utter alien. He was emphatically Anglican in his dogmatic teaching, and attached authority to the decisions of the early church. He attacked dissent in his Friendly Debate (1668), and that in no very friendly spirit; but in the House of Lords, after the Revolution, he expressed regret "for the warmth with which he had written against dissenters in his younger years." He was openly accused of favoring nonconformists, and on this account, it is said, "lost the love of the gentry." He was a good man, and aimed at maintaining in his diocese an unusual strictness of discipline. He wished to see an improvement in psalmody, and early published a Century of Psalms for the use of the Charter House. See Patrick's Autobiography, Oxford, 1859, and Complete Works, Oxford, 1856, 9 vols. His commentary was con-

"doctor of the church" must possess the addi-

"patronymics" (from pater passus, "the suffer-

ing father"); a name applied to those Christians, who, denying that there is a definite distinction between the personalities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, said that the "Father had suffered in the Son. It occurs for the first time in the treatise of Tertullian against Praxeas, about 200. See Christology, p. 453.

PATRISTICS and PATROLOGY are the names of that department of theology which gives in-
struction concerning the lives, writings, and theo-

logical doctrines of the Church Fathers, and all else which has a direct bearing upon the study of the Church Fathers. If a distinction is to be made between the two names, then patrology concerns the external history, lives, etc., of the Fathers; patristics (patristica sicut doctrina), their doctrinal teachings.

1. Definition of a Church Father. — The honorable title "father" was used in the early church to designate ecclesiastical teachers and officers who had exercised a positive and permanent influence upon the doctrinal system or growth of the church. The term "father" was applied by the early church to the "writers;" (3) Sanctity of life; and (4) The "doxology" — Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, etc., for this reason being numbered only among the "writers;" (3) Sanctity of life; and (4) The approbation of the church, which is doubtful in the cases of Hippolytus, Theodoret, etc. A "doctor of the church" must possess the additional quality of eminent learning (erudito emi-

nien, comp. the Bull of Benedict XIV.,

1 His labors in this respect are criticised by Lord Macaulay, in his History of England.
ecclésia, 1754). Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory represent this dignity among the scholars of the Western Church; Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, of the Eastern Church. At a later time the number of doctors has been arbitrarily increased, and made to include Hilary, John of Damascus, Anselm, Thomas, Bonaventure, Alfonso da Liguori, etc. The Protestant Church includes under the designation Church Fathers all those teachers and authors of the ancient church who made essential contributions to the development of Christian life and doctrine. The period to which the designation may be properly regarded to refer is extended to Gregory the Great (d. 604), or to John of Damascus (d. after 754).

2. Scope of Patristics. — According to the old definition, patristics included all kinds of facts about the personal life, writings, and doctrines of the Fathers. It was, therefore, an introduction to church history and the history of Christian doctrine. In the stricter and more scientific sense, patristics is concerned with the literature of the Fathers, its history and contents, and (1) investigates and determines the text of the writings and monuments of the patristic age, and (2) presents the biographies, literary works, and doctrines of the Fathers individually. Three periods are to be distinguished in the patristic literature,—that (1) of the early church in the apostolic and post-apostolic age, (2) the struggling church in the ante-Nicene age, and (3) the victorious church. Others distinguish only two periods,—(1) the ante-Nicene, and (2) the post-Nicene. The Fathers of each of the various periods are distinguished into Greek or Latin; or, according to nationality, into Orientals, Greeks, Occidentals; or, according to the literary form and contents of their works, to dogmaticians, writers on ethics, exegetes, historians, etc.

3. History and Literature.—We distinguish two periods separated by the Protestant Reformation. (1) The first preliminary work for a history of Christian literature was done by the historians of the ancient church, especially Eusebius. He gives many very valuable notices of Christian authors, and excerpts from their writings. The real father of patrology is Jerome, whose work on the writers of the church (De viris illustribus s. de scriptoribus ecclesiasticos), as he distinctly says in a note to his friend Dexter, was designed to "briefly describe all those, who, from the passion of Christ to the fourteenth year of Theodosius, had produced any thing worthy of preservation about the Holy Scriptures." Beginning with James and Peter, he gives in a hundred and thirty-five sections a biographical notice of each of these authors. This production was much admired, translated into Greek by Sophronius, and continued by Gennadius of Massilia (who about 492 wrote notices of ninety-five or a hundred ecclesiastical authors, mostly of the fifth century), Ialdore of Seville (d. 638), and Iledefonsus of Toledo (d. 607). In the middle ages the writings of the Fathers, carefully preserved them in the convents, and made collections of excerpts; but there was no critical study of these writings. Collections of notices were, however, made, some of which, uncritical though they be, are invaluable. Here belong the collections of Photius (d. 890), especially his Bibliotheca, or Μανοιχίδιον, the so-called Nomenclatores veteres, who continued or imitated Jerome's Catalogue; especially Honorius of Autun (d. 1120), who beginning his work De luminaryibis eccles., etc., with the apostles, carries it down to Anselm, Sigebert of Gembloux (d. 1112); and Johann Trauenberg (d. 1516) who begins with Clement of Rome, and concludes with the author himself, nine hundred and seventy writers being noticed.

(2) A new period in the history of patrology dates from the rise of Humanism and the Reformation. The immense strides in culture in the fifteenth century, the classical studies of the Humanists, the growing acquaintance with the Greek language in the West, the invention of printing, etc., all redounded to the interest of this science. Patristic writings were discovered, edited with notes, first those of Latin, then of Greek authors. Special mention in this connection is due to Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus, Ecolampadius, and the learned booksellers Robert and Henry Stephens, Froben, Opocin, and others. Editions appeared of Lactantius (1485), the Letters of Jerome (1485–70), Augustine's City of God (1470), Leo's Sermons, Orosius' History of the Cæsars (1481), Ovid's Metamorphoses (all 1471). In the sixteenth century Erasmus, in quick succession, issued editions of the works of Cyprian (1520), Hilary (1523), Jerome (1528), Irenæus (1529), Augustine (1528), Epiphanius, (1529), Chrysostom (1530), [Origen, 1531], Athanasius, and also Basil (1532). The Reformers, while denying to the Fathers an equal authority with the Scriptures, got weapons for the struggle in which they were engaged from their writings. Luther was well read in them; although he passed an unfavorable judgment upon Jerome, Origen, and Chrysostom. Melanchthon urged very earnestly the study of the Fathers, collected their opinions about the Lord's Supper (Sententias patrum de cons domini, 1530). The Wurttemberg theologian, Schopf, wrote Academia J. Chr. s. brevia descriptio Patrum de Doctorum ecclesiast. (Antwerp, 1639; reprinted, Rome, 1613, Paris, 1616), which was often republished; and compiled the Medulla theol. Patrum (Amberg, Neustadt, and Heidelberg, 1598–1613, 4 vols.). Of the seventeenth century, deserve to be mentioned, Gerhard's posthumous work, Patrologia a d. prin. ecc. doctorum vita et lucubrationibus (Jena, 1653, 1673), Hulsius's Patrologia (Leipzig, 1670), Meelfürer's Corona patrum (Giessen, 1676), Olearius' Abacus patrologicus (Jena, 1673, new ed. Jena, 1711, under the title Bibl. scr. eccl.). None of these works have any critical value. In the seventeenth century, the Roman-Catholic Church did far more in this department than the Protestant. Among the Italians, Baronius and Belarmino deserve mention; the latter writing the liber de script. eccl. (The Writers of the Church, Rome, 1613, Paris, 1616), which was often republished, and supplemented by Labbé (1809) and Oudin (Paris, 1808). The Belgian theologian, Aubertus Mispel, published a Patrologia and Auctar. de script. eccl. (Antwerp, 1639; reprinted, A. Fabricius, Bibli. Eccles., 1718). The French Congregation of St. Maur did a work of imperishable value in this department, by publishing editions (known as the "Benedictine;" for list see Benedictine) of the Fathers superior in

In England, Ussher (d. 1656) distinguished by his patristic investigations; as also Grabe (d. 1712), by his Spicilegium patrum and his editions of Justin and Irenæus, Pearson (d. 1680), Henry Dodwell (d. 1711), William Cave (d. 1718), and Lardner (d. 1768), who exhibits an abundance of patristic erudition in his Credibility of the Gospel History. [For the works of these authors, see the special articles.] Of the German works and authors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the following Roman-Catholic works and authors deserve mention: Wilhelm, Patrolog. ad usus acad. (Freiburg, 1775), Schramm, Anal. fidei opp. ss. Patrum et script. eccl. (Augsburg, 1780–95, 18 vols.), Lamper, Hist. theol. crit. de vita, scriptis et don. Patrum, etc. (Augsburg, 1758–90, 13 vols.), Pernamer, Patr. (Landshut, 1841–44, 2 vols.), and the treatises and text-books on patrology of Lochner (Mainz, 1837), Mühler (incomplete, Regensburg, 1840), Magon (Regensburg, 1864, 2 vols.), Alzog (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1866, 3d ed., 1878), J. Schmid (Freiburg, 1890), Nirschl (Mainz, 1881). Among the Protestant works, those of Fabricius deserve prominent mention as of special value; viz., his Bibl. eccles. (Hamburg, 1715), Bibl. graeca (1705–28, 14 vols., new ed. by Harless, 1790 sqq.), Bibl. latina (1807, new ed. by Harless, 1850), etc. (Leipzig, 1734 sqq.). We mention further, Ittig, Schlesiussa de autori-bus, etc. (Leipzig, 1711), Walch, Bibl. patriot. (Jena, 1751, 1770, new ed. by Danz, Jena, 1834), Schönew.-mann, Bibl. . . . Patrum latin. (Leipzig, 1792–94, 2 vols.), Thiel, Bibl. patriot. (Leipzig, 1854), and the treatises on patriology of Pestalozzi (Göttingen, 1811), Danz (Jena, 1839). For special editions of authors, see the special articles.


Patronage (Jus patronatus). In the fifth century the opinion became current, both in the East and the West, that it was proper to grant to the founder of a church or some other religious institution the right of appointing not only the manager of the property set aside for the purpose, but also the priest or other ecclesiastics to be maintained from the donation (Nov. Justin. 131, c. 10 (c. 545), c. 1, C. XVI. qu. 5, and can. 10, Council of Orange, 441). This tendency was further strengthened by a peculiar feature of the social organization of the Germanic nations. Among them the owner of the soil, the lord of the peasant-community, exercised full right of possession over any thing in or on the glebe, and had perfect control over the temple or over the Christian church erected on the ground, appointing and dismissing the priest according to will (can. 7, 26, 33, Council of Orleans, 541). This arrangement was continued during the Carolingian age, and the consecration of the building to the dotation, to have co-proprietors, to appoint incapable persons, to dismiss an incumbent without the consent of the bishop, etc. It was not, however, until the twelfth century that the popes, more particularly Alexander III., succeeded in re-organizing the whole arrangement on a new and firmer basis. Maintaining that the ecclesiastical character of the foundation, and not the ownership of the founder, was the decisive feature in the legal position of the institution, he denied the proprietorship of the lord of the ground, and confined his right of appointment to a mere right of presenting a candidate to the bishop. Thus arose the jus patronatus.

The introduction of the Reformation brought no very considerable change in the ruling practice, though it gave rise to some curious complications, as, for instance, when a Roman-Catholic lord came to exercise patronage over a Protestant church.
PATTESON.

1768 PAUL THE APOSTLE.

[In Norway the right of patronage was never established, as Christianity was introduced in the country, not by the voluntary adoption of the people, but by their admission to the position of the kings. In Denmark it was completely abolished by the constitution of June 5, 1849. In Prussia it was abolished during the revolution of 1848, but quietly re-establishd when the re-action came into power again in 1850. In England, where the greater part of the benefits are personal, it has proved impossible to abolish patronage.

As real patronage — that is, a patronage which belongs to the glebe, in contradistinction to personal patronage, which belongs to the person, and is extinguished with the family of the founder — has a market-value, and can be the object of buying and selling, its abolition would bring along with it a very difficult conflict with the established ideas of property; and in 1875 the Church Private Patronage Association was founded, for the purpose of maintaining, by every legal means, the immemorial rights of private patrons. In 1848, patronage was abolished in Scotland, but re-established in 1860. Once more abolished in 1869, a pecuniary compensation having been voted to the patrons, it was suddenly restored by Queen Anne in 1712, and the patrons did not pay back the compensation received in 1690. The feeling against it was steadily increasing; however, and in 1842 a motion for its entire abolition was carried in the General Assembly. But the practical result was only the so-called "Lord Aberdeen's Act," which, in rather vague expressions, gives a certain scope to objections from the side of the congregation. In the Roman-Catholic Church a patron saint is a saint who is chosen as a protector, it may be of a nation, a city, a village, a church, a class, or an individual. The earliest witness of this usage is Ambrose of Milan (386).]


PATTESON, John Coleridge, D.D., Bishop of Melanesia: b. in London, April 1, 1827; murdered at Santa Cruz, by the Melanesians, Sept. 20, 1871. He was the son of Sir John Patteson, an English judge, and studied at Elon, and afterwards at Oxford, where he was elected fellow of Merton College, 1850. After being some time curate at Alftington, Devonshire, he went out to New Zealand in 1855, to assist Bishop Selwyn in his missionary work among the South Sea Islands, and in 1861 was consecrated Bishop of Melanesia. Possessing great linguistic talent, he reduced to writing and grammar several languages which had only been spoken before. His work among the islands was noble and self-denying. In time of sickness he would watch and nurse the poor natives himself, and by love and kindly example lead them up to the thought of God, till he knew their speech sufficiently to lead them to the knowledge of their Saviour. The kidnapping of the islanders, to be sent to the plantations of Queensland and Fiji, was the chief hinderance to the work in which he was engaged; and the ill feeling engendered by this traffic, to which he was much opposed, may be said to have been the cause of his death. But it is likely, the missionary ship in which he was cruising about among the islands of his dio-

cese, for a kidnapper's craft. Accordingly, they opened fire, and he was killed.


ROBERT S. DUFF.

PAUL THE APOSTLE AND HIS EPISTLES.

This article will consider the life of the apostle and the scope and contents of his writings.

Life.—The life of Paul falls into three periods: (1) The period before his conversion, (2) The period between his conversion and the Roman imprisonment, (3) The period beginning with the Roman imprisonment. The sources of Paul's life are the letters by his hand and the Acts of the Apostles.

1. The Period before his Conversion. — Paul was of pure Jewish descent (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5); belonged to the theocratic part of the nation after the exile, being of the tribe of Benjamin, an ardent Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6); and was born at Tarsus in Cilicia (Acts ix. 11, etc.). The statement of Jerome (Cot. 5; Ad Philm. 28), that he lived at Giskalis in Galilee until it was taken by the Romans, when Tarsus became his abode, cannot be accepted, as no record exists of a Jewish war at the time of Paul's childhood (Josephus, B. J., iv. 2, 1). Paul inherited the dignity of Roman citizenship (Acts xxii. 18). How his ancestors or father had secured the title is unknown. (See Cellarius: De Pauli Rom. civitate, Hal., 1708; Arntzen: De civ. Pauli, Traj.-ad-Rh., 1725; Eckermann: De Rom. Ap. Pauli civ., Ups., 1746.) His Hebrew name in its hellenized form was Saulos (Sasu), in its Aramaic form, Saoul (Saoua). His Roman citizenship explains his Roman name Paul, by which he is uniformly known by the writer of the Acts, after Paul's meeting with Sergius Paulus on the Island of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 9). He did not get the name from his connection with the conversion of Paulus, as the teacher would hardly be called after the pupil; nor from his insignificant stature (2 Cor. x. 10); nor did he assume it as an expression of humility (1 Cor. xv. 9), Paul meaning little. It was customary for Jews who were Roman citizens to have two names, a Hebrew and Latin (Acts xii. 25, xiii. 1); and the use of the Latin name Paul, from the apostle's visit to Cyprus, is to be explained by the fact that he began to employ it exclusively in his relations to extra-Jewish peoples. The theory, based upon Rom. xvi. 22, that Paul had three names, is untenable (Roloff, De tribus Pi. nominibus, Jen., 1781).

The accounts of Paul's youth are meagre. The date of his birth is unknown. It is not fair to conclude from 2 Cor. viii. 22 that he had a brother, as Rückert and Hausrath do; but he had at least one sister (Acts xxiii. 18). Tarsus at that time was a very flourishing city, and, like Athens and Alexandria, a seat of schools and art (Strabo, iv. 5, 19). If Paul belonged to the upper classes of society, as his Roman citizenship would seem to imply, he must have had access to these privileges of culture. But his character was formed under the strict Jewish discipline of his home and his training at Jerusalem. The time of his going to Jerusalem is not known; business, that he was "brought up" there (Acts xxii. 3), and that he was a "young man" (Acts vii. 58) at the
the death of Stephen, lead us to suppose that he left Tarsus at an early age. The object of his going to Jerusalem was probably to obtain practical knowledge of the training of a rabbi. He was the pupil of the celebrated Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3), whose moderation of spirit he did not imitate (Acts v. 34 sqq.). He probably, as Godet also affirms, witnessed the public activity of Jesus in Jerusalem; but nowhere is it intimated that he saw Jesus, not even in 2 Cor. v. 13, where the reference is to a carnal conception of him before his conversion. His sudden appearance at Jerusalem at the death of Stephen has suggested the idea that his sojourn there had been interrupted for a while (Neander, Mangold, Wieseler, Beyrich; etc.). Following the usual custom of the rabbis, Paul learned and practised a trade,—the trade of a tent-maker (Acts iii. 3). During this period, Paul was a zealous for the law and the doctrines of the Pharisees. It has often been affirmed that Paul was married (Clem. Alex.: Strom., III. 6; Origen: Op., IV., pp. 481 sq.; Eusebius: H. E., III. 20; Luther, Grutius, Haurwath, Ewald). Erasmus and others explain the term "yoke-fellow." in Phil. iv. 3, of a wife (Canon Farrar zealously defends the theory of Paul's marriage, on the ground of his alleged membership in the Sanhedrin (Acts xxvi. 10), his accurate description of domestic life, etc.; but the way Paul writes of his confinement in 1 Cor. vii. 7, and his argument in 1 Cor. ix. 5, absolutely forbid the view that he was married. Paul was bitterly hostile to Christianity, as his share in the stoning of Stephen as an approving witness of the bloody scene shows. In the persecution which began at that time, he took a zealous and fanatical part, going from house to house, dragging Christians to prison and to death (Acts xviii. 4, etc.).

In the midst of this persecuting activity an event occurred which completely changed the attitude of the inquirer Paul to Christianity. On his way to Damascus to persecute the Christian sect, he was suddenly arrested by a brilliant light, above the brightness of the noonday sun. Paul declares he had seen Christ (1 Cor. ix. 1); but this can hardly have been the historical Christ, as he derives his apostolic dignity from the teaching of Jesus, and refers in his Epistles to sayings of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, etc.; compare Acts xiii. 25; xx. 36). To this were added special revelations (Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 15) and ecstatic visions (2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq.).

Arbitrary as this explanation is, it fails to explain Paul's conversion. According to Luke, the real objective appearance of Christ made Paul a Christian; and Paul's own testimony (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 5) forbids the thought that a psychological preparation had been going on in Paul's mind through the influence of Gamaliel and the speech and calmness of Stephen, as Olshausen, Neander, [Farrar, Schaff, and others] urge.

The date of Paul's conversion has repeatedly been derived from 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33 (comp. Gal. i. 17 sqq.; Acts i. 19 sqq.), and, according to the best view, is put in s. 4.

2. From the Conversion to the Roman Imprisonment. — Paul's conversion opened up to him a world-wide mission. He enjoyed a valuable external preparation. He had no graces of person. The descriptions of the Acta Pauli et Thecla and Nicephorus (H. E., II. 37), which Renan accepts, are to be put down as distorted fancies; but from 2 Cor. iv. 7, x. 10, Acts xiv. 12, we gather that he was insignificant in stature; and in 2 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 13, physical infirmities are mentioned. The "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7), from which he prayed in vain to be delivered, was not a spiritual temptation (Luther), but either an ophthalmic infirmity (Howson, Farrar, Plumptre), or epilepsy (Holsten, Ewald, Haurwath, Lightfoot, Schaff). For pictorial representations of Paul, see Schultze: D. Katakomben, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 149 sq.; [Howson: Life of St. Paul, chap. vii.; Mrs. Jamieson: Legendary Art]. Paul had received ineffaceable impressions from the Greek world of culture, although he did not possess encyclopedic learning (Schramm: De stupenda eruditione Pauli, Herb., 1710), or exhaustive knowledge of philosophy (Zobel: De Paulo philosopho, Alt., 1731) or jurisprudence (Stryck: De jurispr. Pauli, Hal., 1695; Kirchmaier: De jurispr. Pauli, Vit., 1750; March: Specimen jurispr. Pauli, Leipzig, 1738).

He cited Greek poets (Acts xvii. 8), but such sentences were too proverbial in their tone to justify us in attributing to the apostle large acquaintance with Greek literature. At Tarsus, Paul became thoroughly conversant with the Greek idiom, and there can be no doubt [?] that he learned to understand Latin (Ehrhardt: De latinitate Pauli, 1755). Paul's spiritual preparation for his apostolate was derived from his conversion. He undoubtedly had, prior to that occurrence, some historical knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus, and refers in his Epistles to sayings of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, etc.; compare Acts xii. 25; xx. 36). This event was the turning-point in Paul's life from an inquisitor to an apostle of the new faith. Three times the event is narrated in the Acts (ix., xxxii, xxvi.). The rationalistic criticism (Baur, Zeller, Holsten, etc.) has explained the occurrence as simply an ecstasy of condition of Paul's own mind; so that Paul was a Christian before the event, and had fought his way through spiritual conflicts to faith, so that the vision was "an announcement of the event to Paul's own soul." Others, like Ammon, Winer, and Ewald, have explained the light and sound which Paul saw and heard to be lightning and thunder. Paul the Apostle.
the Gentile churches. In company with Barnabas, he went up to Jerusalem with the collection of the Antiochene Christians (xi. 30). Retiring to Antioch, and under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, with the consent of the church there, he started out with Barnabas and John Mark on his first missionary journey, the account of which is preserved in Acts xiii. xiv. The route was to the Island of Cyprus (where the sorcerer Bar-jeus was humbled, and the proconsul Sergius Paulus converted), to Perga in Pamphylia (whence Mark returned to Jerusalem), Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. At these places, Paul preached, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles; and, although he received harsh treatment, his preaching won converts. The journey was brought to a close by the return of the two missionaries to Antioch in Syria after an absence of probably two years (46±47?).

After Paul had been for some time (Acts xiv. 28) in Antioch, extreme Jewish Christians from Jerusalem (“the Ultramontanes of that age,” Hilgenfeld) came, insisting that Gentile converts should submit to circumcision. The trouble which resulted in the Antiochene Church was the occasion for Paul and Barnabas to go up to Jerusalem, and discuss the question of liberty concerning some of the churches in Syria, Cilicia, and Asia Minor. (Acts xv. 38; 2 Cor. xii. 14 sq.). He there received a letter (Gal. ii. 1 sq.) from the Galatian Churches, expressing certain opinions, and requesting Paul to send Barnabas and perhaps himself, to Jerusalem, “in order that they might deliberate with the elders concerning matters of doubt, regarding the law, on the part of legalistic Jewish Christians.” Paul’s answer is given in Acts xv. 1 sqq. and Gal. ii. 1 sqq. The differences, real or apparent, cannot be explained from the different aims of the two accounts.” After Paul’s return, Peter met him at Antioch. Paul rebuked Peter for demanding, in spite of his own example, the Gentile Christians to live as the Jews. Barnabas was likewise carried away into the same error; and perhaps it was differences growing out of this difficulty that led Paul to refuse the proposition of Barnabas (Acts xv. 36–39) to take Mark with them on a second missionary journey. Paul chose Silas as his companion.

The account of the second missionary journey is given in Acts xv. 40–xviii. 22. After visiting some of the churches in Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, accompanied by Timothy, a disciple of Lystra (Acts xvi. 1–5), he went in a north-westerly direction to Phrygia and Galatia (a province settled by Celtic tribes about 250 B.C.), where he met with a warm reception (Gal. iv. 12 sq.). Travelling thence through Media, he arrived in Elymais, where he received a vision of the sorceress, who was miraculously delivered. At Phœbus Apollo, where he had received reports. Since his first visit, different parties had arisen in the church, acknowledging Paul, Peter, and Apollos as leaders. Paul turns their attention to Christ. About the time of writing this Epistle, Paul left Ephesus, and went by way of Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12), to Macedonia, where he met Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1) and Titus (2 Cor. vii. 6 sqq.), both of whom came from Corinth. No doubt influenced by them, the apostle wrote from Macedonia (perhaps Philippi, as in the Peshito) the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 16). After a tour in Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19), Paul went in person to Achaia, probably spending most of his time in Corinth (Acts xx. 2). To this period, without doubt, belongs the composition of the Epistle to the Romans, which mentions Phœbe, a deaconess in Cenchrea, the eastern seaport of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 1), and Gaius (xvi. 25), who can be no other than the Gaius of 1 Cor. i. 14. The collection for the Jerusalem Christians, mentioned in Rom. xvi. 25 sqq., is the same which Paul urged in 2 Cor. viii. ix. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans was designed to prepare for his own visit to the city by contributing to the progress of the gospel (Rom. xvi. 4 sqq.). Influenced by Jewish plots to give up his original plan to return to Syria by sea (Acts xx. 2), the epistle of Philip and Thomas was brought to Miletus, where he bade good-bye to the elders of Ephesus (xx. 17 sqq.), and from there, by way of Cesarea, in spite of the warnings of Agabus (xxi. 10 sqq.), to Jerusalem.

Arrived in Jerusalem, Paul soon discovered a bitter hostility against him, as an enemy of the law, on the part of legalistic Jewish Chris-
to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16; see Anger: Ueber mentioned, because it was a metropolitancity. Paul reached Rome by written during this captivity. The Epistle to the Colossians and Philippians likewise belong to the prison for two years, till the arrival of his successor, M. Porcius Festus. Another hearing was granted him (xxvi. 1-23); and he might have been released, but for the fact, that, earnestly desiring to see Rome (Acts xix. 21, xxiii. 11; Rom. xv. 24, 28), he had used his right as a Roman citizen to appeal to the emperor (Acts xxvi. 32). Under the guard of Julius, he sailed from Caesarea, changed vessels at Myra, but, after a stormy passage, was shipwrecked off the coast of Malta (Boysen: Ecloga arch. ad difficile Pauli iter, Hal., 1713; Eskuche: De naufragio Pauli, Bern, 1780; Walch: Antiq. manuass ad itin. Pauli rom., Jenae, 1767, Antiqu. naufragii in itin. Pauli, Jenae, 1767; Lassen: Tentam. in ite Pauli, etc., Aarhus, 1821; J. Smith: The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 4th ed., London, 1880). Paul reached Rome by way of Syracuse and Rhegium. His arrival occurred in the spring of 61, Festus having become procurator in the summer of 60. Paul's conversion is set by Wieseler in the year 40; Anger and Ewald, 38; Schott, Godet, [Alford, Schaff], etc., 37; [Howson, 36]; Meyer, [Ussher], 35; [Bengel, 31. For a tabular view of the chronology of Paul's life, as fixed by various chronologists, see Lange's Com. on Acts, and Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul, ii. 625].

3. The Period beginning with the Roman Imprisonment.— Paul was cordially received by the Christians of Rome. He had been familiar with the condition of the local church, as the Epistle to the Romans proves (i. 8, 11 sqq., iv. 1, xvi. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, etc.). It had probably been founded about the time of the conversion of the Beloved (Acts xi. 18). After a period of freedom, during which he was free to do as he pleased, he then went by way of Crete (Tit. i. 5), Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), and Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3), to Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), where he wrote 1 Timothy. Then returning by way of Troas (2 Tim. iv. 19), Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20), and Neopolis (Tit. iii. 12), he went to Spain, and was again imprisoned at Rome.

SCOPE AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLES. — The Epistles of Paul were, in the best sense of the word, tract for the times (Gelegenheitschrift-ten), intimately connected with the writer's circumstances at the time of composition, and the needs of the correspondents. The investigations of Mangold, Weitzsicker, and others, have shown this to be true of the Epistle to the Romans. Side by side with letters full of messages of friendship (Philémon, Philippians) are letters with a decided polemical purpose, with strong words of rebuke (Galatians, Colossians). With its author prevailing didactically in aim, and dialectically in method (Romans and Ephesians). Of the lost letters of Paul—if there be any such — no fragments remain; the Latin letter to the Laodiceans (Fabricius) not being found in the Muratorian Frag-
ment, but mentioned by Jerome (Cat., 5). The Latin correspondence, in six letters, between Paul and the philosopher Seneca, mentioned by Jerome (Cat., 22), is also spurious. Paul wrote in Greek, and not in Aramaic (Bolten, Bertholdt). His training and personality are plainly reflected in his Epistles. With the exception of the letter to the Galatians (vi. 11), and perhaps Philémon (19), Paul did not write his Epistles with his own hand (Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17). [It is held by Farrar and others that this was due to his weak eyes.] The traces of rabbinic culture are everywhere patent. He employs Hebrew and Chaldee terms (abba, Rom. viii. 15, etc.; amen, Rom. xv. 33, etc.; maranaatha, 1 Cor. xvi. 22; pascha, 1 Cor. v. 7, etc.), Hebraistic combinations (respect of persons, προσωποληπθη, Rom. ii. 11, etc.), turns of expression (1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21), parallelism of clauses (1 Cor. ii. 7), of the psalm of trusting love (1 Cor. xiii.), and the noble dithyramb of faith, in Rom. viii. 31 sqq., led Longinus to place the new covenant is contrasted with that of the old covenant; and no one was better fitted, by reason of experience, than Paul himself, to state and elaborate this contrast. He allows the heathen world to speak for itself, and shows how it had darkened its own understanding (1 Thess. iv. 5; Rom. i. 28, etc.), and given itself up to all manner of vice (Rom. i. 24 sqq.; 1 Thess. iv. 3 sqq.; 1 Cor. v. 10). Israel had this advantage over the heathen world, that it possessed the oracles of God; but it did not keep the law (Rom. ii. 1 sqq.). The whole world failed to get righteousness by the works of the law. He refers the origin of sin to Adam (Rom. v. 12), and death came upon all men through him. Sin, as transgression of the divine law, is enmity against God (Rom. v. 10), and is cited in the inscription of the letter to the heathen world (Rom. i. 24, etc.) and passions (Rom. i. 26, etc.). The law was given because of transgression, and was designed to be a schoolmaster to lead Israel to Christ (Gal. iii. 24). To Israel the promise was given of redemption, and with its fulfilment the reign of grace began (Rom. vi. 14). Grace excludes works (Rom. xi. 6), and righteousness henceforth is a gift (Rom. iii. 24). The mediator of grace is Christ. The two facts in Christ's life most prominent before Paul's mind are his resurrection and glorification. He was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4), who, after that event, etc., and into Judaism, etc.), Hebraistic combinations (respect of persons, προσωποληπθη, Rom. ii. 11, etc.), turns of expression (1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21), parallelism of clauses (1 Cor. ii. 7), of the psalm of trusting love (1 Cor. xiii.), and the noble dithyramb of faith, in Rom. viii. 31 sqq., led Longinus to place the new covenant is contrasted with that of the old covenant; and no one was better fitted, by reason of experience, than Paul himself, to state and elaborate this contrast. He allows the heathen world to speak for itself, and shows how it had darkened its own understanding (1 Thess. iv. 5; Rom. i. 28, etc.), and given itself up to all manner of vice (Rom. i. 24 sqq.; 1 Thess. iv. 3 sqq.; 1 Cor. v. 10). Israel had this advantage over the heathen world, that it possessed the oracles of God; but it did not keep the law (Rom. ii. 1 sqq.). The whole world failed to get righteousness by the works of the law. He refers the origin of sin to Adam (Rom. v. 12), and death came upon all men through him. Sin, as transgression of the divine law, is enmity against God (Rom. v. 10), and is cited in the inscription of the letter to the heathen world (Rom. i. 24, etc.) and passions (Rom. i. 26, etc.). The law was given because of transgression, and was designed to be a schoolmaster to lead Israel to Christ (Gal. iii. 24). To Israel the promise was given of redemption, and with its fulfilment the reign of grace began (Rom. vi. 14). Grace excludes works (Rom. xi. 6), and righteousness henceforth is a gift (Rom. iii. 24). The mediator of grace is Christ. The two facts in Christ's life most prominent before Paul's mind are his resurrection and glorification. He was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4), who, after that event, etc., and into Judaism, etc.), Hebraistic combinations (respect of persons, προσωποληπθη, Rom. ii. 11, etc.), turns of expression (1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21), parallelism of clauses (1 Cor. ii. 7), of the psalm of trusting love (1 Cor. xiii.), and the noble dithyramb of faith, in Rom. viii. 31 sqq., led Longinus to place the new covenant is contrasted with that of the old covenant; and no one was better fitted, by reason of experience, than Paul himself, to state and elaborate this contrast. He allows the heathen world to speak for itself, and shows how it had darkened its own understanding (1 Thess. iv. 5; Rom. i. 28, etc.), and given itself up to all manner of vice (Rom. i. 24 sqq.; 1 Thess. iv. 3 sqq.; 1 Cor. v. 10). Israel had this advantage over the heathen world, that it possessed the
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Chronology of the Life and Writings of the Apostle Paul.

Paul's conversion 57

Sojourn in Arabia 57–60

First journey to Jerusalem after his conversion (Gal. i. 18); sojourn at Tarsus, and afterward at Antioch (Acts x. 29) 59

Second journey to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas, to relieve the famine 60

Paul's first great missionary journey, with Barnabas and Mark; Cyprus, Antioch in Paphus, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe; return to Antioch in Syria 60–49

Apostolic council at Jerusalem; conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christianity; Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, with Barnabas and Thecla (Acts xv. 39), resolution of the difficulty; agreement between the Jewish and Gentile apostles; Paul's return to Antioch; his collision with Peter and Barnabas at Iconium; temporary separation from the latter 60

Paul's second missionary journey; from Antioch to Asia Minor, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Troas, and Greece (Philippi, Thessalonica, Berenice, Athens, and Corinth). From this tour dates the Christianization of Europe 61

Paul at Corinth (a year and a half); First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians 62, 58

Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem (spring); short stay at Antioch; his third missionary tour (autumn) 54

Paul at Ephesus (three years); Epistle to the Galatians (56 or 57); excursion to Macedonia, Corinth, and Crete (not mentioned in the Acts); First Epistle to the Corinthians (spring, 67); return to Ephesus; First Epistle to the Corinthians (spring, 67) 54–57

Paul's departure from Ephesus (summer) to Macedonia 61

Second Epistle to the Corinthians 57

Paul's third sojourn at Corinth (three months); Epistle to the Romans 57, 58

Paul's fifth and last journey to Jerusalem (spring), where he is arrested and sent to Tarsus 58

Paul's captivity at Cesarea: testimony before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa (the Gospel according to the Acts commenced at Cesarea, and concluded at Rome) 58–60

Paul's voyage to Rome (autumn); shipwreck at Malta 60

Paul's arrival at Rome (spring, 61) 60, 61

Paul's first captivity at Rome; Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon, Titus, and Jude (61–63)

Confutation at Rome (July); Neronian persecution of the Christians; martyrdom of Paul 64

Hypothesis of a second Roman captivity, and preceding missionary journeys to the East, and possibly to Spain; First Epistle to Timothy; Second Epistle to Timothy; Second Timothy 63–67
PAUL is the name of five popes.—Paul I. (757–767) was raised to the papal throne, April 26, 757, at the death of his brother, Pope Stephen II. He was supported by the Frankish party, and followed his elevation with a letter to Pippin, the Frankish king, asking him to confirm his election. He promised “to hear and yield to your holy and mighty protection.” The hostile attitude of Desiderius, king of the Lombards, soon made this aid necessary. Desiderius laid hands upon the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, which had placed themselves under the protection of the Frankish king and the Pope, and refused to deliver Bologna and other cities to the papal see. With the aid of France, Paul secured most of his demands, but practised a double-faced policy with Desiderius to do it. Paul lived in constant anxiety lest the Byzantine emperor should form an alliance with the Lombards or Pippin. He died June 26, 767. See his Life, in Liber pontif. (Muratori, Rer. Ital. iii., 172 sq.), his Letters, in Migne (vol. lxxxix.) and JAFFÉ (Bibl. rer. Germ., pp. 67 sq.); JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif.; BARONIUS: Annales, the Histories of the city of Rome of Redon and Gregorovius; HEFEL: Conciliengeesch., vol. iii. pp. 420, 431 sqq. (2d ed.).—FABRY (p. 143–147), whose civil name was Pietro Barbo, a nephew of Pope Innocent IV., was b. in Venice, Feb. 26, 1418; d. July 26, 1471. After occupying various positions of ecclesiastical dignity, he was made cardinal-priest of St. Mark’s, Venice, by Nicholas V., and on Aug. 30, 1464, unanimously chosen pope. He was obliged to sign a document, pledging himself to do away with nepotism, continue the war against the Turks, call an oecumenical council, and put down plots against his life. His opposition to the Humanists led him to pass the ridiculous measure commanding the Romans to confine the education of their children to reading and writing. His tastes were luxurious; and his introduction of public carnivals, horse-races, etc., tended to corrupt the morals of the city. From March 17, 1534, to Feb. 17, 1547, Paul was supported by the Prankish party, and refused to deliver Bologna and Beneventum, which had placed themselves under the protection of the Lombards, soon made this aid necessary. Paul, being made pope; was again unsuccessful at the death of Hadrian VI. (1523), but secured the prize at the death of Clement VII., and at his suggestion. Alexander’s ability to secure the favor of one pope after another is a sufficient evidence of his diplomatic endowments. His election as pope occurred Oct. 13, 1534, and was in spite of his transgression of the rule of celibacy. He had four children, one of whom, Pier Luigi, became notorious for his debauched habits. Alexander adopted the name of Paul III., and soon after his promotion, Dec. 18, 1534, gave his grandchildren (Alexander Farnese, a boy of fourteen, and Guido Ascanius Sforza, a boy of sixteen) cardinal’s hats. The remonstrance of the emperor the Pope answered by saying that boys had been appointed cardinals in the cradle. The bad impression created by this act was counteracted by the speedy admission of learned and devoted ecclesiastics to the college of cardinals, such as Contarini, Pole, and Sadolet. The Pope declared in favor of an oecumenical council to correct the abuses of the church, and stem the tide of the Reformation, and, encouraged by the emperor, issued a bull (June 2, 1536) for its convention at Mantua. The Duke of Mantua declining to receive the council unless all the expenses were paid by the Pope, it was appointed for May 1, 1538, at Vicenza. In June, 1538, he secured the conclusion of a peace between Charles V. and Francis I. at Nice. In 1536 Paul appointed a commission to prepare a programme for the council, which included thirty propositions for the reformation of the church (constitutum de emendanda ecclesia). These propositions, which were not received with favor, were translated by Luther into German (1538), with preface and notes, who, ignorant of the good intentions of the commissioners, calls them “distracted fellows, who want to reform the church with the tails of foxes.” Paul’s deep interest in the proposed council is vouched for by the excommunication of Henry VIII. of England (July 12, 1535), his Letters, in Migne (vol. lxxxix.) and SADOLET. The Pope declared in favor of an oecumenical council to correct the abuses of the church, and stem the tide of the Reformation, and, encouraged by the emperor, issued a bull (June 2, 1536) for its convention at Mantua. The Duke of Mantua declining to receive the council unless all the expenses were paid by the Pope, it was appointed for May 1, 1538, at Vicenza. In June, 1538, he secured the conclusion of a peace between Charles V. and Francis I. at Nice. In 1536 Paul appointed a commission to prepare a programme for the council, which included thirty propositions for the reformation of the church (constitutum de emendanda ecclesia). These propositions, which were not received with favor, were translated by Luther into German (1538), with preface and notes, who, ignorant of the good intentions of the commissioners, calls them “distracted fellows, who want to reform the church with the tails of foxes.” Paul’s deep interest in the proposed council is vouched for by the excommunication of Henry VIII. of England (July 12, 1535), after he had declared against the council in two tracts. The Pope was intensely loyal to his family, and got into wars and controversies in the endeavor to promote the interests of his grandchildren and nephews. The refusal of Perugia to pay a salt tax which he levied, called forth from him in 1540 an interdict, and was punished with the army he sent out under his son. In 1540 he confirmed the order of Ignatius Loyola, which helped him to check the progress of Protestantism by violent measures. But he did not give up the idea of settling matters through a council, sent delegates to the dispute at Worms (1540, 1541), and Cardinal Contarini to the Colloquy of Regensburg. In consequence of a meeting between the Pope and the emperor at Lucca, the proposed council was appointed for Nov. 1, 1541, at Trent. This delay afforded time for the conversion of Zwingli, and, by checking the spread of heresy. Cardinal Caraffa proposed that all heresies should be crushed from Rome as a centre; and Paul, acting upon the idea, issued the bull Licet ab initio (July 21, 1542), and appointed a tribunal of inquisitors, with headquarters at Rome, whose office it was to extirpate
heresy. It was the aim of Charles V. to gain Paul's confidence. This he failed to do when he refused to pay Paul's price,—the transfer of Milan to his nephew Ottavio Farnese. Paul threatened to lay his hands on Parma and Piacenza, but Charles was prevailed upon to refer the matter to another papal legate. The intrigues went on; the Pope's policy, looking to the enrichment of his family, finally suffering a severe defeat. Charles V. was obliged to conclude the compact at the Augsburg diet (1548) on his own responsibility. Paul consented to three of the articles—granting to the Protessants dispensation concerning celibacy, the gift of the cup, and fasting—was secured; but Charles had to agree to refer all future measures of Reformation to a committee of prelates at Rome. The intrigues went on; the Pope's policy, looking to the enrichment of his family, finally suffering a severe defeat. Charles refused to give up Piacenza, and determined to lay his hand upon Parma. Paul resolved to claim the cities which he could not secure for his family for the papal see, but died during the progress of the intrigues. Venetian, Spanish, and French diplomats represent Paul's prominent traits as cunning, foresight, tenacity in the execution of his plans, but irresoluteness at the critical moment. The Protestant historian will deem it a mark of the Divine Providence over the affairs of the Reformation, that the emperor placed such mighty impediments in the way of the progress of the papal plans for the suppression of Protestantism.


**R. ZOEPPFEL.**

Paul IV. (1555-59), an energetic and violent opponent of the Reformation, whose civil name was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa; of a noble Neapolitan family; was b. June 26, 1579; d. at Rome, Aug. 18, 1559. He enjoyed the favor of his uncle, Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa, who opened to him the way to ecclesiastical promotion. Julius II. made him bishop of Chieti (Theate) in 1504, and used him for political missions. Leo X. despatched him as papal legate to England to demand the payment of Peter's pence, and to Spain to induce Ferdinand to form a general alliance of Christian princes against the Turks. The second mission was unsuccessful; but Caraffa secured the Spanish king's favor, and received the appointment of vice grand chaplain, which he held for several years. Soon after the king's death he returned to Italy, and after 1520 resided in Rome. He was one of the commission of eight appointed by Leo X. to destroy the hydra of heresy, but was disappointed in its failure to take energetic measures. He was a member of the Oratory of the Divine Love, which developed into the order of the Theatines. Caraffa, true to his profession, set the example in renouncing worldly possessions. In 1527 he was in Venice, and began the rôle of a violent enemy of the heretics, which he pursued for thirty years. In a letter to the Pope, he said, "Heretics are heretics, and must be treated as such," etc. Paul III. made him cardinal; and he soon took sides in the conclave against the party led by Contarini, which was in favor of mild and conciliatory measures towards the Protestants. After Contarini's failure to come to any agreement with the Protestants at the Regensburg Colloquy (1541), the radical party at Rome secured the preponderance of influence. Caraffa was energetic in spying out any indications of the Reformation in Italy; and by the bull *Licet ab initio* promulgated July 21, 1542, the Holy Office of the Inquisition was established at Rome. Caraffa threw all his force into it. His elevation to the papal throne, May 23, 1555, enabled him to carry out his plans fully, covering Italy with a network of Inquisition offices. He extended his efforts in opposition to the Reformation, to Spain, France, and England; and the order of the Jesuits was favored by him to such an extent, that he was hailed as its second founder (Orlandini, i. 15). His last dying words to the cardinals assembled at his death-bed were in commendation of the Inquisition. His death was hailed with jubilation by the people, who stormed the house of the Inquisition (freeing the prisoners), broke his statue, and dragged the head through the streets. But the next day all Rome thronged to see the remains of the great Pope, who had impressed the stamp of his mind and will upon the future history of the Papacy. See notices of the early lives of Paul in BRUMATO: *Storia di Paolo IV.*, Ravenna, 1748-63, 2 vols. Very important is the manuscript work, *Vita e gesti di G. Caraffa*, in the British Museum, etc. RANKE: *History of the Popes* (an excellent description of his character...
and work). [See also the Histories of the Reformation of Fisher, Benkath.

Paul V. (1605–21), whose civil name was Camillus Borghese, was b. Sept. 17, 1552, at Rome; studied philosophy at Perugia, and law at Padua; d. Jan. 28, 1621, at Rome. He was made cardinal in 1590 by Clement VIII., in recognition of his service as papal legate in Spain, and afterward as delegate in France. He was elected pope, May 18, 1605. He endeavored to increase the authority of the papal throne, but, instead, weakened it. In the controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans over the work of the Jesuit Molina (see art.), he decided in favor of the former. He placed Venice under an interdict (April 17, 1606) on account of the State's interference in ecclesiastical matters (imprisonment of two priests, etc.). Paolo Sarpi, as well as the Senator Quirino, opposed the assumptions of Rome in able writings; and all the orders, with the exception of the Jesuits, Theatines, and Capuchins, refused obedience. Services of the communion were dispensed, and the refractory orders banished. The Pope endeavored to excite Spain to a crusade against the refractory State. The measure miscarried, and the Pope was obliged to submit. The State refused to acknowledge the justice of the interdict, or to deliver up the prisoners; but Cardinal Joyeuse, who conducted the proceedings, made the sign of the cross secretly, with his hand concealed behind his baretta, in order to give out that the papal censures had been recalled, and dispensation granted in the usual way. This was the last papal interdict. Paul succeeded, too, in getting worsted in his relations with England when he forbade the Catholics to take the oath of allegiance, and with France after the murder of Henry IV. The Jesuit Mariana's work, condemning the murder of tyrannical kings, was burned by the public hangman, by order of the French Parliament; and Bellarmin's work, written in the same spirit, against the king of England, was, by an act of Parliament, forbidden to be sold in the land. The work which Paul commissioned Suarez to write against the English king was publicly burned by order of James I. of England, but was successful in making the Pope look into the affairs of the church. St. Peter's was finished by Carlo Maderno, by his order, and the great palace of Borghese built by his gifts. The city of Rome owed the repair of its water-works to him, as did also the Vatican Library its enlargement. Exempt from moral stain, he approached close to Fius IX. in his willingness to be apotheosized, and allowed himself to be called "Vicet-God." See Bzovius: Vita Paulus V., Rome, 1625; Platina: Historia Pontif., Cologne, 1826; Ciaconius: Vita et res gestae Pontif. Rom., Rome, 1877; Gardiner: History of England, 1838–46, Lond.; Historia, 1847; Fischer, etc. Weitere Entwicklung und themistisch-molinitischen Contrerse, Freib.-Br., 1880. R. Zopfpepfel.

PAUL, Father (Paolo Sarpi). See Sarpi.

PAUL OF SAMOSATA. See Monarchianism, p. 1542.

PAUL THE DEACON. See Monastery, p. 1551.

PAUL, Vincent de. See Vincent de Paul.

PAUL THE DEACON, son of Warnefried, the historian of the Lombards; was b. about 720 or 725; d. April 18, probably in the year 800. He conducted the education of Adelberga, daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius. He entered the clerical order, and became the friend of Charlemagne, at whose court he remained for some time. In 787 he returned to his former cloister at Monte Casino, Italy. Paul was versatitle as a writer. From one of his poems on John the Baptist, Guido of Arezzo got names for the notes:

> "Urqueat laixs\* Re-somare fibris\* Mi-1a gentorum\* Fa-nul tuorum\* Scot-vd potillum\* La-bil reatum\* Sancte Joannes."

His historical works are a Life of Gregory the Great (a compilation from Beda, and Gregory's own writings), Gesta episcoporum Mettensium (a History of Rome down to the time of Justinian, written for Adelberga), and especially a History of the Lombards to Liudprand's death (744), which preserves many valuable popular traditions. German translations of the last work by Spruner (Hamb., 1838) and Abel (Berlin, 1849); Dahn: Des Paulus Diaconus Leben und Schriften, 1870; Wattenbach: Deutschland's Geschichtsguellen, 4th ed., Berlin, 1877.

PAULA, a Roman lady of the highest rank and of great wealth; married, and mother to four children; settled, after the death of her husband Toxotius, most of her property on her children, and followed Jerome to the Holy Land, where she founded a monastery, nunnery, and hospital at Bethlehem, and spent her life in devotional practices. She died in 404, and is commemorated by the Roman-Catholic Church on Jan. 26; See Act. Sanct. Bull., Jan. 26.

PAULICIANS, a dualistic sect of the Orient, whose name was derived from their respect for the apostle Paul, rather than from their third leader, the Armenian Paul, as Photius and Petrus Siculo confirm.

History. — The founder of the sect was a certain Constantine, who hailed from Mananalis, a dualistic community near Samosata. He studied the Gospels and Epistles, combined dualistic and Christian doctrines, and, upon the basis of the former, vigorously opposed the formalism of the church. Regarding himself as called to restore the pure Christianity of Paul, he adopted the name Silvanus, one of Paul's disciples, and became the head of the sect, which he carried with him to Episparis. He died in 715, leaving two sons, Gennadius (whom he had appointed his successor) and Theodore. The latter, giving out that he had received the Holy Ghost, rose up against Gennadius, but was burned to death in 740 (the punishment pronounced upon the Manicheans). The adherents of the sect fled, with the Armenian Paul at their head, to Episparis. He died in 715, leaving two sons, Gennadius (whom he had appointed his successor) and Theodore. The latter, giving out that he had received the Holy Ghost, rose up against Gennadius, but was burned to death. Gennadius was taken to Constantinople, appeared before Leo the Isaurian, was declared innocent of heresy, returned to Episparis, but, fearing danger, went with his adherents to Mananalis. His death
of the empty and vain heresy of the Manichseans, of peace were not accepted, the war was renewed, arranged for their exchange. His sojourn of nine months among the Paulicians gave him an opportunity to collect many facts, which he preserved in his "History of the empty and vain heresy of the Manichceans, otherwise called Paulicians". The propositions of peace were not accepted, the war was renewed, and Chrysocrates killed. The power of the Paulicians was broken. In 970 the emperor, John Tzimisces, transferred some of them to Philipopolis in Thrace, and, as a reward for their services, granted them religious freedom. This was the beginning of a revival of the sect; but it was true to the organization, ascetic practices, etc., forbid this opinion. [The Seventh Council of Twin (719) forbade all intercourse with them.]

PAULINUS OF AQUILEJA, one of the ornamentsof the Carolingian period; was b. in Friuli, Italy; d. about 802. Elevated by Charlemagne in 787 to the patriarchal chair of Aquileia, he took an active part in the ecclesiastical controversies of the day, and was one of Charlemagne's chief counselors in matters of ecclesiastical concern. He took part in the synods of Regensburg (792) and Frankfurt (794) against the Adoptionists, and in 796 held a provincial synod, at Forum Julii, against the Greek doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit and the Adoptionists. The acts of the last synod are given in Mansi and Hefele. Alcuin, who was very intimate with Paulinus, never wearied of his praises. Paulinus left behind him a number of Letters to Charlemagne, Leo III., and Heistulf (at one time ascribed to Stephen V.), who murdered his wife on the suspicion of adultery, and the following works: Sacræsylabus contra Elipandum (a statement against Adoptionism); Libri tres contra Felicem, Lib. exhortationis seu de salutaribus argumentis (a work dedicated to Henry, Duke of Friuli, enumerating the vices he should avoid, and the virtues he should practise, and at one time ascribed to Augustine); a tract on the "Institutum" of Sergius; and a tract to him by the Histoire littéraire de la France, and some poems, among which, a statement of faith in the Trinity and Incarnation, under the title De regula Jideimetrica, etc., deserves special mention. The works of Paulinus have been edited, with a Life, by MANSIUS (Venice, 1730) and MIGNON, Pat. Lat. xgix. HERZOG.
PAULINUS. Pontius Meropius Anicius, usually called Nolusus, from the town of which he was bishop; a devoted ecclesiastic; was b. at Bordeaux, 353; d. June 22, 431. He belonged to one of the noblest and richest families of the land, and inherited such vast wealth, that Augustine (De civit. Dei, i. 10) could speak of him as opulentissimus dices. His youth was spent in the pursuit of pleasure. In 379 he was consul, and might have occupied the most distinguished civil positions. But turning his thoughts seriously to religious concerns, and under the influence of Martin of Tours, and Ambrose, he determined upon a clerical life, and separated from his wife Therasia, and with her full consent. In 383 or 384 he was made presbyter at Barcelona, and relinquished his wealth, but, retaining a certain control over it, dispensed it in charities,—building hospitals for monks and the poor, in constructing extensive water-works for Nola, etc. Martin of Tours, Augustine, and Jerome applauded his self-denial and devotion. He lived humbly, and established strict ascetic habits. In 394 Paulinus made Nola his home, and was subsequently (409, according to Tillemont) chosen his bishop. Of Paulinus' writings there are preserved fifty letters to friends (Augustine, etc.), and thirty poems. Some of his letters contain valuable notices of the church architecture of the day, and the celebration of the Agape. (See Augusti: Beiträge zur christl. Kunsgeschichte, i. 147-170.)

PAULINUS OF YORK came to England to the original band were Redemptorists, who at their establishment were called Nolanus, from the town of which he was Dialconus at Leonberg, was not only a rationalist, but at one time had doubts about the resurrection. In order, if possible, to satisfy those doubts, he asked his wife on her death-bed to appear to him in bodily form after her death. This she did, so that her husband saw, or thought he saw, her with her body upon her: she became such an ardent advocate of spiritualistic visions, that he was deposed, in 1771, from his office, "on account of his absurd and fanciful divine visions" (ob absurdas phantasmagoricas visiones divinas). Young Paulus was brought up with stern severity; entered the seminary at Tubingen, where he graduated in 1784, and then became teacher at Schorndorf. His intense application to study necessitated a prolonged vacation (1787, 1788), which he spent in travel through Germany, Holland, England, and France. In 1788 he was called to the chair of Oriental languages at Jena.

The period of rationalism can hardly produce a theologian who gave a more characteristic display of rationalistic tendencies than Paulus. The views he held as a young man he continued to hold in his old age. As a youth, he understood by righteousness intellectual probity, and by faith honesty of conviction; and just before his death he said, "I am justified in the sight of God by my desire of that which is good." He conceived of religion as the intellectual knowledge of God. All definitions which associated it with the emotional nature, or regarded it as an act of immediate consciousness, he discarded, as savoring of pietism, mysticism, etc. Paulus did not succeed as professor of Oriental languages, and at Doderlein's death (1789) he was transferred to the chair of exegetical theology. He was, however, exceedingly busy as a student and author, and published, among other writings, the Philological Key to the Psalms (Philologische Clavis über die Psalmen), 1791 [2d ed., Heidelberg, 1815], and Philological Key to Isaiah, 1793; a critical commentary on the New Testament (Philologisch-Kritischer Com. über d. N. Test.), in three parts, 1800-04; and an edition of Spinoza's works (1802 sq., 2 vols.). His labors upon the Old Testament, in 403, 404, 405, and 406, press upon the Old Testament, and the principles which he sought to carry out in his criticism of the New Testament created a decided sensation. The so-called natural explanation of the miracles of Christ is indelibly associated with his name. This method of interpretation stood in close connection with his philosophical principle, which measures facts by the conception of their possibility. It is impossible that one who was really dead should rise again: therefore Christ was only apparently dead when he lay in the sepulchre. Christ could not walk on the lake — that is an impossibility; and the Gospels mean that he walked on the shore of the lake. No rationalist of our day who lays claim to exegetical culture can read such interpretations without smiling. The remark is attributed to a well-known philologist, that "the theologians are creating exegetical miracles in order to do away with the biblical miracles." It was Lavater, and none of the sages of rationalism, who resented the ridiculous hypothesis that Christ walked on the shore, and not on the lake itself.

"We dare not pronounce such interpretations of afterwards became at Jena and Würzburg; d. Aug. 10, 1851, in Heidelberg. His father, who was Dialconus at Leonberg, was not only a rationalist, but at one time had doubts about the resurrection. In order, if possible, to satisfy those doubts, he asked his wife on her death-bed to appear to him in bodily form after her death. This she did, so that her husband saw, or thought he saw, her with her body upon her; she became such an ardent advocate of spiritualistic visions, that he was deposed, in 1771, from his office, "on account of his absurd and fanciful divine visions" (ob absurdas phantasmagoricas visiones divinas). Young Paulus was brought up with stern severity; entered the seminary at Tubingen, where he graduated in 1784, and then became teacher at Schorndorf. His intense application to study necessitated a prolonged vacation (1787, 1788), which he spent in travel through Germany, Holland, England, and France. In 1788 he was called to the chair of Oriental languages at Jena.

The period of rationalism can hardly produce a theologian who gave a more characteristic display of rationalistic tendencies than Paulus. The views he held as a young man he continued to hold in his old age. As a youth, he understood by righteousness intellectual probity, and by faith honesty of conviction; and just before his death he said, "I am justified in the sight of God by my desire of that which is good." He conceived of religion as the intellectual knowledge of God. All definitions which associated it with the emotional nature, or regarded it as an act of immediate consciousness, he discarded, as savoring of pietism, mysticism, etc. Paulus did not succeed as professor of Oriental languages, and at Doderlein's death (1789) he was transferred to the chair of exegetical theology. He was, however, exceedingly busy as a student and author, and published, among other writings, the Philological Key to the Psalms (Philologische Clavis über die Psalmen), 1791 [2d ed., Heidelberg, 1815], and Philological Key to Isaiah, 1793; a critical commentary on the New Testament (Philologisch-Kritischer Com. über d. N. Test.), in three parts, 1800-04; and an edition of Spinoza's works (1802 sq., 2 vols.). His labors upon the Old Testament, in 403, 404, 405, and 406, press upon the Old Testament, and the principles which he sought to carry out in his criticism of the New Testament created a decided sensation. The so-called natural explanation of the miracles of Christ is indelibly associated with his name. This method of interpretation stood in close connection with his philosophical principle, which measures facts by the conception of their possibility. It is impossible that one who was really dead should rise again: therefore Christ was only apparently dead when he lay in the sepulchre. Christ could not walk on the lake — that is an impossibility; and the Gospels mean that he walked on the shore of the lake. No rationalist of our day who lays claim to exegetical culture can read such interpretations without smiling. The remark is attributed to a well-known philologist, that "the theologians are creating exegetical miracles in order to do away with the biblical miracles." It was Lavater, and none of the sages of rationalism, who resented the ridiculous hypothesis that Christ walked on the shore, and not on the lake itself.

"We dare not pronounce such interpretations of
the plainest statements foolish and insolent, for our very tolerant generation would declare that it would be very unjust to think of such a thing; but I would like, in all modesty, to ask these philological illuminators, whether a single philologist for the last seventeen hundred years can be found who stumbled upon the idea of translating the words "Jesus walked upon the sea" by "near the sea, on the shore," but whether, indeed, the three evangelists intended to teach that Jesus was nothing more than a man who springs suddenly from his seat, and without sinking in deep devotion before him. The results he produced are to be explained by natural causes, some of the circumstances of the day, which he denounced, was the miracle of the Christ is Christ himself,—his person. The miraculous feature of Christ's moral character was decreasing. In 1807 Paulus went to Bamberg as school director, in 1808 to Nürnberg, and in 1810 to Anachab, to fill a similar position. He longed to be again connected with a university; and in 1811 his wish was gratified by a call to the chair of church history at Heidelberg, where he remained during the rest of his life. At Heidelberg, Paulus was very active. His lectures spread over the whole field of Old and New Testament criticism. His publications, which were numerous, are enumerated by Keichlin-Meldegg. His most important work of this period was his Life of Jesus as a Basis for a History of Early Christianity (Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristenums), Heidelberg, 1828, 2 vols. A learned supplement to it was offered in his Commentary on the Three First Gospels (Ezechgetisches Handbuch über d. drei ersten Evangelien). Heidelberg, 1830–33, 3 vols. Paulus acknowledged the miraculous feature of Christ's moral character; but we are not weary of repeating against me! Believe me, that I never look up to the Holy One on the cross without sinking in deep devotion before him. No, he is not a mere man, as other men. He was an extraordinary phenomenon, altogether peculiar in his character, elevated high above the whole humanities and literature. But I would like, in all modesty, to ask these philological illuminators, whether a single philologist for the last seventeen hundred years can be found who stumbled upon the idea of translating the words "Jesus walked upon the sea" by "near the sea, on the shore," but whether, indeed, the three evangelists intended to teach that Jesus was nothing more than a man who springs suddenly from his seat, and without sinking in deep devotion before him. But he continued to be active, and in his eightieth year proposed to found a new periodical, The Sophronion. The philosophical method of thought had changed, but Paulus remained the same. He still believed in his "intellectual faith" (Denkgläuben). One of his colleagues trenchantly explained the meaning of this when he said such an intellectual believer is one who "thinks he believes, and believes he thinks. There was neither thought nor faith in this intellectual faith." To the day, I wish, we walk on terra firma. Wonderful statement! Oh, most marvellous of miracles!

In 1803 Paulus left Jena, not much regretted, to accept the chair of theology at Würzburg. The effort was being made, of rendering this institution a distinguished centre of the new rationalism. Schelling and Hufeland had already been called: Voss and Schleiermacher were to be. A good deal was expected from Paulus, especially in his lectures on theological encyclopaedia; but disappointment came quickly. The Catholic students all left, and the number of the Protestants was decreasing. In 1807 Paulus went to Bamberg as school director, in 1808 to Nürnberg, and in 1810 to Anachab, to fill a similar position. He longed to be again connected with a university; and in 1811 his wish was gratified by a call to the chair of church history at Heidelberg, where he remained during the rest of his life. At Heidelberg, Paulus was very active. His lectures spread over the whole field of Old and New Testament criticism. His publications, which were numerous, are enumerated by Keichlin-Meldegg. His most important work of this period was his Life of Jesus as a Basis for a History of Early Christianity (Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristenums), Heidelberg, 1828, 2 vols. A learned supplement to it was offered in his Commentary on the Three First Gospels (Ezechgetisches Handbuch über d. drei ersten Evangelien). Heidelberg, 1830–33, 3 vols. Paulus acknowledged the miraculous feature of Christ's moral character; but we are not weary of repeating against me! Believe me, that I never look up to the Holy One on the cross without sinking in deep devotion before him. No, he is not a mere man, as other men. He was an extraordinary phenomenon, altogether peculiar in his character, elevated high above the whole humanities and literature. But I would like, in all modesty, to ask these philological illuminators, whether a single philologist for the last seventeen hundred years can be found who stumbled upon the idea of translating the words "Jesus walked upon the sea" by "near the sea, on the shore," but whether, indeed, the three evangelists intended to teach that Jesus was nothing more than a man who springs suddenly from his seat, and without sinking in deep devotion before him. But he continued to be active, and in
settled over the Second Congregational Parish in
Portland, near the close of 1807. Here he continued
labor with extraordinary zeal and success,
until his death, at the age of forty-four. Dr. Pay-
sont was a highly gifted man intellectually and
spiritually, and left his mark upon American
piety. His Life, which had a very wide circula-
tion both in this country and in Great Britain,
earned for him the name of the "Hungarian Cicero.

As a Writer. — In the sixteenth century the
Catholic Church was much demoralized
in Hungary, both intellectually and financially.
The clergy were dissolve. He had to build up
from the foundation. His first care was to pro-
vide the church with well-trained ecclesiastics.
Theological and other schools were
established in many places, and richly endow-
ed. The clergy were dissolute. He had to buildup
the finances of the State and the church. He
was of a melancholy temperament, and not with-
out morbid tendencies, which mar somewhat the
influence of his example; but, notwithstanding
this drawback, the records of his religious expe-
rience and pastoral labors are so full of impos-
sioned love for Christ and love for the souls of
men, so inspired by seraphic devotion and all
holy sympathies, so illumined by light from
heaven, that no one can easily read them without
being stimulated to a better life. His fine nat-
ural traits — sportive humor, ready mother-wit,
facetious pleasantry, and keen sense of the ridicu-
ous — rendered him a delightful companion, and
in the centre of attraction alike in his home and in
society. Just before his death he dictated a letter
to his sister, which is one of the gems of religious
literature. Here are the opening sentences:

"Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bun-
yan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah,
stay here for some weeks a happy inhabit-
ant. The Celestial City is full in my view. Its glo-
ries beam upon me, its breezes fan me, its odors are
wondrous, its sounds strike upon my ear, and its
spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing separates
me from the river of death, which now ap-
ppears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed
at a single step, whenever God shall give permission.
The Sun of righteousness has been gradually draw-
ing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter
as he approached, and now he fills the whole heaven-
sphere, pouring forth a flood of glory, in which I
seem to float like an insect in the beams of the sun,
exciting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on this
excessive brightness."

LIT. — The Complete Works of Edward Payson
in 8 vols. 8vo, Portland, 1846. This edition con-
tains the Memoir by Dr. Asa Cummings, first pub-
lished in 1829; Payson's Select Thoughts, edit-
ded by his eldest daughter, Mrs. Hopkins; and
his life by G. L. Prentiss.

PÁZMÁNY, Peter, the most distinguished
Catholic prelate of Hungary; was b. Oct. 4, 1570,
at Grosswardein; d. at Presburg, March 19, 1637.
His parents, who were Calvinists, sent him to the
Jesuit college at Kolozsvár. At the age of seven
he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was
made a Jesuit by his eldest daughter, Mrs. Hopkins; and
in 1636, he was made cardinal.

As an Ecclesiastic. — At the appearance of Pá-
zmány the Catholic Church was much demoralized
in Hungary, both intellectually and financially.
The clergy were dissolve. He had to build up on
the foundations. His first care was to pro-
vide the church with well-trained ecclesiastics.
That Europe possesses one Protestant nation less than she has is due to
the zeal and ability of Pázmány. See FRANKL:
Pázmány Péter és kora (P. Pázmány and his Times),
 Pest, 1868-72, 3 vols.: KAUKOFFER: P. Pázmány,
Cardinal, Vienna, 1866. FRANZ BALOGH.

PEABODY, George, an illustrious philan-
thropist, descended from New-England Puritans,
who came to the United States in 1630. He
resided in Danvers, Mass., which now bears
the name of Peabody, Feb. 18, 1795; and d. in
London, Nov. 4, 1869. He was employed as a
boy in a country store; but he soon broke away
from its limitations, and, before he became of
age, had engaged in business at Georgetown, D.C.,
and in 1815 at Baltimore, in a commercial house
which soon established branches at Philadelphia
and New York. He visited England for the first
time in 1827, and was of much service in protect-
ing the financial interests of the State of Mary-
land. He made his permanent home in London
in 1843.

As his fortune increased, he cherished the pur-
pose of devoting a large part of it to the good of
his fellow-men. His generosity first became con-
spicuous when he gave a large sum to enable
exhibitors from the United States to make a suita-
able display in the Universal Exhibition of 1851;
then he made a liberal contribution toward the
expense of the Grinnell expedition, which went in
search of the Arctic explorer, Sir John Franklin;
and in 1852, when the centennial anniversary of
the settlement of his native place was commemo-
rated, he sent to the committee a letter, offering
as a sentiment this maxim, "Education, a debt due
from the present to succeeding generations," and
giving a generous foundation for a local library.

Next came his proposal to establish in Baltimore,
where he had long resided, an institute for the
encouragement of literature and the fine arts.

This was followed, in 1862, by his gift to the poor
of London, which has been employed in building
good dwellings to be rented at low rates to moral,
industrious, and needy persons. This was fol-

duced the election of Ferdinand II. to the throne,
in spite of the herculean efforts of the Protestant
nobles at the Parliament. In 1629 he was made
primate.
led, in 1866, by a noble endowment for the promotion of education in the Southern States of this Union.

The magnitude of these three last-mentioned endowments eclipses several other gifts, which, taken by themselves, would have made his name distinguished. He established a museum of archaeology at Harvard, of natural history at Yale, and endowed an academy of sciences at Salem. He founded a second library in his native town, at North Danvers; built a church at Georgetown, Mass., as a memorial of his mother; and gave liberal sums to Kenyon College (Ohio), Washington and Lee University (Virginia), Phillips Academy (Andover), and to the Maryland and Massachusetts historical societies. He also founded a library in Georgetown, D.C.

He received during his lifetime innumerable tokens of the gratitude of those whose appreciation he valued. The queen, it is said, offered him a baronetcy, and, when it was declined, presented him with her portrait; citizens of London caused a statue by William W. Story to be placed in his honor near the Royal Exchange, while Oxford conferred on him the honorary degree of J.C.D.; while his countrymen, by large assemblies in the places where he had lived, and by other innumerable tokens, manifested their admiration and respect; Harvard conferred on him the degree of LL.D., and Congress caused a gold medal to be struck in his honor.

In all his good deeds George Peabody was as sagacious as he was generous. He gave in his lifetime for worthy objects, and he helped them on with a nice sense of their proportionate value. He gave for purposes in which he was personally interested, and which others had neglected, yet by methods which were likely to incite and call out the co-operation of others. His deeds of trust were prepared with remarkable skill, so as to secure in successive generations excellent managers, and so as to indicate clearly the main purpose of each foundation without fettering it by too many trivial regulations. His endowments are free from narrow sectarian or sectional limitations, but are for the purpose of promoting education in the United States, and for the relief of the poor in England. His trustees were selected with great discrimination. Consequently all his gifts have been well administered, and most of them are of increasing value. They have also suggested other benefactions. It is certain, for example, that the bequest of Johns Hopkins for a university in Baltimore was quickened by the example of his former townsman; and the John F. Slater Fund, for the education of freedmen, was indirectly due to the success of the Peabody Fund. His interest in every place where he had resided—Danvers, Thetford, Georgetown, Baltimore, and London—was shown by some endowment.

Mr. Peabody was never married. He was hospitable and patriotic, and during his residence in England, from 1820 to 1829, he was promoting a good understanding between England and the United States. His habits to the close of life were careful and thrifty; his demeanor was dignified, simple, and affable; he took great pleasure in his benefactions. When he died, his body, after funeral services in Westminster Abbey, was brought to his native land in a British man-of-war, and buried in his native town. The eulogies by Hon. R. C. Winthrop (at the funeral) and by Hon. S. Teackle Wallis in Baltimore are among the best tributes to his memory.

Mr. Wallis closes his address with these words: "Peabody has shown how the rich may keep above their riches by clinging to the treasure of their souls."

It is impossible to give a complete list of his benefactions, but those which are of the most general interest are indicated in the following list:

- Establishment of a trust for the London poor by a gift which has increased (1882) by investments to the sum of $4,000,000
- Establishment of a Southern educational fund (besides, in Mississippi bonds, $1,000,000)
- Foundation of the Peabody Institute, Baltimore (including $1,000,000 in cash, $300,000 in Tennessee bonds, and $100,000 in Virginia bonds), total valued at $1,400,000
- Repeated gifts for libraries in Danvers and Peabody, which amounted to $250,000
- Peabody Museum of Archaeology, Cambridge, Mass., $150,000
- Peabody Museum of Natural History, New Haven, Conn., $150,000
- Peabody Academy of Sciences, Salem, Mass., $140,000
- For a church at George, Exeter, N.H., $100,000
- Kenyon College, $25,000
- Phillips Academy, Andover, $25,000
- Maryland Historical Society, $20,000
- Massachusetts Historical Society, $20,000
- Newburyport, Mass., for a library, $15,000
- United States department in the World's Fair, Georgetown (D.C.) Public Library, $15,000
- Grinnell expedition to the Arctic Ocean, $10,000
- United States Sanitary Commission, $10,000
- Peabody Library, Thetford, Vt., $5,000
- Washington and Lee University, $2,000

Most of the institutions which bear the name of Peabody publish annual reports giving full particulars in respect to their operations. The proceedings of the trustees of the educational fund fill two octavo volumes of several hundred pages each.

D. C. GILMAN.

PEABODY, William Bourne Oliver, D.D., b. at Exeter, N.H., July 9, 1799; d. at Springfield, Mass., May 28, 1847; graduated at Harvard, 1817; studied divinity at Cambridge; and was from October, 1825, Unitarian pastor at Springfield.

"A man of rare accomplishments and consummate virtue," he was one of the most distinguished ornaments of his denomination. He wrote much for the *North American Review*, *Christian Examiner*, and Sparks's *American Biography*, and prepared for the Massachusetts Zoological Survey a Report on the Birds of the Commonwealth, 1859. He was familiar with landscape-gardening, and gave some lectures on scientific topics. His *Sermons*, with a memoir by his twin-brother, appeared, 1849, and his *Literary Remains*, edited by his son, 1860. He published in 1832 a *Catechism in Verse*, with ten lyrics on the seasons, etc., among them, *Behold the Western Evening Light*, and in 1835 *The Springfield Collection of Hymns.*

F. M. BIRD.

PEACE, Kiss of. See *Kiss of Peace*.

PEACE OFFERING. See *Offerings*, p. 1688.

PEARSON, Eliphalet, LL.D., b. in Byfield, a parish in Newbury, Mass., June 11, 1732; d. at Greenland, N.H., Oct. 13, 1798. He entered Harvard College in 1759, and was graduated in 1773.

Soon after graduation he was called to teach a grammar-school at Andover, Mass., the home of

Owing to the loss, on the Arctic, of certain bonds, the recovery of which is still in litigation, the amount of this donation cannot be exactly stated.
his friend Samuel Phillips, afterwards lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts. In 1775 Gov. Phillips was commissioned by the General Court to manufacture gunpowder for the Revolutionary army. In this enterprise he relied very much on the scientific attainments of Pearson. He relied on the same while he laid the foundation of Phillips Academy at Andover. Pearson became the first principal of the academy, and remained in office from 1778 to 1786. He was one of the twelve original trustees, and was the first president of the board who did not belong to the Phillips family.

In 1786 he was called to the professorship of the Hebrew and Oriental languages at Harvard College,—an office for which he was well qualified. He delivered to the students a valuable course of lectures on language. He was eminently successful as a teacher of rhetoric. Occasionally he spent the entire night in correcting the compositions of the students, in order that he might spend the day in the multiplied extra-official duties which were heaped upon him. He labored with rare zeal and tact for the financial as well as literary welfare of the college; he searched the documents which illustrated the claim of the university to certain disputed possessions; examined old deeds in the registry of probate, old notes pertaining to farms, ferries, and bridges, in which the university had, or was thought to have, an interest. For twenty years he was an uncommonly laborious professor in the college; for six years was a leading member of its Board of Fellows, and for a long time performed many of the duties belonging to the president. Among his pupils were some of the most eminent men of the day, such as John Quincy Adams, Judge Story, Presidents Kirkland and Quincy, Drs. William E. Channing and Edward Payson, John Pickering, Alexander H. Everett. It has been often said, that, if Gov. Phillips had lived, Pearson would have been elected president of Harvard College, as successor to Dr. Joseph Willard.

He resigned his office at Cambridge in 1806. He then repaired to Andover, where he gave the first impulse to the formation of the Andover Theological Seminary. He originated its remarkable constitution. He and Dr. Leonard Woods were the main instruments of effecting the union between the seminary planned at Andover and that which had been planned by Dr. Samuel Spring of Newburyport. He rode from Andover to Newburyport thirty-six times for the purpose of consummating that union. He was elected the first professor of sacred literature in the seminary. He was the first president of the Board of Trustees after the theological institution came under its care. He retained the presidency of that board nineteen years,—a longer period than any other one, either before or since his time, has held it. He continued a member of the board forty-eight years.

He was an adept in the fine arts; he possessed remarkable skill and taste in music; he had also an architect's eye and forecast. For many years he had been an industrious member, and also the secretary, of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He had associated mainly with men of letters, of science, and of political renown; he had not addicted himself to the niceties of theological study. Not feeling at home in his Andover professorship, he retained it only one year (1808-09).

His person was noble and commanding: his manners were dignified and courtly. As a teacher, he was dignified and severe. He published a Hebrew grammar and also five pamphlets. He edited two or three important volumes and numerous tracts. He originated the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and was the most conspicuous man in forming the American Education Society. His enterprising spirit made him a pioneer in many great and good works.

EDWARDS A. PARK.

PEARSON, John, b. at Snoring, Feb. 12, 1612; d. at Chester, July 16, 1686. He was educated at Eton, whence he proceeded to King's College, Cambridge, to be there chosen as fellow. He became prebendary of Sarum, 1629; chaplain to Lord-Keeper Finch, and incumbent of Torrington, 1640; minister of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, London, 1650; rector of St. Christopher's, London, prebendary of Ely, archdeacon of Surrey, and master of Jesus College, Cambridge, 1652; and bishop of Chester, 1672. This rapid promotion is accounted for when we find Burnet pronouncing him "in all respects the greatest divine of the age." His reputation stood excessively high in his own day, and it has retained a lofty position in the Church of England ever since; and, if the eulogium from Burnet just quoted be somewhat exaggerated, no one can fairly dissent from the words which follow, in which the historian of his own times speaks of Pearson as "a man of great learning, strong reason, and of a clear judgment." His great work is the Exposition of the Creed (1659), long a text-book with Church-of-England clergymen; and it is praised, not only by the general run of Anglican theologians, but by such men as Dr. Johnson, Dean Milman, and Henry Hallam. Pearson was by no means a high-flown Anglo-Catholic, but a cautious, moderate thinker, citing the Fathers in support of his positions, but nowhere exceeding patristic authority. He must have been moderate in his ecclesiastical opinions, or he would not have retained his lectureship at St. Clement's, Eastcheap, where he delivered during the Commonwealth the theological lectures which formed the basis of his distinguished treatise. The passages in his Exposition of the Creed with regard to the church would not have satisfied Thorndike or Heylin, or even Bishop Bull. He uses strong expressions respecting the atonement, speaking of it as "the punishment which Christ, who was our surety, endured," and as "a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God," and he defines faith as a "spiritual act, and consequently immanent and internal, and known to no man but him that believeth." His perspicuity of style and directness of reasoning are strong recommendations; and his orderly arrangement and compact manner of expression render him very helpful to divinity students.

Next to the Exposition in point of fame is Pearson's Vindiciae Epistolorum S Ignatii (1672). Bentley and Boyle highly esteemed this erudite work: so did Dr. Lardner, who pronounced it "unanswerable." It was very valuable at the time, and so it is still, in a measure; but much
new light has been thrown on the Ignatian Epistles since Pearson's day. Pearson wrote a book entitled *Annales Paulini*; and the posthumous publication of it has been translated by J. M. Williams, Cambridge, 1825. *Minor Theological Works* by the same divine were collected and edited by the late Frederick C. Cross, 1844.

Pearson took part in the proceedings of convocation in 1861, and was one of the commissioners at the Savoy Conference the same year. Baxter describes him as a true logician, disputing "accurately, soberly, and calmly;" "breeding a great respect, and a persuasion, that, if he had been independent, he would have been for peace. Pearson was remiss in his episcopal duties, and for some years before his death sunk into second childhood.

**JOHN STOUGHTON.**

**PECK, George, D.D., Methodist; b. in Middlefield, N.Y., Aug. 3, 1797; d. at Scranton, Penn., May 20, 1878.** He began his ministry (1816) in the Genesee Conference, and experienced those trials which accompany and characterize pioneer work. In 1824 he was appointed presiding elder of the Susquehanna district; in 1835 elected principal of the Oneida Conference Seminary; in 1839 resigned; from 1842 to 1848 edited *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, from 1848 to 1852, *The Christian Advocate* and *Journal*; re-entered the pastorate; from 1858 to 1872 was presiding elder of the Lackawanna district and Wyoming district; was superannuated in 1878. He enjoyed the confidence of his denomination to a high degree. In 1846 he was appointed by the New-York Central Conference a delegate to the General Convention of the Evangelical Alliance in London. He was a delegate to every General Conference from 1824, and was an authority in questions of polity. He was also an effective speaker and eloquent preacher. Among his numerous publications may be mentioned, *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection*, New York, 1842, revised ed., 1848; *Rule of Faith: Appeal from Tradition*, 1844; *Wyoming; its History, Stirring Incidents, and Romantic Adventures*, 1858; *Early Life in the New World*. The *Old Nevada Conference from 1788 to 1888*, 1880; *Life and Times* (autobiography), 1874.

**PECK, Jesse Truesdell, D.D., Methodist-Episcopal bishop; b. at Middlefield, N.Y., April 4, 1811; d. in Syracuse, Thursday, May 17, 1883.** He was licensed as a local preacher in 1829; in 1832 joined the Oneida Conference; from 1837 to 1841 was principal of the gouverneur Wescott Seminary, from 1841 to 1848, of the Troy Conference Seminary at Poultney, Vt.; from 1848 to 1852, president of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn.; pastor of the Foundry Methodist-Episcopal Church, 1852 to 1854. Subsequently, he was secretary of the Tract Society of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and editor of its publications, pastor in New-York City, pastor and presiding elder of the San-Francisco district, pastor in Peekskill, Albany, and New-York City, N.Y. In 1872 he was elected bishop, and distinguished himself in the synodical work of the time. He was secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society. He also was agent (1823) of the American Bible Society, and active in the organization of Sunday-schools. By reason of his advocacy of the plan in 1826, it deserves the epithet of "father" of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, which was organized 1832. In 1827 he established the Rock Spring Seminary (now Shurtleff College); in April, 1829, *The Pioneer*, the first Baptist, perhaps the first religious, newspaper west of the Alleghanies. In 1833 he projected the American Baptist Historical Society. His life was that of a pioneer, and fruitful in good works. He wrote *The Emigrant's Guide*, Boston, 1831 (it induced large emigration); *Gazetteer of Illinois*, Jacksonville, Ill., 1834; *Life of Daniel Boone*, in Spark's *American Biography*, Boston, 2d ser., xiii.; *Life of Father Clark N.Y.*, 1855. See R. Babcock: *Forty Years of Pioneer Life: Memoir of John Mason Peck, D.D.*, edited from his Journals and Correspondence, Phila., 1894.

**PEDERSEN, Christiann, b. at Svendborg, in the Danish Island of Funen, 1460; d. at Helsinge, in the Island of Zealand, Jan. 16, 1564.** He studied in Paris; became canon at the cathedral of Lund, but was implicated in the political vicissitudes of Christian II.; fled to Holland, and lived, after his return, in retirement, though active for the spread of the Reformation. He translated the New Testament into Danish, 1590.

**PEDOBAPTISM, PEDOBAPTISTS.** See PEDOBAPTISM, PEDOBAPTISTS.

**PELAGIUS AND THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.** While the Eastern Church engaged all her energies in the elaboration of the doctrines of the Trinity and incarnation, and the demonstration of the supernatural character of Christianity as a fact in the objective world, it fell to the lot of the Western Church to take up the doctrines of sin and grace, and demonstrate the supernatural character of Christianity as an agency in the subjective world. Not that those ideas were altogether wanting in the Eastern Church, but they were only partially developed. The problem was then and there to burst the bounds of Pagan naturalism, and rise to the higher level of spiritual morality. Both in the contest between the Greek philosophy and the old mythological spirit, and in the contest between Christianity and Gnosticism, the issue at stake was to make a definite distinction between nature and morality, to disentangle man from all his improper complications with nature, to make him feel himself an independent moral centre, to place him as a free, responsible personality in his relation to God.
PELAGIUS.

Hence the constant and strong emphasis which all the Greek Fathers, from Origen to Chrysostom, lay on human freedom: hence the shyness they evince towards any thing which might make sin appear as a natural power. However grave the consequences of the fall may be,—the overpowering sensuality and death in its track; the weakness of the will; always open to the temptations of the world, the Devil, and the demons; the dulness and the errors of the intellect,—nevertheless, actual sin is always man's own deed, issuing from that point in him which cannot be obliterated without destroying him as a moral being,— the freedom of his will. The general state of sinfulness is recognized; but at the same time it is now and then hinted — as, for instance, by Gregory of Nyssa — that there might exist human beings who were sinless. Quite otherwise in the Western Church. Tertullian, and, after him, Hilary and Ambrose, recognized in human nature a vitiositas animal, the effect of the fall of Adam, and since that time propagated in the race by generation; and they consequently define grace, not simply as an objective means of salvation, but also as the subjective cause of repentance and conversion. But it was not until the contest broke out between the British monk Pelagius and Augustine (the head of the African Church) that the development of these anthropological doctrines entered its decisive phase.

Of the earlier life of Pelagius nothing is known; but legend acknowledges the close correlation between him and his great antitype Augustine by assuming that they were born on the same day and in the same year. At what time he came to Rome from Britain cannot be ascertained; but his stay there must have been of some duration, since he gave an almost complete literary exposition of those views which soon were to cause such vehement opposition before (in 411) he left for Africa. He was thoroughly conversant with the Greek language and theology, and shows a certain affinity to the doctrinal tendencies of the Eastern Church, which seems to indicate that the original connection between the British monasteries and the East was still alive. He had much with Rufinus, the zealous propagator of Greek theology in the Latin Church, and the circle which gathered around Rufinus, Paulinus of Nola, Sulpicius Severus, and others. The odious stories told about him by Jerome and Orosius are completely refuted by the circumstance, that, even when the controversy was hottest, Augustine never ceased to pay an unstinted respect to his moral zeal and Christian conduct.

The great work he wrote in Rome — his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles — exists only in the orthodox redaction of Cassiodorus; but even in that form it is a valuable testimony to Augustine's views. In speaking of a letter, which, during his stay in Rome, Pelagius wrote to Paulinus, Augustine complains that it is so completely occupied with the forces and faculties of nature, that it hardly mentions the grace of God; and, indeed, another letter by Pelagius, written somewhat later (415), and addressed to Demetrius, indicates exactly the same point of view. To Pelagius, religion was not the vital germ of morality, but only an external influence; and, when he sometimes mentions religion as the highest moral motive, he means the fear of God as it is found under the dispensation of the law. Nowhere in the above letter does he speak of grace as an inner agency creating a new life. He acknowledges that in the course of history sin has increased so fearfully as to become almost an element of nature; but he nevertheless maintains that at any moment the will is able to resist the influence of sinful habits, and vindicate its own independence. In the Commentary all the principal propositions which afterwards called forth the controversy are found, — the rejection of the doctrines of hereditary sin (tradux peccati), of the connection between sin and death, of grace as the sole cause of conversion, etc. His very object in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was to deprive those propositions of their scriptural basis because he considered them subversive of all morality.

It was, however, not Pelagius, but Celestius, who opened the campaign. He belonged to a distinguished family, and was recognized as a lawyer in Rome, where he became a monk, and joined Pelagius. In 411 they went together to Africa; but after a short stay there, during which he met with Augustine, Pelagius continued the journey to Palestine, while Celestius remained at Carthage, where he hoped to obtain the office of precentor. In 412, however, he was accused of heresy by Deacon Paulinus of Milan, before a synod at Carthage, over which Bishop Aurelius presided.

The accusation referred to six different points of heresy, of which the most prominent seems to have been that concerning infant baptism. Adam, Celestius was said to maintain, would have died, even if he had not sinned. Children are born in the same state as Adam was in before the fall, and consequently they have eternal life, even though they die unbaptized. Both before and after the Lord's appearance in the flesh, there have existed people who were without sin, etc. Celestius tried to show that the question whether or not there existed a true tradux peccati was a theological problem, without any direct bearing on the general creed of the church. From the few fragments of the debate which have come down to us, it would seem that in the East the controversy was hot, but the synod was not satisfied with his vague prevarications. He was excommunicated, and repaired to Ephesus.

Between this, the first act of the controversy, and the second, in which the scene changes to the East, Augustine wrote his De peccatorum meritis, etc. In Palestine, Pelagius was very well received by Bishop Johannes of Jerusalem; but he could not avoid coming into conflict with Jerome, who considered his views a revival of those old heresies of Origen which Rufinus had defended. Jerome stood at that very moment in close communication with St. Augustine, who sent him a letter in 415, at the request of the Spanish presbyter Orosius to him with letters of recommendation. Orosius also brought a report of what had recently taken place in Africa; and Jerome consequently lost no time in writing his Dialogi contra Pelagianos. The book is full of inaccuracies, but without any deep understanding of the subject. Jerome confined himself to the question, whether, as asserted by Pelagius, a human being could be without sin; and that question became, indeed, the principal subject of debate at the synod of Jerusalem, which Bishop
Johannes convened for the purpose of settling the controversy between Jerome and Pelagius. Orosius was invited to give an account of what had taken place in Africa, and laid great stress upon the circumstance that the views of Pelagius had been rejected by Augustine as Augustine. But as Pelagius simply declared that the authority of Augustine had nothing to do with the subject in question, and as Johannes took the side of Pelagius, Orosius had to content himself with claiming that the final decision should be referred to the Bishop of Rome, since Pelagius was a member of the Latin Church. Johannes consented; but it soon appeared that the adversaries of Pelagius could not abide with patience the result of so slow a process. Before the year (415) came to an end, two deposed Western bishops who happened to be in Palestine (Heres of Arces and Lazarus of Aix) laid a formal accusation of heresy before the synod of Diospolis, convened by Bishop Eulogius of Cesarea. To the great chagrin, however, of Jerome, Pelagius succeeded also this time in satisfying his Oriental judges, and was recognized as an orthodox member of the orthodox church. Jerome went over to the side of Coelestius, and since Pelagius acquiesced in that condemnation, Augustine was certainly right when he afterwards, in his De gestis Pelagii, protested that Pelagius could not give his assent to that condemnation without condemning himself.

In the West those decisions caused considerable uneasiness, and it was generally determined to employ more effective measures against the new heresy. At a provincial synod of Carthage, convened in 416 by Bishop Aurelius, Orosius read a report of what had taken place in Palestine, written by the two Gallican bishops; and the synod decided to anathematize Pelagius and Coelestius, unless they retracted. A letter was also sent to Pope Innocent I., asking him to anathematize any one who should teach that man is able by himself to overcome sin, and fulfill the commandments of God, but not by communicating power to grace. He could not give his assent to that condemnation without condemning himself.

The African bishops, however, would not brook the rebuke. A synod of Carthage immediately determined to adhere to the decision of Innocent as the only valid one; and, while Zosimus was trying to effect a decent retreat, the African bishops assembled in a general council (418), at which they also delegates from Spain were present, and formally condemned the views of Pelagius. The propositions condemned were, that man was created mortal, and would have died, even though he had not sinned; that children were born without sin, and needed not baptism as an atonement; that grace works only forgiveness for sins committed, but does not help to avoid committing sins; that grace helps only by revealing the will of God, but not by communicating power to withstand sin, etc. The African bishops further succeeded in gaining the Emperor Honorius over to their side; and an edict of April 30, 418, banished all adherents of Pelagianism, and ordered all adherents of Pelagianism to over come sin, and fulfill the commandments of God, but not by communicating power to grace. He could not give his assent to that condemnation without condemning himself.

PELAGIUS.

Lit. — The sources are the works of Pelagius,
— Expositiones in epist. Pauli, Epistola ad Demetr.,
and Libellus fidei ad Innocentium (preserved among
the works of Jerome, ed. Mart. V.; the Libellus
fidei was for a long time considered an orthodox
work, and is quoted as such in the Libri Carolini,
iii. 1); the pertinent works of Jerome, Augustine,
Orosius, Julian, and Marius Mercator; the acts of
the various councils (see in Mansi, iv.). Among
modern treatments of the subject, F. Wiggers:
"Praq. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelag.,
Berlin, 1831-32, 2 vols. (vol. i. translated by R.
Emerson, Augustinianism and Pelagianism,
An- dover, 1840); J. L. Jacobi: Die Lehre d. Pelagius,
Leip., 1842; WÖRTER: Der Pelagianismus, Freib.
1888; KLÄRER: Die Entwickelung des Pelagi-
anismus, Freiburg, 1882.

PELAGIUS, the name of two Popes. — Pelagius
I. (555-560), b. in Rome, and d. there March 3,
560. Under Pope Silverius he held the position
of aposcrisarius at the court of Justinian I.,
and combined with the Empress Theodora, a secret
advocate of Monophysitism, for the overthrow of
PELAGIUS.

PELAGIUS, Alvarus, Spanish Franciscan, papil of Duns Scotus, and bishop of Silves in Algarve [Portugal]. d. 1352; is famous for his immediate defense of the Papacy, in his work De planctu ecclesiae (Ulm, 1747; Venice, 1580; Lyons, 1570); "The Pope is above every thing, even eccen- trical councils. From him councils get their authority and the privilege of communing. The Pope may pronounce judgment upon all creatures, but be judged by none. As the Spirit was given to Christ without measure (John iii. 34), so authority upon earth is given to the Pope without measure." He also wrote a Colloquium adv. here- ses, which has never been printed. See BELLAR- mine: De script. eccles. ; RIEZLER: D. liter. Witter- sacker d. Päpste, 1874, pp. 283 sqq. HEKZOS.

PELLIKAN, Konrad, a distinguished Hebraist; b. Jan. 8, 1478, at Ruffach in Alsace; d. April 6, 1556, at Zürich. His German name, Kursner, was altered to Pellicanus by his uncle, who provided for his education at Heidelberg and Tubin- gen. In 1499 he began the study of Hebrew, which he pursued with intense avidity. His only help was the Stern mecha of Peter Negri (Ess- lingen, 1477). In 1501 he prepared the De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraum, which was the first Hebrew text-book ever written by a Christian. It was published in the Margarita philosophica, Strassburg, 1504. In 1501 Pellikan was con- secrated priest in Ruffach, and, after filling various other academical positions, was, with Ecolamps- dius, made professor of theology at Basel, and in 1525 was, on Zwingli's invitation, induced to go to Zürich. His first lecture in Zurich, on Exod. xv., he began with the words, "Thanks be to my God, who, having snatched me from Egypt and from the Egyptian and papal captivity, has caused me to pass over the Red Sea." He threw aside the owl, and married, although already arrived at the age of forty-eight. He died as professor of Greek and Hebrew, and librarian, at Zürich. Pellikan's text-book of the Hebrew was the first, but was soon displaced by Reuch- lin's Rudimenta. He was also the first in the Reforma- tion period to write a complete com- mentary of all the books of the Bible (Comment. biblischer, Zürich; and, 1835, professor at Kiel, as Twisten's successor. His Latin commentary on the Thessalonian Epistles appeared at Greifswald, 1829. Pelt took a high position as a theological professor of the Hebrew text-book was reprinted by Nestle, Tu- bingen, 1877. HERMANN L. STRACK.

PELT, Anton Friedrich Ludwig, a theologian of comprehensive culture in the departments of philology, history, and exegesis, and a master in the department of theological encyclopaedia; was b. at Regensburg, June 28, 1799; d. at Kem- nitz, Jan. 22, 1861. Educated at Jena and Kiel, he became in 1808 dean of the church at Greven- zehn at Greifswald; and, 1835, professor at Kiel, as Twisten's successor. His Latin commentary on the Thessalonian Epistles appeared at Greifswald, 1829. Pelt took a high position as a theological teacher; and, while he was originally in closer sym- pathy with the Reformation at Heit, he wrote D. Zwingli aus d. Glauben (1837) in answer to Strauss's Life of Christ. He took part in the practical ecclesi- astical movements of the day. When Schleswig- Holstein was finally made subject to the Danish
CROWN, in 1882, he lost his position at Kiel, and
was nominated by the university of Greifswald
to the pastorate of Kemnitz, which was in its
province; he was also a professor of
intendant of the diocese. Pelt's greatest work
is the Thol. Encyclopädie als System, im Zusam-
menhange mit d. Gesch. d. theol. Wissenschaft u.
Dorner.

PENANCE, the fourth of the seven sacraments
of the Roman-Catholic Church, is a means of
repairing a sin committed, and obtaining pardon
for it, and consists, partly in the performance of
expiative rites, partly in voluntary submission to
a punishment corresponding to the transgression.
It is found in all religions. In the Old Testa-
donit occurs under the form of purification,
which was afterwards, by expiatory sacrifices,
fasts, etc.; but this merely
ment it. It is found in the Old Testa-
trine was not accepted without certain restric-
tions found in Mansi (Coll. Council., XVIII.
p. 525) it is stated, that, by means of a sufficient
number of co-fasters, a fast of seven years may
be accomplished in six days. Penance was con-
ceived of as a satisfaction; and consequently, as
Thomas Aquinas has it, so long as the debt is
paid, it does not matter who pays it. All these
various features have been retained by the Council
of Trent (Sess. XIV., c. 2 and 8) in its de-
definition of the sacrament, though in a somewhat refined
form. The conception of the Greek Church dif-
fers in no essential point from that of the Roman-
Catholic. Penance is there considered a second
baptism, the “baptism of tears” (Boissard:
L'Eglise de Russie, i. p. 334). For further details
and pertinent literature, see Confession, Peni-
tentials, and Repentance.

PENITENTIALS (Libri Pcenitentiales) were col-
clections of rules for the guidance of the confessor,
prescribing the penalty he ought to impose; that
is, the satisfaction he ought to demand before
granting absolution. In the ancient church the
Councils of Ancyra (314), of Nicesa (325),
and others, gave such rules. Of great influence on
the reigning practice were also the two epistles on the
subject by Basil of Cesarea (d. 379). In his Sy-
tagma, Joannes Scholasticus (d. 578) gave sixty-
eight canons, which were confirmed by the Trullan
synod of 692; but the farther development of this
literature in the Greek Church is of compara-
tively small interest. In the Latin Church the
Letters of Basil formed the starting-point; though
a work of similar kind, but of native growth, is
mentioned in the middle of the third century.
(Comp. Cyprìan: Epist. 2, and De lapsis, 51, 52.)
The monastic discipline exercised a special
influence; and from it there grew up in the old British
or Irish Church a number of penitentials, which,
exact these rules found in Mansi (Coll. Council.
XIV.), “Some think it sufficient to confess to God alone, while others
think it necessary also to confess to a priest: both
ways have their advantages.” In the twelfth cen-
tury, however, the treatise De vera et falsa peniten-
tia, generally but without good reason ascribed
to Augustine, contributed much to the establish-
ment of the idea that the priest had the power of
pardoning or retaining sin; and though this doc-
trine was not accepted without certain restric-
iv. dist. 18; Richard of Saint-Victor: Tract.
de potest. ligandi et solvendi, 13; Thomas Aquinas:
Summa, p. iii. qu. 84, art. 31), it served to spread
the custom of confessing to a priest. Finally,
the fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), presided
over by Innocent III., and treating the heresies of
the Cathari and Waldenses, made confession to
a priest an indispensable part of penance, and
consequently compulsory. With respect to the
expiatory part of penance, or penance proper, the
views were originally very severe. It lasted long,
often the whole life through, and the penalties
were very heavy. But, as time went on, the views
became milder, the penalties were confined to
the number of Frankish penalties, which were simply considered as evidences of the sincer-
ity of the repentance; but in course of time they
became a real opus operatum. In the middle ages it was generally agreed that the penance imposed
upon one person could be paid by another, at
least in part; and in a collection of peni-
tentials and Repentance.
PENITENTIAL PSALMS, 1788

Halgarius of Cambrai wrote, about 829, his celebrated Liber Penitentialis, in six books. The sixth book (published in Canisius: Lectiones antiquae, tom. ii. part ii. p. 121) is designated as "Ponitentialis Romanus, quem de serino Romano ecclesia adsumptumus, though it is certainly of Frankish origin. It is one of an another Pemtitential Romanum which is often mentioned, but which had no papal authority either. There exists, indeed, no penitential specially authorized by the Roman curia, though it often happened that a penitential writer ascribed his work to a pope in order to make it more authoritative. Thus there is a Penitentiale Gregorii III., but it belongs to a much later period.

Prominent among the productions of the Frankish Church in this line during the ninth century is the Liber penitentiae, or Penitientium, of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence (d. 856). See Opera, ed. Colvenerius, Coloniae, 1627, vol. iv. None of these penitentials, however, succeeded in gaining authority throughout the whole Frankish Empire. The confusion continued. At last almost every diocese had its own penitential; and in many cases it would, no doubt, prove utterly impossible to disentangle the reciprocal relations of those books.


PENITENTIAL PSALMS, so called because of their expressions of repentance over sin, are seven in number; viz., vi., xxii., xxviii., li., cxx., cxxii., cxliii. They are placed together in the Roman breviary, and indulgences have been promised for those who recited them. Pope Innocent III. ordered their recitation in Lent. The Fifty-first Psalm is the typical one of the seven.

PENN, William, son of Admiral Sir William Penn (of Margary, Jourdain), his wife; was b. in London, Oct. 14, 1644; and d. July 30, 1718. At the age of fifteen he was admitted as a gentleman commoner at Christ Church College, at Oxford, where he made large acquisitions as a scholar, and was distinguished for his excellence in field-sports and manly exercises. The instructions of Dr. John Owen, dean of Christ Church, gave him serious views of life; and he was deeply impressed by the preaching of the Quaker, Thomas Loe, an old Oxford student. Expelled from college for nonconformity, he was harshly treated by his father, who soon sent him to France with a party of young nobles and gentlemen. Presented to Louis XIV., he was a great favorite at court, and added to his former accomplishments all the social graces for which the French capital was famed, while at the same time he was kept pure from vice. At Saumur he attended with great interest the lectures of the Calvinistic theologian, Molinos. After a short stay in Northern Italy, he returned to London, after two years' absence, a good French scholar and a finished gentleman, and entered as a student of law at Lincoln's Inn. The great plague, which broke out a year afterwards, gave his thoughts again a serious direction, and his father, to distract his mind, sent him to the gay and splendid vice-regal court of the Duke of Ormond, in Dublin. Forming a warm friendship for the duke's son, the Earl of Arran, he joined him in an expedition to put down a mutiny at Carrickfergus, and confounded with him in the action with great courage. He wished to accept a commission now offered him in the army, but his father was unwilling. The only certainly authentic portrait of Penn is one taken at this time, representing him in a full suit of armor. Placed in charge of the family estates in Ireland, he showed great capacity for business. Being at Cork one day, he heard the preaching of his old friend, Thomas Loe, who began his discourse with these words: "There is a faith which overcomes the world, and there is a faith which is overcome by the world." Penn was so deeply moved, that he renounced the world for ever, and spent the rest of his life as a devoted servant of Christ. Attaching himself to the Society of Friends, he suffered much from persecution. Imprisoned in 1677, for attending a religious meeting of his fellow-worshippers in Cork, he wrote a letter to the Earl of Orrery, lord-president of Munster, in which he said, "Though to dissent from a national system imposed by authority renders men heretics, yet I dare believe your lordship is better read in reason and theology than to subscribe a maxim so vulgar and untrue." The earl ordered his release; but his father, hearing that he had turned Quaker, sent for him, and he returned home. Observing that his son did not uncover his head when he came into his presence, the admiral demanded an explanation. William answered that he could uncover only to God, and not in homage to any man. "Not even to the king?" asked the father. The son asked an hour for consideration, and, after meditation and prayer, returned with the answer, "Not even to the king." Enraged, his father beat him and turned him out of doors.

However excessive his scruples may have been, the servility of that age made great demands for such a protest than our franker and more manly times. At all events, William Penn gave the fullest proof of his sincerity and Christian heroism. Never did a young man sacrifice more when he renounced the world. Enjoying the intimacy and the favor of the king, admired at court, handsome in person, graceful in manners, adorned with every manly accomplishment, expectant heir of a title of nobility (that of Lord Weymouth), which the king was ready to confer upon his father, he was entering upon life with the most brilliant promise of distinction and success. All this he gave up, to meet persecution and scorn. Hardest of all, he was forced to dissemble his thoughts again a serious direction, and his father, to distract his mind, sent him to the gay and splendid vice-regal court of the Duke of Ormond, in Dublin. Forming a warm friendship for the duke's son, the Earl of Arran, he joined him in an expedition to put down a mutiny at Carrickfergus, and confounded with him in the action with great courage. He wished to accept a commission now offered him in the army, but his father was unwilling. The only certainly authentic portrait of Penn is one taken at this time, representing him in a full suit of armor. Placed in charge of the family estates in Ireland, he showed great capacity for business. Being at Cork one day, he heard the preaching of his old friend, Thomas Loe, who began his discourse with these words: "There is a faith which overcomes the world, and there is a faith which is overcome by the world." Penn was so deeply moved, that he renounced the world for ever, and spent the rest of his life as a devoted servant of Christ. Attaching himself to the Society of Friends, he suffered much from persecution. Imprisoned in 1677, for attending a religious meeting of his fellow-worshippers in Cork, he wrote a letter to the Earl of Orrery, lord-president of Munster, in which he said, "Though to dissent from a national system imposed by authority renders men heretics, yet I dare believe your lordship is better read in reason and theology than to subscribe a maxim so vulgar and untrue." The earl ordered his release; but his father, hearing that he had turned Quaker, sent for him, and he returned home. Observing that his son did not uncover his head when he came into his presence, the admiral demanded an explanation. William answered that he could uncover only to God, and not in homage to any man. "Not even to the king?" asked the father. The son asked an hour for consideration, and, after meditation and prayer, returned with the answer, "Not even to the king." Enraged, his father beat him and turned him out of doors.

However excessive his scruples may have been, the servility of that age made great demands for such a protest than our franker and more manly times. At all events, William Penn gave the fullest proof of his sincerity and Christian heroism. Never did a young man sacrifice more when he renounced the world. Enjoying the intimacy and the favor of the king, admired at court, handsome in person, graceful in manners, adorned with every manly accomplishment, expectant heir of a title of nobility (that of Lord Weymouth), which the king was ready to confer upon his father, he was entering upon life with the most brilliant promise of distinction and success. All this he gave up, to meet persecution and scorn. Hardest of all, he was forced to dissemble his thoughts again a serious direction, and his father, to distract his mind, sent him to the gay and splendid vice-regal court of the Duke of Ormond, in Dublin. Forming a warm friendship for the duke's son, the Earl of Arran, he joined him in an expedition to put down a mutiny at Carrickfergus, and confounded with him in the action with great courage. He wished to accept a commission now offered him in the army, but his father was unwilling. The only certainly authentic portrait of Penn is one taken at this time, representing him in a full suit of armor. Placed in charge of the family estates in Ireland, he showed great capacity for business. Being at Cork one day, he heard the preaching of his old friend, Thomas Loe, who began his discourse with these words: "There is a faith which overcomes the world, and there is a faith which is overcome by the world." Penn was so deeply moved, that he renounced the world for ever, and spent the rest of his life as a devoted servant of Christ. Attaching himself to the Society of Friends, he suffered much from persecution. Imprisoned in 1677, for attending a religious meeting of his fellow-worshippers in Cork, he wrote a letter to the Earl of Orrery, lord-president of Munster, in which he said, "Though to dissent from a national system imposed by authority renders men heretics, yet I dare believe your lordship is better read in reason and theology than to subscribe a maxim so vulgar and untrue." The earl ordered his release; but his father, hearing that he had turned Quaker, sent for him, and he returned home. Observing that his son did not uncover his head when he came into his presence, the admiral demanded an explanation. William answered that he could uncover only to God, and not in homage to any man. "Not even to the king?" asked the father. The son asked an hour for consideration, and, after meditation and prayer, returned with the answer, "Not even to the king." Enraged, his father beat him and turned him out of doors.
word to his father, “My prison shall be my grave before I will budge a jot: for I owe my conscience to no mortal man.” In the Tower he wrote, No Cross, No Crown, the most widely read of all his works. He said, in a letter to the secretary of state, “What if I differ from some religious opinion? What if I differ from all religious opinion? I know not any unif for political society, but those who maintain principles subversive of industry, justice, fidelity, and obedience.”

“I ought to satisfy the most rabid sectarian that he can forbid his rival a share of heaven, without also banishing him from the earth.”

These views he maintained in his after-life, before kings and people, and defended them in speeches before the House of Commons and by his pen. He told Dr. Stillingfleet, sent by the king to endeavor to change his judgment, “whoever was in the wrong, those who used force for religion never could be in the right.” After an imprisonment of nine months, he was released from the Tower by the king, through the intercession of the Duke of York.

In August, 1670, on going to the meeting at Grace-church Street, he found the house guarded by a band of soldiers. Not permitted to enter, the Friends gathered about the door in silence, and held their meeting in the street. Penn preached, but was soon arrested by the constables, together with William Mead. Penn’s bold assertion of the liberties of an Englishman, and the noble constancy of his jury in acquitting him against all the threats of the court, have made this trial ever memorable. Within three months the was again imprisoned for preaching. He travelled in Holland and Germany, preaching fidelity to the light of Christ in the soul; and with his courtly breeding (speaking also Dutch, German, French, and Italian) he mingled with the highest orders of society as well as with the lowly. The princess-palatine of the Rhine, grand-daughter of James I., sought his society, and confided to him the story of her religious conflicts and experiences.

Years Penn had nourished dreams of a home for the oppressed in the wilds of America. Becoming connected with New Jersey, and one of the proprietors of East Jersey, he drew up liberal laws for the Province, and many Friends migrated thither. In 1681 he obtained from Charles II. a grant of the lands now constituting the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, in satisfaction of a claim of his father’s against the crown for sixteen thousand pounds, and became the greatest land-owner in the world. The king insisted on prefixing “Penn” to the name of the principality, against Penn’s protest. Here he had opportunity for his “holy experiment.” He granted perfect toleration, and the fullest liberty consistent with order; he treated the Indians with justice and generosity; and under his government the province grew rapidly, and flourished. He spent a great part of his large estates in England and Ireland for the aid of the settlers; — in fact, thirty thousand pounds more, he says, than he ever got from the Province; and yet, with an excess of liberality, he refused to accept an impost on exports and imports which the Assembly voted him. He found it difficult to collect the moderate annual quit rents, which as feudal proprietor he was obliged to exact, and through the frauds of his steward he became for a time impoverished. He made two visits to his American possessions, but felt it his duty to live at the court of James II., interceding with the king for the release of all victims of religious or political persecution. This he did with great effect. The king, to whose especial care he had been intrusted by the dying admiral, was his faithful friend, and sometimes attended his meetings, and listened to his preaching. Penn did not conceal from him his liberal political views, but labored openly for the election to Parliament of the republican Algernon Sidney. On the accession of William of Orange, Penn was charged with being a Papist, and plotting for the return of the Stuarts, for which he was several times arrested, and once thrown into prison. He succeeded at length in establishing his innocence, and was made a welcome visitor at their courts by William, Mary, and afterwards Queen Anne, thus enjoying the personal friendship of five sovereigns of Great Britain. Six years before his death, he was attacked with an apoplectic disease, by which his mind was impaired, but not the sweetness of his temper, nor the joy of spiritual communion with his Lord. “Clouds lay upon his understanding,” says Cope; “but the sun shone on his eternal prospects, and the long evening sky was clear, and full of light.”

As an author, Penn appears as a defender of the views of Fox and Barclay, a writer of sententious ethical precepts, an opponent of judicial oaths, an advocate of a Congress of Nations for the settlement of international disputes, and a champion of complete and universal religious liberty. Many of his books and pamphlets were translated into German, French, Dutch, and Welsh. Among the more important of them are, Truth Exalted (a defence of Quakerism, 1688); No Cross, no Crown (1670); The People’s Ancient and Just Liberties asserted (1670); A Caveat against Popery (1670); A Guide Mistaken (against J. Clapham’s A Guide to True Religion, 1670); The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly debated, etc. (1670); A Treatise on Oaths (1675); England’s Present Interest discovered, with Honour to the Princes, and Safety to the Kingdom (1675); The Continued Cry of the Oppressed for Justice (1675); A Letter to the Churches of Jesus Christendom (1677); A Persuasion to Moderation (1858); Good Advice to the Church of England, and Qu’o’lic and Protestant Dissenters, for the Abolition of the Penal Laws and Fasts (1867); A Key (elucidating the peculiar tenets and features of Quakerism); The New Athenians no Noble Bereans (1882); An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Diet, Parliament, or Estates (1883); Fruits of Solitude (1883); Travels in Holland and Germany, anno 1677 (1884); Primitive Christianity revived (1898); The Quaker a Christian (1898).

The bi-centennial of Penn’s landing at Chester, Oct. 24, 1882, was celebrated with great enthusiasm in Philadelphia, and throughout Pennsylvania, Oct. 24, 1882.
PENTATEUCH, The, is the name given to that portion of the Old Testament included in the five first books,—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

I. NAMES AND DIVISION.—The names which are beyond dispute given in the Old Testament to the whole Pentateuch are The Book of the Law of Moses (Neh. viii. 1), The Book of the Law (Thirubin, Neh. vii. 2), The Book of the Law of Jehovah (Neh. ix. 3), The Book of Moses (Neh. xiii. 1), and the Epistle of Barnabas (chap. 10). The division into five books is older than the Septuagint, but not original. The Greek designations were 6 νῶευς (The Law in the New Testament) and τί περιερέως (The Pentateuch, Origens, In Joh., 29). The names of the five books were, as a rule, among the Jews their first words: (1) ἢρεν (Breshith, "In the beginning"); (2) μαχαίρα (Shemoth, "The names"), or νομίσματα (Velekh Shemoth, "These are the names"); (3) αἰγών (Vikra, "And . . . called"); (4) δεινόμενος (B'midkbar, "In the wilderness"), or ἀρνιόν (Vayadhab, "And . . . spake"); (5) ὁ οἴχων (D'barim, "Words"), or ὁ κατὰ Δ'αρίμ, (D'shimah, "Among the words"); (6) τὰ ὁδικά ὕδατά των (Etiek had'bharam, "These are the words of the judges."

Another point for fixing the date is the period of Nehemiah, when the Psalter was divided into five divisions with reference to the Pentateuchal books.

II. CONTENTS.—A summary of the contents of the Pentateuch may be stated as a history of the kingdom of God on earth and in Israel, from the creation to the death of Moses, and the laws of God's kingdom in Israel. The following are the contents of the main divisions: (1) Gen. i.—xi. The early history of the world and the human family, including the creation, the origin, and development of sin, the Flood, the construction of the Tower of Babel, and the Dispersion of human kind. (2) Gen. xii.—xlvi. The history of the patriarchs, including Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. (3) Exod. i.—xxiv. The oppression of Israel in Egypt, and its emancipation; Moses being the central figure. (4) Exod. xxv.—xxxiv. The interruption of the divine legislation by the apostasy of the people and the renewal of the covenant. (5) Deut. i.—xxiv. The journey from Sinai to Moab, and the inauguration of the new covenant by the law of sacrifices, priests, and the worship of the tabernacle; the appointment of the Levites and the priests. (6) Deut. xxv.—xxvi. Events and legislation in Moab, including the prophetic call of Balaam, and the appointment of the cities of refuge. (7) Num. x.—xxxiv. The journey from Sinai to Moab, and the inauguration of the new covenant by the law of sacrifices, priests, and the worship of the tabernacle; the appointment of the Levites and the priests. (8) Num. xxxv.—the city of refuge. (9) Num. xxxvi.—the city of refuge. (10) Deut. iv.—xxvi. The second exhortation, including the repetition of the Shema, the covenant renewed, the passage through the Jordan, and the inauguration of the new covenant by the law of sacrifices, priests, and the worship of the tabernacle; the appointment of the Levites and the priests. (11) Deut. xxv.—the city of refuge. (12) Deut. xxx.—xxxiv. The journey from Sinai to Moab, and the appointment of the Levites and the priests.
III. The Critical Problems. 1. The Traditional View and the Province of Criticism.—The synagogue, the church of the Fathers and the nation. (12) Deut. xxxi.-xxxiv. Conclusion of the life and activity of Moses, including the consecration of Joshua.

Josephus made Joshua the author of the last eight verses of Deuteronomy; Philo and the later Talmudists regarded Moses himself as the author. Keil (who follows Hengstenberg closely), in his Introduction, and his Commentary on the Books of Moses, bases the Mosaic authorship upon the testimonies of the Pentateuch itself, the historical books of the Old Testament, the prophets and the New Testament, and finally upon the assertion that the Pentateuch shows no vestiges of post-Mosaic events and customs, no chronological errors, but exhibits a unity of spirit and language, and meets every expectation so great an antiquity would arouse.

The external testimonies are not convincing. The Pentateuchal passages which speak of Moses as a writer (Exod. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, 7, xxxiv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 2) refer either to isolated sections, as the victory over Amalek and the covenant with the content of the Pentateuch, those contents of which may also be traced in the peculiar usage of the divine names in Genesis, a fact which had arrested the attention of others. Astruc, starting, from the peculiar usage of the divine names in Genesis, a fact which had arrested the attention of others, affirmed in 1753 (in his Conjectures sur les mo-
one arranging hand throughout the whole work.
(2) The Supplemental Hypothesis. The identity of
pivotal verses and views in all the Elohist sections
was the occasion of this hypothesis, according to
which the Elohim (or original) document was
supplemented by the Jehovist writer by the inser-
tion of sections and remarks. Deuteronomy
being incorporated at a later period. This view
has been advocated by Tuch, Bleek, Graetz, and
achiene (In宣传) "P," "E," and "J" lived shortlv before the
fourth section, and perhaps was not at an end till
the exile period, and perhaps was not at an end till
the millennium. Both these documents, probably,
were written some time before the middle of the
first millennium B.C., but not much more than a
century or two apart.

(3) The Documentary Hypothesis. According to
this view the entire Pentateuch, or almost the
whole of it, was compiled by two or more com-
pliers from different documents. This view is
held in forms differing very considerably: the
differences concerning the order of succession
and age of the documents, rather than their clas-
sification. Before taking up these views sepa-
rate1y, we will classify the names and signatures
given by different critics to the various Penta-
Yeuch writers and compilers.

The first Elohist (or "E").—Tuch, etc., call
his work "the original document" (Grundschrift);
Ewald, "book of beginnings" (Buch der Ur-
sprünge); Schrader calls him "the annalist" (an-
nalistischer Erzähler); Schultz, Dillmann, "A;"
Wellhausen, etc., "P." The second (or later) Elohist.—Ewald
calls him "the third narrator;" Schrader, "the theo-
ocratic narrator;" Dillmann, "B;" or "the nar-
rator from Northern Israel;" Schultz, "C;"
Wellhausen, etc., "E."
The Jehovist.—Tuch, etc., call him "the sup-
plementer" (Ergänzer); Ewald, "the fourth nar-
rator;" Schrader, "the prophetical narrator;"
Dillmann, "C;" Schultz, "B;" Wellhausen, "E."
The Deuteronomist.—Dillmann calls him "D."
We shall, in the following discussion, use Well-
hausen's terminology, because it has been adopted
by many writers, and does not prejudice the stu-
dent in favor of the age or order of the docu-
ments, except that we will use "P" for "P.""C."

3. The Most Important Views now held.—
Schrader, in the eighth edition of De Wette's
Introduction to the Old Testament (Berlin, 1889),
combines the documentary and supplemental hy-
potheses. "P" is traceable to the close of Joshua,
written early in David's reign, and was a priest.
"E," who can be traced down to 1 Kings ix. 28,
was probably from Northern Israel, and wrote
soon after the division of the kingdom, or about
975-950 B.C. "J," also from Northern Israel,
writing about 825-800 B.C., combined "P" and
"E," adding a good deal which had come down
by oral tradition. The radical part of Deut-
eronomy (iv. 44-xxviii.) was written, not long be-
fore the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, by a
friend of Jeremiah's, who incorporated his work
in "E." The separation of the Pentateuch from
the BabyloniM was incomplete after the close of the
Babylonian exile. This view is still held by
Schrader.

Noldeke (Untersuchungen zur Kritik d. A. T.;
Kiel, 1869) holds the following view. "P," "E,
and "J" lived in the tenth or ninth century B.C.
"E," worked over by "J," who was dependent
upon "D," who wrote not a long time before the
reforms of Josiah. "P," "E," and "J" were
wrought together into one volume by a compiler.

Dillmann will give a connected and comprehen-
sive statement of his views in the concluding
volume of his revised edition of Knobel's Com-
mentary on the Hexateuch. The following is a
summary of his views as expressed up to this
time. It is uncertain which of the two is the older,—"P," or "E." "E," who lived in the flour-
ishing prophetic period of the central tribes, is
certainly older than "J," who was dependent
upon "E," and was nearer being a contemporary
"D," who wrote not a long time before the
reforms of Josiah. "P," "E," and "J" were
wrought together into one volume by a compiler.

Dr. Noldeke has, since 1876, modified his views, and now agrees very closely with the
school of Graf in reference to the classification of the original documents and their order of
succession, but differs with it essentially upon
the date of composition, and pronounces empha-
tically against the conclusions it draws for the
religious history of Israel. "E" and "D" he re-
gards as having written after Solomon, but before
Josiah; and "J" the latest, before Ezekiel. He
brings into comparison the many records prior to
the canonical Gospels, and adds that he "is now
convinced that the process of composition and
formation, out of which the law in its present
form was derived, continued down into the post-
exilic period, and perhaps was not at an end till
the period when the Samaritan Pentateuch and
the Septuagint were made." He continues (p. 621):—"All the more strongly do we insist upon
the Mosaic origin and the divine revelation of
the foundation [Fundament] of the Torah [Penta-
ateuch]. Compare further, for Delitzsch's view,
the translation from his lecture in The Hebrew
Student for 1882 (i.-iv.), and Curtiss, Delitzsch on
the Origin and Composition of the Pentateuch, in
The Presbyterian Review for July, 1892.

Wellhausen. The Decalogue likewise is not
Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx.
20-xxiii. 19) was given to "a people sedentary,
and fully accustomed to agriculture." "J" be-
longs to "the golden period of Hebrew litera-
ture" just preceding the dissolution of the two
kingdoms by the Assyrians. "E" betrays "a
more advanced religious condition, with more
regulations." Both these documents, partly,
went through several editions, and were probably
united in one volume as they appeared in the
third revision. "D" was composed shortly before
the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, and contained at first only Deut. xii.-xxvi. It then went through two editions after the exile, which increased its bulk to thirty chapters (Deut. i.-xxvii.). "D" is incorporated with "J E." Lev. xvii.-xxvi. are a body of laws originating in the period of the exile between Ezekiel and the Priests' Code (which he designates "PC"), which was incorporated in "P." The remainder of the Hexateuch left after the extraction of "J E" and "D" is of post-exilic origin. The original nucleus was "Q," and the legislation of the middle books, standing in very close connection with it both by their contents and language (Exod. xxv.-xxxi., xxxv.-xl.; Levit.; Num. i.-x., xv.-xix., xxv.-xxvi., with a few exceptions), he calls the Priests' Code. The only sections belonging originally to "Q" are Exod. xxv.-xxix.; Lev. ix., x. 1-5, 12-15, xvi.; Num. i. 1-16, 48-iii. 9, 15-x. 28, a part of xvi., xvii., xviii., xxv. 6-19, xxvi., xxvii., a part of xxxii., xxxiii. 50-xxxvi. The legal and historical document was incorporated in "J E" in the year 444, and published by Ezra; for there is no doubt that the law of Ezra was the entire Pentateuch (History, 423, 370 eqq., 421). Compare Henry P. Smith's art. in The Presbyterian Review for April, 1882: The Critical Theories of J. Wellhausen.

Graf, although he died July 16, 1869, deserves mention here on account of the great influence his main thesis has exerted. Upon the basis of studies upon the feasts, priesthood, and tabernacle, he declared that the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch bear the "plainest marks of their post-exilic composition;" and shortly before his death he pronounced the so-called "original document" (Grundschrift) post-exilic.

"J," wrote in the middle of the eighth century; "D," shortly before the eighteenth year of Josiah; "P," after the exile, and his document was incorporated in "J D," soon after Ezra.

Reuss, who has taught, since 1833, substantially the same views as his pupil in his Geschiche des Alien Testaments (§ 77), that the Decalogue is, "perhaps, the oldest of all the parts of the written law," but not Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant probably belongs to the time of Jehoshaphat, and "J," to the second half of the ninth century, which was later worked together in one volume with "E:" so that "it is almost impossible to separate the two." In the eighteenth year of Josiah, "D," consisting of Deut. v.-xxvi., xxviii., was unearthed, to give national authority to the legislation, and "purporting to be a discovery of the priests." After the first deportation, "D" was joined to "J E," but not by the author of "D." The section Lev. xvii.-xxvi. is not preserved in its original form; and the nucleus is of a later date than "D," and belongs after Ezekiel. The work promulged by Ezra in 444 was not the entire Pentateuch. Its framework is "a gross fiction, . . . dreams of an impoverished people," in his hand; but the contents are "a collection of laws of different origins." This code of Ezra was revised and enlarged in the period between Nehemiah and Alexander. "The prophets are to be regarded as older than the law, and the Psalms later than both." It is impossible for us in our limits to go into a minute criticism of all these views: we will content ourselves with making some general observations, and giving a limited explanation of some of the Pentateuchal problems now most agitated.

4. Preliminary and Explanatory Principles.—(1) Essentially the same methods are to be pursued in the criticism of the Old Testament as of other literary works. Miracles and prophecies, however, are not to be used as proofs of incredibility and untruthfulness. We hold to the religion of the Old Testament as a revelation: therefore we shall not expect the standard of a development according to natural laws to apply everywhere to the history of Israel. (2) Caution must be used in drawing arguments from the language and style of any portion of the Old Testament. Archaisms and obscurities were likely to be removed by copyists, an analogy being found in the editions of Luther's Bible. Again: difference of style points to a difference of authorship, rather than of date. (3) A written code of laws may exist for a long period without being known beyond a narrow circle. A record which was committed to writing at a comparatively late date, it does not necessarily follow that the essential part has not been accurately handed down. The credibility of the history and legislation of the Pentateuch is of more importance than the Mosaic authorship. (5) Many differences in the Pentateuchal laws are to be explained by the difference of time referred to. Notice must be taken whether a law refers to the time of sojourn in the wilderness, or looks forward to the sojourn in Canaan.

5. The Theory of Graf and Wellhausen.—The new school represented by Graf, Kayser, Reuss, Wellhausen, and others, has introduced a wide chasm between critics of the Pentateuch. Here-tofore "P" has been regarded as the oldest document, and looked upon as credible, at least in the main points. The Pentateuch has been regarded as finished before the exile. The new school admits the antiquity of the Book of the Covenant alone. After it, came the historical works "E" and "J," then the first comprehensive code of laws, "D," then Ezek. xl.-xlviii., then the law of holiness, and finally "P." Wellhausen and others place the completion of the Pentateuch in 444 B.C.

The significance of this new arrangement is at once visible in the revolution it necessitates in our views of Hebrew history. A few notices, based upon Wellhausen's able (geistvoll) History of Israel, will suffice. (1) The Place of Worship. The historical and prophetic books know nothing of a central and only place of worship. The Jehovist ("J E") sanctions many altars. The fall of Samaria is favorable to centralization. "D" demands it, and "P" presupposes it, and associates the idea with the tabernacle in early times. (2) Offerings.—"J E" represents Sacrifice as a pre-Mosaic practice; "E" does not. According to "J E," with which the historical and prophetical books agree, the person to whom the sacrifices are made is prominent; according to "P," the ritual. "P" introduces the sin and guilt offerings, of which "there is no trace in the rest of the Old Testament before Ezekiel." (3) The Feasts. The feasts at first celebrated the beginning and close
of the harvest, and the vintage. "P" adds to their number the day of atonement; and the sabbath and jubilee years were likewise later additions. (4) Priest or Levite. — In the earliest period of Israel's history, there was no distinction between clergy and laity. Everybody might sacrifice. Hence there is no mention of a priesthood in the oldest portions of "JE," no Aaron at the side of Moses. There was a tribe of Levi, but it perished in the time of the Judges. Later it became the title of a priestly caste. According to Ezek. xlii., the Levites of Jerusalem were to officiate as priests in the golden period; and the other Levites were to be degraded. Accordingly to "P," the Levites never performed the functions of priests, but only the sons of Aaron. The capstone which "P" lays down is the high priest, a personage whose incomparable importance is foreign to the spirit of the remainder of the Old Testament.

We shall now proceed to lay down some criticisms of these positions of the new Pentateuchal school. The Egyptians had, at a very early date, a rich literature, and were accustomed to write much. Why should not the Jews, who were always open to foreign influences, have imitated them in this regard, and especially Moses, who had been brought up in all the wisdom of the Egyptians? From of old, Egypt had a large and influential priestly caste, divided into orders. Israel must also have had a priesthood at an early day, and not have remained a millennium without written priestly laws. It is to be assumed that the priest Moses (Exod. xxv. 6 sqq.; Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. xcviii. 6) established a ritual. There are not wanting testimonials to the early date of a priestly law (Deut. xxxiii. 10; Mic. iii. 11; Jer. xviii. 18; Ezek. vii. 26; Zeph. iii. 4; Hos. viii. 12). Especially is Deuteronomy, which was certainly in existence at least in the eighteenth year of Josiah, rich in proofs of this assertion. Compare Deut. xviii. 2 with Num. xviii. 20, 23 sqq., and Deut. xxiv. 8, where a priestly law concerning leprosy is referred to, such as is found in Lev. xii. 14.

The new theory leaves the basal periods of Israel's history without a literature. Moses wrote no laws nor history; David, no psalms; Solomon, no proverbs.

The reason for the larger number of, and more exact references in the post-exilic books, to the Pentateuch, is that Ezra began an entirely new period, — that of the scribes.

The new theory not only excludes the divine factor from the history of Israel, but is obliged to resort, not infrequently, to the very precarious assumption of fictions, — a word which Wellhausen does not hesitate to use.

One of the principal arguments of the new school is, that the non-observance of a law proves its non-existence. This conclusion, however, is by no means inculcated by the earlier writers, for example, Jer. xvi. 8 with Deut. xiv. 1. When we remember the corruption of the priests, over which the prophets lament (Isa. xxviii. 7 sqq.; Mic. iii. 11; Zeph. iii. 4, etc.), it is easy to understand how the laws were lying neglected among the archives of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The writings of the Old Testament are violently treated, both from a critical and an exegetical point of view, in order to serve the new theory of Hebrew history. The following may serve as examples. (1) The Pentateuch. — The Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 24, 25), according to Wellhausen (p. 30), "sanctions" sacrifices at any locality. He explains the words, "in all places where I record my name," thus: "This means nothing more than that they did not want the place of communion between heaven and earth to be looked upon as having been chosen arbitrarily; but that they regarded it as chosen in some way (1) by God himself." In truth, the matter stands thus: the passage forbids an arbitrary choice of the place of sacrifice, and, while it does not exclude a plurality of such places, neither presupposes nor demands them. The command which the Book of the Covenant also lays down, to appear three times a year before the Lord (Exod. xxiii. 17), decidedly points to a centralization of the worship. (2) The Historical Books — According to Wellhausen, these were subjected to many emendations and revisions, "so that the old tradition is covered up as with a Judaistic mould." The Chronicles are considered with particular sharpness. Leaving the refutation of such assertions, let me say that the picture of Ezra as given in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and by tradition, does not accord at all with the picture which the new theory draws. In order to overthrow a proof of the law of inheritance which prevailed among the priests of the line of Aaron, the false conclusion is drawn by Wellhausen from 1 Sam. ii. 27 sqq., that Zadok was the "first of an absolutely new line," and was neither a Levite, nor of the line of Aaron. The divine threat, however, is made only against Eli's house, and not against the entire house of his father. (3) The Prophets. — The treatment which this school gives to the prophets is, to say the least, of questionable value. Wellhausen says the word יִשְׁרֵי ("create") was not originally in Amos iv. 13, Isa. iv. 5. Joel is put after the exile. More violent however is done in the exegesis. The difference in the aim of the law and the prophets is ignored, as is the moral character of the ritual law. The prophets were not opposed to the observance of the sacrificial ritual, but only to practices of the people. Bredenkamp very justly insists upon the distinction of the prophets of the northern kingdom, who prophesy more against the introduction of heathen rites, and the southern kingdom, who prophesy more against an external service. (4) The Poetical Books. — Job is put after Jeremiah (Wellhausen, Bleek, W. R. Smith, etc.). Job i. 5, however, does not fit in with the new theory of the history of offerings. Of the Psalms, Wellhausen says the question is, "not whether any of the Psalms were composed after the exile, but whether any were written before the exile." If the words "baptizing offering and sin offering hast thou not required," in Ps. xi. 6, were, for example, before the exile, then the mention of sin offerings occurs before Ezekiel. If they were written after the exile, a view I do not hold, then the analogous utterances of Amos v. and Jer. vii. do not exclude the existence of the law of offerings at an earlier period (Comp. Bredenkamp and W. H. Green, in the Presbyterian Review for January, 1882, pp. 42 sqq.).

"P" contains a number of laws which were
without a motive, and could not be carried out after the exile, e.g., the Urim and Thummim (Exod. xxvii. 30; Lev. viii. 8; Num. xxvii. 21; the jubilee year, Lev. xxv. 8 sqq.; the Levitic cities, Num. xxxv. 1 sqq.; the law concerning spoils, Num. xxxi. 25 sqq.). It gives only the general principles, relations to the wilderness, and no special legislation is made for the time of rest in Canaan. Such a fiction would be in the highest degree astounding. The relation of P, especially as regards the law of holiness to Ezekiel, is now a subject of animated discussion. A careful comparison of the language shows that Ezekiel is dependent upon P. Ezekiel (xliv. 18 sqq.) differs from P in the number of daily offerings and the method of making them. A prophet has liberty to change; but it is inconceivable, that, at a period when so much emphasis was put upon the written word, a document like P, later to divine authority, could be composed with changes in this regard. Ezekiel was not the first to make the distinction of priests and Levites, but presupposes that distinction (xl. 45 sq., xlii. 13, xliii. 19).

It can be clearly shown of many laws of the Priests’ Code, that they are older than Deuteronomy. To date the command to kill the sacrifices only at the tabernacle (Lev. xvii. 1 sqq.) after Deuteronomy, or after the exile, at the side of the altar (Exod. xxiv. 4), is “simple nonsense.” It must have come into existence during the wanderings in the wilderness. A comparison of Deut. xiv. 19–20 and Lev. xi. 2–9 shows that Deuteronomy either draws directly from Leviticus, the better opinion (Ewald, Knobel, Riehm), or from the document which was used for the account in Leviticus (Dillmann). The language of P also deserves attention as an evidence for its antiquity. Ryssel, in his careful treatise on the language of P (De Elohista Pentateuchici sermone, Leipzig, 1878), reaches results inconsistent with the supposition of post-exilic origin.

According to Graf and many other critics, Deuteronomy was written a short time before Josiah’s reforms. There are serious objections to this theory. The account of the discovery — “I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord” (2 Kings xxii. 8) — indicates that its contents were known, not only to Hilkiah, but to others; and it was found in the temple, its proper place (Deut. xxxi. 9). This book contained, at any rate, the body of Deuteronomy; for the words of chap. xxviii. explain Huldah’s utterances, and the contents of the book as a whole explain Josiah’s reforms. And how does it occur that the book received such rapid and universal recognition? There must have been some external manifestation. Did Hilkiah attest it? But, according to the new theory of Hebrew history, the injunction of Deut. xviiiii. 6–8 must have been very unwelcome to the priests at Jerusalem; yet they and Hilkiah co-operate to spread the history of the book. This fact is a convincing proof that it already enjoyed irresistible authority at the time of its discovery. Dr. Green aptly says (Presbyterian Review for January, 1882, p. 114), “If Mr. Gladstone could but find some law-book in Dublin which had never been heard of before, how easily and amicably the whole Irish question might be settled!” From the words of Isa. xix. 19, “In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar (mazzeboth) at the border thereof,” W. Robertson Smith (Old Testament, etc., p. 354) draws the conclusion that Deuteronomy could not have been written before Isaiah.

Was Moses the Author of the Pentateuch?

The survey given by Professor Strack in the preceding article, of the bewildering maze of critical opinions respecting the origin of the Pentateuch, sufficiently shows that no certain conclusion as to its date and authorship is to be reached by that process. Can any thing more reliable be ascertained by appealing to historical testimony? Let us inquire what account the Pentateuch gives of itself, what accounts succeeding ages give of it, and whether there are sufficient reasons for setting this testimony aside.

We read (Deut. xxxi. 9). “Moses wrote this law,” and (ver. 24). “When Moses had made the end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished.” This has very generally been understood to affirm that the entire volume of the Pentateuch, known in later times as “the law of Moses,” was now completed by the addition of Deuteronomy. That this is what these words really mean, is further confirmed by the fact, that a record of the words of this law, begun by Moses, was continued by Joshua himself and contained whatever else may be inferred (1) from the interpretation put upon them in the Book of Joshua, and (2) from the manner in which the words of the law are understood to have been written in the Book of Joshua.

This Book of the Law (Josh. i. 8) contained (ver. 7) “all the law which Moses commanded;” and the commands of Moses by which Joshua was guided were not limited to Deuteronomy; thus, i. 13 ff., iv. 22 ff., drawn from Num. xxviii.; v. 3, from Gen. xvii. 10; v. 10, from Exod. xii. 6, Lev. xxii. 5; xiv. 1, 2, from Num. xxvi. 52-56, xxxii. 44, xxxiv. 18-19; xiv. 28 ff., from Num. xiii. 4; from Num. xxvi.; viii. 1, from Exod. xxii. 42; etc., from Num. xxxv. 9 ff. combined with Deut. xix. 2-8, from Num. xxxv. 2 ff.; xxxii. 29, from Lev. xvii. 1 ff. It is not improbable, from vii. 31-34, that “The Book of the Law of Moses, which Joshua commanded” was more complete of twelve sections, and that it was the same as “the book” referred to in Exod. xvii. 14, and contained whatever else Moses wrote in connection with the law; which is further confirmed by the fact, that a record made by Joshua himself was written in “The
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Book of the Law (Josh. xxiv. 26). (2) The volume written by Moses was to be read to the people at the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii., where vers. 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included), and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary (2 Kings xxii. 8), and thereby undoubtedly to be handed on to the entire Pentateuch. Accordingly, not a few of those who deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.

But, if we give these words the most restricted sense that can possibly be put upon them, they cannot mean less than that Moses wrote the laws contained in Deut. xii.-xxvi. Exod. xxiv. 4, in like manner, affirms that Moses wrote chaps. xx.-xxiii., which is styled (ver 7) "The Book of the Covenant." In Exod. xxxiv. 27 he is commanded to write vers. 10-26. All the laws scattered through Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are expressly declared in detail to have been given by God to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. The occasion upon which these statutes were severally enacted, the circumstances which called them forth, and facts connected with their actual observance in the time of Moses, are in many cases recorded in detail. Moreover, these laws bear the impress of the age and the region to which they are referred. The law of the passover (Exod. xii.) was given when each father of a family was priest in his own house; and atonement could be made by sprinkling the doorposts. The law of tabernacles (Neh. viii.), where vers. 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included, and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary, and thereby undoubtedly to be handed on to the entire Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.

The Pentateuch legislation, it is urged, is not digested unto one self-consistent code, as might be expected if it all belonged to one period, and sprang from a common source, but consists of several distinct bodies of law, which both differ in the matters to which they severally relate, and contain divergent regulations concerning the same matter. But this finds its adequate explanation in the different occasions upon which they were prepared, and the ends which they were respectively designed to answer. "The Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx.-xxiii.) was the basis of the relation about to be established between Jehovah and Israel. After the sin of the golden calf, Exod. xxxiv. 10-26 remains as interpreted to have been given by God to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. The occasion upon which these statutes were severally enacted, the circumstances which called them forth, and facts connected with their actual observance in the time of Moses, are in many cases recorded in detail. Moreover, these laws bear the impress of the age and the region to which they are referred. The law of the passover (Exod. xii.) was given when each father of a family was priest in his own house; and atonement could be made by sprinkling the doorposts. The law of tabernacles (Neh. viii.), where vers. 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included, and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary, and thereby undoubtedly to be handed on to the entire Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.

The Pentateuch legislation, it is urged, is not digested unto one self-consistent code, as might be expected if it all belonged to one period, and sprang from a common source, but consists of several distinct bodies of law, which both differ in the matters to which they severally relate, and contain divergent regulations concerning the same matter. But this finds its adequate explanation in the different occasions upon which they were prepared, and the ends which they were respectively designed to answer. "The Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx.-xxiii.) was the basis of the relation about to be established between Jehovah and Israel. After the sin of the golden calf, Exod. xxxiv. 10-26 remains as interpreted to have been given by God to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. The occasion upon which these statutes were severally enacted, the circumstances which called them forth, and facts connected with their actual observance in the time of Moses, are in many cases recorded in detail. Moreover, these laws bear the impress of the age and the region to which they are referred. The law of the passover (Exod. xii.) was given when each father of a family was priest in his own house; and atonement could be made by sprinkling the doorposts. The law of tabernacles (Neh. viii.), where vers. 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included, and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary, and thereby undoubtedly to be handed on to the entire Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.

The Pentateuch legislation, it is urged, is not digested unto one self-consistent code, as might be expected if it all belonged to one period, and sprang from a common source, but consists of several distinct bodies of law, which both differ in the matters to which they severally relate, and contain divergent regulations concerning the same matter. But this finds its adequate explanation in the different occasions upon which they were prepared, and the ends which they were respectively designed to answer. "The Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx.-xxiii.) was the basis of the relation about to be established between Jehovah and Israel. After the sin of the golden calf, Exod. xxxiv. 10-26 remains as interpreted to have been given by God to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. The occasion upon which these statutes were severally enacted, the circumstances which called them forth, and facts connected with their actual observance in the time of Moses, are in many cases recorded in detail. Moreover, these laws bear the impress of the age and the region to which they are referred. The law of the passover (Exod. xii.) was given when each father of a family was priest in his own house; and atonement could be made by sprinkling the doorposts. The law of tabernacles (Neh. viii.), where vers. 14 ff. show that Ezra understood Lev. xxiii. 40-42 to be included, and to be laid up beside the ark, and preserved in the sanctuary, and thereby undoubtedly to be handed on to the entire Pentateuch, nevertheless admit that the words in question were intended to assert that he did.
from the post-Mosaic history and writings is the officiating persons. Deuteronomy, which alleged discrepancies admit of satisfactory explanation.

Plurality of altars. In Leviticus, priestly duties are assigned by name to Aaron and his sons as the officiating priests, and the term "priestly" is used by them. But it neither asserts nor implies, as has sometimes been maintained, that every Levite was entitled to discharge priestly functions. Leviticus has, of course, fuller details in respect to the feasts and the ritual than Deuteronomy; but there is no disagreement between them.

There is, accordingly, no such diversity in the laws of the Pentateuch in respect to the altar. Exod. xx. 24, as Professor Strack correctly observes in the preceding article, gives no sanction to a simultaneous plurality of altars. In Leviticus, priestly duties are assigned by name to Aaron and his sons as the officiating priests, and the term "priestly" is used by them. But it neither asserts nor implies, as has sometimes been maintained, that every Levite was entitled to discharge priestly functions. Leviticus has, of course, fuller details in respect to the feasts and the ritual than Deuteronomy; but there is no disagreement between them.

There is, accordingly, no such diversity in the laws as conflicts with their having been given by Moses, and recorded by him. And the objection from the post-Mosaic history and writings is equally unfounded. It is said that the history affords no evidence of a law restricting sacrifice to one altar, or priestly functions to the family of Aaron, until long after the time of Moses, and that the contrary practice of good men makes the existence of such a law inadmissible and impossible.

It should be observed here, that history cannot be expected to record the regular observance of established institutions. This is taken for granted, and rarely referred to, except incidentally, or for the sake of mentioning infractions of them.

That, however, the Book of Joshua implies the existence and observance of the entire Mosaic law, is universally confessed. Judges speaks of but one house of Jehovah (xix. 18), this located at Shiloh (xviii. 31); of the annual feast there (xxi. 19); of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, as priest (xx. 28). Though the idolater Micah consecrated one of his own sons as priest (xxvii. 5), he was overjoyed to have a Levite instead (vers. 12, 13), who deserted his service to become priest of a tribe (xviii. 19, 20).

Plainly it would have been more tempting still to have been a priest of all Israel in Shiloh, if that had been permissible. In Samuel's childhood, the Mosaic "tabernacle of the congregation" (1 Sam. ii. 22), called indifferently "the house of the Lord" (i. 24) and "the temple of the Lord" (ver. 9) was still in Shiloh, and was the one commanded place of sacrifice for Israel (ii. 29). Eli and his sons officiated there (i. 3) as descendants of the Levites, whose office it was to be the tribes to be his priest (ii. 28). There was the ark and the lamp of God (iii. 5); and annual pilgrimages were made thither for worship (i. 3, 7, 21, ii. 14, 19).

While thus the regular course of the history establishes the existence of the Mosaic law of sacrifice and of the priesthood, all apparent anomalies are readily explicable. Sacrifices in the presence of the ark (Judg. xx. 27, 27, xxvi. 4; 1 Sam. vi. 15) were not irregular. The phrase "before God" (Josh. xxiv. 1), or "before the Lord" (Judg. xi. 11, xx. 1), contains no implication of a place of stated worship. "The sanctuary of the Lord" at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 26) was not a building erected for sacrifice, for the oak was "in it," not "by it" (as the Authorized Version has it), but a spot hallowed by its associations (Gen. xii. 6, 7, xxiii. 18, 19, xxiv. 4). The sacrifices at Bochim (Judg. i. 1-5), by Gideon (vi. 20-26) and by Manoah (xiii. 19, 20), were occasioned by the appearances of the angel of Jehovah. These extraordinary manifestations occurred elsewhere than at the tabernacle, since they were called forth by emergencies not adequately met by the ordinary means of divine communication. From the capture of the ark by the Philistines, until its transportation to Zion by David, there was no longer a sanctuary, which was the habitation of him who dwelt between the cherubim (1 Sam. ii. 32-36; Ps. lxxviii. 60; Jer. vii. 12, 14, xxvi. 6, 9). The law of the sanctuary was, therefore, necessarily in abeyance; and Samuel, as God's immediate representative, both assumed the functions of the degenerate priesthood, and offered sacrifice in various parts of the land. Until this provisional period was finally terminated by the erection of the temple, the people worshipped in high places (1 Kings iii. 2). The high places in Judah, after the temple was built, are censured by the sacred historian, and rebuked by the prophets, though even pious kings did not always succeed in suppressing them. Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel (1 Kings xvii. 23 ff.) was offered by divine command (ver. 36); and the unrebuked altars in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xviii. 30, xix. 10, 14) were erected by those who were debarred from going up to the temple at Jerusalem.

To the psalmists, from David onward, God's sole dwelling-place is Zion; and they make frequent mention of the law, which was spoken of as "written in the volume of the book" (Ps. xi. 7). The older prophets make frequent allusions to the ceremonial and other laws, and denounce the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. Hos. viii. 12 refers to an extensive written law.

There are, accordingly, abundant traces of the Mosaic legislation, from the days of Moses downward; and there is no reason to discredit its claim to have been delivered and written by Moses himself. If the laws are from the pen of Moses, so is the entire Pentateuch. For 1. These are not mere local peculiarities of a single tribe, but an integral portion of the Pentateuch, and have been so ever since the time of Ezra, when it is confessed that "The Book of the Law of Moses" (Neh. viii. 1) was the name given to the Pentateuch in its present form, which was thus attributed to Moses as its author. 2. The name of the first book of the Bible is spoken of on the first return of the exiles (Ez. iii. 2), as existing in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 3, 8, xxiv. 24, 25), of Amaziah (xiv. 6), of David and Solomon (xxi. 8; 1 Kings i. 3), in the
time of the judges (Judg. iii. 4) and of Joshua (1:7, 8). Unless decisive reasons can be adduced to the contrary, this must be held to be the same book.

2. There is no historical evidence or intimation that the pentateuchal laws ever existed separate from the rest of the Pentateuch, with which they are closely interwoven; the whole forming a unit in point of authorship and design. If Moses wrote the laws, the entire Pentateuch, as traditionally ascribed to him, must likewise be conceded to be his, unless there are valid reasons to the contrary. The Book of Deuteronomy consists of three addresses by Moses to the people (i.-iv. 40, v.-xxvi., xxvii.-xxx.) and an historical appendix (xxxvi.-xxxvii.). These addresses are intimately related to one another and to the laws which are included in the second address; the aim of the whole being to urge Israel to obey these laws. The style and language are identical; one spirit reigns throughout; and like recurring phrases frequently recur. The objections to the unity of the main body of the book (i.-xxx.), and to Moses as its author, are of the most trivial description. In the appendix, Moses is expressly said to have written the song (xxxii.), and to have spoken the blessing (xxxiii.). That he did not write chap. xxxiv. is plain from the contents. Whether he wrote any portion of chap. xxxiii., and if so, at what precise point he laid down the pen, and it was taken up by his successor, it might be difficult to determine; and fortunately this is wholly immaterial.

The laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are so intimately blended with the history as to be inseparable. Whoever wrote the one must of necessity have written the other likewise. And Genesis is plainly conceived and written as introductory to the Mosaic history and legislation. In fact, one consistent topic and method of treatment is pursued throughout the Pentateuch; the genealogies are continuous, and mutually supplementary: a consistent chronology is maintained; there are implications and allusions in one portion to what is found in other portions by way of anticipation or reminiscence, which bind all together. And even the alleged gaps in the history during the sojourn in Egypt, and the greater portion of the wanderings in the wilderness, only make more manifest how rigorously the plan of the entire work is adhered to.

3. Moses is expressly said, not only to have written these laws, but, in instances at least, historical incidents as well (Exod. xvii. 14; Num. xxxii. 2): which shows both that matters designed for permanent preservation were committed to writing, and that Moses was the proper person to do it. The statement respecting Amalek was to be written for a memorial in the history during the sojourn in Egypt, and the greater portion of the wanderings in the wilderness, only make more manifest how rigorously the plan of the entire work is adhered to.

4. The alleged inconsistencies and statements, implying a later date than that of Moses, are capable of a ready solution. There are only a very few isolated passages, which it is necessary to assume have been added or modified at a subsequent time; e.g., Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff.  

5. There are frequent allusions to the pentateuchal history in post-Mosaic writings, which not only confirm its truth, but by their evident verbal allusions, in some instances at least, imply its existence in written form. Joshua is throughout based on the entire antecedent narrative (Judg. i. 10, 20, comp. Num. xiii. 25-27, 15-26, comp. Num. xx. 14 ff., xxx. 2 ff.). See also Judg. ii. 1-3, 7, iv. 11 (Num. x. 29), v. 4, 5, 8, 10, 18; Ruth iv. 11, 12, 18 ff.; 1 Sam. ii. 27, 28, xii. 6, 8, xv. 2, 6, 29 (Num. xxii. 19); 2 Sam. vii. 6, 22-24; in the Davidic Psalms, such allusions as Ps. xii. to Gen. i.; x. 6 to Gen. xii. 24; xxxiv. 10, cx. 4. In the prophets it will be sufficient to refer to the following passages in Hosea: i. 10 (comp. Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 12), xi. 8 (comp. Deut. xxxix. 23; Gen. xiv. 2), xii. 3, 4, 12, xi. 1, xii. 9, xiii. 4-6 (Deut. viii. 12-14), viii. 15, ix. 3 (comp. Deut. xxviii. 85), ix. 10, xii. 5 (comp. Exod. iii. 16); 2 Sam. xiv. 15, 16 (iv. 10 (comp. xxxvi. 26).  

6. The language of the Pentateuch is throughout the Hebrew of the purest period, with no trace of later words, or forms, or constructions, or of the Chaldaicisms of the exile. The archaisms like for such ("she"), like for such ("girl"), are peculiar to the Pentateuch. It always uses "laugh", never "peel"; "fine linen", never "wine"; "afflict the soul", never "fast", nor the later derivative "purify"; "shepherd" ("kingdom"), never "king", and, or, etc.  

7. The familiarity with Egyptian objects and institutions shown by the writer, and presupposed in the people, as this has been exhibited in detail, particularly by Hengstenberg and by Ebers, is most readily explicable in the Mosaic period.

8. The doctrinal contents of the Pentateuch show that it belongs to the earliest period of the Old Testament. Its teachings respecting the Messiah, divine retribution, the distinction between the first-born and the future state, are of the most elementary nature. In respect to all these points, a great advance is made in the Psalms and other poetical books, and in the prophets. Its account of the creation, the fall, and the deluge, while uncontaminated by any Pagan or polytheistic conceptions, has, nevertheless, such points of contact with older Assyrian myths as establish its very high antiquity. Some of the Mosaic laws had already been expanded by usage at an early period of the history; as that of levirate marriage in Ruth, the Nazarite in Samson, and the consecration of the first-born in Samuel. The service of the sanctuary was enlarged by music and by courses of priests under David, and its vessels multiplied under Solomon; and the prophetic order, of which the Pentateuch speaks as still future, superseded the priestly responses, for which it made provision. The Pentateuch ordains rites, but suggests no explanation; this was a matter of tradition, as respecting sacrifice (Ps. xi.; Isa. liii.), purifications (Ps. xxi. 6, li. 7), incense (Ps. cxvii. 2), the privileges of God's house (Ps. xxi. 4),
the comparative value of ritual and spiritual worship (Ps. 1. 8 ff., li. 16, 17, Isa. 1. 11 ff.).

9. An argument has sometimes been drawn from the Samaritan Pentateuch, under the impression that it must have been derived from copies existing in Israel prior to the schism of Jeroboam; since the Samaritans would not have adopted it from the Jews, on account of the bitter feud between them. Nor would the northern kingdom, from the time of the Schism, have retained it. Hence they have accepted from the hostile kingdom of Judah a volume of laws which was in open contradiction with both the worship and the civil polity existing among themselves. But, inasmuch as the grievance of the Samaritans lay in the refusal of the Jews to recognize them as their brethren (Ex. iv. 1-3), the former coveted whatever would lend support to their claim. Hence their temple, modelled after that at Jerusalem. Hence their doctrines and traditions, borrowed from the Jews. And their Pentateuch was drawn from the same source and in the same spirit.

But the existence and authority of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of Israel, from the time of the schism, can be established by a different line of argument. The prophets of the ten tribes, Hosea and Amos, make frequent appeals to "the law," which was a written law of ten thousand precepts (Hos. viii. 12), and a covenant (viii. 1) formed when Israel came out of Egypt (xii. 9, xiii. 4); and the people are charged with gross criminality for disobeying it. The ceremonial which they describe, the statutes to which they refer, and the events to which they allude, are precisely those which are found in the Pentateuch. And no valid reason can be given for supposing the volume of which they speak to be any other than the Pentateuch itself, which is thus shown to have been possessed of incontrovertible divine authority among those who had the strongest reasons for denying its binding obligation if they could.

10. The testimony of our Lord, and of the inspired writers of the New Testament, is in various passages unequivocally given to the Mosaic origin and authority of the law that bears his name, and which is indifferently denominated "the law of Moses," "the Book of Moses," and "Moses." It thus peremptorily waives aside any theory which makes the statutes of the Pentateuch, in whole or in part, the product of a later age. The Pentateuch is further, by fair implication, attributed to the pen of Moses. Jesus says to the Jews, concerning Moses (John v. 46, 47), "He wrote of me," and, without further explanation, refers them to "his writings," as something well known, and in their possession, and which they should have believed. We read in the same Gospel (i. 45), "Moses in the law," as well as the prophets, wrote concerning Jesus. The contrast with the prophets shows that it is the entire Pentateuch, and not its legal sections merely, which is here referred to. The same is the case in Luke xxiv. 27, where our Lord, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (comp. Acts xxvii. 28). There is New Testament authority for understanding in the protevangelium (Rom. xvi. 20), the promises to the patriarchs (John viii. 56; Gal. iii. 18), the blessing of Judah (Heb. vii. 14), the account of Melchisedec (Heb. vii.), the ladder of Jacob (John i. 51), the paschal lamb (John xix. 36), the daily sacrifice (John i. 29), the sin-offering (Heb. xii. 11, 12), the day of atonement (Heb. ix. 7), the whole system of sacrifices and lustrations (Heb. ix. 13, x.), the high priest (Heb. viii. 1), the water from the rock (1 Cor. x. 4), the prophet like unto Moses (Acts iii. 22). These, and other things of a like nature, are written in the "law," or in Moses, concerning Christ, and are designated by our Lord as written by Moses himself. It is not to be supposed that he makes here the special revelation of a fact known by his omniscience,—that Moses wrote the Messianic passages, and nothing more. But Christ affirms that Moses wrote them, because he was the well-known author of the Pentateuch, which contained them. This explicit assertion of Mosaic authorship gives the key to the proper understanding of other passages, which, taken singly, might have been susceptible of a different interpretation, but, viewed in this light, afford it abundant corroborating evidence.

There is, accordingly, nothing to contradict, but much to confirm, the idea, which has come down from the earliest times, that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, unless a fatal objection is to be found in the modern critical hypothesis, that it is composed of a diversity of documents. There is no space here for an examination of that hypothesis, or of the grounds on which it rests. Some things are plausibly said in its favor, but there are serious objections to it which have never yet been removed. I cannot regard it as certainly established, even in the Book of Genesis, much less in the remainder of the Pentateuch, where even Bleek confessed he could no longer endure the Elohist from the Jehovist: the second Elohist he could not find anywhere. Thus much, at least, may be safely said: the criteria of this proposed analysis are so subtle, not to say mechanical, in their nature, so many purely conjectural assumptions are involved, and there is such an absolute absence of external corroborative testimony, that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions, where these conflict with statements of the history itself. Genesis may be made up of various documents, and yet have been compiled by Moses. And the same thing is possible, even in the later books of the Pentateuch. If these could be successfully partitioned among different writers, on the score of variety in the literary execution, why may not these have been engaged, jointly with Moses himself, in preparing, each his appointed portion, and the whole have been finally reduced by Moses to its present form, and issued with his sanction and authority? Even the allegation that the pentateuchal documents can still be traced in the Book of Joshua creates no serious difficulty. It is the entire Pentateuch, and not any of their contemporaries, had a hand in the preparation of the Mosaic history and legislation, why might they not continue their work, and record what occurred after Moses was taken away?

The real fact, however, is, that the continuity of the Pentateuch and Joshua lies in the subject, and not in any external sequence in the text. The conquest and settlement of Canaan is the end contemplated in the promises made to the patriarchs and in
the whole course of the subsequent history; but it no more follows that the same pen recorded the whole than that one leader both conducted Israel out of Egypt, and brought them into the possession of Canaan. The coincidences in thought and expression between Joshua and the Pentateuch arise simply from the circumstance that the former records the execution of commands and the fulfilment of promises given in the latter, and these are naturally repeated in exact language. It simply shows that the actors in these events, and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch before them, and carefully followed it. It simply shows that the actors in these events, and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch before them, and carefully followed it. It simply shows that the actors in these events, and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch before them, and carefully followed it. It simply shows that the actors in these events, and the writer of the book, had the Pentateuch before them, and carefully followed it.

W. HENRY GREEN.

PENTECOST. (a) The Jewish (pentacost, rabbinical מֵי יַעֲשֹׂנְתָּן, cf. Joseph., Bell. Jud., 2, 3, 1). — Among the ancient Israelites it was the second of their three pilgrimage festivals, and marked the conclusion of the harvest commenced with the passover, fifty days before. For reasons assigned in Lev. xxii. 23-32, and Num. xxviii. 26-31, according to which, the chief offering made by the whole people shall consist in "two wave loaves" salted, brought "out of your habitations." Concerning preparation of these, cf. Exod. xxxiv. 22; Joseph., Antiqg., III. 10, 6. According to Mishnah, Menachoth, 11, 4, the length of this bread was to be seven breadths; its breadth, four; and its "horns" (יָתְנֶפֶן), the breadth of seven fingers. An analogy is found in the δήμος τῶν ἱερῶν of the Greek sacrifice. In addition to this bread, Lev. xxiii. 10 sqq. prescribes further offerings. Cf. also Num. xxviii. 27 sqq., and, on the later practice, Joseph., Antiqg., 3, 10, 6. In addition to the public offerings, there were also some of a private character. Cf. Num. xxviii. 26; Deut. xvi. 10-12. The manner of bringing these to Jerusalem is described in Mishna, Bekarim, 3, 2 sqq. The law restricted the Pentecost festival to one day, to be kept holy (Lev. xxiii. 21, xxviii. 26). Joseph., Antiqg., III. 10, 6, says it was called άπανθή (ἀπάνθη), in Hebrew, and it is really called thus in the Mishnah; the Pentateuch, however, preferring other designations. Cf. Lev. xxiii. 36, and Deut. xvii. 8. The word ἀπάνθη, used in this context, does not signify the "close of the last cycle," and thus has nothing to do with the ἓξακον of the LXX; nor with the רְאֹתֹת הָעִשֶּׁה, of rabbinical literature. This festival, mentioned but once in the historical books (2 Chron. viii. 18), was purely of an agrarian nature,—thanksgiving for the grain harvest, as the Feast of Tabernacles is for the fruit harvest. Only in post-biblical times did it receive an historical basis and connection. Philo, Josephus, and the older portions of the Talmud, know nothing of it. Since Maimonides (More Nebuchim, 3, 43), Pentecost is regarded as the memorial festival of the giving of the law on Sinai. This is based in Exod. xxi. 1. Cf. Hamburger: Real-Encycl. des Judenthums, i. 1051 sqq.; Schürer: Satzungen u. Gebräuche d. talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums, pp. 216 sqq., and, for the literature, the art. Passover. Von Orelli.

(b) The Christian. — Among the Christians, Pentecost is the third of the chief festivals, closing the cyclus of the festivals referring to the Lord, and thus separating the Semestra Dominii and the Semestra Ecclesiae. It is connected with its Jewish predecessor, not only historically, through the events recorded in Acts vii., but also internally, being early regarded as a festival of thanksgiving for the first-fruits of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 23; cf. Augustine, Ep. 54 ad Januar.). Originally the term "Pentecost" designated the whole period of fifty days, from Easter to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is thus used by Tertullian, De Idolatria, c. 12; by Origen, Contra Celc., viii. 22; by the Antiochene Synod of 341, in canon 20; by Basil the Great, De Sp. Sancto, c. 27, Const. App. V. 20, and the Ordo Romana. In contrast to Lent, there was no fasting during this season, and prayers were spoken while in a standing posture. In addition, this joyful period was marked by a cessation of theatre and circus exhibitions, and by increased ceremonial and liturgy in the church services.

In a narrower sense, as designating the last day of this quinquagesimal period, the word "Pentecost" is first found in a canon of the Council of Elvira, 305; cf. Labbe, Concill. I. X. 975. On the importance of this feast for the early Church, cf. Euseb., De Vita Const., IV. 64. Gregory of Naz., Orat. XLIV. de Pentec., honors it as ημέρα τοῦ πνεύματος; and Chrysostom, Hom. II. de Pentec., as μητρόπολις τῶν ιερότων. Cf. also Augustine, Ep. 54 ad Januar. c. Faust, I. xxxii.; Leo the Great, Serm. 75-77 de Pentec.; Concil. Agath. a. 508; 31 sqq. At an early period already the days around Pentecost were also regarded with especial honor; but, from the eighth century down, these festivals began to be curtailed, and the Protestant Church of to-day celebrates only two Pentecost days.

Because it was customary to wear white garments on Pentecost, this day is called Whitsunday, and the whole period Whitsuntide. The older literature is found in Augustii: Denkwürdigkeiten, ii. 384 sqq; Guericke: Lehrbuch der christ.-kirchl. Archäologie, pp. 190-196. For later, cf. Nilles (S. J.): Kalendarium manichaei Ecclesiae, etc. (1879), tom. ii. 270 sqq. Zöckler: (O. H. Schodde.)

PERATÆ. See Gnosticism, p. 881.

PERCY, Thomas, D.D., Bishop of Dromore, County Down, Ireland; b. at Bridgnorth, Shropshire, England, April 13, 1728; d. at Dromore, Sept. 30, 1811. His fame rests on his History of Ancient English Poetry (1780); such work was edited by him from an old manuscript. He was, in consequence of this publication, advanced in the church, being made chaplain-in-ordinary to the king, 1799, Dean of Carlisle, 1778, and Bishop.
of Dromore, 1782. His religious publications embrace The Song of Solomon (newly translated from the original Hebrew) with a Commentary and Annotations, which came out anonymously in 1764; and Key to the New Testament, 1765, 3d ed., 1779.

Perea, the lower part of Eastern Palestine.

Pereira, Antonio de Figueiredo, b. at Macao, Feb. 14, 1725; d. in Lisbon, Aug. 9, 1797. He was educated by the Jesuits at Villa-Vicosa, but refused to become a member of the order; entered the society of the Fathers of the Oratory; devoted himself to art and literature, and attracted much attention by his Exercícios da língua latina e portuguesa (1751) and his Novo Método da gramática latina (1752). In the contest between Don José I. and the Ultramontanist party, he threw himself with violence on the royal side; wrote Doctrina veteris ecclesiae, etc. (1765), Tentativa theologica (1769), both translated into French; obtained a high position in the government; and became a member, afterwards president, of the Academy of Sciences. The list of his works numbers a hundred and sixty-nine. It is his translation of the Bible into Portuguese, originally published in Lisbon (1778–90, 23 vols.), which the British and Foreign Bible Society circulates.

Perfectionism. Calvinists and Lutherans deny any perfection in this life; but there are three theories in the other branches of the Christian Church upon this subject, advocated by Roman and Greek Catholics, Wesleyan Arminians, and Friends respectively. There is also the theory of the Oberlin school of theology. (1) Roman Catholics teach that the observance of God's command is possible for one who is justified. His sins are venial, not mortal. He may even suffer an obedience beyond the demands of the law. Yet his venial sins compel him to use the petition, "Forgive us our debts." In some cases, by a special privilege of God, he may avoid all sins. Cf. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, sess. vi. chap. xi. and can. 23, 25; Schaff, Creeds, ii. pp. 100–102, 115. (2) Wesleyan Arminians teach a perfection which is not angelic, Adamic, nor absolute, but one that is relative; i.e., according to the special economy introduced by the Divinity, in which, for the present, the nature of the saved is to be fulfilled. This is the "highest perfection," says Wesley, "which man can attain while the soul dwells in the body does not exclude ignorance and error and a thousand infirmities." This is what is styled Christian perfection. Its source is the grace of God; its fruit, freedom from all ungodly tempers, self-will, pride, anger, sinful thoughts. (3) The Friends teach, in the case of the justified, "The body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united, and subjected unto the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the evil one, but to be free from actual sinning, and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord." — Eighth point of order of Friends. Schaff, Creeds, iii. pp. 974, 975. (4) The Oberlin school of theology teaches that "as virtue and sin belong only to voluntary action, and are contradictory in their nature, they cannot co-exist in the soul. The beginning of the Christian life is entire obedience. Every lapse into sin involves, for the time, the entire interruption of obedience. The promises of God and the provisions of the gospel are such, that, when fully and continuously embraced, they enable the believer to live a life of uninterrupted obedience,—an attainment which may be promoted and expected in the present life." Cf. art. New-England Theology, 5, p. 1897.

Pericopes, properly PERGAMUM (Rev. i. 11, ii. 12–17), the seat of one of the seven churches of Asia, a celebrated city of Teuthrania, Great Myasia, on the north side of the Caicus, about three miles from the Ægean Sea. The city began as a fortress upon the acropolis, and early obtained a sacred character. There Lyismachus, a general of Alexander the Great, stored his stolen treasure, which amounted to nine thousand talents. But Philaterus of Tium, a eunuch, whom he implicitly trusted, faithlessly appropriated the money, in revenge for ill-treatment by Lyismachus' wife, declared himself independent, and thus laid the foundation for a long-continued prosperity, B.C. 283. Under the house of Attalus, the city was beautified, and its territory extended. Pergamum was also a literary centre, and boasted of a library of two hundred thousand rolls, which was finally moved to Alexandria, as a gift of Antony to Cleopatra, and thus destroyed. The word "parchment" is derived from the Latin charta pergamenta ("paper of Pergamum"). The city was renowned for its Æsculapian worship, as the birthplace of celebrated physicians (chief of whom was Galen), as the seat of a famous medical school, indeed, of a university, as a bathing-place, and also for its idolatry and gladiatorial shows. Here, however, Christianity made one of its first triumphs, and here some of the first blood was shed for Christ. It is probably to this persecution that the allusion "Satan's throne" (Rev. ii. 13. cf. 10) refers.

In the second century A.D., Pergamum had a population of a hundred and twenty thousand. To-day it is called Bergama; and the population is from twenty thousand to thirty thousand, of whom two thousand are Christians, the rest Mohammedans. Many ruins attest its former magnificence, but none of them antedate the Roman period (190 B.C.).

Pericopes (περικόπαι), or the sections of Holy Scripture appointed to be read in the services of the church, for many reasons deserve the consideration which older theology already has bestowed upon them. They belong to the distinguishing characteristics of the cultus of the religion of revelation in the Friends. Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 5, p. 1634; and History of the Christian Church, 4, p. 333.

Lit. — See, for the Calvinistic side, Hodge: Systematic Theology, iii. (245 pp.); Van Oosterzee: Christian Dogmatics, ii. p. 661. For the Wesleyan-Arminian side, see Wesley: Plans Account of Christian Perfection; Fletcher: Christian Perfection. For the Oberlin side, see Finney: Systematic Theology; Fairchild: On the Doctrine of Sanctification, in Congregational Quarterly, April, 1876.
1. The employment of pericopes in the church originated in the forms of worship in the synagogue. The Scriptures themselves command that the law shall be publicly read (Deut. xxxi. 10-13) for the instruction of the people. Cf. also Josephus, c. Ap., ii. 17. When synagogues were built, this public reading formed a portion of the regular sabbath services. Cf. Acts xvi. 15. With the reading of the law, was already, in Christ's day, associated the reading of the prophets. Cf. Luke iv. 16, 17; Acts xii. 15. Both have been retained to the present day. The sections of the law to be read on the sabbath at the present time can be seen by a reference to the Hebrew text. They are called Parashas (παρασάς, from σαράμι, separari). Genesis contains twelve, Exodus eleven, Leviticus and Numbers each ten, Deuteronomy eleven. — fifty-four in all. This number is arranged for the Jewish leap-year, which contains fifty-four sabbaths. In ordinary years, several of the shorter sections are sometimes read on the same day; so that each year the whole law is completed. With the above are connected the sections in the prophetic books. The law is called from לְדָמוּס, dimissio, or missa, because, after reading these, the people were dismissed, a list of which is found appended to the Hebrew Bible. Rabbinical tradition assigns a high antiquity, not only to the public reading of the prophetic books in general, but also to the present selection of sections, and a still earlier date to the Parashas. Elias Levita (cf. Bodenschatz: Die kirchl. Verfassung d. heutigen Juden, ii. p. 24) relates, that, when Antiochus forbade the reading of the law, the people began to read sections of the prophetic books in general, but also to the present selection of sections, and a still earlier date to the Parashas. Thus, e.g., if on the first sabbath an account of creation was to be read, a prophetic section would be chosen, such as Isa. xlii.5-xliii. Case, the reading of the law, was already, in Christ's day, associated the reading of the prophets. Cf. Vitringa's idea (Archisynagogus, pp. Ill sqq.), that the Jews were chiefly induced by their antipathy to their enemies, the Samaritans, who read only the law, to introduce lessons for the Sundays, (a lectio continua, which is generally supposed to exist there, is not so apparent. Some system, however, has been followed out. Thus, for the period between Easter and Pentecost, as Chrysostom already states, the Acts and the Gospel of John were read continuously. For the rest of the church year, three separate and independent series of lessons are employed,—one series for the Sundays, beginning with the second after Pentecost; one series for the sabbaths, beginning on the Pentecost Week; and one series for the five week days between the Sunday and sabbath. All these series select both from Gospels and Epistles, following the order of the books and chapters in the New Testament.

History explains this strange phenomenon. It is very evident that the Greek Church at first introduced lessons for the Sundays, later for the sabbaths, and still later for the week-days. Documentary evidences to this effect are at hand, especially for the lectionaries for the week-days, which are found only in later and poorer manuscripts. The Sunday and sabbath lessons are already referred to by Chrysostom. The Old Testament was read chiefly during the season of Lent. The peculiar character of the Greek Church, however, makes it probable that the present system of lessons known as the Antiochian-Byzantine was not the only one used in early days. And in the churches during the fourth century we already possess a system of reading in this direction in some very old manuscripts.

5. Next in importance is the Armenian system. Professor Petermann of Berlin first translated it from the Armenian Church Almanac, published in Venice, 1782; which translation appeared in Dr. Ait's instructive work (Kirchenjahr, ed. ii., pp. 136, 225.) Scripture-reading is a most important part of Armenian
church service,— more so than in the Greek Church. During the time from Easter to Pentecost the Armenian Church does not only have services daily, but has them three every day, and for every service has prescribed lessons from the Old and New Testaments. During the rest of the year, this church not only celebrates every Sunday and saint's day, but also regularly every Wednesday and Saturday. In this way it is made possible that between Easter and Pentecost, during the principal services, the whole Psalter, the Acts of the Apostles, the whole of St. John to chap. xiv., are read; in the matins, the first half of the Gospel of Luke, and, in the vespers, the Gospel of Matthew to xvi. 1, and Mark to xii. 37, are read. From Pentecost on, both the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels are read; for ten weeks, Matthew; for eleven weeks, Mark; for thirteen weeks, Luke; and from Epiphany, John i.—vii., these latter chapters thus being read twice every year. In addition to these, selections from the Old Testament are also read.

The Armenian system in its kernel is very ancient. It shows enough of connection with the Greek system to prove that the latter is its source, and is thus older than the separation of these churches, in 695 A.D. But even a higher antiquity can be shown; since this system exhibits the two chief peculiarities of the Cappadocian plan, which, as early as the sixth century, presented lessons for Wednesdays and Saturdays, and also from the Old Testament were regularly read. The Armenian system in its kernel is very ancient. But the Nestorians had more than one system: at least there is a second series of epitola lessons recorded in a Vatican manuscript of 1301.

The "Nestorian" lessons recorded by Dr. Alt (Der Christl. Cultus, ii. p. 485), as found prescribed in the New Testament for the Christians of Malabar, have some marked peculiarities, but are of doubtful authenticity.

The documents with reference to the reading-system of the Jacobite Christians are quite ample, but have not yet been satisfactorily examined. The very first edition of the Syriac New Testament, published by Widmanstadius, Vienna, 1855, contains a list of the New-Testament pericopes of the Jacobites; and, besides, a Jacobite Liturgy, found in the second volume of Renaudot's collection, contains relevant matter.

This latter volume prescribes a twofold liturgical arrangement,— the first called Ordo communis secundum ritum Syrorum Jacobitum (pp. 1 sqq.); and the second, Alius Ordo generalis liturgiae (pp. 12 sqq.). And, according to the investigations of Bickell, only the latter is a Jacobite, while the former is a Maronite, plan; which explains the discrepancies between them. The Alus Ordo also agrees with Widmanstadius' list. That the latter is that of the Jacobite Church is plain from the fact that Moses of Marden, from whose hand this Syriac text was derived, was a Jacobite. But this list itself lacks inner harmony, the epitola lessons not according with those of the Gospel. The British Bible Society, in retaining the liturgical readings of the Widmanstadius' edition, seems to have published its edition only for the Jacobite Christians. Widmanstadius' list is thus not satisfactory. But other evidences, chiefly ample and good manuscript authorities, as to the Jacobite system, are at our command. Their common peculiarity, like that of the Nestorian system, consists in the selection of particular portions of Scripture for certain prominent days. Thus Christmas is marked by selections that treat of the incarnation of Christ historically; the Epiphany period by extracts from the early work of Christ; and there is here a series of lectiones selectae that are of such a character as to deserve in some respects to be placed at the side of the Roman pericope-system. For certain portions of the church-year, certain New-Testament books are used. Thus, for the first half of the Epiphany period, the Gospel of St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are chiefly employed. In place of the latter, the Epistle to the Romans is used from the Monday of the first week in Lent to Palm Sunday; and, side by side with this, sections of the Sermon on the Mount are read. The Old Testament lessons of St. John's Gospel are again employed, however, with some interruptions. From Pentecost on, selections from Matthew, then from Luke, follow, accompanied by portions of Corinthians, Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians. It is possible that the Nestorians adopted this arrangement to mark their contrast with the Greek Church, either originating it themselves, or taking it from existing practices. The date would then be the fifth century. The system is certainly very peculiar, and in marked contrast with the Byzantine, as is especially seen by the Old-Testament selections.
Maronites, the youngest of the Syrian churches, is virtually the same as that of the Jacobites.

7. While the lectionary plan adopted by the Alexandrian churches was entirely distinct, and is a portion of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Basilius. A Latin translation is found in Renaudot's collection (i. pp. 137 sqq.), from which it is evident, that, in every chief service, the Copts read from four different parts of the New Testament. Upon this they laid much stress. The constitutions of the Patriarch Cyrilrus Lablaki enjoin the bishops to watch at *un omittant lectionem librorum quingue in quasis liturgia*, nempe Pauli, Catholici, Actorum, Psalmorum, et Evangeli. Cf. l. c. i., 203. The particular features of this system are not known.

8. The Ethiopic system is virtually identical with the Coptic, as is its whole Liturgy. Cf. Renaudot, i. 489, 507 sqq.

9. The proper transition from the eastern to the western systems would be the North-African lectionaries, if we were in possession of such. With the Mozarabic, prevalent among the African and Spanish Christians in the thirteenth century, no list has been preserved. An examination of Augustine's authentic works seems to indicate that a lectio continua was followed; the chief festival days, of course, having their fixed lessons.

10. In the Occidental Church we have, in reference to the public reading of Scriptures, a phenomenon similar to that observed in the Church of the East. As here the Byzantine system was the one most extensively spread, thus, in the West, the Roman system gradually supplanted all the rest. A difference between the two consists in this, that the non-Byzantine systems of the East were mostly followed by bodies that stood opposed to the Byzantine Church, while the non-Roman systems found a home in bodies on doctrinal and fraternal footing with the Roman Church.

11. Of the existence of a south-Italian system employed at Capua, we have ample proof in the Cod. Fuldensis, corrected in the year 545 by Bishop Victor himself of Capua.

12. That the Christians of Gaul pursued a peculiar plan in the public reading of Scriptures is already manifest from a letter of the missionary Augustinus to Gregory the Great. Besides, there are other scattered evidences from Hilary (354), Sidonius (472), Salvianus (440). Cf. Mabill., *De liturg. Gallic*, pp. 29 sqq. Then we have a Capitular of Charlemagne, abolishing the Gallic Liturgy in favor of the Roman. The very ancient Liturgy and reading-system of the Milan Church has been more fortunate. It is still preserved under the title *Missae Ambrosiana*. Its original form cannot be definitely determined, as the different printed texts do not agree among themselves.

13. On the very peculiar Mozarabic system, consult the special article. It seems to be older than the Gallic system, or they form two branches from one stem.

14. Of the old British and Irish systems, not a single trace remains, the Roman having entirely supplanted them.

15. The Roman system of scriptural reading, like the whole Roman Liturgy, has passed through three stages,—that of its origin and development down to the time of the Carlovignians, that of its supremacy in the middle ages, and that of fixed and formal codification by the Council of Trent.

The oldest traces of it are found in the fifth century, about the time of Jerome, to whom Berno and later writers ascribe its origin. It consists of a double list,—one of Epistle, and the other of Gospel selections,—partly chosen freely, and partly with partiality for certain books.

In the second period, this system made its greatest conquests; in France supplanting the Gallic, in Germany entering with Christianity. It also experienced some internal changes during this time, especially on account of the many saints' days and the introduction of the Corpus Christi Festival in 1264.

Finally the Council at Trent declared the papal system the only legitimate one for the Roman Church, only allowing those churches the use of any other which could prove that the latter had been in constant use there for the past two hundred years.

16. With the Reformation effected by Luther and his German Bible, the traditional character of church services necessarily had to change also. The Bible was read, studied, and explained. The most complete system of Bible lessons was introduced in England, to some extent, also, in Germany and Switzerland. This whole subject is treated in extenso by Ranke: *Fortbestand des kirchlichen Perikopenkreises*, Gotha, 1859.

17. The old pericope system has a peculiar history within the section of the Protestant Church that has retained it. In England, Cranmer, in writing the Prayer-Book, simply took the Epistles and Gospels as found in the Missale of the English bishoprics, omitting only those intended for days not celebrated by the Protestants. This latter was also done in Germany; but some other changes were made here, especially at the close of the Epiphany and Trinity Sundays. In the pre-reformatory system there were no lessons for the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, nor for the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh Sundays after Trinity. This defect was remedied successfully during the sixteenth century by an unknown master in liturgies; and the present arrangement is the result.

18. The subordinate services, such as the matins, vespers, as also services during the week, prayer-meetings, and the like, found great favor in the eyes of the Reformers. Luther in 1528, the Zurich order of worship for 1635, and the Geneva Liturgy, gave directions for the use of lessons in such services.

The Church of England pursued its own plan in arranging the daily lessons. Not content, as the Continental Reformers were, with selecting only certain sections of Scripture to be read, Cranmer arranged for morning and evening services such a course of lessons, that in every year the entire Old Testament, with the exception of the Psalter and the purely ritual sections of the Pentateuch, was read through once, the New Testament three times, and the Psalter twelve times, i.e., was to be chanted through once a month.

In Germany the services during the week in the course of time became almost extinct.

PERICOPES.
19. The public scriptural reading, thus reduced to the regular Gospel and Epistola lessons for the different Sundays, could not long satisfy the church. Already Spener advocated an enlarged pericope system; and since 1769, when the movement was started by the Elector George of Hanover, the evangelical authorities in the various provinces of Germany have sought to remedy this defect, especially by the adoption of new series of pericopes. Cf. Ranke in the original of this art. (Herzog, II. vol. xi. 460-492), and Nebe on the Pericopes. E. N. RANKE. (G. S. SCHOTZELD.)

PERIKAU, Synods of. — I. (1551). The consolidation of the Roman-Catholic party in Poland, and the drawing-up of the Confessio catholica fidei by Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Culm and Ermeland, as a counterbalance to the Confessio Augustana.

— II. (1555). The consolidation of the Protestant party in Poland, and the sending of a royal embassy to Paul IV., demanding the celebration of mass in the vernacular tongue, the administration of the Lord's Supper in both forms, the abolition of annata, the abrogation of ecclesiastical celibacy, etc. — III. (1562). The wild outburst of disension with the Protestant camp, between Lutherans, Calvinists, and Antitrinitarians. — IV. (1564). Religious disputation (Aug. 6-14) between the Antitrinitarians, Grigor Pauli and Georg Scholmann, and the Reformed, Stanislaus Saruziki, Discorda, and others. The Lutherans took no part in the discussion. The Antitrinitarians were excluded from any discussion with the Reformed Church. See POLAND.

PERIZZITES. See CANAAN, p. 380.

PERKINS, Justin, D.D. American missionary in Persia; b. at West Springfield, Mass., March 12, 1805; d. at Chicopee, Mass., Dec. 31, 1869. He was graduated at Amherst, 1829; studied at Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1833 was sent by the American Board to the Nestorians in Persia. He established himself at Oroonoini (November, 1834), and for thirty-six years conducted the mission. He translated the Bible into the Nestorian dialect, and also other books. In 1842 he made a tour through the United States, accompanied by Mar Yohanan, an early convert, and repulsive features of old scholasticism, and adapted to the modern state of controversy. His system appears in two works, unabridged and abridged, — under the titles Praelectiones theologicae qua in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu debat, Rome, 1835 sqq., 9 vols. 8vo, republished and reprinted in many editions at Turin (51st ed., 1865), Paris (1870, 4 vols.), Brussels, Ratisbon, and elsewhere, translated into French and German; and Praelectiones theologicae in Compendium redactae (abridged), Rome, 1845, 4 vols., 36th ed., 1881, 2 vols., translated into several languages. Besides this great work, he wrote Iter Heresiastid, Rome, 1838; Pericopes. Cf. Ranke in the original of this art. (Herzog, II. vol. xi. 460-492), and Nebe on the Pericopes. E. N. RANKE. (G. S. SCHOTZELD.)

PERKINS, William, b. at Marston Jabet in Warwickshire, Eng., in 1558; entered Christ's College, Cambridge, 1577; was chosen fellow of the same in 1582; entered the ministry, and was appointed lecturer at Great St. Andrews, Cambridge. He married in 1590. He was called before the High Commission for inquiry as to his participation with Cartwright in the Puritan movement. He seems, however, to have taken little interest in ecclesiastical affairs, but was a high Calvinist and scholastic. He was a powerful preacher. Fuller says, "He would pronounce the word 'damn' with such an emphasis as left a mark on the auditors, and for some time after." He was an extreme Calvinist in doctrine. His Armilla aurea, published in 1600 at Cambridge, stirred up Arminius to reply in 1602, and had a great deal to do in bringing on the Arminian controversy, on the Continent, as well as in England. He compiled The Foundation of Christian Religion into Six Principles (1592, London, 12mo), made its influence felt in numberless Puritan catechisms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He wrote a large number of books and tracts, the most of which were collected, abridged, and published in a new series of pericopes. Cf. Ranke in the original of this art. (Herzog, II. vol. xi. 460-492), and Nebe on the Pericopes. E. N. RANKE. (G. S. SCHOTZELD.)

PERPETUA, St., a native of Carthage, who, together with her brother Saturus, and a female slave, Felicitas, suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus. The Acts were first discovered by Lucas Holstenius, and edited, together with his notes, by Valesius, Paris, 1684. They are also found in RUI NART: Acta primor. martyr. (1716) and A. S. Bol. (March, vol. 1). Their genuineness is above question; but there is no reason to suppose that they were written by Tertullian, though the author certainly was a Montanist, and prepared Acts for the use of a Montanist congregation. HAYACK.

PERRONE, Giovanni, D.D., Roman-Catholic theologian; b. at Chieri, Piedmont, 1794; d. in Rome, Aug. 29, 1876. He received his doctorate at Turin (1815); went to Rome, and entered the Society of Jesus; was sent the next year (1816) to Orvieto as professor of dogmatic and moral theology. Recalled to Rome (1823), he became professor of theology in the Roman college, and held the position until 1873, except when rector of the colleges at Ferrara (1830-33) and Rome (1853-56). He took refuge for two years with some pupils at Stonyhurst, Eng. (1848-50). In 1854 he played a prominent part on the affirmative side in the discussions preceding the bull Ineffabilis Deus, which proclaimed the Immaculate Conception dogma. In 1869 he figured similarly upon the Ultramontane side in the Vatican Council. He was a member, and chosen councillor, of nearly all the papal congregations on doctrine, discipline, and liturgy, and thus wielded great influence. He is, however, as emphatically the theological teacher of the present Roman Church that he deserves most attention. His system of dogmatics is now that most widely used in his church, and comes up most fully to its standard of orthodoxy. His method is scholastic and traditional, but divested of the wearisome and repulsive features of old scholasticism, and adapted to the modern state of controversy. His system appears in two works, unabridged and abridged, — under the titles Praelectiones theologicae qua in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu debat, Rome, 1835 sqq., 9 vols. 8vo, republished and reprinted in many editions at Turin (51st ed., 1865), Paris (1870, 4 vols.), Brussels, Ratisbon, and elsewhere, translated into French and German; and Praelectiones theologicae in Compendium redactae (abridged), Rome, 1845, 4 vols., 36th ed., 1881, 2 vols., translated into several languages. Besides this great work, he wrote Iter Heresiastid, Rome, 1838; Pericopes. Cf. Ranke in the original of this art. (Herzog, II. vol. xi. 460-492), and Nebe on the Pericopes. E. N. RANKE. (G. S. SCHOTZELD.)

PERROTEAU, Synods of. — I. (1551). The consolidation of the Roman-Catholic party in Poland, and the drawing-up of the Confessio catholica fidei by Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Culm and Ermeland, as a counterbalance to the Confessio Augustana.

— II. (1555). The consolidation of the Protestant party in Poland, and the sending of a royal embassy to Paul IV., demanding the celebration of mass in the vernacular tongue, the administration of the Lord's Supper in both forms, the abolition of annata, the abrogation of ecclesiastical celibacy, etc. — III. (1562). The wild outburst of disension with the Protestant camp, between Lutherans, Calvinists, and Antitrinitarians. — IV. (1564). Religious disputation (Aug. 6-14) between the Antitrinitarians, Grigor Pauli and Georg Scholmann, and the Reformed, Stanislaus Saruziki, Discorda, and others. The Lutherans took no part in the discussion. The Antitrinitarians were excluded from any discussion with the Reformed Church. See POLAND.

PERISSITIDES. See LUCANUS, p. 390.
PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. It was formerly usual to distinguish between ten general persecutions; but the distinction was very arbitrary, and gave an entirely wrong idea of the real state of affairs. The fact is, that persecution, when once started, never ceased until stopped by law. Frightful at some periods, and insignificant at others, it was always permitted, and by the edict of Trajan it became legal. Thus the history of persecution naturally falls into three great periods. The first, from the beginning of Christianity to the reign of Trajan. Persecution is permitted, but not legal. The second, from the reign of Trajan to the accession of Decius. Persecution is legal, and increases both in extension and intensity, but remains local, and depending on the individual view of the governor. The third, from the accession of Decius to the promulgation of the first edict of toleration in 311. Persecution is legal and general. Its reason is political. To the empire the speedy suppression of Christianity has become a question of life and death.

I.— The first persecutor was Nero. But his reason was merely incidental. Two-thirds of Rome had been consumed by a huge conflagration. The populace was on the very verge of revolt, and Nero fastened the charge on the Christians; that is, the capital was a duty of patriotism; and persecution was carried out as a regular government measure. What in Marcus Aurelius had been a mere instinct became in Constantine, however, soon realized that the undertaking was impossible. He consequently changed policy, and became a Christian himself. 

imagination, so easily touched by the idea of plots, conspiracies, attentates, etc. The persecution, however, was only short and local; though in the provinces some official may have seen fit to imitate his master, and may have been aided by the base passions of an ignorant mob. And in the main this state of affairs continued during the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, and Nerva. A great general persecution is spoken of under Domitian; but see that article.

II.— At the beginning of the second century the number of Christians throughout the empire had increased so much, that they could not be overlooked any more, nor be identified with the Jews. But the more the Christians came to the front, the more striking the difference became between the spirit which ruled them and the spirit insulat ed by the official religion. Serious men could not fail to see that Christianity acted as a powerful element of dissolution in the Roman state; and it was consequently the enemy of the government. The third period — Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius — saw the number of Christians throughout the empire had increased so much, that they could not be overlooked any more, nor be identified with the Jews. But the more the Christians came to the front, the more striking the difference became between the spirit which ruled them and the spirit insulat ed by the official religion. Serious men could not fail to see that Christianity acted as a powerful element of dissolution in the Roman state; and it was consequently the enemy of the government. The third period — Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius — saw the number of Christians throughout the empire. The crowds in the amphitheatre to cry out, "To the lions with the Christians!" The edict of Hadrian (which art. see) has also been misunderstood. It is simply a confirmation of the edict of Trajan. But these two edicts formed, up to the accession of Decius, the legal foundation of the political and religious position of the Christians; that is, the capital was a duty of patriotism; and persecution was carried out as a regular government measure. What in Marcus Aurelius had been a mere instinct became in Constantine, however, soon realized that the undertaking was impossible. He consequently changed policy, and became a Christian himself.

III. — Hitherto the worst enemy of the Christians had been the mob. Stirred up by accusations of monstrous stupidity, and prompted by unborne envy and hatred, it was the mob which instituted the persecutions. But now the situation was changed. The government itself became persecutor, and from principle. What in Marcus Aurelius had been a mere instinct became in Decius conscious action. He considered the Christians in the cities as more enemies of the state than the barbarians on the frontiers. To suppress Christianity seemed to him a political necessity, a duty of patriotism; and persecution was carried out as a regular government measure. The same policy was renewed by Diocletian, and failed. (See the arts. Diocletian and Constantine; however, soon realized that the undertaking was impossible. He consequently changed policy, and became a Christian himself. 

See Aure: Histoire des persecutions de l'Eglise, Paris, 1875; Weiseler: Die Christenverfolgungen
PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS. 1808

PERSIA.

Persia was one of the great world-powers of Daniel, the rival of Rome in its palmy days, the rival of the Ottoman Empire when Europe trembled before it, and, even in the last century, a conquering power, the extent of whose dominions was by no means inconsiderable. In extent of dominion, and continuance of power, it is worthy of comparison with Rome, and as a civilized, fertilizing power, with the ancient world. It represented civilization and barbarism. It was a nation of philosophers and poets, as was recognized by Mohammed, in the saying, that, "if science were suspended from the height of heaven, there are among the Persians those who would possess themselves of it." Mohammedanism, on its intellectual side, was largely Persian. Arabian philosophy was Persian only in name and language. The brilliancy of the Baghdad caliphate, the Augustan age of Mohammedanism, was largely due to Persian influence. Language and literature are rich and copious, and characterized by a union of profound thought with brilliancy of expression—true "apple of gold in pictures of silver." This brilliancy is not that of high art, but of life. Persian, like other Oriental literature, preserves the characteristics of spoken language, which give it a perennial freshness, and make it independent of the changing fashions of time and place. It is nearer to practical life than Hindu thought,—not thought merely, but thought in action. This brings out the most characteristic feature of the Persian mind, which is not so much its absolute originality as its giving currency and influence to the thoughts and institutions of other Oriental lands. It maintained this supremacy under all circumstances. Conquering or conquered, it makes a deep impression upon all the Oriental peoples with whom it comes in contact. Hindu, Arab, Tartar, and Turk, all feel its influence. In this respect it bears a striking resemblance to Greece. In religion it occupied a still higher position. Of all non-Christian religions, it was the one most free from idolatry, most pure from moral taint, and characterized by moral earnestness, and depth of sense of sin. Life a warfare; man, soldier of the Prince of light, in conflict with the Power of darkness. The Persian was the people most in sympathy with the people of God under the old dispensation, sustaining to them a peculiar relation, delivering them from Babylon, and aiding and assisting them after their return.

Turning now to the Persia of to-day, we find that it still occupies an important central position with reference to Russia on the north, India on the east, Arabia on the south and south-west, and Turkey on the west. In political power, influence, and glory, it is but the mere shadow of what it once was. Its territory, its immense, its dominion and slavery of sin in this life, though not altogether from the body of sin and from the infirmities of the flesh, so long as they continue in this world." (Art. I.)

"By reason of these remains of indwelling sin, and the temptations of sin and of the world, those who are converted could not persevere in a state of grace if left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who, having conferred grace, mercifully confirms, and powerfully preserves them therein, even to the end." (Art. III.)

"Of this preservation of the elect to salvation, and of their perseverance in the faith, true believers for themselves may and do obtain assurance according to the measure of their faith, whereby they arrive at a persuasion that they ever will continue true and living members of the Church; and that they experience forgiveness of sins, and will at last inherit eternal life." (Art. IX.)

"This certainty of perseverance, however, is so far from exciting in believers a spirit of pride, or of rendering them carnally secure, that, on the contrary, it is the source of humility, filial reverence, true piety, patience in every tribulation, fervent prayers, constancy in suffering and in confessing the truth, and of solid rejoicing in God; so that the consideration of this benefit should serve as an incentive to the serious and constant practice of gratitude and good works, as appears from the testimonies of Scripture and the examples of saints." (Art. XII.)

"The carnal mind is unable to comprehend this doctrine of the perseverance of saints and the certainty thereof, which God hath most abundantly revealed in His Word, for the glory of his name and the consolation of pious souls, and which he impresses upon the hearts of the faithful. Satan abhors it; the world ridicules it; the ignorant and hypocrite abuse, and heretics oppose it. But the spouse of Christ hath always most tenderly loved and constantly defended it as an inestimable treasure." (Art. XV.)

This doctrine was first clearly set forth by Augustine in the Pelagian controversy (De Dono Perseverantiae), renewed by the Reformers, and is held by all Calvinistic churches, as a logical conclusion on the doctrine of predestination. See Westminster Confession, chap. xviii.

Arminius at first hesitated about it, and then left it an open question. The later Arminians took strong ground against it, and affirmed the possibility of a total and final fall from grace. This is the position of the Wesleyan Arminians to-day in Europe and America. The Lutherian Confessions hold a middle position. The Church of England leaves room for both theories. See Arminianism, Five Articles of; Arminianism, Wesleyan.

Persia, a country which in the past has played not only one, but several important parts on the stage of the world's history. Going back to remote antiquity, we find, according to Sir William Jones, that "Iran, or Persia, in its largest sense, was the true centre of population, of knowledge, of languages, and of arts; which, instate, as dwelling everywhere, as it has been fancifully supposed, or eastward, as might with equal reason have been asserted, were expanded in all directions, to all the regions of the world."
population, in some cases, is but a tithe of what it has been. Making due allowance for exaggerated estimates, the probability is, that the population of Persia to-day is not more than a fourth of what it was two centuries ago, and that its wealth has diminished even more. The same causes which have brought about the present state of things are at work to-day. The ex- tinction of the government, dissenison among rival princes, and the jealousy of the two leading nations,—the Tartars and Persians, between whom the land is divided,—are rapidly paving the way for the dismemberment of the empire. The Kurd, in his mountain fastnesses, watches for the opportunity to swoop down, and take possession of the fertile lowlands; and Russia, who already within the present century has twice enriched herself at the expense of Persia, waits the time when the whole of Northern Persia shall become part of her possession. True, losses on the north may in part be compensated by extension on the south-west; Bagdad and the region round, rich in historical and religious memories to Persia, falling to her as her share of the possessions of the sick man. It is not likely that Persia will ever again be a great political power. As regards literature, it was the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, that the time is at hand when Oriental literature shall take the place occupied by that of Greece and Rome. Within the last few months Max Muller has borne very emphatic testimony to the importance of this literature; and it is a noticeable fact that this conviction is a growing one among those who have given attention to the subject. The question, however, of Oriental literature, is but part of a larger question. The distinctive characteristic of that literature is the religious element which pervades and dominates it; and it is just here, that, at the present time, the position of Persia is of special significance. Persia is a distinctively Mohammedan country. In a population of five or six millions there are only about forty thousand Armenians, thirty thousand Nestorians, fifteen to twenty thousand Jews, and eight thousand Fire-worshippers, or about a hundred thousand in all. But the Mohammedanism of Persia is a peculiar Mohammedanism. In the ordinary sense of the term, the Persians are, and always have been, bad Mohammedans. They are the Broad Churchmen of that religion, and Mohammedanism in its Arabian dress has always been too narrow for them. Hence has arisen a type of Mohammedanism which may be called the Persian mystical, dervish, or monkish, Mohammedanism, the leading representative of which is Jelalu-d-Din, author of Mevnevi, not so well known in the West as Saadi and Hafiz. It is immensely greater significance from the religious stand-point.

The work is an old one. Mevane Jelalu-d-Din ("Our Lord, the Majesty of the Religion of Islam"), son of an eminent mystic, was born at Balkh, Sept. 29, 1207 A.D. The time of his birth is significant; as it is the period richest in Persian history in its records of the life of distinguished poets and philosophers, thus preparing the way for the coming of him who was to bring together and unite all the separate streams of thought in one mighty river. About 1227 we find him settled at Conya, the ancient Iconium, where in 1240 he instituted the order of Mevlevi,—dancing or whirling dervishes; and here, in 1278, he died. A truly extraordinary man, of marvellous insight and susceptibility for spiritual truth, not only a profound thinker, but a man of affairs as well, a combination of philosopher and statesman. For our judging, he is not dependent upon the statements of credulous disciples; the six books of Mevnevi being an imperishable monument of his genius, fully entitling him to the name of "Prince of Persian Mystics."

But what is mysticism? We may sum it up in one pregnant sentence from the Gospel of John (iv. 24), read in the order of the Greek text,—"Spirit the God;" not merely higher than matter, but that from which matter derives all its significance. God is Spirit, God is truth, Elohim, fulness of might, the unlimited, inexhaustible source of life and light; matter, the opposite pole, without form, without substance, without even a shadow; that which is, but has not; existence without attributes; a purely negative conception, characterized by emptiness and necessity, as spirit is by fulness and liberty. Relation of God and matter, that of giver and receiver; of the two will ever be again a great political power. As regards literature, it was the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, that the time is at hand when Oriental literature shall take the place occupied by that of Greece and Rome. Within the last few months Max Muller has borne very emphatic testimony to the importance of this literature; and it is a noticeable fact that this conviction is a growing one among those who have given attention to the subject. The question, however, of Oriental literature, is but part of a larger question. The distinctive characteristic of that literature is the religious element which pervades and dominates it; and it is just here, that, at the present time, the position of Persia is of special significance. Persia is a distinctively Mohammedan country. In a population of five or six millions there are only about forty thousand Armenians, thirty thousand Nestorians, fifteen to twenty thousand Jews, and eight thousand Fire-worshippers, or about a hundred thousand in all. But the Mohammedanism of Persia is a peculiar Mohammedanism. In the ordinary sense of the term, the Persians are, and always have been, bad Mohammedans. They are the Broad Churchmen of that religion, and Mohammedanism in its Arabian dress has always been too narrow for them. Hence has arisen a type of Mohammedanism which may be called the Persian mystical, dervish, or monkish, Mohammedanism, the leading representative of which is Jelalu-d-Din, author of Mevnevi, not so well known in the West as Saadi and Hafiz. It is immensely greater significance from the religious stand-point.

The work is an old one. Mevane Jelalu-d-Din ("Our Lord, the Majesty of the Religion of Islam"), son of an eminent mystic, was born at Balkh, Sept. 29, 1207 A.D. The time of his birth is significant; as it is the period richest in Persian history in its records of the life of distinguished poets and philosophers, thus preparing the way for the coming of him who was to bring together and unite all the separate streams of thought in one mighty river. About 1227 we find him settled at Conya, the ancient Iconium, where in 1240 he instituted the order of Mevlevi,—dancing or whirling
ideas in this work, as it were, a very seed-bed, where there is oftentimes more of meaning in a single sentence than in learned tomes; comprehensiveness as well as rich, the truth of Mohammedanism supplemented by the truths of all other religions; a doctrine of incarnation, of atonement, of regeneration; practice of morality based entirely on love; claims to be the absolute religion, — the ocean, of which all forms of religion are but the streams: hence the reconciling character of the system. Not only does it furnish a centre for the multitudinous sects of Islam, but it presents a platform on which theistic Hindu and Mohammedan meet, and on which the followers of Darwin, Carlyle, and all non-Christian philosophies and sects, may unite. Another important characteristic is, that we find Jelalu addressing all classes of men, unfolding the highest themes to the lowest as well as to the highest intelligence. No man so low or so ignorant for whom he has not something fit and appropriate. To make a learned man a philosopher were nothing. The soldier, the musician, the last rank of men, them would he teach the first principles of doctrinal and moral truths. An important practical feature of this system is, that it is not a mere philosophy: it is an institution whose disciples and propagators are the thirty-six dervish sects, scattered over all the Mohammedan world, forming centres of spiritual influence in opposition to the secular element which has thus far had the upper hand.

The history of these monks of Islam is full of significance in its bearing on the history of to-day. Originating in Arabia, at the very beginning of Mohammedanism, the dervish movement did not become prominent till it was taken up in Persia. From that country it received a twofold impulse. The Hindu doctrine of successive incarnations, or, as it is termed in dervish phrase, of the constant presence of the living God upon earth in the person of the Imam, was made its foundation. Two ideas of tremendous power were thus brought together,— that of abject submission to the will of God, and that of a direct commission proceeding from the very mouth of God; and the result was seen in a series of revolutionary movements which, from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries, convulsed the Mohammedan world, finally culminating in that sect of the Assassins, who, for nearly two centuries, kept up a reign of terror, compared with whom, as Von Hammer says, "All earlier and later secret combinations and predatory states are crude attempts, or unsuccessful imitations." Persia, however, did something more than provide dynamite for the ascetic tendencies of the age. It was at the very time when that movement seemed to have exhausted itself, that Jelalu-d-Din appeared, and stamped upon it a dervish character, thus giving it a new lease of life.

From Persia the movement goes into all surrounding lands, and, in spite of opposition, everywhere prospers. In Persia itself it takes possession of the throne, placing upon it a dynasty which yields the sceptre for nearly two hundred and twenty-five years,—from 1499 to 1722. Its history in the Ottoman Empire is still more marvellous. Distressed and hated because of its Persian origin, it wins its way despite all obstacles; and to-day its power is greater than ever. Not only are many of the principal men of the nation Mevlevis, not only has the order stood high in the favor of sovereigns, the Sultan is never regarded as fully invested with imperial power till girded with the sword of Osman by the successor of Jelalu-d-Din. There remains but one position to be attained,—the caliphate itself; and that, at the present time, seems to be within its grasp. The whole trend of the Mohammedan world, may, we may say, of the Oriental world, is in the direction of this pantheistic dervish system. The pressure of the European powers, of Christianity, and the re-action against the secularization of the official heads of Mohammedanism, all contribute greatly to strengthen dervish Mohammedanism. New orders have sprung up: old orders have been strengthened. The present Sultan might almost be called a dervish, surrounded by dervish counsellors, having, as his aim, to propagate dervish principles. The doctrine of the Mahdi, or guide, is a dervish doctrine. The impending change in the seat of the caliphate cannot fail to help the movement; and if, as seems not unlikely, Baghdad be the new centre, that is the very dervish world, "its City of Saints." Already there have been, within the present century, three marked manifestations of this religious system, — Muridism or Shamyism in the Caucasus, the Braho Somaj in India, and Babism in Persia. The first has been put down, but only after a war of thirty-five years, which tasked the resources of the Russian Empire. The other two have but begun to manifest themselves; and it is a significant fact, that they are not merely defensive, but offensive, movements. Chunder Sen has lately given out that he is about to visit Europe as the bearer of a divine command to it to abandon its sectarianism, and receive the universal religion. If we are inclined to laugh at the idea, we should do well to remember that many of the leading minds in Europe and America are more in sympathy with this Oriental Pantheism than with Christianity; that Emerson was but a Persian Sufi in a Yankee dress; and that at the very time these lines are being penned (May, 1883), five thousand American citizens, members of the order of Bektashi dervishes, are commemorating with Oriental rites the death of Abd-el-Kader. We should do well also to remember, that, whatever decay of faith there may be in Europe and America, there is none in Asia. There it is but latent, and is already beginning to manifest itself with the same power as in the days of old. Mohammedanism is not passing away in any other sense than that it is being perfected in a universal religion, which sustains the same relation to Mohammedanism that Christianity does to Judaism; and this bastard Christianity, this false logos, as we may call it in view of the fact that it holds the cardinal truths of Christianity while at the same time it makes them void by its tradition, is a far more dangerous Mohammedanism pure and simple ever was or could be. Now, if ever, Christianity is called upon to justify its claims to be the universal religion.

Persia is an old mission-field. In the New Testament (Acts ii. 9; 1 Pet. v. 19) there are indications, too, of its specific mission. The Gospel message was not unknown. We may divide the work into four periods,— early Christian mis-
missions down to the fifth century, from the fifth century onward, Nestorian missions, Roman-Catholic missions, commencing with the thirteenth, and eventually with the nineteenth century.

For the first two, see Nestorians.

John de Monte Corvino, the first Roman missionary, began his work at Tabreez, near the end of the thirteenth century; and since that time Rome has made a number of efforts to gain a footing in Persia.

In the seventeenth century, in Chardin's time, she occupied a number of important centers. Neither the Nestorian nor the Roman mission has exercised any permanent influence upon the nation.

The Nestorians to-day are a small body in one corner of the country, speaking a different language from that of the surrounding peoples; and the Romanists are mainly those who have been gained during the present century.

About the middle of the last century the Moravians made an attempt to establish a mission in Persia, which was unsuccessful. Martyn's stay, 1811-12 (see Martyn), was brief, but memorable for the boldness with which he grappled with the Mohammedan problem. For three years and a half (1829-33) Groves labored at Bagdad; Basel missionaries (1833-37), at Tabreez; and James L. Merrick (1835-45), at various points in Persia, principally at Tabreez. These different attempts had to do largely with work for Mohammedans.

Dr. Perkious commenced the Nestorian mission in 1834 (Nestorians, Grant, Perkins); in 1870 it became the mission to Persia, or, more properly, Northern Persia. In 1872 Teheran was occupied by James Bassett; Tabreez, by P. Z. Easton, in 1873; and Hamadan, by James Hawkes, in 1881. In 1889 Isphahan was occupied by Robert Bruce of the English Church Missionary Society; and in 1883 Bagdad, by missionaries of the same body. Connected with the five stations above referred to (Bagdad not included) there are 17 male missionaries (14 connected with the Presbyterian Board, 2 with the English Church Missionary Society, and 1 independent), and, inclusive of wives of missionaries, 20 female missionaries, between 80 and 90 native helpers, about 1,500 native communicants, one college, several high schools, and a large number of village schools. Summing up the work of the evangelical missionaries, we may say, that, thus far, much has been done for the Nestorians, something for the Armenians, and something also for the Mohammedans, but that, taking a broad view of the field, we have made but a commencement; and, while we have no reason to doubt the final victory, we have no reason to expect an easy triumph.


See Literature under Cyrus, Dervish, Grant, Magi, Manicheism, Martyrs, Missionaries, Mohammed, Nestorians, Parsi, and Persians.

PERSONS, Robert (or Parsons), Jesuit emissary and agitator; b. at Nether Stowey, Somersetshire, June 24, 1548; d. at Rome, April 16, 1610. He was graduated M. A. at Oxford, 1572; but, having been converted to Romanism, he quitted England, 1574, and entered the Society of Jesus at Rome, July 4, 1575. Five years later he and Campian (see art.) were sent to England. They were the first Jesuits to visit that country.

The arrest of Campian caused his return to Rome, 1583; whence, however, he continued to manage the English mission, of which he became prefect in 1582. In 1592 he was the first rector of the English seminary in Rome, and in 1588 was sent to Spain to look after Jesuit interests in England, in case the Armada should make its expected successful attack upon that country. He founded schools for the training of English priests at Valladolid (1589), Lucar (1591), Seville and Lisbon (1592), and St. Omer (1593), besides lending his efficient aid to the colleges of the secular clergy at Douay. He was an indefatigable, wily, and learned man. Of his numerous writings may be mentioned, A brief discovery containing certaine reasons why catholicks refuse to goe to Church, Douay, 1580; A Christian directorie guiding men to their salvation, Lond., 1583-91, 2 parts, reprinted, modernized, and Protestantized by Dean Stanhope, 1700, 8th ed., 1782; A conference about the next succession to the crowne of Ingland, 1584 (the printer of it was hanged for sedition: it supported the claim of the Infanta); Treatise of the three conversions of England from paganism to Christian religion, 1603-04, 3 parts (an answer to Fox's Acts and Monuments). For his biography, see E. Gee: The Jesuit's memorial for the intended reformation of England under their first Popish prince, London, 1860; Hallam: Lit. hist. Eng.; Green: Hist. Eng. People.

PERU, a republic of South America, established in 1821; numbered 2,099,945 inhabitants in 1876, besides some tribes of wild Indians, estimated at 350,000 souls. Most of the inhabitants are of Indian descent, and the overwhelming majority of the people belong to the Roman-Catholic Church. In 1876 there were 5,087 Protestants, 498 Jews, and 27,073 persons belonging to other denominations; but, according to the constitution of Aug. 31, 1867, only Roman Catholics have the right of public worship. The ecclesiastical division of the country is: History of the Archdiocese of Lima, founded in 1530, and the bishoprics of Arequipa (1609), Chachapoyas (1805), Cuzco (1538), Guanama (1609), Huaynuco (1683), Puño (1862), and Truxillo (1767). In 1855 there were only 634 parishes, but 1,000 secular priests, and 720 regular clergy. The Church of Peru was exceedingly rich; and in spite of repeated confiscations of estates, and seizures of revenues which have come over her
since the establishment of the republic, she is still very wealthy. But her bishops are appointed by the secular government, and treated as government officials. See D'URSEL: L'Amerique du sud, Paris, 1878.

HAUCK.

PESSUM. See BIBLE VERSIONS, p. 292.

PESSUM. See OPIUM, SCHOPENHAUER.

PESTALOZZI, Johann Heinrich, b. at Zurich, Jan. 12, 1746; d. at Yverdon, Feb. 17, 1827. He studied theology, but soon felt that the ministry would not give him the opportunities he wanted. He then tried jurisprudence, but felt still more disappointed. Finally, in 1769, he bought at Neuhaf a tract of waste land, and became a farmer, not from any business speculation, but from sheer philanthropy, hoping to do something to better the conditions of the human race by making unproductive soil productive. But his capital proved insufficient; and in 1775 he turned his farm into a kind of poor-school, in which the children maintained themselves by manual labor between the hours of instruction. In one respect, so far as education was concerned, the experiment turned out a great success. But, as the school could not financially support itself, Pestalozzi was compelled to dispense with it, and from 1780 to 1798 he devoted himself to literature. Some of his books — Lienhard und Gertrud (1781) and Nachforschungen über den Gang der Natur in der Entwickelung des Menschen (1789) — attracted much attention, and made a great name for him; and in 1788 he once more found an opportunity of employing his great educational powers. He obtained the use of an old, dilapidated nunnery at Stanz, opened an orphan-asylum, and gathered together eighty children, who, after the lapse of a few months, looked, physically, intellectually, and morally, as if they had gone through a transformation-mill. But the following year the French took the nunnery for a hospital, and Pestalozzi's work was destroyed. He had determined, however, to become a schoolmaster, and in 1799 he accepted a position at Burgdorf. The novelty of his method surprised people, and an investigation was made; but it served only to prove the magnitude of his achievements. In the following year he was able to found an independent educational institution at Burgdorf, which in 1803 was removed to Yverdon; and hardly ten years elapsed before he stood forth as the schoolmaster of Europe. Education was the enthusiasm of the world, and Pestalozzi seemed to realize even the greatest expectations. Pupils flocked to his school from Russia, Germany, France, and America. The emperor, Alexander I., embraced him with tears; and the Spanish king made him a grandee of Spain. His lack, however, of economical talent, dissensions among the teachers, the passing-away of the educational enthusiasm, and other causes, brought on hard times; and in 1825 it was necessary to close the school on account of debt. The last years of Pestalozzi's life were full of hardship, and his death came as a grand relief. His works are numerous, and such as mutual instruction, common recitation, etc., are not, perhaps, strictly speaking, his inventions; but they were by him brought into systematic form, and into general use. With respect to religion, he stopped short at natural religion, though without any antagonism to Christianity.

Lit. — Blochmann: Heinrich Pestalozzi, Leipzig, 1846; R. de Guimps: Histoire de Pestalozzi, 1873. In English there are biographies by Buber (London, 1891) and Kruis (Cincinnati, 1870).

PETAVIUS, Dionysius (Denys Petau), b. at Orleans, Aug. 21, 1583; d. in Paris, Dec. 11, 1632, one of the most celebrated Roman-Catholic theologians of the post-Tridentine age, — the Aquila Jesuitarum. His learned and philosophical work at Orleans and Paris, which latter place he acquired the friendship of Isaac Casaubon: indeed, he at various epochs of his life received some of his most powerful impulses from Protestant scholars, — Scaliger, Gerhard, Grotius, etc. In 1602 he was appointed teacher in the university of Bourges, but in 1605 he resigned that position in order to enter the order of the Jesuits. He made his novitiate at Nancy, studied theology at Pont-à-Mousson, and was in 1621 appointed professor of theology posítica in the university of Paris; which position he held for twenty-two years. In 1644 he retired into private life, and devoted himself exclusively to literature. His works, numbering forty-nine (of which ten are in folio), comprise philology, chronology, and theology. Among his philological works are editions of Synesius (1611, with translation; 2d ed., 1631; 3d ed., 1633, with valuable notes), Themistius (1619), Julian (1614), Vespasianus (1615), Libanius (1616), and Epiphanius (Opera omnia, 1622, with translation and notes). Of his chronological works, the Opus de doctrina temporum (Paris, 1627, 2 vols. fol.; new edition by Hardouin, Antwerp, 1703, Verona, 1734—36; Venice, 1767) contains a new system of chronology, which was further developed in his Uranologion (1630), defended against the attacks of Le Peyre in La pierre de touche chronologique (1636), and practically applied in his Tabulae chronologicae (1628) and Rationarium temporum in XII libros (Paris, 1633—34), an outline of the world's history, which became very famous, and continued down to our time (last edition, Venice, 1849); not to speak of the eight thousand mistakes he corrected in Baronius' Annales. Of his theological works, some are polemical, of a rather harsh description, against Salmasius, Maturin Simon, Grotius, etc.; but his principal work is his De theologica dogmatibus, Paris, 1644—50, 5 vols. fol., but unfinished. It is a "history of doctrines," planned under the influence of that aversion to scholasticism which was the universal result of the Reformation, and executed with enormous learning and great literary skill. It defines the doctrine of development. At first is
made no great impression; but, when the Reformed theologians began to praise the book, it once flew into unparalleled celebrity, and edition followed edition, the last by J. B. Thomas, Bar le Duc, 1804 sqq., 8 vols. See his biography by Franz Stanonik, Graz, 1876. Wagnermann.

PETER, The Apostle.—I. His Life. 1. From his Call to Christ's Ascension.—His original name was Simon, or Symeon. His father's name was John (John i. 42), or Jonah (Matt. xvi. 17). He was born in Bethsaida, but after his marriage lived at Capernaum, and, with his younger brother Andrew, carried on the trade of fisherman. He was an adherent of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave an adherent of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon. In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.

In the Gospels and Acts he is called Simon who also was named Peter, simply Peter; while Paul usually calls him Cephas (1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11), and only rarely Peter (Gal. ii. 7, 8). After meeting Jesus, he became a disciple, but resumed his occupation until, some time after this, Jesus gave him that final call (Matt. iv. 19) which made him henceforth an inseparable companion and apostle. His house was a kind of rendezvous for the dissatisfied followers of John the Baptist, and by Andrew introduced to Jesus (John i. 41, 42). The latter at once described him as Cephas ("rock"); and the appellation in its Greek translation, Peter, superseded entirely his original name. Our Lord always called him Simon. James speaks of him as Symeon.
Jesus. After this event we have the Acts of the Apostles, a few notices in the Pauline Epistles and in the Apostolic Fathers. In the Acts, Paul receives greatest attention; but in their earlier portion Peter is the principal figure. Luke derived his account from Mark (Col. iv. 10, 14; cf. Acts xii. 12), Philip the evangelist (Acts xxi. 8), and other members of the primitive church, and from certain documents; e.g., in the speeches of Peter. The result is a reliable and full history. From it we learn that Peter, undisturbed by the threatenings and persecutions of the Sanhedrins, prosecuted with great energy his apostolic calling; that he went down into Samaria (Acts viii. 14 sqq.), and, after Paul’s conversion, to the Syro-Phenician coast, and visited Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea (ix. 32—x. 48). On his return to Jerusalem, he was arrested by Herod Agrippa, released miraculously, and left the city (xii. 1—17), nor again appears in the history until the Council of Jerusalem, in which he held not a prominent part (xiv.). In the latter part of his life he is spoken of by Paul as making great missionary journeys, accompanied by his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. ii. 11). His position among the primitive disciples is in thorough accord with the declaration of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 18; Acts i. 8). He was their leader. On his advice an apostle is chosen (Acts i. 22); by his preaching the first great increase in the church was occasioned (ii. 14), by him the disciples were defended against the Jewish hierarchy (iv. 8, 10, v. 29), the church cleansed of unworthy members (v. 3 sqq.); the union of the outside communities with it guarded (viii. 14, ix. 32), and the first heathens received into the church (x.). But Peter’s position was so far from giving him exclusive jurisdiction, that the ordination—the first ecclesiastical officers, the seven deacons—was shared by all the apostles (vi. 6); the Samaritan tour of inspection was made with John, on terms of entire equality, and on the commission of the apostolate (vii. 14); his conduct in Caesarea was sharply criticised by the strict party, and elaborately defended (xi. 1—18); and finally, in the Council of Jerusalem, the presiding officer was not Peter, but James (Acts xi. 16). It was evident; for Joel connects it with the outpouring of the Spirit, which had taken place at Pentecost. Then would God send Jesus to be the judge of quick and dead, and believers would be finally free from persecution (ii. 20, x. 42).

**Peter’s Relation to the Gentiles.** — Peter believed that the Gentiles would ultimately receive the gospel (iii. 29 sqq.), but he and the other apostles believed that the conversion of the Jews as a nation would come first. Hence he did not feel himself called to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and it was only after special preparation and direction that he went. But what he then witnessed in the house of Cornelius convinced him that God put Gentiles on the same footing with Jews in the matter of salvation (x. 34, 44—48). Yet, as far as he personally was concerned, he felt no call to become an apostle to the uncircumcision. He shared, however, in the interest the mother-church took in the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles, very cordially received Paul, and defended the latter’s position, that the yoke of the law must not be laid upon the necks of the Gentile converts (xv. 10). Peter showed the sincerity of his convictions, and also his independence by mingling freely for a time with such converts at Antioch. But when certain came down there “from James,” he gave up his association with the Gentiles at table. For this he was publicly rebuked by Paul (Gal. ii. 11 sqq.), who told him plainly that his objectionable conduct was not due to any change in his opinions, but to dissimulation. At heart Peter and Paul were exactly agreed, and all attempts to make out conflict between them are futile. For so far was Paul’s bold speech from causing dissension between them, that Paul subsequently alludes to Peter in the friendliest way (1 Cor. i. 5, xv. 5).

**Peter’s Death at Rome.** — Of the last days of Peter, nothing is known from the New Testament. The few scattered allusions in the Fathers and early church writers was the fulfillment of prophecy and of God’s decree (ii. 23, iii. 18, iv. 25), and had, as its designed result, that first blessing of the Messianic kingdom,—the forgiveness of sins. It was a further proof of Jesus’ Messiaship, that God raised him from the dead on the third day (ii. 32, iii. 15, 26, iv. 10, x. 40), showed him unto chosen witnesses (x. 41), and raised him to his own right hand (iii. 30 sqq.). By this resurrection God set Jesus forth as the Messianic King (iii. 36, v. 31), made him the corner-stone of the kingdom (iv. 11), and Lord over all (x. 36, cf. ii. 36). This kingdom is that long ago foretold (iii. 13, 24), and is attended by the graces of forgiveness (ii. 28, iii. 18, 19, v. 31, x. 43), peace (x. 36), the gift of the Holy Spirit (iii. 17), deliverance from ungodly men (iv. 40), bodily healing (iii. 10), salvation (iv. 12), and the blessing of God (iii. 26). In order to share in these blessings it was necessary sincerely to repent, and honestly to believe in Jesus as the Christ (ii. 38, iii. 19, v. 32, vii. 21, 22). In expression of this repentance and belief, and as pledge of the blessings promised, baptism into the name of Jesus followed. Not yet, however, was the Messianic kingdom fully set up. This would not be true until all Israel had turned unto the Lord, according to the prophetic announcement. But that this was near was evident; for Joel connects it with the outpouring of the Spirit, which had taken place at Pentecost. Then would God send Jesus to be the judge of quick and dead, and believers would be finally free from persecution (ii. 20, x. 42).
first letter to the Corinthians (c. v.), says, “Let us set before our eyes the good apostles, both (who), though unjust envy endured not one or two, but numerous, labors, and, after he had at length suffered martyrdom, went to the place of glory appointed to him.” Inasmuch as tradition invariably makes Rome the place of Peter’s martyrdom, and Clement speaks of Paul’s martyrdom immediately after the allusion, it is at least most probable that he means Rome was the scene of Peter’s death. Papia would seem also to be a witness to the Roman residence of Peter. He relates, on the testimony of a presbyter, that the Gospel of Mark, whom he calls “the interpreter of Peter,” was composed in Rome. More unmistakable is the testimony to this residence of the apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul, (second century) of Dionysius of Corinth (Euseb., Ch. Hist., II. 25), of Irenæus (Adv. Haer., I. 1), of Tertullian (De praesc., 36; cf. Adv. Marc., IV. 5), of Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., Ch. Hist., IV. 14, and of the Roman Church’s history). For, if Simon Magus had ever been in Rome, he was not long there, after the latter’s death, composed his Gospel on the Via Ostia. To break the force of this concurrent testimony, recourse is had to the theory that the tradition is merely an extension of Peter’s recollections. The Homilies and Recognitions close this chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch. It is far more reasonable to trace the Ebionite story to tradition than vice versa. Besides, the Catholic tradition brings Simon Magus to Rome, without any mention of Peter. Thus Justin Martyr relates, that, under Claudius, a statue was erected to Simon upon the Island of the Tiber, with the inscription Simon Deo Sancto. But he says nothing of the supposed flight between Peter and Simon Magus. But this theory will not do; for, let alone the fact that it presupposes an unproved diffusion of Ebionitism, the story itself is found only in the pseudo-Clementine literature, which sprang from small heretical circles, and originally had no connection with Rome. The Roman residence of Peter is mentioned in the first chapter of the letter of Clement to James, which belongs to the later parts of the literature. The Homilies and Recognitions close their account at Antioch.
to act in their respective relations (ii.–v.), and how to avoid that impending danger of purchasing the friendship of the world by compli-
 bow to avoid that impending danger of pur-
to act in their respective relations (ii.–v.), and be-
the heathen concerning the Christians' hatred of the
human race and shameful secret practices. It was the object of the Epistle to cheer these Christians in their trying circumstances, and to prevent their return to heathenism by showing that they stood in the true grace of God (v. 12). Peter exhorts them to bear patiently their ills, conscious of their rectitude and possession of the truth. He points them to the near future when their sufferings shall cease, and shows them how those very sufferings were divinely appointed for their salvation. There is no hint that his readers had these experiences. This is a point in favor of the genuineness of the Epistle, which is not, however, systematically ar-
anged. After alluding, by way of preface (i. 1–12), to the glorious end of their faith, even the salva-
tion of their souls, as a source of comfort under their sufferings, Peter passes on to give general exhortations to a holy walk (i. 13–21), to brotherly love (i. 22–25), and the rebuilding of a spiritual house in the Lord (ii. 1–10). He then exhorts them respecting those special dangers incident to the pilgrim condition of the Christian (ii. 11, 12), further respecting their several relations, as sub-
jects, husbands, wives (i. 13–iii. 7), telling them not to render evil for evil (iii. 8–12), not to de-
scribe the strokes they may receive (iii. 13–17), to imitate Christ in their sufferings (iii. 18–22), not turning back to the heathen vices and sins, but maintaining at all hazards their Christian char-
acter (iv. 1–10). Peter then exhorts the elder to a faithful performance of their duties (v. 1–4), the younger to be subject unto the elder, and all to be on the watch (v. 5–9). He closes with a benediction and salutations (v. 10–14).

The Epistle, in some respects, occupies a unique position in the New Testament. Although it bears evidence of the author’s acquaintance with the Epistles of James, Romans (especially with xii. and xiii.), and Ephesians, the treatment of the existing material is by no means slavish. It has originality in point of style. It is not so highly dialectic as Romans, not so orderly as Ephesians, not, like James, full of gnomic sentences: it is rather loose and free, yet not confused. The style is fresh: thought follows thought with a general connection between them. Grammatical peculiarities are such as insertions between article and noun, the use of the participle with the impera-
tive, and its use as the substantival particle. In the trinal position, it shows the influence of Paul (cf. Rom. vi. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2; Rom. vi. 18, 1 Pet. ii. 24; Rom. xiii. 34, 1 Pet. iii. 22), yet in general presents the same theology which character-
izes the speeches of Peter. So in the Epistle we have the exhortative teaching of Christianity by the realization of the Old-Testament king-
dom of God, the connection between the Old and New Testament revelation (which is emphasized, as it is not by Paul), and very clearly and strikingly the risen Christ as the source of present spirit-
ual blessings, and the allusion of the Epistle to the condition of the Christians do not point to any persecution solely on the ground that they bore the name of Christ, since Peter expresses the hope that their good manner of life will silence their traducers (iii. 13, 18), but rather on the ground of the vague reports which were circulated among and believed by the

The time of composition of First Peter must have been the latter part of Nero’s reign; and, since the writer uses the Epistles of Paul and James, it may be more definitely stated as 65–66. Additional evidence for this date is, that Peter would scarcely address Paul’s congregations before the latter’s demise, which took place 64. The place of composition is given as “Babylon” (v. 13). There is good reason for taking this as the sym-
bolical name for Rome, as at a somewhat later date (60 or 70) it is used in Revelation. The historic Babylon, when Peter wrote, was almost entirely a heap of ruins. There was, to be sure, a colony of Jews there; but there is no tradition in the first five centuries connecting Peter with the ruined city. Moreover, it is somewhat difficult to understand how Mark, who a little while before was with Paul in Rome (Col. iv. 10; Phil. 24), and a little after was again in Rome, could have been between times in Babylon. Again: figurative expressions occur in the Epistle; such as “strangers,” “dispersion,” the “elect,” “my son;” and this lessens the strangeness of a symbolical name for Rome. Moreover, if there had been any difficulty in understanding the name “Babylon,” it would have been removed by Silvanus, who bore the Epistle (v. 12). In regard to the genuineness of the Epistle there is no question. It is quoted in the Second Epistle, by Hermas, Iapias (Euseb., Ch. Hist., III. 39), Polycarp (Euseb., IV. 14), Basileides (Clem. Alex., Strom. IV. 12), Ire-
neas, Tertullian, Clemens Alex., Origen; reck-
oned by Eusebius among the iiomologoumena, by Eusebius among the Iinomologoumena, and translated in the Peshito (second century). Its genuineness was first questioned by Claudius (Uranischen d. Chr., 1808), but upon insufficient grounds. There was call for such an epistle. It in every respect is worthy of, and agrees with, the character of Peter; and that he could write Greek is every way probable. The only ground for rejecting it which the Baur school can give is the baseless assumption of an antagonism between Peter and Paul.

2. Second Peter.—The objections to its genui-
ness are solid. Its occasion is the entrance of false teachers of two classes,—the libertines, practical and theoretical, and the mockers of Christ’s second coming. After an introduction, which reminds the readers of their possession in Christ, and exhorts them to fidelity (i. 1–10), the Epistle divides itself into three parts: 1st, The certainty of the second coming (i. 11–21); 2d, The character of libertinism and its future punishment, with biblicalillus-
trations (ii. 22); 3d, The coming destruction of the world by fire asserted against the mockers, the delay explained by God’s long-suffering, with ex-
hortations to constancy (iii. 1–13). The Epistle ends with a reference to Paul’s Epistles, with an encouraging, exhortation, and praise to God (iii. 14–18).

The similarity between Second Peter (in chap.
ii. and also, in part, in i. and iii.) and Jude is most striking; and that the latter was the basis is apparently proven by the greater simplicity, naturalness, and spontaneity of those expressions in Jude which are all second-hand, and, if Jude borrowed from Second Peter, it is hard to see why he copied the description of libertinism, and not also the refutation of the mockers, in chap. iii. How comes it, also, that the marked linguistic peculiarities in Second Peter are limited to that portion to which Jude presents a parallel? Comparing Second and First Peter, the Second is in point of style less Hebraic, less varied, more periodic, contains less allusion to the Old Testament and to the sayings of Christ, brings out prominently new ideas concerning "knowledge" (epistemen), "godliness" (theos), and the destruction of the world, and says nothing about the "hope" which characterizes the First Epistle. It describes Christ as the Saviour (soter), which the First never does, but does not mention his death and resurrection. These facts tell strongly against the genuineness of the Epistle, and cannot be removed by any theory of a ten-years' interval between the Epistles, or of their different audiences,—the First, Jewish; the Second, Gentile Christians. Nor, in support of the genuineness, is there early tradition. First in the third century, by Firmilian of Caesarea (d. 269), was it unmistakably quoted. According to Origen, only the First was recognized as canonical; and Eusebius puts the Second among the Antilegomena. Jerome, however, defended it, and principally effected its recognition. In the Reformation era it was doubted by Erasmus and Calvin, and is now pretty generally rejected. Yet the moral earnestness of the Epistle; the difficulty of assigning it to a place in the post-Petrine period, or to any other author; the declaration that the writer was Symeon Peter (i. 1), and had been with Jesus in the holy mount (i. 18); and the commendation, of Paul's Epistles (iii. 15, 16)—all point to its Petrine character. Quite recently, Dr. E. A. Abbott (in the Expositor, 2d series, vol. iii.), followed by Farrar (Early Days of Christianity, vol. i. pp. 190 sqq.), has maintained that the author of Second Peter must have read Josephus. For a satisfactory criticism of such a theory, see Professor B. B. Warfield: Dr. Edwin A. Abbott on the Genuineness of Second Peter, in the Southern Presbyterian Review, April, 1883. The Epistle was declared canonical by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 366; and, as the writers who we know had previously used it are spread over a wide territory, it may well be that the council had more evidence of its genuineness than we now possess. And the fact that it ventured to give canonical authority to an Epistle previously doubted may be cited in proof that such was the case.

LIT. Besides the Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, Ritgen, [Kipko and Smith], the New Testament Introduction of Crocker (1804), Credner (1836), Ilug (1847), De Witte (3d ed., 1860), Reuss (4th ed., 1864), Bleek-Mangold (1873), and the New Testament Biblical Theologies of Schmid (1853), Van Oosterzee (1867), Immer (1877), Weiss (1880), see the Commentaries (notably by Potter, De Witte (2d ed., 1865), Weissinger, in Olshausen (1856), Huther, in Meyer (4th ed., 1877), [Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1881]), Frohmüller, in Langer (Eng. trans. by Mombert, New York, 1867), Houdhausen (1873-78); on Second Peter, Dietlein (1861), T. Schott (1892); on First Peter, C. A. Witz (1881); [in English, the general Testament Commentaries, and the Cambridge Bible for Schools. The best English Commentaries upon First Peter separately are by Leighton (very famous, first published York and London, 1863-94, 2 vols., revised several times; it has been styled a "truly heavenly work—a favorite with all spiritual men") and Brown (Edinburgh, 1869, 3 vols.); upon Second Peter separately, A. Adams (London, 1833, new ed., 1862), T. Smith (London, 1881); upon both together, Little (New York, 1869). For the question whether Peter ever was in Rome, and on his apostolic bishopric, see especially Lipsius: Chronology der römischen Bischofren (Brunswick, 1869), Quellen der römisch. Petruswege (1872); Johann Schmid: Petrus in Rom, Luzern, 1879 (literature very fully given). [See also F. Leon: De l'autenticidad de la segunda epître de Saint Pierre, Luasaine, 1877; Martin: De l'apologie de Saint Pierre et Paul dans l'église primitive, Atria, 1878; Howson: Hora Petrina, London, 1883.]

PETER, Festivals of St. — I. Depositio Petri in catacombis et Pauli in via Ostiensi. The Catalogus Librarianus (524) first mentions the entombment of the bones of Peter and Paul as having taken place in the year of the consuls Tuscius and Iassus (258), and gives the date as III. Cal. Iulii.; that is, June 29. A festival in commemoration of that day is first mentioned in the Latin Church by Prudentius in the fourth century; by Augustine (Serm., 295-296), Maximus of Turin (Serm., 82-84), and Leo the Great (Serm., 82-84) in the fifth: after the sixth, it is mentioned in all martyr chronicles. In the Greek Church neither the Apostolical Constitutions, nor the two Cappadocian Gregories, nor Chrysostom, know anything of it. It is first mentioned by Theodorus Lector in his church history (16) as having been celebrated in Constantinople towards the close of the reign of Anastasius 1. (518): after the seventh century it is mentioned in all calendars, also those of Copts, Ethiopians, and Armenians. In 1743 Benedict XIV. decreed a celebration of eight days for the city of Rome; and in 1867, the eighteenth centenary, it was renewed with great magnificence by Pius IX. — II. Festum cathedrae Petri Antiochenae. The Calendarium Librarianum mentions that a festival was celebrated on Feb. 22 in commemoration of the accession of the apostle Peter to the episcopal chair. But it uses the words VIII. Kal. Mart.: Natale Petri de Cathedra, and thus leaves the locality of the chair in uncertainty. The same is the case with the Calendars of Polumius Silvius (448). In the Ambrosian Liturgy and in the Sacramentarium of Gelasius I. the festival is omitted altogether; but it is found again in the Sacramentarium of Gregory, and after his time always. — III. Festum cathedrae Petri Romanae, Jan. 18, was generally confounded with the preceding, up to the eighteenth century, but became independently established, and formally fixed during the Carolingian age, to which time, also, belongs the final recognition of the double episcopacy of St. Peter. — IV. Festum Sainti Petri ad vincula or in vinculis is not men-
PETER OF ALCANTARA. 1818 PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI.

mentioned until the ninth century in Wandelbert's Martyrology and Pseudo-Beda's Homil. de vini
culatione. It is celebrated by the Church of Rome on Aug. 1; by the Greek Church, on Jan. 16; and by the Armenian Church, on Feb. 22. The Armenian Church has also a festival of "the finger of the Apostle Peter;" but nobody knows anything of the origin or signification of this celebration.

Peter of Brusy, a Reformator of the order of the regular canons of St. Augustine, at Padua, and was made abbot of Spoleta, and after-
wards prior of St. Petri ad aram, near Naples.

PETER OF ALCANTARA, b. in 1499; d. Oct. 18, 1502. He entered the Franciscan order in 1515; became guardian of a newly erected monas
tery at Badasar in 1519; was appointed superior-general of the province of Estramadura in 1538; and induced the chapter of his order to sanction his reforms at a meeting in Placentia, 1540. He also aided Ste. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. Not content, however, with the role of a reformer, he founded, with the consent of John III., a new congregation, the severity of whose rules far surpassed that of the Franciscans. He was canonized by Clement IX. in 1669. See Acta Sanctorum, Oct. VIII. Two works are ascribed to him, of which the De oratione et meditatio is genuine, while the De animi pace hardly belongs to him.

HERZOG.

PETER OF ALEXANDRIA became bishop of that city in 306, and was decapitated, on the order of Maximinus, without any preceding trial, in 311. In his time fell the schism of Meletius and the persecution of Diocletian: according to legend, he was himself the last victim of that persecution in Alexandria. He left a lógos peri meta
crion, - a treatise on the subject of the lópsi, the degree of their crime, and of the penance de

GASS.

PETER D'AILLY. See Ailli.

PETER OF BLOIS (Petrus Bloisensis), d. about 1200. He studied canon law at Bologna, and theology in Paris, and became chancellor to the archbishop of Canterbury, in whose service he made several voyages to Rome. Of his works — treatises on theology, philosophy, canon law, medicine, and mathematics, more or less influ
cenced by John of Salisbury — the most interest
ing are his hundred and eighty-three lettersto Henry II., various popes, and higher ecclesiastics. They are not only of historical, but sometimes also of theological in
terest. They were edited by Sirmond, Paris, 1613.

C. SCHMIDT.

PETER D'AILLY. See Ailli.

PETER OF CELLE (Petrus Cellensis), abbot of Moutier-La-Celle, near Troyes, in 1150; abbot of St. Remi, near Rheims, in 1162; bishop of Chartres in 1181; d. in 1183. Of his works, ed
ited by Janvier, Paris, 1671, and consisting of mystical expositions of scriptural passages, treat
ises on conscience, discipline, etc., the most im
portant are his letters to Alexander III., various princes, bishops, abbots, etc. They are not only of historical, but sometimes also of theological in
terest. They were edited by Sirmond, Paris, 1613.

PETER LOMBARD. See Lombard.

PETER MARTYR, or Peter of Verona, a Dominican monk, who in the middle of the thir
teenth century was appointed inquisitor in Lombardy. The severity with which he exercised his powe produced much hatred against him, and in 1262 he was assassinated. In the very next year he was canonized by Innocent IV. See Act. Sanct. Boll. Apr. III.

C. SCHMIDT.

PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI, b. in Florence, Sept. 8, 1530; d. at Zurich, Nov. 12, 1562. In 1518 he entered, against his father's wish, the order of the regular canons of St. Augustine, at Fiesole; studied Greek, Hebrew, and theology at Padua, and was made abbot of Spoleta, and after-
wards prior of St. Petri ad aram, near Naples.

He there came in contact with the circle of Juan Valdes, and was, especially by the influence of Ochino, completely won for the Reforma
tion. Though suspecting Peter of not being a powefully endowed man, he was appointed visitor-general of his order; but his severity in enforcing the rules made him hated by the monks, and he was sent to Lucca as prior of San Frediano. But soon the Inquisition be
came aware of a decidedly evangelical movement set on foot by him among the clerics of Lucca, and he had to flee for his life. In 1542 he reached Zurich, and went thence to Strassburg, where he was most kindly received by Bucer, and finally

xvi. 16, and, with respect to the Lord's Supper, he not only rejected the doctrine of transubstan
tiation, but he also denied the sacramental char
acter of the act, considering it a mere historical incident in the life of Christ. Church-buildings were an abomination to him; for the church is the community of the faithful, and the place
where they gather, whether a stable or a palace, is of no consequence. For church officials, bishops, and priests, he represented as mere frauds; and generally he demanded the abrogation of all ex
ternal forms and ceremonies. In Southern France,
where the Cathari were numerous, he found many adherents; and in the dioceses of Arles, Embrun, Die, and Gap, he caused much disturbance. Churches were destroyed, images and crucifixes burned, priests and monks maltreated, etc. At last the bishops were able, by the aid of the secu
lar power, to put down the movement, and expel the leaders. But soon after, Peter of Brusy ap
peared in the dioceses of Narbonne and Toulouse, where he preached for nearly twenty years, and with still greater success. In 1126 he was seized, however, and burnt at St. Gilles; but his party, the Petrobrusians, did not immediately disappear. Peter Venerabilis visited them, preached to them, and wrote the above-mentioned book against them, but without any result. They joined Henry of Lausanne, and finally disappeared among the Henricians.
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appointed professor of the Old Testament. In 1547 he came to England, on the invitation of Cranmer. He was professor of Hebrew, and was one of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, in 1548; on the Epistle to the Romans, in 1549, etc. He took, also, a prominent part in the disputations concerning the Lord's Supper, in the negotiations concerning the new Liturgy, etc. After the accession of Mary, he fled to the Continent, and went back to Straubing. There, however, the state of affairs had changed, a strict Lutheranism prevailing; and he was appointed only after subscribing to the Confessio Augustana. But two years later on (1553), when the controversy of the Lord's Supper broke out, he left Straubing, and accepted a call to Zürich, where he spent the rest of his life in very lively communication with the Reformed party in England (Defensio doctrina veteris et apostolicae de Eucharistia sacramentum, 1559, against Gardiner, and Defensio ad R. Smythii duas libellolos de celebrato ac verbo monastico, in Poland (two letters concerning the Holy Trinity and the two natures in Christ), in Italy, and in France. He was present at the disputations at Poissy, September, 1561; but the formula (concerning the Lord's Supper) which the assembly finally agreed upon was rejected by the Sorbonne. His Commentaries were published after his death; and his Loci communes, edited by Robert Masson, London, 1575, and one of the principal sources for the study of the Reformed theology of the sixteenth century. See SIMLER: Oratio de vita et obitu P. M., Zürich, 1602; SCHLOSSER: Leben des Theodor Beza und P. M. Vermigli, Heidelberg, 1807; C. SCHMIDT: P. M. Vermigli, Elberfeld, 1838. C. SCHMIDT.

PETER THE VENERABLE. Pierre Maurice de Montboisier, called “the Venerable,” was b. in Auvergne, France, 1092 (94), and d. Christmas Day, 1156 (98), at Cluny. He was the seventh son of Maurice, Lord of Montboisier, and of Ringarde his wife. Four of his brothers became ecclesiastics also; and one, Armanus, was prior of Cluny. At seventeen years of age Peter became a monk of Cluny, and at thirty (1122) he was elected abbot. He reformed the abbey, and established good management in all its distracted affairs; and began to lecture at Oxford, -- on the Epistle to the Corinthians, in 1148; on the Epistle to the Romans, in 1149, etc. He took, also, a prominent part in the disputations concerning the Lord's Supper, in the negotiations concerning the new Liturgy, etc. After the accession of Mary, he fled to the Continent, and went back to Straubing. There, however, the state of affairs had changed, a strict Lutheranism prevailing; and he was appointed only after subscribing to the Confessio Augustana. But two years later on (1553), when the controversy of the Lord's Supper broke out, he left Straubing, and accepted a call to Zürich, where he spent the rest of his life in very lively communication with the Reformed party in England (Defensio doctrina veteris et apostolicae de Eucharistia sacramentum, 1559, against Gardiner, and Defensio ad R. Smythii duas libellolos de celebrato ac verbo monastico, in Poland (two letters concerning the Holy Trinity and the two natures in Christ), in Italy, and in France. He was present at the disputations at Poissy, September, 1561; but the formula (concerning the Lord's Supper) which the assembly finally agreed upon was rejected by the Sorbonne. His Commentaries were published after his death; and his Loci communes, edited by Robert Masson, London, 1575, and one of the principal sources for the study of the Reformed theology of the sixteenth century. See SIMLER: Oratio de vita et obitu P. M., Zürich, 1602; SCHLOSSER: Leben des Theodor Beza und P. M. Vermigli, Heidelberg, 1807; C. SCHMIDT: P. M. Vermigli, Elberfeld, 1838. C. SCHMIDT.

PETER THE HERMIT. b. at Amiens, in the middle of the eleventh century; d. in the monastery of Neuf Montier, in the diocese of Liege, July 7, 1115. During a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, which he made in 1093, he is said to have conceived the idea of a crusade; and he was, at July 7, 1115. During a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, which he made in 1093, he is said to have conceived the idea of a crusade; and he was, at

PETERBOROUGH, a city in Northamptonshire, Eng., situated on the left bank of the Nene, seventy-six miles, north by west, from London. It is the seat of the bishopric of the same name. The episcopal stipend is forty-five hundred pounds. The see was founded by Henry VIII., in 1541. Peterborough Cathedral is a beautiful specimen of Norman and Early English architecture. It was commenced by abbot John de Seez, 1117, and completed 1528. It is cruciform, 476 feet long, with transepts 203 feet broad, ceiling 78 feet, and tower 150 feet high. See G. A. POOLE: Peterborough, London, 1881. PETER-PENCE (Denuarius S. Petri, Census B. Petri, Romaeot, Rumscot) denotes a money-tribute which several of the northern kingdoms of Europe annually paid to the see of St. Peter. It seems to have originated in England, and was, according to the report of later chroniclers, paid there for the first time by King Ina of Wessex (725), though not in the form of a tribute, but as a support of the Schola Saxorum, — an educational institution in Rome for English clergy. The whole report, however, is somewhat doubtful, as Beda knows nothing of the affair. The first certain notice of it is found in a letter from Leo III. to Cenulph, archbishop of Canterbury, in 756 ("Epist. ad Cenulp., Concl., XIII.; JAFFE: Regest., No. 1915"). In which the Pope states that Offa (d. 796), the predecessor of Cenulph, had promised for himself
and his successor to pay annually three hundred and sixty-five mances to the apostle Peter for the maintenance of the poor and the illumination of churches. In the eleventh century it seems to have been paid regularly, first as a charity, but afterwards as a duty. Gregory VII. even tried to use it as a means of bringing England into a relation of vassalage to the papal see: but William the Conqueror, though he declined to take the oath, refused to take the duty, refused to pay. The money was collected through the bishops, though not without some difficulties, partly because people refused to pay, partly because the bishops were unwilling to give the sums collected. Under Henry VIII. it was abrogated, by Act of Parliament, July 9, 1533. In Poland the peter-pence was introduced in the eleventh century, as later chronicles tell us, from gratitude, because Benedict IX. absolved Casimir, on his accession to the throne in 1034, from the monastic vows. From Poland it was introduced into Prussia, at that time a fief of the Polish crown; but there it met with repeated protests, and was never paid regularly. In the Scandinavian countries it was proposed by papal legates in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but never paid in the form of a regular duty. Gregory VII. even tried to use it as a duty, refused to take the oath. The money was collected through the bishops, though not without some difficulties, partly because people refused to pay, partly because the bishops were unwilling to give the sums collected. Under Henry VIII. it was abrogated, by Act of Parliament, July 9, 1533.

In the Scandinavian countries it was proposed by papal legates in the eleventh century, as later chroniclers tell us, from gratitude, because Benedict IX. absolved Casimir, on his accession to the throne in 1034, from the monastic vows. From Poland it was introduced into Prussia, at that time a fief of the Polish crown; but there it met with repeated protests, and was never paid regularly. In the Scandinavian countries it was proposed by papal legates in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but never paid in the form of a regular duty. Gregory VII. even tried to use it as a duty, refused to take the oath. The money was collected through the bishops, though not without some difficulties, partly because people refused to pay, partly because the bishops were unwilling to give the sums collected. Under Henry VIII. it was abrogated, by Act of Parliament, July 9, 1533.

In 1081 Gregory VII. endeavored to introduce it in France, arguing that Charlemagne had presented offerings of the kind to the papal see (Gregorius, Liber censuum Romano: ecclesiae, in Muratori: Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Eclogae Chronologicae (Paris, 1632), Leges Aetatis (Paris, 1636, dedicated to De Thou), Observationum Libri III. in varia vetterum scriptorum loca (Paris, 1641), etc. His biography was written in Latin by Pierre Formy, Paris, 1673.

PETRA. See SEDA.

PETRI is the name of two brothers — Olaus (b. at Oerebro, 1497; d. in Stockholm, 1552) and Laurentius (b. at Oerebro, 1499; d. at Upsala, 1574), who were chiefly instrumental in the establishment of the Reformation in Sweden. They studied theology at Wittenberg, and began, soon after their return home, to preach the Reformation, protected by Gustavus Vasa. Olaus was in 1523 made rector of the seminary of Strengnäs, and in 1539 preacher in Stockholm; Laurentius, professor in Upsala in 1523, and in 1551 archbishop. Together with Lars Anderson, they translated the Bible into Swedish. Olaus also wrote a Manuale Succitae, an Ordo Missae Succitae, and a number of polemical treatises in Swedish. Laurentius wrote a Disciplina Succitae, which became part of the Swedish constitution. See SWEDEN.

PETROBRUSIANS. See PETER OF BRUYS.

PETRUS (or PETER), Hugh, Puritan, b. at Fowey, Cornwall, Eng., 1599; hanged at Charing Cross, London, Oct. 15, 1600. He was graduated M.A. at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1622; took holy orders, and preached for a time in London. But, having been imprisoned for nonconformity, he removed to Rotterdam, preached to an independent congregation there; emigrated to America; and on Dec. 21, 1630, succeeded Roger Williams as pastor in Salem. He returned to England in 1641, and, from that time on, entered into politics, and threw in his fortunes with the Puritan party. On the Restoration he was arrested, sentenced, and hanged as a regicide. He was a busy man in his day, and is still remembered. His character has been the subject of protracted discussion. See Allibone, s. v. He wrote in prison A Dying Father's last Legacy to an only Child, published 1717.

PETRUS, Johann Wilhelm, b. at Osnabrueck, June 3, 1649; d. at Dessau, an estate near Zerbst, Jan. 23, 1727. He studied theology at Giessen and Rostock; visited also other German universities; made in 1675 the acquaintance of Spener at Francfort; and was in 1677 appointed superintendent of Lieben. In 1688 he removed to Lüneburg as superintendent, but was in 1692 dismissed partly because he held Protestant ideas into the pulpit, partly on account of his relations to Juliane von Asseburg; which article see. After that time, he retired into private life, and devoted himself to a literary propaganda for his mystical and chiliastic ideas. Of his works, which are very numerous, the principal are: Heiligkeit des herrlichen Reiches Jesu Christi, Magdeburg, 1692-93, 2 vols.; and Geheimniss der Widerbringung aller Dinge, Francfort, 1700-10, 3 vols. fol. He also wrote exegetical works, Latin and German poems (the former edited by Leibnitz), and an autobiography, 1718. See Cohrodi: Geschichle des Chiliasmus, Francfort, 1731, 2d ed., Zürich, 1794, 4 vols.

PETIT, Samuel, b. at Nîmes, Dec. 25, 1694; d. there Dec. 12, 1743. He studied theology at Geneva, and was in 1718 appointed professor of Oriental languages, and pastor in his native city. Among his numerous works are Miscellanea Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Eclogae Chronologicae (Paris, 1632), Leges Aetatis (Paris, 1636, dedicated to De Thou), Observationum Libri III. in varia vetterum scriptorum loca (Paris, 1641), etc. His biography was written in Latin by Pierre Formy, Paris, 1673.

PETIT, Samuel, b. at Nîmes, Dec. 25, 1694; d. there Dec. 12, 1743. He studied theology at Geneva, and was in 1718 appointed professor of Oriental languages, and pastor in his native city. Among his numerous works are Miscellanea Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Eclogae Chronologicae (Paris, 1632), Leges Aetatis (Paris, 1636, dedicated to De Thou), Observationum Libri III. in varia vetterum scriptorum loca (Paris, 1641), etc. His biography was written in Latin by Pierre Formy, Paris, 1673.

PETIT, Samuel, b. at Nîmes, Dec. 25, 1694; d. there Dec. 12, 1743. He studied theology at Geneva, and was in 1718 appointed professor of Oriental languages, and pastor in his native city. Among his numerous works are Miscellanea Libri IX. (Paris, 1630), Eclogae Chronologicae (Paris, 1632), Leges Aetatis (Paris, 1636, dedicated to De Thou), Observationum Libri III. in varia vetterum scriptorum loca (Paris, 1641), etc. His biography was written in Latin by Pierre Formy, Paris, 1673.

PETRUS. See SEDA.

PETRI is the name of two brothers — Olaus (b. at Oerebro, 1497; d. in Stockholm, 1552) and Laurentius (b. at Oerebro, 1499; d. at Upsala, 1574), who were chiefly instrumental in the establishment of the Reformation in Sweden. They studied theology at Wittenberg, and began, soon after their return home, to preach the Reformation, protected by Gustavus Vasa. Olaus was in 1523 made rector of the seminary of Strengnäs, and in 1539 preacher in Stockholm; Laurentius, professor in Upsala in 1523, and in 1551 archbishop. Together with Lars Anderson, they translated the Bible into Swedish. Olaus also wrote a Manuale Succitae, an Ordo Missae Succitae, and a number of polemical treatises in Swedish. Laurentius wrote a Disciplina Succitae, which became part of the Swedish constitution. See SWEDEN.

PETROBRUSIANS. See PETER OF BRUYS.

PEUCER, Caspar, b. at Bautzen, Jan. 6, 1525; d. at Dessau, Sept. 25, 1602. He studied in the university of Wittenberg, and was appointed professor of mathematics there in 1564, and of medicine in 1560, superintendent-general of the Latin schools of Saxony in 1568, and body-physician to the elector. From his arrival at Wittenberg he was an inmate of Melanchthon's house. In 1560 he married his youngest daughter, and after his death he became one of the most active representatives of the so-called Philippists; which article see. As he enjoyed the favor and confidence of the elector in an uncommon degree, it was easy for him to prevent anybody but Philippists from being appointed at the university. He was also very active in the publication, and introduction into the school, of the Wittenberg Catechism of 1571, which, on account of its antagonism to the doctrine of unio mystica, was an abomination in the eyes of the Lutherans. But through the electress, who was a strict Lutheran, his enemies finally succeeded in estranging the elector from him. In 1574 he was suddenly arrested, and kept in prison till shortly before the death of the elector, in 1586. After his release he returned to his old occupations, but his child died at Dessau. He published an edition of Melanchthon's works (Wittenberg, 1652-64, 4 vols. fol.), and a collection of
his letters (Wittenberg, 1585); wrote Tractatus historicus de P. M. (1590), a report of his imprison-
ment (published at Zürich in 1604), besides a
great number of medical, theological, and mathe-
matical treatises. See HEHN: Caspar Peucer and
theotheist Krell, Marburg, 1865.

PEW. The word comes from the old French
puis, an elevated space, puye, an open gallery
with rails (hence applied to an enclosed space,
or to a raised desk to kneel at), which is the
Latin podium, a balcony, especially near the arena,
where distinguished persons sat. So pews were
originally places for distinguished persons in
church. See SKEAT: Etymological Dictionary. In
the Roman-Catholic churches on the Continent
there are generally no pews, but in Protestant
churches they are universal. In England they
are said to date from the Reformation, and not
there are generally no pews, but in Protestant
the Reformed churches on the Continent
church. See SKEAT: Etymological Dictionary. In
to have been in general use until the middle of
the seventeenth century. The renting of them
is a common source of revenue in support of the
minister in unestablished churches. They are
very of the controversies about the Lord's Supper
disposed of by will. Originally there was only
also bought and sold, and as property can be
the seventeenth century. The renting of them
nearer and nearer to strict Calvinism. See IKEN:
PFAFF, Christof Matthaus, b. in Stuttgart,
Dec. 25, 1686; d. at Giessen, Nov. 9, 1780. He
studied at Tubingen; travelled extensively; was
appointed professor of theology at Tubingen in
1719, and chancellor of the university in 1720;
and removed in 1756 to Giessen, where he occu-
pied the same position. He was a man of great
accomplishments, a consummate scholar, a bril-
liant lecturer, wielding a great authority.
He defended the collegiate system against the reign-
ing territorialism (De originibus juris ecclesiasticis,
1719), and was very active in promoting a union
between the Reformed and Lutheran churches
(De unione Laici et Cleri, Elberfeld, 1716; Disserta-
tiones, etc. Kirche, 1719, and Alloquium irenicum ad Protas-
tantes, 1720). His doctrinal stand-point was more
liberal than the prevailing orthodoxy (Institutiones
Theologiae, 1719; Abris vom wahren Christenthum,
1720). It contained an element of Pietism, and
was very antagonistic to the rising school of
Wolff. His biography was written by Leporinus,
Leipzig, 1726.

PHAR'AOH (φαραώ). The Egyptian
word for king was per-āw, of which the Hebrew
parō was a transliteration: it means the "great
house," and finds its modern parallel in the Turk-
ish ruler’s epithet, the “Sublime Porte.” It was
customary to call the monarch by this epithet,
without adding his proper name, like "King,
“Cesar,” “Caesar.” So in the
it is quite common to have pews locked.
Formerly there were square pews, and pews with
very high backs; but now they are built with
backs no higher than a chair's, and very com-
monly without doors.

PEZEL (PEZOLT, PEZOLD), Christof, b. at
Plauen, March 5, 1539; d. in Bremen, Feb. 25,
1604. He studied theology at Jena and Witten-
berg, and was in 1567 appointed professor of the-
oLOGY in the latter place. As a representative of
Philippism, he was discharged in 1574, and ban-
ished from the country in 1576. In 1580 he was
appointed pastor in Bremen, and in 1584 superin-
tendent, and professor of theology. He edited
Melancthon’s correspondence with Hardenberg,
1598, and his Constilia Latina, 1602, and wrote the
Bremer Catechismus, the Bremen Consensus, a sur-
vey of the controversies about the Lord’s Supper
and the doctrine of ubiquity, Argumenta et Objec-
tiones, etc. (1580-89), Ausfrightige Rechenschaft vor
Lehre u. Ceremonien in der reform. Kirche (1592),
etc., which show that he gradually approached
nearer and nearer to strict Calvinism. See IKEN:
Die Wirksamkeit des Christof Pezel in Bremen, in
Brem. Jahrlärcher ix., 1877.

PFLEGER, Christof Matthaus, b. in Stuttgart,
Dec. 25, 1686; d. at Giessen, Nov. 9, 1780. He
studied at Tubingen; travelled extensively; was
appointed professor of theology at Tubingen in
1714, and chancellor of the university in 1720;
and removed in 1756 to Giessen, where he occu-
pied the same position. He was a man of great
accomplishments, a consummate scholar, a brilli-
ant lecturer, wielding a great authority.
He defended the collegiate system against the reign-
ing territorialism (De originibus juris ecclesiasticis,
1719), and was very active in promoting a union
between the Reformed and Lutheran churches
(De unione Laici et Cleri, Elberfeld, 1716; Disserta-
tiones, etc. Kirche, 1719, and Alloquium irenicum ad Protes-
tantes, 1720). His doctrinal stand-point was more
liberal than the prevailing orthodoxy (Institutiones
Theologiae, 1719; Abris vom wahren Christenthum,
1720). It contained an element of Pietism, and
was very antagonistic to the rising school of
Wolff. His biography was written by Leporinus,
Leipzig, 1726.

PHLUG, Julius, Canon of Naumburg and Mis-
na, afterwards Bishop of Naumburg-Zeitz; d.
1584; enjoyed the confidence of Charles V., and
was by him employed in the various negotiations
caused by the Reformation. He presided at the
religious disputations of Ratibon and Worms,
and drew up, together with Agricola, the Augs-
burg Interim. See JANSEN: De Julio Pflugo,
1858.

PHAR'AESEES, The (Heb., pərašā’im, Aramaic,
pərəšā’im, pərəšāhāy, the "separatists"), formed
by a party among the Jewish people. The name
they bore was not of their choice, but given them
by their opponents, who looked upon them as
separating themselves from the rest of the people
on account of their superior piety. They called
customs, is alluded to. The Pharisees were the
reign of John Hyrcanus I., 135-105 B.C. (see
Sadducees. Hyrcanus' son, Alexander Jan-
descendants of the Chassidim (see art.), and first
emerge as a party, under the name Pharisee, in
the members of a brotherhood designed to further
themselves Haberim (the "companions"); i.e.,
by which term, not any departure in doctrine
from the beaten track of Judaism, but only in
customs, is alluded to. The Pharisees were the
descendants of the Chassidim (see art.), and first
emerge as a party, under the name Pharisee, in
the reign of John Hyrcanus I., 135-105 B.C. (see
art.), whose political measures they opposed; and
so, while at the beginning of his reign he sided
with the Pharisees, ere the close he went over to
the Sadducees. Hyrcanus' son, Alexander Jan-
æus, 104-78 B.C. (see art.), for six years vainly
strived to annihilate the Pharisees, who had be-
come numerous. But his widow Alexandra, 78-
68 B.C., gave them control in the government: and
from that time on they were the leaders of the
people, at least in spiritual things; and, although
the Sadducees were the nominal chiefs in the San-
hedrin, they succeeded in carrying out their will
Joseph., Antig., XVIII. 1, 4). In 63 B.C. Pal-
estine passed under the Roman power. The pres-
ence of the foreign power was a constant irritation
to the Jews, who maintained that God was their
only rightful ruler. The Pharisees were in a
sense responsible for the terrible war which de-
stroyed their nation; because they strengthened
the people in the notion that it was not lawful to
give tribute to Caesar (Matt. xxii. 17 sqq.), be
cause it was an acknowledgment of a temporal
superiority which a theocratic people should not
make. Indeed, some of the Pharisees became
Zealots. But, inasmuch as their principal busi-
ness was the conversion of the people to the strict
observance of the law (see the strict observance of
the law. It was because they quibbled about trifles
and commands, that our Lord was so severe upon
them as generally luxurious in life. On the con-
trary, the great esteem in which they were held
by the people seems to prove just the opposite, as
Josephus asserts (Antig., XVII. 1, 3). They rep-
resent a religious system carried to a burdensome
and blameworthy minuteness. Yet there were
doubtless among their number the upright and holy
and of Joseph of Arimathea, who were truly pious, and,
if bigoted, were not hypocritical. The Pharisees
were proselytizers. The spread of Judaism thus
accomplished led to the wider spread of Christi-
nity. It is to Paul, a Pharisee of Pharisees, that
the church is indebted for the first extensive mis-

LIT.—See list in Schürer: Neutestamentliche
Zeitgeschichte, Leipzig, 1874, p. 423; also Weix-
hausen: Die Phariser und die Sadduæer, Greifs-
wald, 1874. Comp. art. "Pharisees," in Herzog,
1st ed. (Reuss); id., in Bib. Wörterb.; art.
"Pharisees," in Kittel (Ginsburg) and in Smith
(Twistleton).

PHILADELPHIA ("brotherly love"), the seat
of one of the seven churches of Asia (Rev. i. 11,
iii. 7-18), a city on the borders of Lydia and
Phrygia, about twenty-five miles south-east from
Sardis. It was built by Attalus II. (Philadel-
phus), king of Pergamus (d. 138 B.C.), but in 133
passed into the hands of the Romans. It was the
mart of the immense wine-traffic of the
district. As the district is volcanic, the city has
been once nearly destroyed (A.D. 17), and sev-
eral times severely injured. It was captured by
the Osmanli Turks in 1380. It is now called
Allah-shehr ("city of God"). It contains some
ten thousand inhabitants, mostly Turks. Accord-
ting to tradition, Peter ordained Demetrius the
first bishop of the city (Apos. Constit., vii. § iv.).
One of the Ignatian Epistles was addressed to
that church.

PHILADELPHIA, the largest city in Pennsyl-
vania, and the second in the United States, is
situated in lat. 38° 57' N., and long. W., 75° 10'.
It extends north and south, along the west bank
of the Delaware: this work and west an average distance of five miles and
a half, beyond the River Schuykill, which flows
through the city, and is spanned by thirteen
bridges. It contains 130 square miles, or 82,600
acres, and has 750 miles of paved streets.

It was founded in 1682 by William Penn, a
Quaker from England, and was incorporated in
1701, when it had its first mayor. The first Con-
inental Congress met in Carpenter's Hall, Sept.
4, 1774. The Declaration of Independence was
adopted here July 4, 1776. (Independence Hall
still stands, a noted building. The convention
that framed the Federal Constitution met in an
adjoining building, May, 1787.) It was the seat
of the Federal Government from 1790 to 1800.
Up to 1854 it consisted of the "city proper" and
"districts"; but in that year they were consoli-
dated under one municipal government.

The population in 1680 was 600; 1684, 2,500;
1700, 4,500; 1800, 40,452; 1850, 487,672; 1860,
508,034; 1870, 674,022; 1880, 846,980.

Philadelphia is the "city of homes." In 1880
it had 146,412 dwelling-houses for its 165,044
families and 846,980 people,— an average to a
house of only 5.79 persons.
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Its annual death-rate is only 10.06 per thousand. It has forty-five cemeteries.

The first American paper, The Weekly Mercury, was established here in 1719.

The prominent educational and scientific institutions of the city are the Central High School, Girls' Normal School, University of Pennsylvania, the American Philosophical Society (founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1769), Academy of Fine Arts, Franklin Institute, Wagner Institute, School of Design for Women, Lutheran, Episcopal Roman Catholic, and Reformed Presbyterian theological seminaries, and nine medical and dental colleges. Its schools and seminaries, public and private, are numerous and of a high order.

The largest libraries are the Philadelphia (and Ridgeway), Mercantile, Apprentice's, Friends', Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Presbyterian Historical Society, and of the University of Pennsylvania.

Fairmount Park, lying on both sides of the Schuylkill, contains 2,740 acres. The Zoological Garden is in it. The National Centennial Exhibition of 1876 was held in it.

The principal and oldest United-States Mint is located in the city. The American Sunday-School Union, organized in 1824, and also several of the missionary boards of the great religious denominations, have their head offices here. "The First Day or Sunday School Society of Philadelphia," which was the first Sunday-school organization in America for missionary work, was formed here in 1791.

The places licensed for the sale of liquor number about 5,500.

The chief religious denominations began in the city as follows: forty years before Penn came, a Lutheran minister was preaching to the Swedes at Tinicum Island, and a church was built at Wicaco in 1669; Episcopal services began in 1646 (the oldest church edifice still standing is the Gloria Dei, or Old Swedes, dedicated in 1700; it was originally Lutheran); Roman Catholic, 1686; Presbyterian, 1687; Baptist, 1689; German Reformed, 1727; Methodist-Episcopal, 1769; Jewish, 1769 (the first Jewish congregation in America); Episcopalian, 1776; Unitarian, 1796; Zion African, 1820; Swedish, 1787; Unitarian, 1796; Zion African, 2; Scottish Episcopal, 1825; Congregationalist, 1831; Advent Christian, 1843; Free Methodist, 1850; Church of God, 1856; Reformed Episcopal, 1873; Independent Methodist, 1879; Mormon, 1881.

There are 611 places of worship in the city. This number includes churches, mission preaching-stations, and the other denominational institutions in which public religious services are regularly held. They are classed as follows: Advent Christian, 2; Baptists, 78; Free Baptists, 7; Bible Christian, 1; Children of Zion, 1; Christadelphians, 1; Christian (Independent), 2; Church of the Brethren (Dunkards), 2; Church of God, 2; Congregational, 2; Congregational (Independent), 1; Disciples of Christ, 4; Evangelical Association, 8; Friends, 17 (Orthodox, 7; Hicksite, 9; others), 1; General Convention of Latter-Day Saints, 2 (Mormon Anti-Polygamous, 1; Polygamous, 1); Lutheran, 31 (English, General Council, 11; German, General Council, 12; Independent, 1; Swedish, Augustan Synod, 1; German, Mission Synod, 1; English, General Synod, 5); Mennonites, 2; Methodist, 122 (Methodist-Episcopal, 101; African, 10; Zion African, 2; Free, 3; Independent, 6); Moravians, 5; New Jerusalem, 3; Presbyterian and Reformed, 135 (Northern Presbyterian, 92; Reformed Presbyterian, 3; United Presbyterian, 1; Reformed [Dutch] 5; Reformed [German] English, 7; German, 8); Protestant-Episcopal, 96; Reformed Episcopal, 10; Roman Catholic, 47; Spiritual Association, 3; undenominational missions, 7; Unitarian, 3; United Brethren in Christ, 3; Universalist, 4. Of the total number, 500 are organized churches.

The 611 places for worship give one to 1,386 persons of all ages: in 1776 there were 37 for a population of 80,000 or 70,000, or not more than one to every 1,600 persons.

The strongest Protestant denominations are the Presbyterian (Northern General Assembly), which had, in 1882, 26,853 communicants; Methodist-Episcopal, 22,747; Protestant-Episcopal, 22,679; Baptist, 18,564; making a total of 90,943. The other Protestant denominations with these will number at least 130,000 communicant members. The Philadelphia Sunday-school Association, representing all these denominations, reports 552 Sunday schools, with 148,885 scholars. The population in connection with the Protestant churches and Sabbath schools, and under their influence, may be set down as not less than 500,000.

The Jewish population is 12,000. The Roman Catholic population of the diocese, which includes the city and several of the counties of Eastern Pennsylvania, is estimated as 300,000. The exact Roman-Catholic population of the city cannot be had,—not much, if any, over 100,000.

The Young Men's Christian Association was organized in 1854. Present membership about 3,000. It has a magnificent building on Fifteenth and Chestnut, covering 230 by 72 feet, five stories high, built in 1875. There is also a very efficient Women's Christian Association, and a Young Men's Christian Association in Germantown. The Girard College for orphan boys, founded by a wealthy Frenchman, 1682, is also located here, and now provides for the education of a thousand boys. R. M. Patterson.

PHILADELPHIAN SOCIETY. As early as 1692, Dr. and Mrs. Pordage and Bromley established a gathering of mystics of the Jakob Böhme pattern. To their meetings Mrs. Leadbeater, after the death of her husband, was admitted; and in 1670 she, with those already named, founded the Philadelphian Society. To it she soon gave what were called "the laws of Paradise," which contained the ground ideas of the society. The new enterprise was designed to advance the kingdom of God by improving the life, teaching the loftiest morality, enforcing the duty of universal brotherhood, peace, and love. At the same time, no disturbance in the political world was contemplated, unless, indeed, any government acted
PHILASTER.

against the light of nature and the gospel. The
Philadelphians also believed firmly in what they
called the "divine secrets," — the wonders of God
and nature, the profound spiritual experiences
of regeneration and soul-resurrection, — in the speedy
establishment of Messiah's kingdom, and in the
better end promised for the future world. These ideas formed
such ready acceptance, that oral and epistolary
intercourse with many persons of Holland and
Germany was soon begun. Among those interested
were Horec, May, Petersen, and Spener. Since
the time for the ingathering of the Phila-
delphian Church had come, the living word must
be spoken by a living man. Accordingly, Joh-
nannes Dittmar of Salzungen was appointed "in-
spector," and, armed with credentials, was sent to
Germany for the purpose. One important part
of his mission was to unite the Philadelphians
with the Pietists, especially those with Professor
Franke at Halle. Although kindly received,
his mission was well-nigh fruitless. At the end
of 1703 the Philadelphians drew up their Confes-
sion; but, instead of advancing, they declined. In
England they were forbidden to meet. The Hol-
land branch withdrew, — a particularly serious
embarrassment, since it had been the medium of
communication with Germany. Still, the visions
of Mrs. Leade were to many irrefragable proofs of
divinity, and implicitly accepted. Her death end-
ed her repute; but, if the torrent has sunk in the
sand, she has the credit of first giving practical
expression to the idea of universal brotherhood.

PHILASTER, or PHILASTRIUS, b. in the first
quarter of the fourth century, probably in Italy;
d. as Bishop of Brescia, July 18, 387, a noted
heretic-hunter of his time. From his youth to
his death he travelled from one end of the Roman
Empire to the other, to track heretics, and convert
them. Especially noticeable are his attacks on
the Arian bishop, Auxentius, the predecessor of
Ambrose, and his appearance at the council of
Aquileia (381), where the two Arian bishops, Pal-
ladius and Secundianus, were condemned. About
twenty years earlier (374-377), Epiphanius
wrote his Hærarum; and as, up to a certain point
(Epiphanius, 57, and Philaster, 58), the two
books agree with each other, not only with respect
to materials, and arrangement in general, but
often, also, with respect to the minor details of
the representation, — phrases and words, — it has
been inferred that Philaster plagiarized Epipha-
nius. The inference is hardly correct; however,
and R. A. Lipsius, in his Zur Quellenkritik des
Epiphanius (Vienna, 1885), has made it very pro-
bable that they both borrowed from the lost Ἐπι-
φανιος of Hippolytus. What Philaster has added
of his own is completely worthless. He discov-
ered, or rather invented, the Puteorium, who are
heretics because they misunderstand Jer. ii. 13;
and the Troglodytes, who are heretics because they
misunderstand Ezek. viii. 7-12. The book was
first edited by Sichardus, Basel, 1628; which
edition is incorporated in the Bibli. Patr. Max.,
later editions by Fabricius, Hamburg, 1721; Ga-
and Oehler, in his Corpus hærerologicum, Berlin,
1856. i. MANGOLD.

PHILEMON. See PAUL.

PHILIP THE APOSTLE. In the Synoptists
and the Acts his name occurs only in the list of
apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14;
Acts i. 13). These ideas formed
such ready acceptance, that oral and epistolary
intercourse with many persons of Holland and
Germany was soon begun. Among those interested
were Horec, May, Petersen, and Spener. Since
the time for the ingathering of the Phila-
delphian Church had come, the living word must
be spoken by a living man. Accordingly, Joh-
nannes Dittmar of Salzungen was appointed "in-
spector," and, armed with credentials, was sent to
Germany for the purpose. One important part
of his mission was to unite the Philadelphians
with the Pietists, especially those with Professor
Franke at Halle. Although kindly received,
his mission was well-nigh fruitless. At the end
of 1703 the Philadelphians drew up their Confes-
sion; but, instead of advancing, they declined. In
England they were forbidden to meet. The Hol-
land branch withdrew, — a particularly serious
embarrassment, since it had been the medium of
communication with Germany. Still, the visions
of Mrs. Leade were to many irrefragable proofs of
divinity, and implicitly accepted. Her death end-
ed her repute; but, if the torrent has sunk in the
sand, she has the credit of first giving practical
expression to the idea of universal brotherhood.

PHILIP THE ARABIAN, Roman emperor
(244-249), was b. at Bostra in Arabia, whence
his surname, krao. His reign was in political
respect, utterly insignificant; but the question
whether or not he was a Christian has some in-
terest to the church historian. Eusebius is the
first who states that Philip was a member of
the Christian Church, and subject to its discipline
(Hist. Eccl., vi. 84); but the statement is corrobo-
rated by notices by Vincentius of Lerimum (Com-
ad Olymp. (257), by Chrysostom (App., H. 470),
Jerome (Chron. ad an. 248), and Orosius (Hist., 20).
Some, as, for instance, Scaliger, Spanheim, etc.,
reject these testimonies as dependent upon Euse-
bius, who introduces his story with a "People
say;" while others — Moesheim, Uhlhorn, etc. —
accept the statement that Philip was the first
Christian emperor. See AUBE : Les chrétiens dans
l'empire Romain, Paris, 1881.

PHILIP THE EVANGELIST, one of the seven
chosen to attend to the secular concerns of the
primitive Jerusalem Church (Acts vi. 5); most
probably a Hellenist, certainly, like Stephen, a
very liberal Jew. He was, indeed, the first to
put liberal principles in practice; for, when per-
secution in Jerusalem dispersed the disciples, he
went and preached to the.Replace the he who, in his mission was to unite the Philadelphians
with the Pietists, especially those with Professor
Franke at Halle. Although kindly received,
his mission was well-nigh fruitless. At the end
of 1703 the Philadelphians drew up their Confes-
sion; but, instead of advancing, they declined. In
England they were forbidden to meet. The Hol-
land branch withdrew, — a particularly serious
embarrassment, since it had been the medium of
communication with Germany. Still, the visions
of Mrs. Leade were to many irrefragable proofs of
divinity, and implicitly accepted. Her death end-
ed her repute; but, if the torrent has sunk in the
sand, she has the credit of first giving practical
expression to the idea of universal brotherhood.

PHILIP THE FAIR (king of France 1285-
1314), an unscrupulous man, who never hesitated
to employ even the basest means in order to reach
his goal, but who, in the ends he pursued, was
often supported by the hearty sympathy of the
people he ruled. In the history of the church he
occupies a conspicuous place; for it was he who,
more than any other prince, contributed to break
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the spell by which the Pope kept bound all the nations of Western and Northern Europe. In order to defray the expenses of the war with England, he imposed a heavy tax on the French clergy. The clergy complained to the Pope; and, by bull (1296), the Pope forbade the export of precious metal, coined or uncoined, and thereby cut off a considerable portion of the Pope's revenue. Boniface immediately entered upon the retreat. A new bull (Ineffabilis amor, Sept. 25, 1296), and several briefs to the king and the French clergy, tried to explain the bull Clericis laicos into harmony with the king's wishes. Aug. 11, 1297, he canonized Louis IX.; in June, 1298, he appeared as umpire between France and England,—all on the side of France, etc. The immense success, however, of the jubilee of 1300 again brought forward the papal dreams of a universal monarchy; and as Pierre Dubois at the same time published his Super secretum, and the French claims on a universal monarchy, and reducing the papal authority to purely spiritual matters, there came again a dangerous tension in the relation between the two sovereigns. Finally the sending of Bernard de Saisset, Bishop of Gance, Philip assembled the states-general for and he had returned to his see, he was summoned as soon as his legatinomission was finished, and the more he was brought to support. Only the clergy preserved a respectfulbehaviortowards the Pope. The unification of the Papacy, and Philip was by no means anxious to conceal the real state of affairs. See Clement V. BOUTARIC: La France sous Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1881.

PHILIP THE MAGNANIMOUS, Landgrave of Hesse; b. at Marburg, Nov. 23, 1504; d. there March 31, 1567; one of the most prominent characters in the history of the German Reformation. He was only five years old when his father died, and only fourteen when he was declared of age. He was present at the Diet of Worms in 1521, but had at that time not yet made up his mind with respect to religious matters. He was, however, one of those who insisted that the safe conduct accorded to Luther should be kept sacred. He visited Luther in his lodgings, and on his return he allowed mass to be celebrated in German at Cassel. In the campaign against Franz von Sickingen, in 1522, he was accompanied by a Protestant preachers; and an incidental meeting with Melanchthon, on the road to Heidelberg, finally decided him. In February, 1525, he opened his country to the Reformation; in May he joined the Torgau Union; and in June he appeared at the Diet of Spires as one of the leaders of the Protestant party, surprising the Roman-Catholic bishop by his theological learning, the imperial commissioners by his outspokenness, and King Ferdinand himself by the open threat of leaving the diet immediately if the enforcement of the edicts of Worms was insisted upon.

The great task he had on hand was to unite the German and Swiss Protestants into one compact party, and at the Diet of Spires (1529) he succeeded in baffling all the attempts of the Roman Catholics of producing an open breach. The Conference of Marburg, in the same year, was also his work; and it had, at all events, the effect of somewhat mitigating the hostility of the theologians. Nevertheless, at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), the Lutherans appeared to be willing to buy peace by sacrificing the interest of the Zwinglians. Philip proposed war, open and immediate; but the Lutherans suspected him of being a Zwinglian at heart, and their suspicion made him powerless. He subscribed the Confessio Augustana, but reluctantly, and with an express reservation with respect to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Finally, when he saw that nothing could be done, while he knew that the emperor could not be trusted, he suddenly left Augsburg, and his resoluteness made an impression on the other Protestant princes; and in March, 1531, he was able to form the Smalcaldian League, though he was not able to procure admission to it for the Swiss Reformed. In the same year he opened negotiations with the king of Denmark; in 1532 he compelled the edicts of the Reichstag; in 1533, by the edicts of Nuremberg; in 1534, after the brilliant victory at Laufen, he enforced the restoration of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg, by which that country was opened to the Reformation; in 1539 he began negotiations with Francis I.; and in 1540 he again proposed to wage open war on the emperor.
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But at that very moment his authority was greatly impaired, and his activity much clogged, by his marriage with Margarethe von der Saal,—a clear case of bigamy. She was maid-of-honor to his sister, the Duchess of Rochlitz, and sixteen years old. He fell in love with her, and, having ed his legitimate wife, a daughter of Duke George of Saxony, to give her consent to double marriage. The theologians, even Luther and Melanchthon, also consented, on the condition that the marriage should be kept a deep secret. The Duchess of Rochlitz, however, would not keep silent; and the question then arose, what the emperor would do. The case was so much the worse, as in 1535 Philip had issued a law which made bigamy one of the greatest crimes in Hesse. The emperor, however, simply used the affair to completely undermine the political position of the landgrave; but the profit he drew from it was, nevertheless, no small one. During the difficult times which followed after the peace of Crespy (1544), the Protestant party had no acknowledged leader; during the Smalcal- dian war (1546–47), no acknowledged head. After the war, the emperor treacherously seized the landgrave, and kept him in prison for five years. After his release, in 1552, Philip was not exactly a broken man; but he was much humbled, and was compelled to play the part of the mediator, especially between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics; thus he was very active in promoting the conferences of Naumburg in 1554, and of Worms in 1555.


KÜPFEL.

PHILIP II., king of Spain (1556–98), b. at Valladolid, May 21, 1527; d. at the Escorial, Sept. 13, 1598. He was the most powerful and relentless adversary of the Reformation. From his father, Charles V., he inherited Spain (which at that time furnished the largest, the best drilled, and, with Silas, his companion, miraculously delivered. The Jewish place of prayer on the banks of the Gangas, or Gangites, a tributary of the Strymon, now called Bournabachi, was the scene of their first labors in Europe; and Lydia, the first convert (Acts xvi. 12–40). A church was formed in consequence: to it Paul paid a visit subsequently, in 57 (Acts xx. 2), and apparently spent some little time there shortly afterwards (xx. 6). The church at Philippi is distinctively mentioned as contributing to Paul's support (2 Cor. xi. 9; Phil. iv. 16), and that of the Jerusalem Christians (2 Cor. viii. 1–6). The state of the church at Philippi was particularly dear to the apostle's heart; and to it he addressed, in A.D. 62, a letter of great tenderness, without those rebukes and criticisms which the other churches called forth. Ignatius of Antioch visited Philippi on his way to Rome (Martyr., c. v.), where he was martyred (A.D. 107). Polycarp of Smyrna wrote them a
letter, still preserved, at their request, and to them sent all the letters of Ignatius in possession of the Smyrna church (Polyc. Ad Phil., c. xii.). But from the time of Luther and his contemporaries, save as one of its bishops signs his name to some ecclesiastical document. The place itself is now a mere ruins. See especially Lightfoot: Philippians, London, 4th ed., 1878, pp. 46-94.

Philippi, Friedrich Adolf, b. in Berlin, Oct. 15, 1809; d. at Rostock, Aug. 29, 1832. He was a descendant of Jewish descent, but early embraced Christianity, studied philology and theology, and was appointed professor of theology at Dorpat in 1811, and at Rostock in 1832. His Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Frankfurt, 1748-50) ran through several editions, and was translated into English, Edinburgh, 1783. His Kirchliche Glaubenlehre appeared at Gütersloh, 1854-82, in 6 vols., and is a learned and able vindication of strict Lutheran orthodoxy. See his Life by L. Schulze, Norderingen, 1883.

Philippists, term denoting pupils and adherents of Philip Melanchthon. It originated in the middle of the sixteenth century, and probably in the Flacian camp. At first it simply designated a theological party, and was, by the Philippists, applied to the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipzig who had adopted the views of Melanchthon, and were accused of deviation from pure Lutheranism, both in the direction of Romanism and in the direction of Calvinism. Afterwards it also assumed an ecclesiastico-political significance, and was applied to the party, which, under the lead of Peucer, Cracau, Stossel, and others, labored to bring about a union between all the Protestant powers, and to break down the confessional barrier between Lutheranism and Calvinism by means of Melanchthonianism.

Luther had hardly died before the peace of the Lutheran Church was gone. The difference between him and Melanchthon had long been distinctly felt; but, as long as he lived, it was not allowed to take positive form. Immediately after his death, however, the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Philippists arranged themselves over against each other in open antagonism. The Gnesio-Lutherans—Amshoff, Flacius, Wigand, Mörlin, and others—considered themselves the representatives of the pure faith, the guardians of orthodoxy, and looked upon the Philippists as a set of men who had been carried away by a dangerous weakness. The Philippists—Camerarius, Major, Menius, Cruciger, and others—were conscious of being the party of progress, and suspected the Gnesio-Lutherans of despising science, and bowing too submissively to the letter. Other elements—personal, political, and ecclesiastical—were introduced in the divergence, and served to widen the breach, the rivalry between the two Saxon lines, the Albertine and the Ernestine; the jealousy between the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, etc.

The Leipzig Interim of 1548 gave occasion for the first controversy between the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Philippists: but the synergistic controversy broke out only a little later; and all the differences between the views of Luther and Melanchthon concerning justification, the Lord's Supper, the freedom of the will, etc.—were at once brought into the fire. The Gnesio-Lutherans were very violent; and the attacks which the conventions of Weimar, Coswig, and Magdeburg (1555-57), leveled against his universities. See the highest degree offensive. The Philippists, however, were equal to the situation, as may be seen from their Synodus Avium, a satire by Johann Major, and the famous Epistola Scholasticorum Wittenbergensium, issued by the two Philippist universities, and pointed at Flacius. The culminating point is indicated by the Lex Confutatio (1559), in which synergism, majorism, adiaphorism, etc., are confused, and condemned as heresies. As it soon became apparent, however, that the extravagances of the Gnesio-Lutheran professors drove the students away from the university, they were dismissed (1562-63), and Philippists appointed in their stead. But after the accession of Johann Wilhelm, in 1567, a re-action took place, and the Philippist professors had to give way to the Gnesio-Lutheran. A reconciliation of the two parties was attempted by the collogny of Altenburg, Oct. 21, 1568, but failed.

In 1569 the Elector of Saxony demanded that all ministers in his country should subscribe to the Corpus Doctrinal Philippiicum, which was a great victory to the Philippists. But the elector did so, not from any preference for Philippism, but because he believed said instrument to be a representation of pure Lutheranism, free from all Flacian extravagances. The publication, however, of the Wittenberg Catechism (1571), containing a very outspoken exposition of the doctrines of the Lord's Supper and the personality of Christ, and the outcry which the whole Gnesio-Lutheran camp raised against it, made him uneasy; and when the Exegesia perspicua controversiae de sacra cena appeared in 1574, he began to suspect that he had been the victim of some kind of mystification. The Philippist professors—Widemir, Petzel, Cruciger, and others—were at once dismissed, and treated in a rather harsh manner. The blow thus struck at Philippism was fatal. With the introduction of the Formula Concordia, the Philippists lost their hold on the public attention; and, with the exception of a short episode in the history of electoral Saxony, 1586-91 (see the art. KHELL), it survived only as a local coloring of the theology of certain universities. See the various representations in the histories of Protestant theology, by Planck, Heppen, Frank, Gass, Dorner, and others.

Philistines—D'fl^a (D^fl^a; only Amos ix. 7), LXX., Φιλισται, and also Ἀλλόφιλος, called by Josephus, Arch. 1, 6, 2, Φλωστίνα, by Herodotus, 2, 104; 3, 5, 91; 7, 68, Φλωστίνιος.—were the inhabitants of a district along the south-western coast of Canaan, which, not counting the Negeb, south of Gaza, was only about twenty-five miles in length. We describe,—

1. The Country. — Egypt, with its district Pelusium, extends as far as the River of Egypt (Gen. xv. 18; Num. xxxiv. 5, etc.), i.e., to the modern el-Arish, which, coming northward out of Arabia, flows into the Mediterranean where the coast turns from the east to the north. Here the Philistine territory commenced, and extended to where the Sorek, which rises near Jerusalem, empties into the Mediterranean. The district south of Gaza already belongs to the Negeb, or
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south country, and is therefore mostly a desert. One of its rare fruitful spots is the Saracen strong- 
hold el-Arish, the ancient Rhinocolura, called 
Larsa during the time of the crusades, one of the 
principal stations between Egypt and Syria. A 
little north of this is Bir Refa, the Raffa of the 
Greeks and Romans; eastward of this, the ruins 
of Umm Jerâr, the ancient Gerar. The country 
from the coast north of the Wady Sheriah was 
in olden times highly productive. (Cf. the map 
of Western Palestine by Conder.) North of Ash-
kelon were the most fertile districts. In this 
territory proper, from Gaza to Jabne we can dis-
tinguish between Ḫârîmah (Deut. i. 7; Josh. v. 1), 
with the corresponding Ḫârîmah (Josh. xi. 18; Jer. 
xxvii. 44, xxxii. 13), and the hilly districts ex-
tending towards Judea, Ṣülâq (Josh. x. 40, xii. 8).

Of the five chief cities, three were situated on 
the coast. The southern and most important, 
both formerly and now, is Gaza (Syr. and Assyr. 
Gazatha, Khazita, and probably the Kadwâ of 
Her. 2, 159; 3, 5), Ḫârîmah, the Powerful, now el-Ghaz-
zeeh. In olden times it was the chief medium of 
the Syrio-Egyptian trade, and is at present yet an 
important market. Situated on the edge of the 
desert, and twenty stades (two miles and a half) 
from the coast, it was surrounded by a plain rich 
water and vegetation. North-west of the city 
is an olive-woods, the largest and most beautiful 
in Palestine. In the south there are immense 
fruit and palm orchards. The city has now six-
teen thousand inhabitants. The streets are nar-
row and ugly; there is neither wall nor gate. It 
lies on a slope looking to the north. The most 
beautiful building is the chief mosque Jâmi-el-
Kebir, a Mohammedan reconstruction of an 
ancient Christian church. The ancient Gaza was 
probably situated about two miles and a half 
south of the modern city. In the south-west por-
tion of the city, tradition points out the spot 
whence Samson carried the gates in his resi-
tion to adorn his residence, Acca. North of this,
and almost on the coast, lie the ruins of Ashke-
lon, famous in the Old Testament. It was situated 
on an elevation, and surrounded by a circle-wal-
extends to the sea north of Ashdod, then its ter-
riory was comparatively large. No ruins of a 
former city are found here.

Ekron, the Accaron of the Greeks and Latinos, 
was the most northern of the five Philistine cities; 
and Robinson (iii., p. 229 sqq.) correctly finds it 
in the village of Akir, two miles and a half north 
of the Wady Surar. There are, however, few 
evidences of a high antiquity found here. Jabne 
is also called a Philistine city in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 
identical with the border city of Judah, Jabneel 
(Josh. xv. 11). Later it was called iûmâw or iûmâw 
(Joseph., B. J., I, 7, 76; Strab. 16, 759; Plin. 5, 14). 
It is, beyond a doubt, the modern Jebna.

II. THE PEOPLE. — Although never able per-
manently to subdue any important portion of 
Palestine, yet the inhabitants of Philistia were 
sufficiently warlike to oppose Israel's supremacy 
in Canaan, generally to maintain their independ-
cy, in later times to take part in the move-
ments of the nations, especially of Hellenism 
against Judaism, and for a long time to resist the 
introduction of Christianity. Their historical 
importance, as far as Israel was concerned, con-
sisted in their mission of calling forth the better 
purposes and activity of the latter, and hence 
adding to its preservation and development.

The name Ṣûmârû is probably connected with 
the verb fâlascha, retained in the Ethiopic, and 
related to Ṣûmârû. In harmony with this is that 
LXX., from Judges on, always translates 'αλλοτρί-
kos. They bore this name of "Immigrants," 
probably because they arrived in Canaan later 
than the other inhabitants. The poetic form, 
益 profits, in the sense of immigration, was originally 
also the name of the people. (Cf. Ps. vi. 10, 
xxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 4, cviii. 10; Jer. xiv. 29, 31, 
but cf. Exod. xv. 14.) The country is called 
益 in Gen. xxii. 32, 33; Lev. xi. 17; 1 
Sam. xxvii. 1, 7, xxix. 11; 1 Kings xiv. 21; 2 
Kings viii. 2, 3). The corresponding Greek name 
was Ἑλλοτρίκιος, αγν. ἀνδ., as it seems, by Herod-
otus (2, 12, 104, 157; 3, 5, 91; 7, 89), and certainly
by Josephus (Arch., 12, 610), for the land of the Philistines exclusively, but afterwards employed for all Canaan.

In reference to the origin of the Philistines, Gen. x. 14, and, in connection with it, Deut. ii. 23, Amos vi. 7, Jer. xlvii. 4, come into consideration. In the first passage they are traced to the Cašluhin, in the others to Caphtor. 1 Chron. i. 12, and the older versions, show that the statement in Gen. x. 14 is not a lapsus calami. Both statements are undoubtedly correct. The descendents of Caphtor probably first went into the Cašluhin, and then migrated to Canaan. Thus Baur and Köhler. The passages can be harmonized only if Cašluhin and Caphtorim are virtually one and the same. Good authorities, on the basis of the view in the Targum Jerush., such as Knobel, Ebers, and others, connect Cašluhin with the Coptic κας = hill, and λοκή = sterility, the Arabic el-Rasrun, and find the locality in the dry district along the northern coast of Egypt, near Pelusium. But how about Caphtor? Many think it is Crete, because in 2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 45-47, the larger cities had offshoots as far as Gaza; and according to Jerome, in other cities; and Baal-zebub in Ekron (2 Kings i. 2, 3, 6, 10). The former was probably identical with the old Babylonian divinity, Dakan; the latter was, beyond a doubt, a mere modification of the Canaanite Baal. The worship of the former, as his name and idol indicate—for [π] w points to τειχεῖα (LXXX.) = form of a fish—is derived from the fact that the people living along the seacoast saw the principle of life and productiveness in the water, and more especially in the fish. The worship of the other—connected with the Baal who brings and takes away the flies, and with whom Zeus and Hercules as ἀπόγονος can be compared—was suggested by the vast number of insects in Lower Egypt and Philistia. Like the other Canaanites, they worshipped also a female principle. They had Astarte temples (1 Sam. xxxi. 10; cf. Diod., 2, 9), in which they worshipped an image the head of which was a woman, and the body a fish. (Cf. the arts. Dagon and Atargatis.) On the basis of this cultus, diviners enjoyed higher honor among the Philistines than elsewhere. (Cf. 1 Sam. vi. 1; Isa. ii. 6; 2 Kings i. 2 sqq.). Entirely distinct from this ancient religion are the later—such as Zeus, Bel, and others—introduced by the Syrian rulers.

In reference to the language, the surest index of the origin of a people, Hitzig has attempted to connect the twelve to fifteen names and titles which we know as Philistine, with the Sanscrit and Greek, in order to support his Pelasgic theory. But everywhere the Semitic etymology proves to be the best, as the names Gaza, Gath, Abimelech, Delilah, Dagon, Jishbi, Jittai, and Saph show. Other names, such as Achusath (Gen. xxi. 26), Goliah (1 Sam. xvii. 4), have, as can be easily explained from the emigration of the people from Egypt to Canaan. The term Golyath (cf. Gubnath, 1 Kings xi. 20). Also the ending en in Seren, the name of a Philistine prince, is Egyptian. The name of the Philistine harbor, Majuma, is entirely Egyptian-Philistineian; maj, in Coptic, meaning "place," and jun, "sea." Other names point to the same origin. Above all, the fact comes into consideration, that the Philistines spoke a language which the Hebrews could understand well without an interpreter.

In their religion they worshipped Dagon, according to Judg. xvi. 23 sqq., in Gaza; according to 1 Sam. v. 1 sqq., 1 Mac. xx. 83, xi. 4, in Ashdod; and, according to Jerome, in other cities; and Baal-zebub in Ekron (2 Kings i. 2, 3, 6, 10). The former was probably identical with the old Babylonian divinity, Dakan; the latter was, beyond a doubt, a mere modification of the Canaanite Baal. The worship of the former, as his name and idol indicate—for [π] w points to τειχεῖα (LXXX.) = form of a fish—is derived from the fact that the people living along the seacoast saw the principle of life and productiveness in the water, and more especially in the fish. The worship of the other—connected with the Baal who brings and takes away the flies, and with whom Zeus and Hercules as ἀπόγονος can be compared—was suggested by the vast number of insects in Lower Egypt and Philistia. Like the other Canaanites, they worshipped also a female principle. They had Astarte temples (1 Sam. xxxi. 10; cf. Diod., 2, 9), in which they worshipped an image the head of which was a woman, and the body a fish. (Cf. the arts. Dagon and Atargatis.) On the basis of this cultus, diviners enjoyed higher honor among the Philistines than elsewhere. (Cf. 1 Sam. vi. 1; Isa. ii. 6; 2 Kings i. 2 sqq.). Entirely distinct from this ancient religion are the later—such as Zeus, Bel, and others—introduced by the Syrian rulers.

For the commerce and culture of the Philistines, it was doubtless a matter of importance, that, outside of the five chief cities, also the country was densely populated. As is seen from Josh. xv. 45-47, the larger cities had offshoots as far as the River of Egypt. (Cf. also 1 Sam. xxvii. 5 and 1 Sam. xiii. 5.) The productive agriculture was probably mostly in the hands of the remnants of the original inhabitants. (Cf. Deut. ii. 23.) The herds were kept mostly in the Negeb (2 Chron. xvii. 11); the vine and the olive were cultivated (Judg. xv. 5). Hence the Philistines had nothing whatever to do with the Pelasgians, as Hitzig and others imagine; but they are "nothing else than Semites" (Schrader: Keilinsch. u. d. A. T., p. 74), i.e., Hamitic, degenerated Semites,—Semites in the wider sense of the word, in the same sense as the other Canaanites were such.

In reference to the language, the surest index of the origin of a people, Hitzig has attempted to connect the twelve to fifteen names and titles which we know as Philistine, with the Sanscrit and Greek, in order to support his Pelasgic theory. But everywhere the Semitic etymology proves to be the best, as the names Gaza, Gath, Abimelech, Delilah, Dagon, Jishbi, Jittai, and Saph show. Other names, such as Achusath (Gen. xxi. 26), Goliah (1 Sam. xvii. 4), have, as can be easily explained from the emigration of the people from Egypt to Canaan. The term Golyath (cf. Gubnath, 1 Kings xi. 20). Also the ending en in Seren, the name of a Philistine prince, is Egyptian. The name of the Philistine harbor, Majuma, is entirely Egyptian-Philistineian; maj, in Coptic, meaning "place," and jun, "sea."
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with "ט), sometimes "יִשְׂרָאֵל" (1 Sam. xviii. 30, xxix. 3, 8). They were more than mere leaders in war (Judg. xvi. 5, 8, 15, 27, 30; 1 Sam. v. 8, 11, vi. 12). At the same time there are references to kings among them. (Cf. Gen. xxvi. 1, 8; 1 Sam. xi. 12, xxvii. 2 sqq.; 1 Kings ii. 39; Amos i. 8; Zech. ix. 5; Jer. xxv. 20; 1 Kings v. 1.) These are probably different names for the same office. In all probability there was no union of the different peoples, as they always act in harmony and unison.

III. THE HISTORY. — Beside the old Enakim, whose descendants were found in Gath, Gaza, and Ashdod (Josh. xi. 22; 2 Sam. xi. 19-21; 1 Chron. xi. 5-8), and to whom Goliath and other giants belonged, the Avim belonged to the original inhabitants (Deut. ii. 29; Josh. xiii. 2), who, since they are not reckoned among the Canaanites, was appointed to be taken possession of by the children of Israel (cf. Gen. xxi. 21; xxvi. 22). Their villages and open country, where they were found in the days of Joshua, and later (Deut. ii. 29; Josh. xiii. 3), the country of the Philistines, like that of the other Canaanites, was appointed to be taken possession of by the children of Israel (cf. Gen. xv. 19 sqq.); but neither Joshua nor his successors succeeded in subduing it. The subjection of the three Philistine cities, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron, by the tribe of Judah, mentioned in Judg. i. 18, did not prove permanent. The necessary result of these relations between Israel and the Philistines was constant war, which, however, developed into small and irregular combats only. With a commerce of small importance, compared with that of the Phoenicians, the Philistines, owing to the density of their population, were in constant temptation of making freebooting expeditions into the neighboring districts of Judah and Dan. The deed of Shemgar (recorded Judg. iii. 31) is probably but one example of many similar but less important. Samson's adventures are probably of a later day, since they seem to belong to a later period. The great activity in the movements of the Philistines in the days of Eli, Samuel, and David, are not the results of a renewed immigration of Caphtorim, as Ewald and G. Baur think, but are rather connected with the general uprising of the Eastern nations, especially the Assyrians. The Philistines attempted to drive them back into their own territory; but the Philistines succeeded in achieving a great victory, and secured the ark of the covenant (1 Sam. iv. 1 sqq.). Only when Israel had been more united, through Samuel's far-reaching activity, did it succeed in its endeavors against the Philistines. After forty years of oppression by the Philistines, Israel was delivered of these enemies by a decisive victory in the neighborhood of Mizpah, near Beth Kar, down the Wady Beit Hanina (just west of Jerusalem, where Samuel erected his Eben-ezer, about the site of the present Kolucioneh and the New Testament Emmaus); and 1 Sam. vii. 13 reports that after this they did not again come across the boundaries of Israel. This probably means that the frequent customary freebooting expeditions ceased.

Probably fearing the result of Israel's union under their king, Saul, the Philistines made a desperate effort to regain what they had lost. Soon after their defeat (1 Sam. x. 6), they pressed on, even beyond Mizpah, and took possession of the pass between Gibea of Benjamin and Michmas, in order to separate the south country from the northern tribes (1 Sam. x. 5, xiii. 8). And, in truth, their supremacy, to a greater or less extent, continued for a second forty years, down to the days of David. Saul's efforts did not prove successful (1 Sam. xiii. 6, x. 8, xiii. 7; cf. Joseph., Arch., 6, 5-7, 1). One of the episodes during these wars was the death of Goliath by David, in the southern Wady Samt, near Bethlehem (1 Sam. xvii. 1 sqq.); and later they were repeatedly defeated by David (1 Sam. xviii. 25, xix. 8). Yet they again took up arms against Israel with success (1 Sam. xxiii. 1-5). David's stay with them, and his residence in Ziklag, secured for them the possession of the southern country (1 Sam. xxi. 10-15, xxvii. 3 sqq.). Saul and his sons fell in a battle with them fought in the mountains of Gilboa (1 Sam. xxxi. 1); and, through this victory, the northern country also, in all probability, fell into their hands. Only after David had united the various tribes of Israel under his sceptre did he succeed in breaking this yoke by a series of famous victories (2 Sam. xxi. 15 sqq., xxiii. 9 sqq., v. 17 sqq., viii. 1). No attempt of complete destruction was now any longer made. Gath paid tribute to Solomon, and was fortified by Rehoobam (1 Kings iv. 24, v. 1, 4, x. 5; 2 Chron. xi. 8).

After the division of Israel into two kingdoms, the Philistines seem again to have enlarged their boundaries. (Cf. 1 Kings xxvii. xvii. 15; 2 Chron. xvii. 11.) They even conquered Jerusalem in conjunction with the Arabs (2 Chron. xxi. 16 sqq.; Joel iv. 4). Judaea in its better days records some victories over them (2 Kings xv. 17; 2 Chron. xxiv. 8 sqq.). Among such is Solomon's attempt to subdue them (2 Chron. xxv. 8, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 18.). But they kept up their warlike proclivities to the very days of Assyrian and Babylonian conquests. The Assyrian king, Biunirar (about 800 B.C.), mentions that he conquered Philistia; Tiglath-pileser boasts of having overcome Hanno (Haunu) of Gaza, and that the latter was conquered and destroyed Gaza and other cities; his general (Tartan) later took Ashdod; Sanherib add-
ed to this the conquest of Ashkelon and Ekron; and Assarhadon completed this to overthrow the power of this little country in connection with the conquest of all Egypt and Asia east of the Mediterranean. (Cf. Schrader: Keilinschrift. u. d. A. T., pp. 112, 145, 171 sqq., 212, 237 sqq.) Psammetichus could take Ashdod, which had been strongly fortified by the Assyrians, only after besieging it twenty-nine years (Herod., 2, 157), and took Gaza also. A later Pharaoh conquered Gaza a second time (Jer. xvii. 1). Yet, notwithstanding all these humiliations, they had not suffered like the Israelites. They were not all led into captivity; and their cities were soon built up anew, though probably, in part, inhabited by Edomites from Southern Judea. Ashdod is mentioned in Neh. iv. 7 as an enemy of Judea; and the Philistine language is called "the speech of Ashdod." (Neh. xiii. 24). Neither the conquest of Gaza by Cambyses, and not even the terrible destruction of the city by Alexander the Great, after a siege of two or more months, could annihilate the community of this city. (Cf. Arrian. Alex., 2, 26, 27; Curtius, 4, 5, 6.) The latter made the place his armarium, and left Macedonian guards there. Immediately the old and revived antiquity of the Jews seems to have sought the destruction of the Philistine nationality. Judas Maccabaeus marched against Ashdod (1 Macc. v. 66 (68)): Jonathan plundered and burned the city and the Dagon temple (1 Mace. x. 86, xi. 60). The Syrian king, Alexander Balas, made the latter a present of Ekron: he forced Gaza to sue for peace (1 Macc. xi. 61 sqq.). Gaza was not entirely destroyed until under Alexander Jannaeus (96 B.C.). Some of these ruined cities again were built up. Gabinius, one of Pompey's generals, again built up Ashdod (55 A.D.), and founded a new Gaza, south of the old (in 58 A.D.). Pompey placed the cities along the coast under the jurisdiction of the Syrian province (Joseph., Arch., 14, 4, 4, 5); only under Herod and Agrippa I. were they to some extent united again with the Jewish kingdom. Herod favored the growth of the Philistine cities; and, owing to this favor, Ashkelon at that time assumed an importance even greater than that of its magnificent buildings, which was afterwards called the "Bride of Syria." In consequence of their Hellenistic spirit the Philistine cities adhered to Vespasian in the last Jewish war; and the Jews, as a consequence, burned Gaza and Anthedon in 65 A.D. While Judea was utterly laid waste by this war, and after the insurrection of Bar-cocheba, the Philistine cities continued to flourish. Jannia even was selected by the Jews as a place of refuge; and the Sanhedrin held its meetings there for a while after the destruction of Jerusalem, and a Jewish academy was maintained in its midst. (Cf. Mishna, Roch Hama. 4, 14, Saub, 1, 4.) In the days of Trajan it became the spiritual centre of the Jewish rebellion. Gaza received a new impetus under Hadrian, and in this city the Jewish captives of the last war were sold as slaves. Ammianus Marcellinus (about 350) mentions Ashkelon and Gaza as egregiae cicitates of Syria. (Cf. Euseb., Praep. evan., i. 3, 21; van Rhijn: Handwiirterbuch: Koiiler: Bibl. Gesch., i. pp. 81-83; Redcliff, in the "Encyclopaedia," sect. iii. part 23, pp. 312-329; A. Knoebel: Vokertafel der Genesis, Giessen, 1850, pp. 98, 208 sqq., 215-222; Ewald: Gesch. Isr., 3 Aufl., i. 3 Aufl., i. pp. 318 sqq.; Stark: Gaza u. d. philistaische Küste, Jena, 1852; G. Baub: Der Prophet Amos, Giessen, 1847, pp. 76-94, and art. "Philister," in Riehm's Handwörterbuch: Köhler: Bibl. Gesch., i. pp. 81 sqq. ; De Goeij, in Theol. Tijdschrif, iv. (1870), pp. 257 sqq. ; Fr. W. Schultz. (G. H. Schodde.)
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found its way into Philistia. Philo was already directed to the way to Gaza (Acts xi. 26); preached in Ashdod (viii. 40); which city later became the residence of a bishop. Tradition reports Gaza as the place where Philemon, to whom Paul addressed one of his letters, was the first bishop. At any rate, Bishop Sylvanus of that city suffered martyrdom there in 255 A.D. under Diocletian; and bishop names of six other bishops of Gaza are preserved. However, the Hellenistic culture that prevailed here since the days of Alexander the Great seems to have broken the influence of Christianity. Eight heathen temples were still found there at the end of the fourth century. In 634 A.D. the city was taken by the Caliph Abubeker, and in the period of the crusades the different Philistine cities at times played important roles.


PHILLIPOTTS, Henry, D.D., Bishop of Exeter; b. at Gloucester, 1788; died at Bishopstoke, Sept. 18, 1869. He was graduated B.A. at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1795; was successively prebendary of Durham (1809), dean of Chester (1828), and bishop of Exeter (1830). He was the recognized head of the High-Church party, and, in the House of Lords, was upon the extreme Tory side, opposing every kind of liberal measure. He was also involved in several memorable controversies, especially with the Roman-Catholic historians. Lingard (1808) and Charles Butler (1822). But he is best known in the Görham Case (which see). On the reversal of the lower courts' decision before the Privy Council, he published A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (London and New York, 1850), in which he communicated the archbishop.

PHILO, b. at Alexandria about 20 B.C.; d. in the reign of Claudius. Very little is known of his life. The sources consist only of scattered notices in his own writings (Legat. ad Cuj., 22, 28; Contra Flaccum; De spec. leg., ii. 1; De provit., 2, 107), and in those of Josephus (Ant., XVIII. 8, 1, XX. 5, 2), Euse-
bius (Hist. Eccl., II. 4), Jerome, Isidorus Pul Een, Photius (Bibl. Cod., C. v.), and Suidas. He belonged to a distinguished and wealthy family of priestly descent, and was a brother to Alexander Lyssmachus, the alabarch, or president, of the Jewry of Alexandria. In 39 or 40 A.D. he visited Rome as the imperial governor. Fabius Avitus Flaccus, was very hostile to the Jews in Egypt. In order to obtain justice, the Jewry of Alexandria sent an embassy to the emperor, Caligula, and Philo headed the embassy. An official audience they did not obtain; and, when they were admitted to the imperial presence, the half-crazy Caligula ran about in the room, taunting them with their abstinence from pork, and allowing them no opportunity of presenting their grievances. Philo also visited Jerusalem and other holy places in Palestine, but at what period in his life cannot be ascertained. The legends of his meeting the apostle Peter in Rome, his conversion to Christianity, and his return into Judaism, are mere fables.

The writings of Philo are exegetical, philosophical, and political. His exegetical works are arranged in three groups,—the cosmogonical, represented by De mundi opificio, an allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation; the historical, containing Legis allegoriarum libri iii., an elaborate allegorical exposition of the doctrines of paradise and the fall (De Cherubim; De sacrificio Caiini et Abeli; De posteritate Caiini; De plantatione Noe, etc.) and the juridical, or, rather, ethical, containing De caritate, De positenitia, De ideologo, De specialibus legibus, etc. Among his philosophical works are Quod omnia probus liber sit; De vita contemplativa, of doubtful genuineness; De nobilitate, probably a fragment of an apology for the Jews; Questions et solutiones in Genesis et Exodum, originally in five books, but now extant only in some fragments of an Armenian translation; De providentia, etc. His political works give historical representations of the position of the Jewish people, of events of the second century, and falsely ascribed to Philo himself always speaks of Plato as the great, the holy. This must not be understood, however, as if Philo had sacrificed anything substantial of the faith of the Old Testament to the fancy of the Greek philosophers, any thing substantial of Judaism to Platonism. By no means! His faith in the living, personal God never wavered,—the Creator and the Ruler of the world, who, out of the whole human race, had chosen Israel as his own people, and revealed himself to them through Moses. To Philo, Moses was the prophet among the prophets, and the Mosaic law the sum total of all revealed wisdom. The fundamental character of his mind is positive, not negative. Faith and piety are to him the highest virtues: criticism is nothing. The influence he has received from Hellenism consists chiefly in a certain element of mysticism, which tempers the sternness of the Jewish consciousness of God, and softens the austere morality of the Old Testament. See WOLFF: Philo's Philosophie, Gothenburg, 1859; STEENBERG: On Phillos Gudserljendelse, Copenhagen, 1870; [DRUMMOND: Philo: Principles of the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy, London, 1877].

His allegorical method, always artificial, often extravagant, and sometimes vicious, was exclusively from the Greek philosophers, especially Plato and the Stoics. The Stoics liked to dissolve the Greek myths into abstract ideas, to reduce to simple observations the images and personifications contained in the traditions of the popular religion; and the method they employed was the allegory. This method Philo adopted, and applied to the Bible. The Bible he taught has a double meaning,—a literal and an allegorical; the latter pervading the former like a fine fluid; and there are cases in which the literal sense must be altogether excluded, as, for instance, when a passage states something unworthy of God (God planting trees, questioning Adam, descending from heaven, etc.), or something self-contradictory (Ishmael with Hagar, at the same time a suckling infant and a half-grown boy, Cain building a city, the eunuch Polipher having a wife, etc.); or de Ja; and the De mundo seems to be a later condensation of a Platonic work by Philo. Information concerning manuscripts and earlier editions of the works of Philo is found in Thomas Mangey's excellent edition, London, 1742, 2 vols. Further details are found in Delaunay's Philon d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1867, Tischendorf's prolegomena to his Philonae inedito, Leipzig, 1868, and in the later editions of Philo by A. F. Pfeiffer, Erlangen, 1786-92, and C. E. Richter, Leipzig, 1828-30, 8 vols. [There is an English translation, by C. D. Yonge, in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, London, 1854-55, 4 vols.]
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sive influence, not only on the ancient Christian theology, but even on Christianity itself. See Ballenstedt: Philo und Johannes, 1812; Goetze: Philo, 1831, and Geschichte des Urchristentums, 1838; Grossmann: Quaestiones Philo necae, 1829; and others. But not the least bit of evidence has ever been offered of an historical connection between Philo and the founder of Christianity, or his apostles. The whole basis of the assertion is a merely incidental resemblance between certain theological ideas and expressions in the works of Philo and the books of the New Testament; and, when the logos-doctrine of John has been represented as directly derived from the logos-doctrine of Philo, the representation rests upon a gross mistake. The logos of Philo is a cosmic, naturalistic power, without real personality, borrowed from the Greek philosophy; while the logos of John is an ethical personality in the highest sense of the word,—the realization of the Messianic idea of the Old Testament. Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen, Leipzig, 1846; Max Heinez: Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie, Oldenburg, 1872; Soulier: La doctrine du Logos chez Philon, Turino, 1875; F. Klaen: Der Logos der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Freiburg, 1879. But his exegetical method, with its principle of allegorization, was generally adopted and extensively employed by the ancient Fathers, not only by Barnabas, Justin, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Eusebius, but also by Jerome and Ambrose. See Dähne: Geschichtliche Darstellung der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Halle, 1894. Zöckler. 

PHILO CARPATHIUS is mentioned in Polybius (Vita Epiphanii, p. 49), and by Suidas; but whether he was from the city of Carpassia in the Island of Cyprus, or from the Island of Carpathes, situated between Creta and Rhodus, cannot be ascertained, nor whether he is the author of the Commentary on the Canticles, which was published in a Latin translation in 1587, by Stephanus Salvius, in Paris. 

PHILOPATRIS is a name of a dialogue found among the works of Lucian, and generally quoted as an example of Pagan satire on Christian theology, but even on Christianity itself. See Ballenstedt: Philo und Johannes, 1812; Goetze: Philo, 1831, and Geschichte des Urchristentums, 1838; Grossmann: Quaestiones Philo necae, 1829; and others. But not the least bit of evidence has ever been offered of an historical connection between Philo and the founder of Christianity, or his apostles. The whole basis of the assertion is a merely incidental resemblance between certain theological ideas and expressions in the works of Philo and the books of the New Testament; and, when the logos-doctrine of John has been represented as directly derived from the logos-doctrine of Philo, the representation rests upon a gross mistake. The logos of Philo is a cosmic, naturalistic power, without real personality, borrowed from the Greek philosophy; while the logos of John is an ethical personality in the highest sense of the word,—the realization of the Messianic idea of the Old Testament. Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen, Leipzig, 1846; Max Heinez: Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie, Oldenburg, 1872; Soulier: La doctrine du Logos chez Philon, Turino, 1875; F. Klaen: Der Logos der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Freiburg, 1879. But his exegetical method, with its principle of allegorization, was generally adopted and extensively employed by the ancient Fathers, not only by Barnabas, Justin, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Eusebius, but also by Jerome and Ambrose. See Dähne: Geschichtliche Darstellung der jud.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, Halle, 1894. Zöckler. 
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The Greek Fathers — Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen — strove to base their apologetics upon the theism and ethics of Plato, and even to couch the mysteries of the trinity, the incarnation, and the atonement, in terms of the Platonic metaphysics. And though some of the Latin Fathers, such as Tertullian and Irenaeus, betrayed an anti-philosophical tendency, yet others, such as Lacontius and Augustine, did not scruple to employ the rhetoric and logic of Aristotle. The union had its hybrid fruit in that half-Pagan, half-Christian civilization which perished in the fall of the Roman Empire. 

In the scholastic age (A.D. 900-1400) the former alliance grew into a bondage; and religion in a dogmatic form subjugated philosophy to the service of orthodoxy. The great schoolmen, such as Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, simply aimed to systematize the patriotic opinions by means of the Aristotelian logic, treating the physics and metaphysics as mere tributary provinces of revealed theology. There were a few philosophic divines, such as Scotus Erigena, Abelard, Roger Bacon, who for their speculations and researches incurred persecution as heretics. The despoticism had its imposing manifestation in that pseudo-Christian civilization which rendered all the art, as well as science, of the middle ages, subservient to the aggrandizement of the papal hierarchy. 

In the reforming age (A.D. 1500-1800) the bondage bred a rupture, and philosophy and religion once more became independent. On the philosophic side, the revolt of reason appeared successively in Italian naturalism, as led by Pomponatus, Cardan, Vanini; in English deism, as led by Herbert, Hobbes, Hume; in French atheism, as led by Voltaire, Helvétius, Diderot; and, more recently, in German pantheism, as led by Strauss and Feuerbach. On the religious side, the recoil of faith was seen in Roman Catholicism, as re-established by Bellarmin and Loyola on the traditional patristic and scholastic dogmas; in Protestantism, as organized by Luther, Calvin, Knox, and Cranmer, by means of the reformed creeds and confessions; and ultimately in a growing sectarianism, which has filled Christendom with polemical feuds to the present hour. At the same time, the wonderful intellectual activity of the
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period has been practically expressed in that rich, progressive Christian civilization which has resuscitated Europe, colonized America, and is already advancing throughout Asia and Africa.

At length, in this present critical age (A.D. 1800–83), the schism has become a truce; and philosophy and religion, treated as for some settlement. Never before have they reached a separate development so extreme. Never before have their relations appeared so problematical; and never before has the need of their reconciliation become so imperative. A few religiousists may still talk of dispensing with philosophy, and a few philosophers may dream of superseding religion; but the intelligent mass of thinkers and divines is confidently awaiting an harmonious settlement.

At the threshold of the question, it is necessary to discriminate between true and false religion and philosophy. All the great philosophers, from Plato to Hegel, instead of assailing religion, have claimed to free it from superstition and error; and all the great theologians, from Clement to Calvin [and Schleiermacher], have interpreted St. Paul as deprecating, not so much a sound Christian philosophy, as one that was deceitful, and not after Christ. Only by some gross abuse of either or both has the union between them ever bred what Bacon terms an heretical religion and a fantastical philosophy.

It may be well also to distinguish their theoretical from their practical importance. Their relative worth and dignity as pursuits and interests cannot predetermine their abstract truth and knowledge. Let it be assumed, once for all, that religion is the one supreme human concern, to which philosophy itself is but subsidiary, and we may then safely proceed to define their reciprocal relations and prerogatives.

The Relation of Philosophy to Religion.—The relation of philosophy to religion has become apparent in every province of religious science. (1) In natural theology, philosophy comes as a witness to prove the divine being and attributes, the divine government, the present state of probation, the future state of rewards and punishments. These are tenets common to all religions, and logically prior, if not fundamental, to revealed religion. The Pagans, the Deists, and the Christian—Cicero, Herbert, and Butler—have been agreed in accepting them; and orthodox divines, as well as devout philosophers, have ever employed the physical and mental sciences for their confirmation and illustration.

(2) In apologetical theology, philosophy appears as a judge to collect the evidences of Christianity, both internal and external, and estimate their logical and ethical value. It was long ago argued by Bishop Butler, that reason, which is our only faculty for judging any thing, is a proper critic of the evidences, though not of the purport or content, of a supposed revelation, unless the latter be found plainly absurd or immoral; and all the great apologists, from the time of Justin Martyr, have shown that philosophy is the best instrument to prove the existence of a Supreme Being. Augustine, as well as Clarke and Wolf, have claimed to offer a more or less philosophical vindication of its truth and value. The countless works which have accumulated on the miraculous, prophetical, historical, scientific, and experimental evidences of Christianity, remain as but so many philosophic judgments in its favor.

(3) In dogmatic theology, philosophy is admitted no longer to be a disciple and handmaid of revealed religion, to learn its teachings, and organize them into a logical system. Once inside an accredited revelation, reason herself is ready to accept mysteries and even paradoxes. But the truths of Holy Scripture, however clear to believing minds, are not given in scientific terms, and can only be formulated by the rational faculty as trained in schools of human learning and consecrated by the Divine Spirit. Accordingly, the Fathers, the schoolmen, the reformers, and the later divines have all proceeded more or less philosophically in their controversies. All the great philosophers, from Plato to Hegel, instead of assailing religion, have claimed to free it from superstition and error; and all the great theologians, from Clement to Calvin, have interpreted St. Paul as deprecating, not so much a sound Christian philosophy, as one that was deceitful, and not after Christ. Only by some gross abuse of either or both has the union between them ever bred what Bacon terms an heretical religion and a fantastical philosophy.

(4) In polemical and practical theology, philosophy may be of essential service in adapting revealed doctrines to the existing state of Christianity and civilization. The Relation of Religion to Philosophy.—The relation of religion to philosophy, though not so obvious, is quite as important, according to any definition that may be employed. (1) Philosophy, as the comprehensive science of things divine and human, embraces theology with the other sciences, and would remain forever incomplete without it. Religion is at least a conspicuous phenomenon to be explained, and the philosophy of religion is a separate department of knowledge. Apart from their practical moment, the articles of natural religion are problems of speculative interest, which have tasked profound thinkers, like Spinoza, Hume, and Kant; and even the dogmas of revealed religion, as treated by Bacon, Descartes, and Hegel, have formed an integral part of human knowledge. The few philosophers like Comte, who would ignore theology, have simply substituted some grotesque imitation in its place. Instead of being monopolized by professional divines, it is now pursued by archæologists and philologists like Burnouf and Max Müller, who claim to have founded a new science of religion termed comparative theology, as well as by non-Christian writers, like Strauss, Theodore Parker, and Greg, who have been constructing ancient and modern faiths into a new philosophic creed of the future. So that, according to the principles of the Christian dogmas, theology is at least entitled to rank as the last and highest of the empirical sciences.

(2) Philosophy, as the science of the absolute, requires religion on the transcendental side of the sciences for their own logical support and consist-
by its very definition is complementary to reason, making known the otherwise unknowable. Sciences, admits revelation as a correlate factor employed by philosophers, no less than theologians, thus meeting our intellectual as well as moral thinkers, such as Comte and Stuart Mill, and Lewes, to theology in demonstrating the authority of divinestory, and as such has been largely ascribed by an immense mass of cumulative evidence. Separate from theism, the metaphysical ideas of causality, absoluteness, and infinity, can only appear vague and contradictory; but they at once become clear and concrete in the conception of an Absolute Will or Infinite Reason as the first and final cause of the phenomenal universe. Such a conception is not to be arbitrarily set aside as a mere anthropomorphic sentiment or superstition because it happens so largely to the imagination of man and the force of want. Few men, in the dry light of pure thought it affords a consistent theory of the world, which has satisfied even atheistic and pantheistic metaphysicians like Schopenhauer and Hegel, as well as theistic metaphysicians like Descartes and Berkeley; while in practical research it has been used as a sort of rational postulate by great physicists like Newton and Herschel, who have thus sought to give unity to their scientific knowledge. The agnostic school of Hamilton, Mansel, and Herbert Spencer, has simply been purging theology from that grosser anthropomorphism which philosophic divinities have assailed from the time that Paul first reproved it at the Athenian altar to the Unknown God. In like manner the pessimistic school of Hartmann and Bahnsen is but emphasizing the riddles of evil, pain, and chance, which were long since met by revealed religion, and can only be fully solved through its aid, as the younger Fichte and Ulrici have shown. And though the history of Christian Gnosticism, as seen especially in the schools of Schelling and Marbeinecke, has been full of mystical conceits, yet it serves at least to show to what extent the dogmas of creation, redemption, and judgment, have been philosophically employed in explaining the origin, development, and destiny of the universe. Theology, therefore, besides being the highest of the empirical sciences, is also their metaphysical foundation and complement, without which they would fall into nescience and absurdity, and the chief problems of philosophy remain forever insoluble.

Philosophy, as the supreme science of the sciences, admits revelation as a correlate factor with reason in each of those sciences. Revelation by its very definition is complementary to reason, making known the otherwise unknowable, and thus meeting our intellectual as well as moral necessities. The Christian revelation in particular is found to be a transcendent communication of divine wisdom, and as such has been largely employed by philosophers, no less than theologians, in supplementing and completing the purely rational portions of our knowledge. It is, in fact, the fitting reward of philosophy for her service to theology in demonstrating the authority of revelation, that she thereby supplies the exigency of reason, and so may connect the infinite mind of God with the finite mind of man throughout the realm of cognition. The few irreligious thinkers, Condorcet, Stuart Mill, who have treated of the logic of the sciences in an otherwise luminous manner, have strangely overlooked, not merely the whole metaphysical domain of those sciences, but the existence therein of a conspicuous, objective revelation, historically attested by an immense mass of cumulative evidence. Revelation not only provides its extent, as those which uphold the Newtonian theory of the solar system. And even Christian thinkers, the most learned in divinity, have yet to see more clearly the strictly philosophical value of that revelation in removing intellectual error and ignorance, as well as moral and practical depravity, and thus perfecting science no less than religion. The truth is, that philosophy, in order to accomplish its own highest aim and function as the science and art of knowledge, must begin by assuming revelation and reason to be joint factors of knowledge, and then proceed to ascertain their normal, existing, and prospective relations in the scale of the sciences, and to formulate the logical rules for organizing the existing medley of rational and revealed truths, theories, and doctrines. In other words, the very foundations of a complete philosophical system must be partly laid in natural theology and the Christian evidences; and no one can foretell to what extent even dogmatic theology, as we now know it, may yet enter with the physical and mental sciences into the growing superstructure of the temple of knowledge.

Finally, in the most practical sense, philosophy as the pursuit of wisdom, needs the religious graces of reverence, docility, and faith, together with the more purely philosophical virtues of abstraction, candor, and catholicity, in all efforts after knowledge and truth.

The Harmony of Philosophy and Religion. — If the foregoing definitions be correct, the relations of philosophy and religion are neither hostile nor indifferent, but reciprocal and harmonious. In their actual development they have become so connected that neither can do without the other; and in their mutual completion, whenever attained, would be involved at once the consummation of human knowledge and the full vindication of the Christian religion. To such an ultimate philosophy, so based upon the concurrence of reason and revelation, the Christian thinkers of all ages have aspired with more or less intelligence; and a clear presentiment of its inevitable approach may be said to have already arisen in minds of "large discourse, looking before and after."

It is an encouraging sign of the times, that these views have begun to pervade our systems of education, learning, and literature. The apparent breach between philosophy and religion is becoming practically healed in divinity schools, colleges, and learned societies, by the establishment of professorships, lectureships, prize-essays, and memoirs, specially devoted to the harmony of science and faith, and the promotion of Christian philosophy. The press is also teeming with works to the same purport, so numerous that it would be impossible to name them. The reader is referred to the writings of the younger Fichte, Ulrici, and Zock- ler of Germany, Murphy, Calvery, and Bairns of Great Britain, and Henry B. Smith, McCosh, and Porter, for examples of authors who have more or less directly treated of the subject of this article.

PHILOSOPHY, Christian. American Institute of was founded in 1881, by Rev. Dr. C. F. Deems of New-York City, for the purpose of investigating fully and impartially the most important questions of science and philosophy, more especially those that bear upon the great truths revealed in Holy Scripture. The institute holds...
PHILOSTORGUS, the Arian church historian; b. in Cappadocia in 368; studied mathematics, astronomy, medicine, etc., in Constantinople; and died after 425: nothing more is known of his life. Of his Ecclesiastical History, in twelve books, only excerpts have come down to us, made by Photius (Bibl. Cod., 40), who recommends its ornate and pleasant style, though, of course, he condemns its tendency. It began with the controversy between Arius and Alexander, and ended at 325. It represents Arianism as the older, the genuine Christianity, with which it was overthrown by the violence and intrigues of the so-called orthodox party, and sides at every point with the Arians, but contains, nevertheless, many valuable historical notices. The excerpts were first edited by Juc. Gothofredus, Geneva, 1493, then by Valetsius, Paris, 1873, and at Canterbury, 1780. They were reprinted by Migne.

PHILOSTRATUS, Flavius, b. in the second half of the second century of our era; a native of the Island of Lemnos; studied rhetoric in Athens, and afterwards taught philosophy in Rome, where he became acquainted with Julia Domna, the wife of Alexander Severus. At her instance he wrote a life of Apollonius of Tyana,— partly from documents in her possession,— which at various times has played quite a conspicuous part in the attacks on Christianity. It was translated into English by Charles Blount (1680) and by Rev. Edward Berwick (1809), into French by Chatillon (1774), and A. Chassang (1862), and into German by Eduard Baltzer, Rudolstadt-i.-Th., 1883. He also wrote Lives of the Sophists, Commentaries on the lives of the Heroes of Homer, descriptions of paintings, letters, etc. The best critical edition of his detached works by Kayser, Leipzig 1870, 2 vols.

PHILOXENUS, whose true name was Xenias: b. at Tahal in Persia; consecrated Bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug), near Antioch, about 500; was one of the leaders of the Monophysite party, and one of the most active adversaries of the Chalcedon Decrees. Of his writings, only the titles have come down to us (De trinitate et incarnatione, De uno ex trinitate incarnato et passo, Tractatus in Nestorianos et Eutychianos, etc.), and a few fragments, preserved by Barthelemeus and Dionysius Barsalibi, and collected by Assemani in his Bibl. Orient., II. For the Syriac version of the New Testament, which was made by Rural Bishop Polycarp, and is called the Philoxenian, see Bible Versions, p. 287.

PHOCAS, a gardener of Sinope in Pontus; suffered martyrdom in the most cruel manner under Trajan, or perhaps under Diocletian. He was the Eastern counterpart of the St. Erasmus or St. Eino of the West, and was honored by the sailors, who during the storm sung hymns to his praise, left a place vacant for him at the dinner-table, and, when the trip was over, distributed a portion of the profit in his name to the poor. The Emperor Phocas considered him as his patron-saint, and built a magnificent church in his honor at Dhihippou, near Constantinople. He is commemorated by the Greek Church on Sept. 22, by the Latin on July 14. See Asterii Aemas. orat. in Phocam, in Migne: Patr. Græc., vol. 48. Different from him is the Antiochian martyr of the same name, race, and日期 of Tours, in his De glor. mart., 99. To touch the door of his tomb was a sure cure when bitten by a serpent. Act. Sanct., July III. ZÖCKLER.

PHOENICIA (Greek, Φωινικία; Latin, Phoenice). The derivation of the name is doubtful, as the Greek phenix means both a date-palm and a deep-red color; the latter sense, however, referring to the reddish-brown color of the skin of the Phenicians, seems to be preferable. The natives called themselves Keana, and their land Keana. The Old Testament generally designates the Phenicians as Canaanites, though sometimes, also, as Sidonians; in the New Testament the land is spoken of as the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xvi. 21; comp. Mark iii. 8, vii. 24). According to Augustine, the Punic peasants of Northern Africa, descendants of Tyrian settlers, still called themselves Chanaani in the fifth century. The country occupied the narrow plain between the Mediterranean and the western slopes of Libanon, from the Eleutherus in the north, to Mount Carmel in the south. It was well watered and very fertile, and produced an enormous amount of wheat, wine, fruit, etc. Iron and copper mines were worked. Glass and purple were among its most famous manufactures. The Bible mentions the following cities: Aco, Achzib, Zor (Tyre), Zarpagh, Sidon, Berothah, Gebal or Byblos, Tripolis, Orthosias, Sin, Arkhe, Simyra, Aryad or Aradus.

According to Gen. x. 6, 15, the Phenicians were Hamites, as were all the Canaanites. That statement, however, has been much questioned on account of the close relation between the Phenician and the Hebrew language. Hebrew is, indeed, in Isa. xix. 18, called the language of Canaan. And how came the Phenicians to speak a Semitic language, when the Semitic race has entirely different traditions? The Egyptians and Ethiopians? There seems to be no other explanation possible than a change of tongue; though it must be left undecided whether that change took place before or after their settlement in Canaan, in the midst of a native Shemitic population. Herodotus tells us, that, according to their own traditions, the Phenicians came from the Erythraean Sea (the Persian Gulf), and penetrated through Syria to the Mediterranean coast, about three thousand years before our era; and Strabo contains the remarkable notice, that the inhabitants of Tyrus and Aradus, two islands in the Persian Gulf, had temples similar to those of the Phenicians, and declared the Phenician cities of Tyre and Aradus to be their colonies. Nevertheless, though the Phenicians adopted the Shemitic tongue, and lived, at least at times, in very friendly relations with Israel, their moral character, their social organization, their commercial and industrial spirit, their talent for navigation and colonization, etc., distinguish them very clearly from the Shemitic peoples, and corroborate the statement of the Bible, that they were Hamites.
PHENICIA.

PHOTIUS, a native of Ancyræ, a pupil of Marcellus, and afterwards Bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia; was consecrated to the see of Antioch (344) as an adherent of the homoeonian doctrine, and also by the synod of Milan (345), because he developed the homoeonian doctrine into open antagonism to the doctrine of hypostasis. He was finally deposed by the synod of Sirmium (351); but his party continued on, as the synod of Aquileia (381) showed. His writings have perished; but his opinions are known to us through Athanasius (De Synod. 20–27), Socrates (Hist. Eccl., ii. 19, 30), Hilary (De Synod. 37), and the acts of his condemnation in Mansi: Cod. Ampl. ii. and iii. W. MÜLLER.

PHOTIUS, b. in the first decade of the ninth century; d. in 891. In 846 the Empress Theodora, regent during the minority of her son Michael III., appointed Ignatius, the youngest son of Michael I., and a man of unblemished character, Patriarch of Constantinople. Bardas, however, the vicious uncle of Michael III., succeeded in estranging the young emperor from his mother; and when Ignatius refused to force Theodora into a nunnery, and in 857 even dared to exclude Bardas from the lord's supper on account of his abominable behavior, the latter had him deposed, and banished to the island of Terekitha. The patriarchal see of Constantinople thus became vacant, and Bardas was looking about for a fit occupant. His choice fell upon Photius.

Photius was rich; he belonged to a distinguished family; he held a prominent position in public life; and he was already celebrated as one of the most learned men of his time: but he was not a theologian. Of course, as he had studied the science of the age in its widest compass, he was well versed in ecclesiastical affairs. But his official position was that of protospatharios, or captain of the body-guard; and he had been most active as a diplomat. It was not without precedence, however, that a layman was raised to the patriarchal see; though it certainly looked a little strange that Gregory of Syracuse, a bitter enemy of Ignatius, in five days hurried him through the five orders of monk, deacon, dikaion, and presbyter, and on the sixth consecrated him patriarch. But Ignatius could not be made to submit, though a synod of Constantinople (850) confirmed his deposition and condemnation. He found support in the West, and soon the whole clergy of the Eastern Church was divided into two hostile parties. The emperor addressed a letter to the Pope, asking him to interfere; and Photius also wrote to him, modestly, even submissively, and defending himself with great shrewdness and tact. Nicholas I. accepted the invitation; but, on the basis of the newly introduced pseudo-Isidorian decrees, he accepted it, not as mediator, but as judge. He sent two bishops — Rhadoald of Porto, and Zacharias of Anagni — as legates to Constantinople, where a numerously attended synod was convened in 861. By intrigues, and, as some say, by violence, Ignatius was forced to resign, and to accept the condemnation. Photius was recognized. The latter again wrote to the Pope in order to explain the position, and, if possible, to gain his favor. But Nicholas I.
had now become fully informed about the true state of the affairs. In 863 he convened a synod in Constantinople, punished the legates for disobedience, and excommunicated Photius. The emperor answered in a letter full of furious invectives. The new papal embassy was not allowed to enter Constantinople; and Photius at once changed attitude, turning the controversy between the patriarch of Constantinople and the legates of Rome into a controversy between the Eastern and the Western Church. In 866 he issued his famous encyclical letter, in which he declared the whole Latin Church heretical on account of its clerical celibacy, its introduction of the *fitumque* into the creed, and its arrangement of the Quadragesimal Fast, and called upon all bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs of the Greek Church to unite firmly and cordially against the common foe.

The turn thus given to the course of affairs was of the greatest importance, and for a moment Photius seemed to have secured success. At a synod which was convened in Constantinople (867), and which, though it was packed, pretended to be oecumenical, he formally excommunicated the Pope. But in September, same year, Michael III. was assassinated; and the first act of his assassin and successor, Basilius Maceo, was to depose Photius, and recall Ignatius. Political calculations seem to have been the ruling motive for these proceedings. Basilius needed the support of the party of Ignatius and of the Pope; and consequently the papal supremacy was recognized, and the papal legates were again received in Constantinople. A synod was convened in 869; and Photius was not only deposed, but condemned as a liar, adulterer, parricide, and heretic, and shut up in the dungeon of a distant monastery, where he was even deprived of his books. As time rolled on, however, circumstances changed. Photius was allowed to return to Constantinople; he was even made tutor to the imperial princes. He was also reconciled to Ignatius; and, when the latter died (in 878), he quietly took possession of the patriarchal see. The Roman legates who were present at the synod of Constantinople (879)—the so-called Pseudonymus Photiana—made no objection; and the frauds which had taken place at the two preceding synods were put down as the true cause of all the confusion. Even the Pope seemed willing to drop the case. He afterwards changed his mind, however; and in 882 he renewed the ban against Photius, which none of his successors could be induced to take away. Shortly after, Photius fell under the suspicion of political intrigues, and embezzlement of public money; and in 886 the emperor, Leo Philosophus, a son of Basilius, banished him to an Armenian monastery, where he remained for the rest of his life.

Whatever verdict may be given on Photius as a church officer, his literary merits, not only in the field of theology, but also in those of philosophy, canon law, and history of literature, are beyond cavil. The principal monument which he has left of his erudition is his *Nomocanon*, or *Biblia paideia*, a work unique in its kind, the product of a stupendous industry, and the most comprehensive legal system, in the whole of history, written on vellum, with Exod. xiii. 2-10, Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-22, written on them, and which are worn on the head and left arm by the Jews, on week-days mornings during the time of prayer. Jewish tradition finds the injunction concerning phylacteries in Exod. xiiii. 8, 16; Deut. vii. 18; the Karaites transcribe it, and Grotius, and others, take the passages in question in a figurative sense. At what time phylacteries were first worn is difficult to say; but the Jewish
I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies, was allowed to write them. Phylacteries saying, "I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, for all the days of Deut. vi. 4-9; and Otho : Lex Rabh., pp. 7v. sq.; WAGENSKHL.: Sota, chap. 2, pp. 39 sq.; LIGHTFOOT: Horae Hebr. ad Matth., xxiii. 5; Beck: De Jud. ligam. prec. (Jense, 1674), and De usu phylact. (ibid., 1679); Gropp: De phylact. (Lipsiae, 1683); i. p. 480; BODENSCHATZ: Kirch. Verfassung d. Juden, iv. 14 sq.; Riehm: Handwörterb. d. bibl. Alterthums, s. v. Denkschrift, pp. 270 sq.; Büxtorf: Synag. Jud., pp. 170 sq.; Margulosh: Modern Juden Investigatio, pp. 1 sq.; [Basnage: Hist. des Juifs, V. 12, 12 sq.; Braun: De Vest. Sacerd., pp. 7 sq.; Townley: Reasons for the Laws of Moses, pp. 350 sq.] LEYRER. (B. Pick.)

PIRISTS, or Fathers of the Pious Schools, or Paulinian Congregation, an order of the Roman-Catholic Church, founded in 1600, in Rome, by a Spanish nobleman, Joseph Calasanze, or Josephus a Matre Dei; b. at Calasanze in Aragon, Sept. 11, 1556; d. in Rome, Aug. 22, 1648; canonized by Clement XIII. in 1767. He studied law at Lerida, and theology at Alcalá; was ordained a priest in 1583, and went in 1692 to Rome, where he devoted his life to ascetic practices, nursing the sick, and teaching school among the poor. His remarkable success in the field of teaching induced him to form an association, which in 1612 had over twelve hundred pupils in Rome. In 1617 the association was confirmed as a regular monastic order, and in 1622 it received its constitution. The jealousy of the Jesuits, however, caused many troubles to the order. It prospered, nevertheless, and in the middle of the present century it numbered about two thousand members. It is especially numerous in Austro-Hungary, where about twenty thousand pupils are under their care. See Seyffert: Ordensregeln der Piaristen, Halle, 1783, 2 vols.

PICARDS, a corruption of Beghards, applied to some branches of the Bohemian Brethren. See ADAMITES.

PICTET, Benedit, b. at Geneva, May 30, 1655; d. there June 10, 1724. He studied theology, travelled much, and was in 1702 appointed professor of theology in his native city. His controversial writings (Entretiens de Philandre el Eva*, 1683; Syllabus controversiarum, 1711; Lutheri et Calculi consensus, 1701, etc.) belong to the best of those produced in that period. His works on systematic theology (Theologia Christiana, 1686, in 11 vols.; Medulla Theologia, 1711; Morale chrétienne, 1695, in 12 vols., etc.) and his devotional books (L'art de bien vivre et de bien mourir, etc.) were also much valued. [See his Life by E. de Bude, Lausanne, 1874.] HERZOG.

PICUS OF MIRANDULA. See Mirandula.

PIERCE, Lovick, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church South; was b. in Halifax County, N.C., March 24, 1783; and d. in Sparta, Ga., Nov. 9, 1879, in the ninety-fifth year of his age. When he was but three years old, his parents moved to Barnwell District, S.C. His early educational advantages were very limited. In December 1813 he was "admitted to a trial" into the South-Carolina conference. In 1809 he was married to Miss Ann Foster, daughter of Col. George Foster of Greene County, Ga. In the war of 1812 he served as chaplain in the army. At the conference which met in 1814 he located, but continued to do active service as a local preacher. He studied medicine and gradu-
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PIETISM.

PIETISM denotes a movement in the Lutheran Church which arose as a re-action of the living, practical faith which demands to express itself in every act of the will, against an orthodoxy which too often contented itself with the dead, theoretical correctness of its creed. At present it is not uncommon to find all the various phenomena of asceticism, mysticism, quietism, separatism, etc., lumped together under the common designation of Pietism; but so vague a definition is detrimental to the precise understanding of history. On the other hand, the old definition of Pietism, as a mere protest against a stiff and barren orthodoxy, is too narrow. Pietism had deep roots in the Lutheran Church: it grew from the very principles of the Lutheran Reformation; and it would, no doubt, have developed, even though there had been no orthodoxy to re-act upon. The personal development of Spener before his public work began in 1670, assimilating, as it did, a great number of various influences, is one evidence. Another is the effect of his work, which was by no means spent with the end of the Pietistic controversies at the death of Löschner, in 1747.

The movement first took shape in Francfort, where Spener was appointed pastor in 1666. He met there with some of the worst features of the Lutheran Church,—sacerdotal arrogance, superfluous confession-practice, neglect of the cure of souls, neglect of the instruction of the youth, etc.; and in 1670 he invited to a kind of friendly re-union in his study, for the purpose of reciprocal edification, the serious-minded in his congregation, and thus constituted the so-called collegia pietas. Chapters of Lutheran and Reformed books of devotion, or the sermon of the preceding Sunday, first formed the topic of conversation; afterwards, portions of Scripture. The experiment proved a great success. Others followed the example; and, as some eccentricity could not fail to creep in, the members of such collegia pietas were nicknamed "Pietists." In 1682, however, Spener was able to transform his private re-unions into public gatherings, and transfer them from his study to the church. Meanwhile, he published (in 1675) his Pin Deudelia, in which he gave a full account of his ideas and purposes. The principal points he insisted on were the spreading of a more general and more intimate acquaintance with the Bible by means of private gatherings, ecclesiola in ecclesia; the development of a general priesthood by the co-operation of laymen in the spiritual guidance of the congregation, and by
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PILATE.

domestic worship; a steady reminding of the truth, that knowledge of Christianity must be accompanied by a corresponding Christian practice, in order to be of any value; the transformation of the merely doctrinal, and generally more or less imbibed, polemics against heresies and infidels into a propaganda whose only motive power was love; a re-organization of the theological study, so as to make a godly life as important a part of the preparation for ministerial work as reading and learning; and a new manner of preaching, by which the silly rhetoric which was in fashion should be completely dropped,—six propositions which he ever afterwards clung to, and which he defended against the attacks of Neutzer and Dilfeld, in his Der Klagen über das verdorbene Christenthum Missbrauch und rechter Gebrauch, 1684.

In 1686 the new school of theology succeeded in obtaining a foothold at the University of Leipzig. J. B. Carpzov, who soon after became one of Spener's most decided enemies, recommended the collegia pietatis in his sermons; and, partly under his authority, Francke and Anton, at that time young magistri at the university, formed so-called collegia biblica, in analogy with the already existing collegia anthropologica and homiletica. Meanwhile Spener had been appointed court-preacher at Dresden; and one of his first acts was to induce the Saxon consistency to administer a rebuke to the theological faculty at Leipzig for neglect of the exegetical and catechetical studies. Carpzov became furious, and from that moment he never ceased to attack pietism and the pietists at every opportunity. The new school prospered, however, at Leipzig, and achieved a real triumph when Francke, Breithaupt, and Anton were appointed theological professors at the newly founded university of Halle. Halle became, indeed, the home of pietism; and great crowds of students soon thronged its lecture-rooms. But the very attraction which pietism exercised on the young theological students stirred up the jealousy of the Wittenberg theologians, who found the fame and predilection once theirs moved to others. In 1695 J. Deutschmann published his Christ-lutherische Vorstellung, an old-fashioned enumeration of two hundred and eighty-three heresies to be found in the doctrinal system of the "new sect." It made no impression: but, ten years later on, it was followed by Lüscher's Timotheus Verinus, and, in the wordy contest which then sprang up, the spokesman of the pietists, Joachim Lange, was far from being a match for Lüscher. Lüscher accused the pietists of being indifferent to the truths of revelation such as systematized in the symbolical books; of depreciating the sacraments and the ministerial office; of obscuring the doctrine of justification by asserting that good works were necessarily connected with saving faith, its evidence, indeed; of favoring novelties by their predilection for enthusiastic eccentrics, and their neglect of existing customs; and he also rejected those chiliasm, terministic, and perfectionistic doctrines which had developed among them. Almost at every point there was some reason for the opposition of Lüscher; and, while the pietists often became offensive to other people on account of their extravagances, Lüscher was by no means a mere dogmatist; on the contrary, he advocated the cause of practical piety almost with as much warmth as the pietists themselves.

Nevertheless, the fundamental ideas of Spener and his friends were too truly Christian, and too intimately related to the very principles of the Reformation, not to find a place in the mind of every person less than half a century pietism spread its influence through all spheres of life, and through all classes of society; and when, after the accession of Ferdinand II., it had to give way, in Northern Germany, to the rising rationalism, it found a new home in Southern Germany. What Spener, Francke, Anton, Breithaupt, Arnold, and others had been to Prussia and Saxony, Bengel, Weissmann, Oetinger, Hahn, and others were to Württemberg and Baden. Indeed, the older school of Tubingen was principally based on pietism.

Ltr.—The general history of pietism has been written by Schmid (1883), Happe (1879), and Ritschl (1880, Geschichte des Pietismus). For details, see the literature to the special articles, Spener, Francke, etc. BERNHARD RIGGENBACH.

PIGMHUS, Albert, b. at Campen in the Netherlands, 1490; d. at Utrecht, Dec. 20, 1542; studied mathematics, philosophy, and theology at Louvain and Cologne; was appointed preacher of his native city, but was in 1533 called to Rome by his teacher, Adrian VI., and enjoyed also the favor of Clement VII. and Paul III., the latter of whom made him provost of the Church of St. John in Utrecht. His principal work is his Asser-tio ecclesiastica hierarchie, Cologne, 1538. He also wrote De libero hominis arbitrio, etc., Cologne, 1542, which Calvin answered, in his Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae.

HERZOG.

PILATE, Pontius, the fifth Roman procurator (i.e., "governor," Matt. xxvii. 2) of Judea and Samaria from A.D. 26-36, the successor of Valerius Gratus. His cognomen Pilate was derived either from pilum ("a javelin") or pilus ("the felt cap given to a manumitted slave in token of his freedom"): if from the latter, he had either been such a slave, or was the descendant of one, and belonging to the gens Pontia. His official residence was in Cæsarea; but he came to Jerusalem during the festivals, and lived in Herod's magnificent palace. During his rule occurred the ministry of John the Baptist and of Jesus Christ; and it was by his permission, although he personally was convinced of the innocence of the accused, and went through the ceremony of washing his hands before the people in token of his belief,—a ceremony already known to the Jews (Deut. xxvi. 6; Ps. xxvi. 6, lxxiii. 13),—spoke kindly to him, and strove to save him, that Jesus was crucified. In the ten years of his procuratorship he was guilty of many a cruel and arbitrary deed. When the people rose against his attempts to defile their holy places by the presence of the Roman standards bearing the image of the emperor, and against his appropriation of the temple revenues from the redemption of vows for the construction of an aqueduct, he suppressed them by force; and on the latter occasion had a number massacred. At last the Jewish people could stand his violence no longer; and so, when he causelessly destroyed a number of Samaritans upon Mount Gerizim, the Samaritan senate formally complained to the president of Syria, Vitel-
PILATE.

1842

PILGRIMAGES.

Pilatus, who ordered him to Rome to answer before Caesar (A.D. 36). Just before his arrival there Tiberius had died, and Caligula had succeeded. According to Eusebius (H. E., II. 7), Pilate took his own life. According to others, he was banished to Vienne in Gaul (Vienna Allobrogum, Vienna-on-the-Rhone), or beheaded under Nero. The character of Pilate, as exhibited in the New Testament, record of his treatment of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 2, 11 sqq.; Mark xv. 1 sqq.; Luke xxiii. 1 sqq.; John xviii. 28 sqq.), is that of a sceptical and scoffing man of the world, not naturally evil-minded or cruel, but entirely without perception of spiritual things, considering all religions equally based on superstition. If it had not been against his own interests, he would have released Jesus (John xix. 10). As it was, he gave him over to crucifixion, although he found no fault in him. Yet Tertullian says he was a Christian in conscience, and in the Ethiopic Church he is a saint. His day is June 24. The Copts also assert that he died as a Christian martyr.

Pilate is said to have forwarded to Tiberius an account of the judgment and crucifixion of Jesus in order to forestall unfavorable criticism (Justin Martyr: Apol., I. 76, 88; cf. Tertullian: Apol., V. 21; Eusebius: II. 2). But the so-called Report, as well as the two letters of Pilate to Tiberius, and the so-called Acts of Pilate, are forgeries.

Legends cluster around his name. It is said that he studied in Huesca, Spain; had Judas Iscariot for his servant; and that the emperor had his dead body thrown into the Tiber. Then evil spirits possessed it, and caused the river to overflow. After the flood, his body was put in the Rhone by Vienne; and there again it caused a storm, so that it was transported to the Alpine Mountain, now called Mount Pilatus, near Lucerne, and there sunk in the deep pool on its top; but again it caused strange commotion. Every year, on Good Friday, the Devil takes him out of the pool, and sets him upon a throne, whereupon he washes his hands. — The wife of Pilate — called Procila, or Claudia Proculla, whose solemn warning, "Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man, for I have suffered many things because of him" (Mark xviii. 19), is introduced so dramatically in Matthew's account of the trial of Jesus — appears in the Pilate legend as a proselyte of the gate. Origen, Chrysostom, and Hilary assert that she became a Christian. The Greek Church makes her a saint, and observes Oct. 27 as her day. Her dream has been considered by Jews as a magical deed of Christ to effect his deliverance, but by Christians (Pseudo-Ignatius, Ad Philip., 4, Bede, Bernard, Heliand) as a work of Satan to hinder the atoning death of Christ.


were performed at Lourdes; immense crowds gathered every year; and in 1876 a large church was built above the grotto. To Knock, also, multitudes came for help, bodily and spiritual. But many modern pilgrims travel by rail. For the Roman-Catholic position on the subject, see Conc. Trident. Sessio xxx.; Scharff: Creeds, i. p. 201; J. Marx: Das Wallfahren in der katholischen Kirche, Treves, 1842.

PILKINGTON, James, Bishop of Durham; b. at Rivington, Lancashire, Eng., 1560; d. at Bishop's Auckland, Jan. 23, 1575-76. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; was on the Continent during the reign of Mary; on his return was appointed master of his college (1559), and on March 2, 1560-61, was consecrated bishop of Durham. He was one of the earliest promoters of Greek learning in England. His writings were much admired by the Puritans. They embrace Commentaries upon Haggai (London, 1560), Obadiah (1560), and upon part of Nehemiah (1585). These and other of his works were reprinted by the Parker Society in 1 vol., Cambridge, 1842.

PILKINGTON, James, Bishop of Durham; b. at Annapolis, Md., April 17, 1810; d. at Cockeysville, Baltimore County, Md., July 4, 1888. He was graduated at St. John's College, Annapolis. He was successively rector in Somerset County, Md., 1836-38; from 1838 to 1855 at Bladenburg; from 1855 to 1870 in Washington. On Oct. 6, 1870, he was consecrated assistant bishop of Maryland. On Oct. 17, 1879, he succeeded Bishop Whittingham as bishop. He was a decided Low-Churchman.

PIRKÉ Aboth (Sayings of the Fathers), the ninth tractate of the fourth order ("Damages") of the Mishna. It consists of six chapters of chronologically arranged pithy sayings of eminent rabbis, like Hillel, Gamaliel, and Jehuda ha-Nasi, the redactor of the Mishna. It is the oldest uncanonical collection of Jewish gnomes, and, by its easy Hebrew and interesting contents, forms an admirable introduction to rabbinical literature. Numerous are the reprints and editions of it; the most recent of the latter is by H. L. Strack: Die Sprüche der Väter, Karlsruhe, 1882 (56 pp.). Twice it has been translated into German (by G. H. Lehmann, Leipzig, 1884; and by Paul Ewald, Erlangen, 1885), and once into English (by Charles Taylor: Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Cambridge, 1877).

PIRMN, St., flourished in the middle of the eighth century, but was almost entirely forgotten in the middle of the ninth. See the biographies of him in Monc: Quellenammlung, Carlruhe, 1818, Acta Sanct., and by M. Gürtingen, Zweibrücken, 1841. He founded many monasteries, —Reichenau, on Lake Constance; Marbach, in Upper Alsace; Hornbach, near Zweibrücken; where he died Nov. 3, probably 753. He is believed to be the author of the Dicta abbatis Pirmnenses, written in Latin, and edited by C. P. Caspari, Christiana, 1883.

PISA, Councils of. 1. The first Council of Pisa was held in 1409, and was the result of an attempt to heal the schism which had distracted the church since 1378. Two popes — one in Rome, and one in Avignon — were a heavy drain upon ecclesiastical finances; and their hostilities gave rise to extortions which were felt to become intolerable. The University of Paris took the lead in attempting to heal the schism; but it was difficult to find any way of dealing with the Papal monarchy, which was regarded as absolute by the canon law. The first proposal, for a voluntary abdication on the part of both popes, naturally failed. The university then advocated a withdrawal of obedience from the popes, but this was found to be impracticable. On a vacancy in the Roman Papacy, in 1409, the cardinals elected, not a pope, but a "commissioner for unity," in the person of the aged Gregory XII., who was bound by oath to abdicate, if the French Pope (Benedict XIII.) would abdicate also. Negotiations for this purpose were set on foot, and were warmly supported by the French court. Gregory XII. agreed to a conference with Benedict XIII. at Savona; but his greedy relatives, and the ambitious Ladislas, king of Naples, dissuaded him from fulfilling his promise. He advanced as far as Lucca in 1408, and there showed signs of pursuing an independent policy. As the first step in this direction, he announced his intention of creating a new batch of cardinals. As these cardinals, on which he had taken his election, his cardinals resisted the proposal. When Gregory XII. persisted, they fled from Lucca to Livorno, and there issued a letter to the princes of Christendom, accusing Gregory of breach of faith. The King of France at the same time withdrew from obedience to Benedict XIII., and exhorted the cardinals to restore the peace of the church. The majority of the two colleges of cardinals united at Livorno, and summoned a general council to meet at Pisa in March, 1409. The aid of Florence, and of Cardinal Cossa, the Papal legate at Bologna, secured the council against King Ladislas, who tried to prevent its meeting.

The summons of a general council was felt at the time to be a great innovation. It was the result of the long schism and of the discussions which it had awakened. There was no constitutional means of bringing it to an end; and, in default of any recognized method, recourse was had to the primitive customs of the church. It was admitted that the assembling of a council had, for the sake of order, been limited by the papal power of summons; but this limitation did not extend to cases of urgency and necessity. In the present necessity, when the law of the Church had failed, the wider equity of a council must interpret the law. These opinions had their origin in the theologians of the University of Paris, and were accepted by the cardinals as a justification of their procedure.

The council, which was largely attended, opened on March 25, 1400. It first cited the rival popes, who had been duly summoned. When they did not appear, they were declared contumacious. On April 24 charges were brought against them of being obstinate in their refusal to heal the schism, and consequently of being themselves schismatics and heretics. Commissioners were appointed to receive testimony on these points. On May 22 they reported that the charges were true and notorious. On June 5 the council declared Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. to be deposed as schismatics and heretics. All the faithful were absolved from allegiance to them, and their extortions were declared to be of no effect. After this the
Cardinals declared themselves ready to make a new election. On June 15 they went into conclave, and on June 26 elected Peter Philargi, a native of Crete, who took the title of Alexander V.

The cardinals, before the election, had agreed that the council should not dissolve until "a due, reasonable, and sufficient reform of the church, in head and members, had been brought about." But this work was never undertaken. The Pope's feeble health, and the desire of the members to leave Pisa, were given as excuses. A future council was promised, in which the question of reform should be taken up; and the Council of Pisa was dissolved on Aug. 6.

The Council of Pisa was not successful in its great object, — the restoration of the unity of the church. Instead of getting rid of the contending popes, it added a third. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. might have fiefed; but, so long as they had any, the Council of Pisa was a failure. This was recognized by the Council of Constance, which negotiated afresh for the abdication of Gregory and Benedict. According to the rules of canonists, the Council of Pisa was not a true council, because it was not summoned by a pope. It was regarded, soon after its dissolution, as of doubtful authority. This was greatly due to its want of success. It did not act wisely nor discreetly. From the beginning it over-rode the popes, and did not try to conciliate them. It accepted as valid all that the cardinals had done previously, and did not wait to take proceedings of its own. Moreover, it was unduly precipitate in its action, and did not give the popes an opportunity for submission, if they had wished it. Its importance lies in the fact, that it was the expression of the reforming ideas which the schism had brought into prominence. It was the first-fruits of the conciliar movement, which was the chief feature of the ecclesiastical history of the fifteenth century.

LIT. — Richer: Historia Conciliorum Generalium, lib. iv., part 1 (Cologne, 1683), contains the proceedings of the council and several of the writings to which it gave occasion. The Papal side is given in Raynaldis: Annales Ecclesiastici, sub annis 1511-12, 16th edition, Bois le Duc, 1877.

Piscator (Fischer), Johannes, b. at Strassburg, March 27, 1546; d. at Herborn, July 26, 1626. He studied theology at Tübingen, and was in 1572 appointed professor in Strassburg, but was soon after dismissed because he leaned towards Calvinism. In 1574 he was appointed professor at Heidelberg, but in 1577 he was dismissed again, for the same reason. Finally he was settled at the academy of Herborn, founded by the Reformed Count Johann of Nassau; and there he remained for the rest of his life. He translated the Bible (Herborn, 1602-24, 3 vols.), wrote Commentaries on several books both of the Old and New Testament, and published a number of doctrinal and polemical treatises. His doctrine of the insufficiency of the "active obedience" of Christ was rejected by the synod of Gap (1608), — and the synod of Rochelle (1607) even went so far as to denounce him to Count Johann as a heretic, — though it was accepted by many of the most learned Reformers and theologians, as indeed, Reues, Scultetus, Cappel, and others.

Pisgah, the summit from which Moses obtained his view of the promised land immediately before his death (Deut. xxxiv. 1). It was also the place of Balak's sacrifice, and Balaam's prophecy (Num. xxiii. 14). It was within Reuben's inheritance (Num. xxx. 14). It was within Reuben's possessions (Josh. xiii. 20). The exact identification of Pisgah was long a problem, until the Duc de Luynes (1864) and Professor Paine of the American Palestine Exploration Society (1873), independently, for the duke's account was not published until after Paine's, identified it with Jebel Slaghah, the extreme headland of the range Abarim, of which the highest summit is Nebao. See Nebao.
PISTORIUS, Johannes, b. at Nidda in Hesse, Feb. 4, 1546; d. at Freiburg, in September, 1608. He studied medicine; published De vera curanda, Anatomia Lutheri, etc. He also wrote a great number of polemical treatises: Theseeurn de fidei. christ. mensura, Anatomia Lutheri, etc. He also published ScripHores arum Cerm, 3 vols., and Politica historia corpus, 3 vols. See Fecht: Historia colloqui Emmendingensis, Rostock, 1694, 1709.

PISTORIUS, Johannes, b. at Nidda in Hesse, Feb. 4, 1546; d. at Freiburg, in September, 1608. He studied medicine; published De vera curanda, Anatomia Lutheri, etc. He also published ScripHores arum Cerm, 3 vols., and Politica historia corpus, 3 vols. See Fecht: Historia colloqui Emmendingensis, Rostock, 1694, 1709.

PITHOM, one of the treasure-cities built for Rameses II. by the Israelites (Exod. i. 11). It has been identified by Brugsch with Succoth, the first encampment on the route of the exodus, the starting-point being Rameses (Exod. xii. 22), and by Naville, the archeologist of the Egypt Exploration Fund, with the present Tell-el-Maskhuta in the Wady et Tumilat on the line of the Sweet-Water Canal, between Ismailia and Trieste, 1447, and Bishop of Siena, 1450. Calixtus III. made him a cardinal in 1456. As he grew older, his amorous aberrations ceased, but he became avaricious and grasping. He was known as the entrance of the East.” It was a name common to several towns, such as Heliopolis. But Pithom-Succoth was called Hero (“storehouse”), or Heroopolis (“store-city”) by the Greeks and Latins; “Hero” being the Greek transcription of Ar, Ari, or Aru, which means “storehouse.” M. Naville prepared a work of his Pithom discoveries, which was printed by the Egypt Exploration Fund, London, 1885.

PIUS is the name of nine popes. — Pius I. reigned in the middle of the second century; according to Jaffé, 142–157 (Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1881); according to Lipsius, 158–154, or 141–146 (Chronologica d. Rom. Bischoffs, Kiel, 1860). Of his reign nothing is known. The decretales ascribed to him are spurious. He is a saint of the Roman-Catholic Church, and his memory is celebrated on July 11. See Duchesne: Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis (Paris, 1877), and the treatises by Edward Maier, in Jährbcher für protest. Theologie (1878 and 1880). — Pius II. (Aug. 19, 1458–Aug. 15, 1464), Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini; b. at Corsignano, near Siena, Oct. 18, 1405; belonged to a noble but poor family. He was enabled, however, to study at Siena and Florence; and in 1432 he accompanied Bishop Capranica of Ferrum to the Council of Basle, as historian and archivist of the latter, and was made his secretary. At Basle he joined the opposition party, took an active part in the negotiations which ended with the deposition of Eugenius IV., wrote his Commentary on the Council of Basle, and his Libellus dialogorum de generalis Concilii auctoritate, in defence of the superiority of an ecumenical council over the Pope, and became secretary to Felix V. In 1442 he entered the service of Friedrich III., who showed him great confidence, and used him in many important diplomatical missions. He was frivolous and sensuous, the author of a heap of worthless verses, a slippery love-story (Eurialus and Lucretia), and a scandalous comedy (Christia); but he was an able diplomat, acute and insinuating. It became necessary for him to change front; and with great artfulness he approached Eugenius IV., and obtained forgiveness. He wrote a new Commentary on the Council of Basle, and a new version of his Pachus, a papal point of view; and published in 1447 his Epistola retractoraria, recanting all his errors of former days. Nicholas V. made him Bishop of Trieste, 1447, and Bishop of Siena, 1450. Calixtus III. made him a cardinal in 1456. As he grew older, his amorous aberrations ceased, but he became avaricious and grasping. He was known as the most scheming and shameless benefice-hunter at the papal court, next to Rodrigo Borgia, the later Alexander VI. By the aid of the latter, he was elected Pope after the death of Calixtus III., and assumed the name of Pius II., probably with an allusion to Virgil’s Pius Aeneas, from whom he claimed to descend. The accession of the poet-pope was hailed with great enthusiasm; but he soon disappointed his brethren of the guild, who expected larger pensions and a more flattering treatment than he saw fit to bestow upon them. Only the artists, architects, poets, and the doctors found liberal support at his court. The leading idea of his whole policy was the new crusade. The conquest of Constantinople by the Turks seems to have made a deep impression upon him; and on June 1, 1458, he opened a
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congress of princes at Mantua, for the purpose of uniting the whole force of Christendom against Islam. But the attendance was so small that nothing serious could be carried through; and the too high-strung tone of the bull Excruciarum (Jan. 16, 1580), declaring the idea of the superiority of an ecumenical synod over the Pope heretical, abominable, and dictated by a spirit of rebellion, was ill suited to awaken sympathy. The papal propositions, that for three years the clergy should pay a tenth, and the laity a thirtieth, of their income, for defraying the expenses of the crusade, met with general opposition. France he entirely estranged from himself by his Neapolitan policy. In order to procure a principality for his nephew, he recognized Ferdinand as king of Naples. But such a recognition was in fact a rejection of the claims of the house of Anjou; and, though Pius II. succeeded in having the pragmatic sanction of Bourges cancelled in 1461, Louis XI. gave his consent, only on the condition that the Pope should dissolve his alliance with Ferdinand, and espouse the cause of René of Anjou. The Pope neither could nor would fulfil that condition; and the consequence was, that France heard nothing of his crusading schemes. In Germany matters proved as difficult. Though Pius II. succeeded in breaking the opposition of Gregory of Helmberg, and humiliating Diether of Isenburg, the thirty-two thousand men which Germany had promised to equip for the war against the Turks never were at hand. The only people who showed any zeal for the undertaking were the Hungarians, who already felt the pressure of the Turks on their own frontiers, and Venice, who was anxious about her possessions in the Greek peninsula. Nevertheless, on Oct. 22, 1463, he issued the bull inaugurating the crusade; and on June 19, 1464, he went to Ancona to place himself, like another Moses, at the head of the armament. He had already, for several years, been lame in his lower limbs; and in addition he suffered from fever when he left Rome. He was dying when he reached Ancona. The most interesting among his numerous writings are, his Autobiography, from his birth to his starting for Ancona; a History of Friedrich III., 1439-56; a History of Bohemia, which has been put on the Index on account of its too favorable mentioning of Hus; Europa and Asia, curious mixtures of geography, ethnography, and history, etc. A collected edition of his works appeared at Basel, 1551. Collections of his letters have several times been made; the best are those by Laufké (Bonn, 1853) and Georg Voigt (Vienna, 1856). His bulls are found in Collectanea: Bullarum amplissima collectio, iii. His speeches have been edited by Mansi: Oraciones politica et ecclesiastica Pii II., Lucca, 1735-59, 3 vols. See Helwing: De Pii II. rebus gestis, etc., Berlin, 1823; Beets: De Aenea Sylvis, etc., Harlem, 1839; Hagedorn: Excerpts, 1839-40; A. S. Paderie: Essai sur A. S. P., Paris, 1843; Heine mann: A. S., Bernburg, 1855; Gengler: A. S. und die deutsche Rechtsgeschichte, Erlangen, 1860; Georg Voigt: En. Sil. de' P., Berlin, 1856-63, 3 vols., the best work on the subject. — Pius III. (Sept. 18-Oct. 13, 1503). He was a nephew of Pius II., and by him made Archbishop of Siena, and cardinal in 1450. His election after the death of Alexander VI. he owed chiefly to the circumstances of his being very old and very weak. The approach of the French army and Cesar Borgia made it possible for the candidate to come to an agreement as swiftly as possible; and an agreement was, of course, most easily obtained when the candidate gave sure prospect of a new election. — R. Zöpfel.

Pius IV. (Jan. 8, 1559—Dec. 9, 1565). His original name was Giovanni Angelo Medici, but he did not belong to the famous Florentine family of that name. He was born at Milan, in stinted circumstances; studied law, and became in 1527 prothonotary to the curia. Clement VII. and Paul III. employed him in several important missions; and the latter made him a cardinal in 1549. Under Paul IV., however, he found it advisable to exile himself from Rome, and to live very quietly in his native city. But his exile paved the way for him to the papal throne. The attempt of Paul IV. at ruling in the spirit of the Gregories and the Innocents had failed utterly. The solutions between the papal see and the foreign powers were very serious; and in the papal dominions the cruelty and violence of the Inquisition had spread general discontent. It was necessary to change system, and everybody's eyes fell naturally on the exiled cardinal in Milan. He was chosen, and the choice proved a success. He understood that the supremacy of the sacerdotium over the imperium could not be maintained any more, because its weapons — the ban, the interdict, etc. — had lost their effect; and he was willing to seek support for the sacerdotium from the imperium. The most difficult task which awaited him was the re-opening of the Council of Trent, and the finishing up of its business. The dangers to the papal authority were very great. Spain acted on the maxim, that the episcopacy was itself a divine institution, and not a mere emanation from the Pope; and it was necessary that the ecumenical council had the highest power in the church, a power which even the Pope had to bow; and the Germans went even into details, and demanded reforms of the curia, the clergy, the monasteries, abolition of the ecclesiastical celibacy, granting of the cup in the Lord's Supper to the laity, etc. The bull of convocation was issued on Nov. 20, 1560. The first session, however, did not take place until Jan. 18, 1562. The temper of the council was unmistakable; but Pius IV. was able, by adroit management, and by direct negotiations with the Emperor Philip II. and Cardinal Guise, to avert all danger. Indeed, the close of the Council of Trent (Dec. 3, 1563) must be considered a great triumph for the papacy. The Pope confirmed its decrees, as if they were not valid without such confirmation; and, though they were received with some reserve in all countries, they gradually forced their way through. With the close of the Council of Trent, the new chapter of Christendom was begun, and the decisive step was taken towards the recovery of the supremacy of the Pope in Italy, and the safety of the Papal States. His bulls and decrees are found in Churerbini: Bullar. Magn., ii. See Leonardi: Oratio de laudibus P. IV., Padua, 1665; [R. Jenkins: Romanism: a Doctrinal and Historical Examination of the Creed of Pius IV., London, 1882; his Breviary of Trent. He was a nephew of Pius IV., and by him made Archbishop of Siena, and cardinal in 1450. His election after the death of Alexander VI. he owed chiefly to the circumstances of his being very old and very weak. The approach of the French army and Cesar Borgia made it possible for the candidate to come to an agreement as swiftly as possible; and an agreement was, of course, most easily obtained when the candidate gave sure prospect of a new election. — R. Zöpfel.

Pius V. (Jan. 8, 1566—May 1, 1572). He was of humble descent; entered the Dominican
order when he was fourteen years old; acted for some time as inquisitor in Como, Bergamo, and the Valtellina; was called to Rome, May 5, 1550, as member of the Board of Inquisition; and made a cardinal in 1557. As Pope, he inspired the Inquisition in Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands with new vigor. The Duke of Alba he presented with a consecrated sword; Elizabeth of England he put under the ban; he signed the bull of Sept. 8, 1571, by which the Turks of Santafiore, whom he told "to take no Huguenot prisoners, but kill them as soon as caught." There were, however, traits in his character which commanded respect. His severity was sincere.

The ecclesiastical reforms began to be carried out. The Catechismus Romanus was issued; the decrees of the Council of Trent were accepted and enforced by the Roman-Catholic princes, etc. The papal squadron also took part in the brilliant but fruitless victory of Don Juan over the Turks at Lepanto, Oct. 8, 1571. The bulls of Pius V. are found in Cherubini: Bullar. Magn. Ill.; his Acta Apostolicae have been edited by F. Gobau, Antwerp, 1840. See Hieron. Catena: Vita del glor. consessissimo papa P. V., which contains his correspondence; and Falloix: Histoire de S. P. V., Angers, 1840. Mangold.

Pius VI. (Feb. 15, 1775-Aug. 29, 1799). He belonged to a noble but poor family; studied law; entered the service of the church, and was appointed secretary to Benedict XIV. in 1755, and director of the papal treasury in 1766. In 1773 he was made a cardinal. One of his first acts as a pope was a curious precept against the vain-shaped, high-colored dresses of the Roman clergy, their powdered perukes, their card-playing in the cafes, their visits to the theatres, and nocturnal promenades with ladies, etc. The intention was, no doubt, very good. But, unfortunately, Pius VI. was himself a very handsome man, and by no means indifferent to his looks; and rumors had more than once told of his own adventures with the fair sex. There was, indeed, in every thing he did a want of perfect consistency, a hesitation with respect to the last consequences of the principles adopted. The most pressing business of hand was the procedure of the French. But the Pope would not confirm the bull of his predecessor (Dominus ac Redemptor noster), dissolving the order; nor dared he re-establish the society. He chose a middle way. In Prussia, under Friedrich II., he allowed the brethren to go on with their work, only under another name and in another costume. In Russia, under Catherine II., he even allowed them to elect a vicar-general. Thus the case remained in suspense. In 1780 Joseph II. ascended the throne; and by an edict of March 24, 1781, he dissolved all connection between the monastic orders established within his dominions, and their generals living outside of the empire, in Rome. The Pope contented himself with some very mild remonstrances; and when the emperor went on with that whole series of ecclesiastical reforms which is generally comprised under the name of Josephinism, the Pope could think of no more effectual means of self-defense than a visit to Vienna. On Feb. 27, 1780, he set out for the imperial residence. He was received with great reverence and enthusiasm by the people, and with much cordiality and politeness by the emperor; but the secretary of state, Kaunitz, indulged in the grossest breach of etiquette; and the general outcome of the visit was, that the Pope had to give in on all the principal points of difference. Nor was a better modus vivendi established. In September, 1783, the emperor appointed a new archbishop of Milan; and, when the Pope hesitated to confirm him, Kaunitz remarked, that, in case of a papal refusal, the confirmation would be performed by a Lombard synod. Pius VI. threatened to put the emperor under the ban; but Joseph II. simply returned the letter, with the demand to have the writer of it properly punished. Once more a personal intercourse between the emperor and the Pope was rescued to. Joseph II. arrived at Rome on Dec. 23, 1788, and staid there till Jan. 21, 1789. But nothing was accomplished. By a decree of April 28, 1784, he interfered with the worship of relics; by another, of March 21, 1784, he levied tax on pilgrimages; by a third, of Jan. 17, 1785, he ordered all side-altars removed from the churches; by a fourth, of Feb. 21, 1786, the vernacular tongue was introduced in divine service. The whole Roman fabric seemed to be tumbling down. The Belgian revolution, which compelled Joseph II. to cancel his ecclesiastical reforms so far as that part of his dominion was concerned, gave the Pope some relief; and when Joseph died (Feb. 20, 1790), matters were allowed gradually to drift back into the old track. But shortly after he had to encounter a still more formidable enemy in the French Revolution. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy of France, as drawn up by the National Assembly in 1790, satisfied, of course, neither Pius VI. nor Louis XVI. But the Pope wanted the king to make the first attack; and, when the king signed the bill, the Pope kept quiet and perfectly inactive, until he heard that more than fifty thousand French priests, and no less than a hundred and thirty French bishops, had refused to take the oath on the constitution. He then decided on a bold stroke. By a bull of April 13, 1791, he condemned the constitution, and threatened with excommunication any and every clergyman who submitted to it. But the National Assembly simply asserted its independence, and the protest of the Pope vanished, unnoticed, in space. In 1795 Pius VI. joined the coalition against France, and raised an army of twelve thousand men; but Gen. Bonaparte compelled him by the armistice of Bologna (June 29, 1796) to cede the legations of Bologna and Ferrara, and the citadel of Bologna, and to pay twenty-one million francs for his rashness; and, when he tried to evade the stipulations of the armistice, the conditions of the final peace of Tolentino (Feb. 19, 1797) were made still harder. Meanwhile the republican sympathies began to show themselves in Rome. Riots occurred; and, when the papal soldiers fired on the French ambassador, Gen. Berthier appeared before the gates of Rome, Feb. 10, 1798. The city was captured, the republic was proclaimed; and the Pope was sent a prisoner to France, where he died as Dominey, on May 10, 1799. His life was written by Anonymus: "Pius VI., Ulm, 1781-95, 6 vols.; P. P. Wolf, Zurich, 1789-1802, 7 vols.; Ferrari, Padua, 1802; Beccatini, Venice, 1801-02, 4 vols.; Travanti, Florence, 1804, 3 vols.
Jesus, and the bull of June 26, 1816, condemning of Jan. 25, 1813, renouncing his temporal power, forced and half persuaded to sign the concordat be brought to Fontainebleau. There he was half on the way to Russia, Napoleon ordered him to of Aug. 7, 1814, re-establishing the Society of June 10, 1809; and, when the Pope protested, etc. But on March 24 he retracted, Consalvi upholding his dignity; and in May, 1812, while to epileptic fits, he was not admitted. The mili- of the papal legate. In 1829 he was made Arch- and liberality of his character; and, in the con- and permitting fire and sword; and carrying of the press were finally compelled Napoleon to yield. The Pope was released on March 10, 1814, and allowed to return to Rome, where he was received with great enthusiasm. The great success which the pope saw achieved at the Congress of Vienna was in the first years of his reign disappoint the tiara; and the Liberals joined him with such an enthusiasm, that he could probably have given an entirely different character to the papacy if he had been resolute enough to place himself at his residence at Gaeta as the guest of the king of Naples; and when he returned to Rome, two years later, under the protection of a French army of occupation, he had completely changed his views, and given up himself entirely to the Church of Rome; and hardly had he taken the eight years later, under the protection of a French army of occupation, he had completely changed his views, and given up himself entirely to the Church of Rome; and hardly had he taken the...
of the immaculate conception, by his encyclical of the Pope; by which three acts he threw, or represented by his establishment of the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope; which by three acts he threw, or at least endeavored to throw, the Church of Rome at least endeavored to throw, the Church of Rome her edicts needed any recognition or confirmation from the authorities of the State. It presupposes that Church and State move along pretty independently of each other; for in the territorial Church, from the period of the Reformation, ruled by the State, a placet would be as much out of place as in the Roman Church from the time of Gregory VII., and according to his ideas. Considering herself as the terrestrial plenipotentiary of God, the Roman-Catholic Church has never admitted that her edicts needed any recognition or confirmation from the State in order to become obligatory upon her members. On its contrary, the bull In Cana Domini, of 1568, excommunicates any one who in any way should try to prevent the publication and enforcement of a papal bull or decree. And, in his encyclical letter of 1861, Pius IX. denounced the placet as one of the great errors of the age. Nevertheless, it is of old date. The first traces of it are found in Spain, under the reign of Charles V.; and Philip II. maintained it with great vigor, and employed very severe measures when the bull In Cana Domini was published in Spain without his consent. In France it developed in connection with the parliaments and their right of registering laws. See fuente: "Tractatus de promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum" (Louvain, 1712); and Besier: "Spec. de juris placeti historia in Belgio" (Utrecht, 1848). In Germany, though in the period from the diet of Spires (1526) till the Westphalian peace (1648) the Empire took its stand very independently over against the Church, the placet remained a relation between the Church and the separate states, — Bavaria, Austria, Prussia, etc. See Friedberg: "Die Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche," Tubingen, 1872.

PIUS SOCIETIES are associations formed in Germany for the defence of the freedom and independence of the Roman-Catholic Church. The first society of the kind was formed at Mayence in March, 1848, consisting of five hundred members, and naming itself after the Pope. But the idea met with so much sympathy, that a general assembly at Cologne, in August, same year, no less than eighty-three such societies were represented. To make the Church entirely independent of the State, and absolutely authoritative in the school, was adopted by the assembly as the principal proposition of its programme. For more special purposes, branch societies with special names have been formed,—the Vincent Societies, for the inner mission; the Francis Xavier Societies, for missions among the heathen; the Canisius Societies, for pure and true education (in the Roman sense of the words); and others. General assemblies, developing the programme, and perfecting the organization, of the societies, meet almost every year; and their influence is strongly felt in the political world.

PLACEUS (Josua Laplace), b. in Bretagne, 1606; was in 1625 appointed preacher to the Reformed congregation in Nantes, and in 1632 (together with Amyraut and Capellus, who, like himself, were pupils of Camero), professor of theology at Saumur, where he d. Aug. 17, 1655. His Opera omnia appeared at Franeker in 1699, and at Aubenet in 1702, in 2 vols. quarto. His views of a mediate, not immediate, imputation of the sin of Adam, first developed in his De statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam (1640), caused considerable uneasiness in the Reformed Church. But when, in 1645, the synod of Clareond condemned those who denied the imputation of the sin of Adam, he defended himself as being not at all included under that verdict. After his death, however, the Formula consensus of 1675 presented a formal rejection of the views of Laplace and Amyraut, and, in general, of all the novelties of Saumur.

PLANCK is the name of two noticeable German theologians, father and son.—Gottlieb Jakob Planck, b. at Nürtlingen in Württemberg, Nov. 15, 1761; d. at Göttingen, Aug. 31, 1833. He studied theology at Tübingen, 1789—74, and was appointed professor at Stuttgart in 1797. He was a member of the commission of the Gallican theory and practice, see Van Espe: "Tractatus de promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum" (Louvain, 1712); and Besier: "Spec. de juris placeti historia in Belgio" (Utrecht, 1848). In Germany, though in the period from the diet of Spires (1526) till the Westphalian peace (1648) the Empire took its stand very independently over against the Church, the placet remained a relation between the Church and the separate states, — Bavaria, Austria, Prussia, etc. See Friedberg: "Die Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche," Tubingen, 1872.
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cal abbreviator by Pius II., and assistant librarian at the Vatican by Sixtus IV. At the instance of the latter, he wrote his *Opus in vitas summorum pontificum* (Venice, 1479) which, from the accession of Eugenius IV. to the death of Paul II., is a source. He also wrote a history of the city of Mantua, and other works. See D. G. MöLLER. *Dissertatione de B. Platina*, Altdorf, 1694.

**PLATONISM AND CHRISTIANITY.** "The peculiarity of the Platonic philosophy," says Hegel, in his *History of Philosophy* (vol. ii.), "is precisely this direction towards the supersensuous world,— it seeks the elevation of consciousness into the realm of spirit. The Christian religion has also set up this high principle, that the internal spiritual essence of man is his true essence, and has made it the universal principle."

Some of the early Fathers recognized, as they well might, a Christian element in Plato, and ascribed to him a kind of *propedieutic* office and relation toward Christianity. Clement of Alexandria's *prohymnion* was a sort of preliminary discipline (συνερχόμενος τον) for those who lived before the coming of Christ," and adds, "Perhaps we may say it was given to the Greeks with this special object; for philosophy was to the Greeks what the law was to the Jews,— a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ (Strom. 1, 104 A; cf. 7, 505, 526). "The Platonic dogmas," says Justin Martyr, "are not foreign to Christianity. If we Christians say that all things were created and ordered by God, we seem to enunciate a doctrine of Plato; and, between our view of the being of God and his, the article appears to make the only difference" (Apol., 2, 96 D, etc.). "Justin" (says Ackermann, in the first chapter of his *Das Christliche des Platonismus*, which is the leading modern work on this subject), "Justin was, as he himself relates, an enthusiastic admirer of Plato before he found in the gospel that full satisfaction which he had sought earnestly, but in vain, in philosophy. And, though the gospel stood infinitely higher in his view than the Platonic philosophy, yet he regarded the latter as a preliminary stage to the former. In the same way did the other apologetic writers express themselves concerning Plato and his philosophy, especially Athenagoras, the most spirited, and philosophically most important, of them all, whose *Apology* is one of the most admirable works of Christian antiquity."

The Fathers of the early church sought to explain the striking resemblance between the doctrines of Plato and those of Christianity, principally by the acquaintance, which, as they supposed, that philosopher made with learned Jews and with the Jewish Scriptures during his sojourn in Egypt, but partly, also, by the universal light of a divine revelation through the "Logos," which, in and through human reason, "lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and which illumined especially such sincere and humble seekers after truth as Socrates and Plato before the incarnation of the Eternal Word in the person of Jesus Christ.

Passages which bear a striking resemblance to the Christian Scriptures in their picturesque, para-\*bolic* manner, and which reflect the lofty moral, religious, and almost Christian sentiments which they express, are scattered thickly all through the Dialogues, even those that treat of physical, political, or philosophical subjects; and they are as characteristic of Plato as is the infinitely spiritual, and, for the person from whom they are clothed. A good selection of such passages may be seen in the introductory chapters of Ackermann's work on the Platonic Element in Plato. A still more copious and striking collection might be made. But we do not wish to rest our thesis upon single passages, which, of course, may be exceptional, or, if taken out of their connection, might be misunderstood. To preclude mistake, we must examine the Platonic philosophy itself in its principles and spirit.

1. Perhaps the most obvious and striking feature of it is, that it is pre-eminently a spiritual philosophy. Hegel, as we have seen, speaks of "this direction toward the supersensuous world," this "elevation of consciousness into the realm of spirit," as "the peculiarity of the Platonic philosophy." There is no doctrine on which Plato more frequently or more strenuously insists than this,— that soul is not only superior to body, but prior to it in order of time, and that not merely as it exists in the being of God, but in every order of existence. The soul of the world existed first, and then it was clothed with a material body. The souls which animate the sun, moon, and stars, existed before the bodies which they inhabit (Timaeus, passim). The pre-existence of human souls is one of the arguments on which he relies to prove their immortality (*Phaed.*, 73-76). Among the other arguments by which he demonstrates at once the immortality of the soul and its exalted dignity are these: that the soul leads and rules the body, and therein resembles the immortal gods (*Phaed.* 80); that the soul is capable of apprehending eternal and immutable ideas, and communicating with things unseen and eternal, and so must partake of their nature (*Ibid.*, 79); that, as consciousness is single and simple, so the soul itself is uncompounded, and hence incapable of dissolution (*78*); that soul being everywhere the cause and source of life, and every way diametrically opposite to death, we cannot conceive of it as dying, any more than we can conceive of fire as becoming cold (102-105); that soul, being self-moving, and the source of all life and motion, can never cease to live and move (*Phaedrus*, 245); that diseases of the body do not reach to the soul; and vice, which is a disease of the soul, corrupts its moral quality, but has no power or tendency to destroy its essence (*Repub.*, 610), etc. Spiritual entities are the only real existences: material things are perpetually changing, and flowing into and out of existence. God is: the world becomes, and passes away. The soul is: the body is ever changing, as a garment. Souls or ideas, which are spiritual entities, are the only true causes; God being the first cause why every thing is, and ideas being the second cause why things are as they are (*Phaed.*, 100 sq.). Mind and will are the real cause of all motion and action in the world, just as truly as of all human motion and action. According to the striking illustration in the *Phaedo* (98, 99), the cause of Socrates awaiting death in the prison, instead of making more sacrifices on his behalf as he had done, was that he chose to do so from a sense of duty; and, if he had chosen to run away, his
bones and muscles would have been only the means or instruments of the fight, which his mind and will would have been the cause. And just so it is in all the phenomena of nature, in all the motions and changes of the material cosmos. And life in the highest sense, what we call spiritual and eternal life, all that deserves the name of life, is in and of and from the soul, which makes the body only clogs and entombed (Gorg., 492, 493). Platonism, as well as Christianity, says, Look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporary (παρακολουθείτω), only for a season; but the things which are not seen are eternal.

2. The philosophy of Plato is eminently a theistic philosophy. "God," he says, in his Republic (716 A), "is (literally, κόσμος) the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things. He is the Supreme Mind or Reason, the efficient Cause of all things, eternal, unchangeable, all-knowing, all-powerful, all-pervading, and all-controlling, just, holy, wise, and good, the absolutely perfect, the beginning of all truth, the fountain of all law and justice, the source of all order and beauty, and especially the cause of all good" (see Philebus, Phaedo, Timaeus, Republic, and Laws, passim). God represents, in the language of the indictment at common law, he did it, "not having the fear of God before his eyes."

3. The Platonic philosophy is teleological. Final causes, together with rational and spiritual agencies, are the only causes that are worthy of the study of the philosopher: indeed, no others deserve the name (Phaed., 98 sqq.). If mind (νοῦς) is the cause of all things, mind must dispose all things for the best; and when we know how it is best for any thing to be made, disposed, then and then only, do we know how it is and the cause of its being so (Phaed., 97). Material causes are no causes; and inquiry into them is impertinent, unhistorical, not to say impious and absurd. Thus did Plato build up a system of rational psychology, cosmology, and theology, all of which are largely teleological, on the twofold basis of a priori reasoning and mythology, in other words, of reason and tradition, including the idea of a primitive revelation. The eschatology of the Phaedo, the Gorgias, and the Republic, is professedly a μορφή, though he insists that it is also a λόγος (Rep., 523) or a παλαιός λόγος (706). His cosmology he professes to have heard from some one (Phaed., 108 D); and his theology in the Timaeus purports to have been derived by tradition from the ancients, who were the offspring of the gods, and who must, of course, have known the truth about their own ancestors (40 C). Yet the whole structure is manifestly the work of his own reason and creative imagination; and the central doctrine of the whole is, that God made and governs the world with constant reference to the highest possible good; and "Ideas" are the powers, or, in the phraseology of modern science, the "forces," by which the end was to be accomplished.

4. The philosophy of Plato is pre-eminently ethical, and his ethics are remarkably Christian. Only one of his Dialogues was classified by the ancients as "physical," and that (the Timeus) is largely theological. The political Dialogues treat politics as a part of ethics,—ethics as applied to the State. Besides the four virtues as usually classified by Greek moralists,—viz., temperance, courage, justice, and wisdom,—Plato recognized as virtues humility and meekness, which the Greeks generally despised, and holiness, which they ignored (Euthyphron, passim): and he insists on the duty of non-retaliation and non-resistance as strenuously, not to say paradoxically, as it is taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Crit., 49). That it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong (cf. Republic, 808 C) is a prominent doctrine of the whole (Phaed., 106 D). But as the highest "idea" is that of the Good, so the highest excellence of which man is capable is likeness to God, the Supreme and Absolute Good. A philosopher, who is Plato's ideal
of a man, and, so to speak, of a Christian, is a lover of wisdom, of truth, of justice, of goodness (Repul, bk. vi., passion), of God, and, by the contemplation and imitation of his virtues, becomes like him as far as it is possible for man to resemble God (Rep., 613 A, B).

4. Plato is pre-eminently a religious philosopher. His ethics, his politics, and his physics are all based on his theology and his religion. Natural and moral obligations, social and civil duties, duties to parents and elders, to kindred and strangers, to neighbors and friends, are all religious duties (Laws, bk. ix., 881 A, xi., 931 A). Not only is God the Lawgiver and Ruler of the universe, but his law is the source and ground of all human law and justice. "The gods not only exist, but that they are good, and honor and reward justice far more than men do, is the most beautiful and the best preamble to all laws" (Laws, x. 887). Accordingly, in the Republic and the Laws, the author often prefaced the most important sections of his legislation with some such preamble, exhortation, or, as Jowett calls it, sermon, setting forth the divine authority by which it is sanctioned and enforced.

5. Plato gives prominence to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. At death, by an inevitable law of its own being, as well as by the appointment of God, every soul goes to its own place; the evil gravitating to the evil, and the good rising to the Supreme Good. When they come before their Judge, perhaps after a long series of transmigrations, each of which is the reward or punishment of the preceding, those who have lived virtuous and holy lives, and those who have not, are separated from each other. The wicked whose sins are curable are purified their hearts and lives by philosophy, will get rid of by bodily mortification, and by the history of the world.

6. Plato gives prominence to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. At death, by an inevitable law of its own being, as well as by the appointment of God, every soul goes to its own place; the evil gravitating to the evil, and the good rising to the Supreme Good. When they come before their Judge, perhaps after a long series of transmigrations, each of which is the reward or punishment of the preceding, those who have lived virtuous and holy lives, and those who have not, are separated from each other. The wicked whose sins are curable are purified their hearts and lives by philosophy, will get rid of by bodily mortification, and by the history of the world.

We have space only to allude to other characteristic features of Plato's philosophy, such, for example, as his doctrine of "ideas"—the True, the Beautiful, the Good, the Holy, and the like,—which, looking at them now only on the ethical and practical side, are eternal and immutable, and not dependent even on the will of God (the holy, for instance, is not holy because it is the will of God, but it is the will of God because it is holy, just, and good—Euthyd., 10 D); the indispensable necessity, in the teaching of Plato, of not saying better than human, society and government (like the ideal republic, which is not so much a state, as a church or a school, a great family, or a Man "writ large"), in order to the salvation of the individual or the perfection of the race; the degenerate, diseased, carnal, and corrupt state into which mankind in general have fallen since the reign of Kronos in the golden age (Laws, 713 C; Polit., 271 D; Crit., 108 D), and from which God only can save any individual or nation (Repul., bk. vi., 482, 489); and the need of a divine teacher, revealer, healer, charmer, to charm away the fear of death, and bring life and immortality to light (Phaed., 78 A, 859). And we can only advert to the radical defects and imperfections of Plato's best teachings,—his inadequate conception of the nature of sin as involuntary; the result of ignorance, a misfortune, and a disease in the soul, rather than a transgression of the divine law; his consequent erroneous ideas of its cure by successive transmigrations on earth, and protracted pains in purgatory, and by philosophy (an aristocratic remedy, in its nature applicable only to the favored few); his philosophy of evil, in the origin of evil (viz., in the refractory nature of matter, which must therefore be gotten rid of by bodily mortification, and by the death of the body without a resurrection, before the soul can arrive at its perfection; his utter inability to conceive of such a thing as an atonement, free forgiveness, regenerating grace, and salvation for the masses, a fortiori for the chief of sinners; the doubt and uncertainty of his best religious teachings; his ifs and whethers, especially about the future life (Apol., 40 E, 42; Phaed., 107 C); and the utter want in his system of the grace, even more than of the truth, that have come to us by Jesus Christ, for, after all, Platonism is not so deficient in the wisdom of God as it is in the power of God unto salvation. The Republic, for example, proposes to overcome the selfishness of human nature by constitutions and laws and education, instead of a new heart and a new spirit, by community of goods and of wives, instead of loyalty and love to a divine-human person like Jesus Christ. Baur (Socr. and Christ) does indeed find in the idealized Socrates of Plato an analogy (speculatively interesting, perhaps, but practically how unlike!) to the personal Christ, and in his " Ideas" a basis, more or less severe, and more or less protracted, according to their deserts. The incurably wicked are hurled down to Tartarus, whence they never go out, where they are punished forever (τῶν ὄντων πάνω) as a spectacle and warning to others (Gorgy., 523 sqq.; Phaed., 113 D sq.). The " Ideas" of the other kind, the " Ideas of the Good," the " Ideas of Justice," are introduced by Plato, and from which God only can save any individual or nation (Repul., bk. vi., 482, 489); and the need of a divine teacher, revealer, healer, charmer, to charm away the fear of death, and bring life and immortality to light (Phaed., 78 A, 859). And we can only advert to the radical defects and imperfections of Plato's best teachings,—his inadequate conception of the nature of sin as involuntary; the result of ignorance, a misfortune, and a disease in the soul, rather than a transgression of the divine law; his consequent erroneous ideas of its cure by successive transmigrations on earth, and protracted pains in purgatory, and by philosophy (an aristocratic remedy, in its nature applicable only to the favored few); his philosophy of evil, in the origin of evil (viz., in the refractory nature of matter, which must therefore be gotten rid of by bodily mortification, and by the death of the body without a resurrection, before the soul can arrive at its perfection; his utter inability to conceive of such a thing as an atonement, free forgiveness, regenerating grace, and salvation for the masses, a fortiori for the chief of sinners; the doubt and uncertainty of his best religious teachings; his ifs and whethers, especially about the future life (Apol., 40 E, 42; Phaed., 107 C); and the utter want in his system of the grace, even more than of the truth, that have come to us by Jesus Christ, for, after all, Platonism is not so deficient in the wisdom of God as it is in the power of God unto salvation. The Republic, for example, proposes to overcome the selfishness of human nature by constitutions and laws and education, instead of a new heart and a new spirit, by community of goods and of wives, instead of loyalty and love to a divine-human person like Jesus Christ. Baur (Socr. and Christ) does indeed find in the idealized Socrates of Plato an analogy (speculatively interesting, perhaps, but practically how unlike!) to the personal Christ, and in his " Ideas" a basis, more or less severe, and more or less protracted, according to their deserts. The incurably wicked are hurled down to Tartarus, whence they never go out, where they are punished forever (τῶν ὄντων πάνω) as a spectacle and warning to others (Gorgy., 523 sqq.; Phaed., 113 D sq.). The " Ideas" of the other kind, the " Ideas of the Good," the " Ideas of Justice," are introduced by Plato, and in places that are bright and beautiful beyond description. More solemn and impressive sermons were never preached in Christian pulpits than those with which Plato concludes such Dialogues as the Gorgias, the Phaedo, the Republic, and the Laws. We have space only to allude to other characteristic features of Plato's philosophy, such, for example, as his doctrine of "ideas"—the True, the Beautiful, the Good, the Holy, and the like,—which, looking at them now only on the ethical and practical side, are eternal and immutable, and not dependent even on the will of God (the holy, for instance, is not holy because it is the will of God, but it is the will of God because it is holy, just, and good—Euthyd., 10 D); the indispensable necessity, in the teaching of Plato, of not saying better than human, society and government (like the ideal republic, which is not so much a state, as a church or a school, a great family, or a Man "writ large"), in order to the salvation of the individual or the perfection of
of the Neo-Platonic and eclectic order who came in contact with Christianity and adopted its teachings, and whose influence was significant in the early Christian church. Among the early Christians, many leaders were educated at Oxford, were so intimately acquainted with the doctrines of Plato, and employed them as weapons for the defence and extension of Christianity, or, perchance, cast the truths of Christianity in a Platonic mould. The doctrines of the Logos and the Trinity received their shape from Greek Fathers, who were not trained in the schools, but who were much influenced, directly or indirectly, by the Platonic philosophy, particularly in its Jewish-Alexandrian form. That errors and corruptions crept into the church from this source cannot be denied. But from the same source it derived no small additions, both to its numbers and its strength. Among the most illustrious of the Fathers who were more or less Platonic, we may name Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Minutius Felix, Eusebius, Methodius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Augustine.

Plato was the divine philosopher of the earlier Christian centuries: in the middle ages Aristotle succeeded to his place. But in every period of the history of the church, some of the brightest ornaments of literature, philosophy, and religion,—such men as Anselm, Erasmus, Melanchthon, Jeremy Taylor, Ralph Cudworth, and Henry More,—have been "Platonizing" Christians.

of the Platonists made a very near approach to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Henry More went so far as to hold the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of human souls. But Neo-Platonism was studied and admired by some of the Cambridge Platonists, perhaps by all of them, even more than the unadulterated teachings of Plato himself; they Plotinized even more than they Platonized in their religious philosophy. More and Glanvil were carried away by a belief in ghosts and witches, which was a cross between Neo-Platonic demonology and modern spiritualism, but whose chief interest, to their minds, lay in the confirmation it lent to their faith in spiritual existences. They were all men of vast learning. They cumbered their pages with quotations, especially from Plotinus, Jamblichus, Proclus, and other Neo-Platonists; and so they were generally sadly deficient in the grace and beauty that shed such a charm over the writings of Plato. At the same time they were genuine disciples of Christ. They called no man master, but sat at the feet of Jesus for instruction, receiving the truth from his lips in a humble, believing, obedient spirit, and using reason and philosophy only to interpret that truth, and commend it to the understanding, love, and obedience of others.

Even such an exercise of reason in religion awakened jealousy and suspicion in the extremists, both on the Anglican and the Puritan side. They were known at the time as the “New Sect of the Latitude-men;” and their teaching was stigmatized as the “New Philosophy.” It was a re-action from the long prevalent and then generally accepted philosophy of Aristotle and the schoolmen. It was also a re-action against the High-Churchism of Archbishop Laud on the one hand, and, on the other, against the High-Calvinism represented by the Westminster Assembly. It was partly in sympathy with, and partly opposed to, the philosophy of Descartes. Above all, it was in direct antagonism to the thinly disguised Jansenism of Hobbes and Pufendorf, and to the unbelieving and licentious tendencies of the times, particularly after the Restoration.

Principal Tulloch, in the second volume of his Rational Theology in the Seventeenth Century, which is devoted to the Cambridge Platonists, characterizes the four leaders of the school as follows: Benjamin Whichcote, rationalist; Ralph Cudworth, Christian philosophy; and Philip Syng Particle, Bible's reason; and John Smith, foundations of a Christian philosophy; and inculcated earnestly the necessity of a righteousness that is not only legal, but ethical, imputed indeed, but also imparted, the gift of God, but not by any spiritual act of God, but not by his creative or regenerating power, but by his grace and the fruits thereof. They argued the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body, from the light of nature and the teachings of philosophy; and they looked at all these questions from the Platonic standpoint. They had “unshaped the spirit of Plato.” They translated his doctrines and arguments into the forms of modern thought. Cudworth’s “plastic, nature” is Plato’s “soul of the world” transmigrated into the seventeenth century: his treatise on Eternal and Immutable Morality is a metaphysiology of Plato’s Eternal and Immutable Ideas; and he maintains, that, in their three hypostases,—Monad or God, mind, and soul,—Plato and some of the Platonists made a very near approach to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Henry More went so far as to hold the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of human souls. But Neo-Platonism was studied and admired by some of the Cambridge Platonists, perhaps by all of them, even more than the unadulterated teachings of Plato himself; they Plotinized even more than they Platonized in their religious philosophy. More and Glanvil were carried away by a belief in ghosts and witches, which was a cross between Neo-Platonic demonology and modern spiritualism, but whose chief interest, to their minds, lay in the confirmation it lent to their faith in spiritual existences. They were all men of vast learning. They cumbered their pages with quotations, especially from Plotinus, Jamblichus, Proclus, and other Neo-Platonists; and so they were generally sadly deficient in the grace and beauty that shed such a charm over the writings of Plato. At the same time they were genuine disciples of Christ. They called no man master, but sat at the feet of Jesus for instruction, receiving the truth from his lips in a humble, believing, obedient spirit, and using reason and philosophy only to interpret that truth, and commend it to the understanding, love, and obedience of others.
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plitt, he asked Professor Plitt, his colleague,
to join him, as one eminently qualified by general
learning, tireless energy, executive ability, and
catholic sentiments. He lived, however, to see
only six volumes through the press, dying before
Dr. Herzog.

Professor Plitt, was, however, no mere student
and writer. He frequently preached with accept-
ance, and took great interest in missions, foreign
and domestic. In 1887 he succeeded Professor
Delitzsch as president of the Bavarian Society
for the Conversion of the Jews. He took a pre-

minent place in philanthropic work and in the
organization of the Christian Commission in the
Franco-Prussian war (1870-71). Consumption
first showed itself in the winter of 1874-75; and,
although able to work at times, he gradually suc-
cumbed to the disease.

F. FRANK.

PLUMER, William Swan, D.D., LL.D., Presby-
terian divine; b. in Greensburg (now Darlington),
Penn., July 29, 1802; d. in Baltimore, Md., Oct.
22, 1880. In the nineteenth year of his age he
was a pupil of the venerable Dr. McElhany of
Lewishburg, W. Va., with whom he pursued his
studies until he was prepared to enter Washing-
ton College, Lexington, Va., where he graduated.
He received his theological training at Princeton
Seminary; was licensed to preach by the presby-
tery of New Brunswick in 1826, and was ordained
by the presbytery of Orange County.

After several years of evangelical labor in North
Carolina, he returned to Virginia; and, after a short term of service in Prince Edward
County, he was called to Petersburg in 1831. He
removed to Richmond in 1834, to become the
pastor of the First Presbyterian Church. In the
thirteenth year of his labors in Richmond, he
accepted a call to the Franklin-street Church,
Baltimore, of which he had pastoral charge from
1847 to 1854, when he was elected to the chair of
didactic and pastoral theology in the Western
Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Penn. Ow-
ging to complications caused by the civil war,
his connection with the seminary having been se-
vered, in 1862 he supplied the pulpit of the Arch-
street Church, Philadelphia, until 1865, when he
accepted a call to the Second Presbyterian Church
of Pottsville, Penn. In 1867 he was elected to the
professorship of didactic and polemic theology in
Columbia Seminary, South Carolina; and, after
filling that chair for eight years, he was trans-
ferred, at his own request, to the chair of historic,
casistic, and pastoral theology, which position he
continued to hold until 1880, when he was made
professor emeritus by the board of directors.
After his connection with Columbia Seminary closed, he
continued to supply different churches in Balti-
more, and other cities and towns in Maryland,
until his labors were terminated by death.

This condensed enumeration of dates, and fields
of labor, illustrates not only the vicissitudes of
Dr. Plumer's life, and the versatility which char-
acterized him, but the important positions and
responsible trusts committed to him by the Great
Head of the church.

Dr. Plumer was a man of commanding personal
appearance. His manner in the pulpit was pecu-
larly impressive. There was a dignity, and even
a majesty, in his presence, that commanded atten-
dion.

He was a voluminous writer. He wrote a Com-
mentary on the Psalms, a Commentary on the
Epistle to the Romans, another on the Epistle to
the Hebrews, many practical works calculated

to establish the faith of believers, or to awaken
the impenitent, besides innumerable tracts for the
Presbyterian Board of Publication, for the Meth-
odist Book Concern of Nashville and of New
York, for the Board of Publication of the Re-
formed Dutch Church, for the Baptist Publica-
tion Society of Philadelphia, for the American
Sunday-school Union, and for the Presbyterian
Publication Committee of Richmond.

Some of these works were republished in
Europe: others were translated into German,
French, Chinese, and modern Greek. While
professor in the Western Theological Seminary,
he was also the successful pastor of the Central
Presbyterian Church of Alleghany. While pro-

fessor in Columbia, the church to which he min-
istered steadily grew in numbers, and was blessed
with precious revivals. While pastor in the city
of Richmond, he edited The Watchman of the
South.

The presidency of several colleges, and the se-
cretaryship of several of the boards of the church,
were at different times offered him; but he never
saw his way clear to accept any of these appoint-
ments. In 1838 Washington College (Pennsyl-
avania), Lafayette College (Pennsylvania), and
Princeton College, conferred upon him the title
of doctor of divinity; and in 1857 the University
of Mississippi conferred upon him the degree of
PLURALITIES.

1856

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

Doctor of laws. In 1877 Dr. Plumer was a delegate to the council of all the Presbyterian churches of the world, which met in the city of Edinburgh.

For more than forty years he was a contributor to the periodical press, and wrote a larger number of letters on subjects so varied and important. Moses D. Hoge.

PLURALITIES, a term (pluralitas) in canon law for the holding, by a clergyman, of two or more livings at the same time. The canon law forbids it; but Catholic bishops granted dispensations to commit the offence, until the general council of 1273, when the right was taken from them. The popes still claim this right. In England the power to grant dispensations to hold two benefices with the care of souls is vested in the monarch and in the Archbishop of Canterbury. By 13 and 14 Victoria, c. 98, the benefices thus held must not be farther apart than three miles, and the annual value of one of them must be under a hundred pounds.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN, so designated in the British Empire and America, upon the European Continent generally named "Darbies." (see App., Danks), are by themselves styled "Brethren." The characteristic of this school is an endeavor, in view of divided Christendom, to keep the unity of the Spirit. "That which characterized their testimony at the outset was the coming of the Lord as the present hope of the church, and the presence of the Holy Ghost as that which brought into unity, and animated and directed, the children of God... The heavenly character of the church was much insisted upon" (Darby's Collected Writings, vol. xx. p. 19).

The prophetic inquiry at the beginning of this century would explain their origin. Powerscourt Mansion, County Wicklow, Ireland, was a centre of such inquiry. It is to Ireland that we trace them earliest. About 1827 an ex-Romanist, the late Edward Cronin, gathered some sympathizers, ultimately at his residence in Lower Pembroke Street, Dublin, for "breaking of bread" every Sunday morning. Shortly afterwards another company was formed, which Cronin joined, at 9 Fitzwilliam Square: in this group, nucleus of the Brethren, the most prominent figure was the Rev. J. N. Darby. A pamphlet by Darby, On the Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ (1828), disturbed many minds in the Protestant churches, and swelled the Brethren's ranks; so that in 1830 a public "assembly" was started in Aungier Street, Dublin.

Amidst those early joining the movement was "the noble-hearted" Groves (Newman's Phases of Faith), who, however, left for Bagdad in 1829. To propagate his views, Darby in 1830 visited Paris, afterwards Cambridge and Oxford. At the last place he met with B. W. Newton, at whose request he went to Plymouth. "On arriving" Darby writes, "I found in the house Capt. Hall, who was already preaching in the village. We had reading-meetings, and ere long began to break bread." Their first meeting-place was called "Providentia Chapel;" the Brethren, accordingly, "Providente People;" but, preaching in country-places, they were there spoken of as "Brethren from Plymouth;" hence elsewhere, "Plymouth Brethren." The largest number ever in regular communion at Plymouth was a thousand, more or less. Amongst those that here embraced the "testimony" was the late S. P. Tregelles.

The title to communion originally, at Plymouth as in Dublin, may be gathered from Darby's Correspondence with Rev. J. Kelly (1839). He there writes of "real Christians," that "we should undoubtedly feel it wrong to shut them out," whatever their peculiarity of doctrine: "we receive all that are on the foundation, and reject and put away all error by the word of God and by the help of his ever-present Spirit." A notable instance had occurred of the excision of one, who, in the story of his religious opinions, has narrated his early connection with the Brethren amongst whom he sought to introduce heterodoxy as to Christ. The Brethren, however, have always restricted discipline, or departure from others, in respect of doctrinal error, to cases falling under the notice of S. J. John. Darby had written to him and to his synod, that "degeneracy claimed service, and not departure" (Ibid.). But there is enough evidence of sharp discipline from the outset to forbid the notion that the so-called "Exclusives" have later employed more stringent measures than was the wont of the Brethren at first: they may have become less consistent and systematic.

The Brethren had given practical expression to their views of ministry ere Darby's Christian Liberty of Preaching and Teaching the Lord Jesus Christ appeared in 1834. In the same year was begun the Christian Witness, for which Darby wrote, On the Character of Office in the Present Dispensation (1835), uprooting all official appointment. In the same periodical he wrote, On the Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations (1836).

We present an outline of these treatises:

"The old economy had fallen by the unfaithfulness of the covenant-people. The whole people was placed under the law, made responsible for its observance. As a whole, it apostatized. This is the ruin of the church. Every present ecclesiastical organization is abnormal; all Christendom obnoxious to judgment. According to Darby's tract, Sur la Form螚ation des Églises (1840) and sequel, there remains but l'apostasie fatale et sans remède. A new church organization supposes a new apostolate. Cf. his Reply to the Zionbote (vi. Jahrgang). All are rejected, Romanist and Protestant alike: they repose upon an unchristian sentiment. Unlike other separatists, Darby places dissenters' systems under the same ban as national churches; only he sees more corruption in the latter. He falls back upon la promesse du seigneur (Matt. xviii. 20), which provides a motto for the assemblies into which the church should resolve itself. Moreover, ecclesiastical office is impaired by the church's ruin. See a tract, On the Apostasy—Succession of? (1840); also Le Ministre considéré dans sa Nature, etc. (1843), and De la Présence et de l'Action du S. Esprit dans l'Église, etc. (1848). The acceptance of official ministry as medium between God and man ignores the privilege, enjoyed by every believer, of access to the throne of grace. There are, nevertheless, ministers in the word; because, without such,
Christ's work would have been imperfect: he has intrusted to man the word of reconciliation. This is not a particular office (charge): service in the word is the faithful exercise of a spiritual gift, something divine, for which the individual concerned is responsible to Christ alone. There are many such gifts. Every believer possesses, besides the general gift (toga of the Spirit), a special gift (ἐκφαντάζομαι), which he should exercise for the good of the assembly. The Spirit distributes these gifts eisókhs peirasítai. It may be difficult to comprehend how Darby could reconcile this scheme with that of a church in ruins. Has Christendom all the χαράκτηρα, like the apostolic church? The difference between gift and office, and in a difference of gifts, some of which, sign-gifts, were withdrawn through the Lord's displeasure. The minutes of gifts have no organic connection with the offices of elders, bishops, and deacons, which do not affect the dispensation, but concern the external order of the assembly and the care of its temporal affairs; yet he would not deny that those, as Stephen, who held office, might also have gifts, fruit of the Spirit's free action, whilst the office was of apostolic appointment, no longer available. Since the decease of the last apostle, of Timothy or Titus, apostolic delegates, no one has had titles. From all church officers, believers must separate, to unite with assemblées de culte.

Kelly explains, that "separation" does not mean entire secession from the church. In 1839 Darby wrote, "I should think it a great sin to leave a church of God because corruption were found in it" (c.f. supra). Kelly says, "If there be acceptance of evil in its confession or conduct, separation from evil according to Scripture is imperative;" and, further, that "what is erroneous and slanderous system is to the same extent dangerous to the church. In 1839 leave a church of God because corruption were found in it" (c.f. supra). Kelly says, "If there be acceptance of evil in its confession or conduct, separation from evil according to Scripture is imperative;" and, further, that "what is erroneous and slanderous system is to the same extent dangerous to the church.

The Brethren presented an unbroken front until 1845, when Darby, at the request of one of the leaders at Plymouth, repaired thither, only to have his solicitude for a consistent testimony exercised by the relapse of Newton, residing there. The spell that had held the Brethren together was broken by "the spirit of clericalism" (Miller), which sprang up at Plymouth. Newton had from the first isolated himself. Darby says, "I sorrowed over this unhappy trait of isolation, love of acting alone, and having his followers for himself; but I had no suspicion of any purpose, bore with it. . . . As to the teaching I heard in Ebington Street from Mr. Newton, the one undeviating object seemed to be to teach differently from what other Brethren had taught, no matter what, so that it set their teaching aside" (Narrative of Facts). And Trotter: "The system thus introduced . . . was directed to the undermining of all the truth by which God had acted on the souls of Brethren, and to the setting-up afeather in other form all that had been denounced. The real unity of the church as one body, indwelt and governed by the Holy Ghost, was annihilated, and so was the presence and sovereign rule of the Holy Ghost in the church was substituted the authority of teachers. There was also the endeavor to form a party distinguished by Mr. Newton's views of prophecy and church order, to which the appellation 'the truth' was arrogated." Newton impeded an investigation, treating it as an attempt by a rival to "thwart and spoil his plans." He suppressed a long-standing weekly church-meeting. On Nov. 17 Darby publicly accused him of moral dishonesty, and, unable otherwise to effect a renovation, on Dec. 28 started a separate assembly. The breach spread to other places. Lord Congleton withdrew from fellowship at Rawstone Street, London, because it upheld Darby's action; but he would not, as Tregelles at Plymouth, support the Newtonian programme.

Since 1848 the position taken by Darby has been placed in a clear light. The points in dispute, so far, had concerned the ecclesiastical testimony, the raison d'être of the Brethren: the precise standpoint of their chief representatives was not yet brought into relief. Harris, having in 1847 acquired some notes of a lecture by Newton which contained teaching subversive of Christ's work, as to our Lord's person, exposed the evil. Christ "was represented as born at a distance from God; involved in the guilt of the first Adam, because he was born of a woman; and under the curse of the broken law, because of his association with Israel" (Miller). The next year "the rulers of Bethesda," Bristol,—strictly a Baptist congregation, but associated with the Brethren,—"received to the Lord's table several of Mr. Newton's partisans, known to hold his heresy. . . . Faithful men on the spot protested, and entreated that such doctrine should be judged, and its teachers put out of communion. Their remonstrances being unheeded, they were obliged to withdraw from communion at Bethesda; one of them printing a letter explanatory of his reasons for seceding. This brought forth a paper signed by ten chief persons at Bethesda, vindicating their conduct" (Ibid.). This is known as The Letter of the Ten. The ground taken was this: "Supposing the author of the tracts were fundamentally heretical, this would not warrant us in rejecting those who come from under his teaching, until we were satisfied that they had imbibed views essentially subversive of foundation truth; and no one defending or upholding Mr. Newton's views should be received into communion." At a church-meeting in July, George Müller, one of the leaders, demanded the confirmation by the Brethren of this letter. "The majority acquiesced, and assumed a neutral position. The question was fairly raised as to whether Brethren were really gathered . . . as independent congregations. . . . Several meetings throughout the country followed the example of Bethesda, while others [countenanced by Darby] maintained the position they had previously occupied" (Ibid.). The seceders, and all linked with them, obtained the name of "Exclusives." While rigidly excluding all on Bethesda ground, they freely receive into communion Christians, as well members of the Established Church as nonconformists, subject to objection raised either of ungodly life or radical error. The explanation is this: the neutral Brethren . . . by not the presence of the Holy Ghost, profess to be one body: in receiving a single member from a body that professes to be a unit, the whole body, sound or unsound, is in principle received. But in the Church of Eng-
land, and in the various forms of dissent, no such position is assumed " (Ibid.). The motto of the open Brethren became, "The blood of the Lamb is the union of saints." With this compare Darby's "Sufferings," where the contrast is drawn between the unity of God's saints on one foundation,—and that in the blood,—and latitudinarianism. The "Exclusives" have zealously guarded the balance of truth by not so employing 2 John as to contravene Rom. xiv., xv. But thenceforth they definitely proclaimed "separation from evil as God's principle of unity." Many companies of the Brethren followed Müller. The assembly at Vevey, amongst others, was affected by Newton's doctrine, and divided; but an increasing number have carried on the testimony under Darby's guidance. Thus was made a fresh start, with accession from this time of doctrinal intelligence and definiteness. The original Christian Witness was in 1849 revived by The Present Testimony, still conducted by Mr. Kelly. To each of these serials Darby contributed largely. No further rupture occurred until after the publication of Darby's "Sufferings of Christ. The author had entered upon ground previously fatal to others. He held that our Lord passed through certain non-atoning sufferings in consequence of the position he had taken voluntarily in Israel, in fulfilment of some psalms, and as typical of the tribulation of the godly "remnant" in the last days. Some, unable to distinguish between this doctrine and that already condemned, raised a storm against Darby (1869), withdrawing from communion; but no division ensued.

Between 1878 and 1881 a second great breach rent the Brethren, completed in Darby's lifetime. A "gathering" at Ryde failed to deal with depravity in gremio. Warnings from Brethren elsewhere seemed futile; but all recognized its status. Headless of this, an old associate of Darby, desiring to set the matter right, visited the place, only to inaugurate a new assembly. Some members of the old one at Temperance Hall, his act was resisted by Darby as a breach of unity; and discipline was called for against the offender. The Brethren at Kennington, London, where the latter lived, were slow to judge his misdeed. The leaders of Park Street, another London meeting, directed the crusade against him: hence a second division of the Brethren, solemn as the former,—a departure from Park Street, London, for having thrown its mantle over Guildford Hall, Ramsgate, as before from Bethesda, Bristol, the champion of Ebrrington Street, Plymouth. The rejecters of Guildford Hall follow Kelly: the others, since the decease of Darby,—just a year after this event,—have been without an estimable leader. Each side charges the other with "Independency." A further disintegrating movement had been at work, with small result. Another Irish ex-clergyman, Samuel O'Malley Cluff, brought up against him a doctrine of sanctification akin to that of R. Pearsall Smith of America, and called "Death to Nature," antithode to Laodicean religion, by Cluff supposed to prevail amongst them. This was refuted and condemned by Darby. Cluff and his followers quietly seceded.

Thus the Brethren have resolved themselves into the following sections:

1. The so-called "Exclusives" in three branches, (a) the followers of the late J. N. Darby, committed to his ecclesiastical course,—the convocation of the church; (b) The followers, since 1881, of W. Kelly, characterized by a general adherence to Darby's views, but with a tendency to deny all infallibility,—the church from a Pauline point of view, modified by Johannine elements; (c) The followers of Cluff, with a special scare of Laodicea. 2. Bethelists, neutral, open Brethren, like Darby's; 3. Bristol,—pronounced leanings to Baptist views, and upholding independency in discipline. 3. Newtonians, with leanings to Reformists, denouncing prophetic views peculiar to their leader. They, too, maintain that the church is fallen.

Of the body of doctrine of which the first-mentioned class are the special representatives, we subjoin a further synopsis:

The Godhead. — They maintain the Catholic doctrines.

Human Nature. — Adam was first sinless, not virtuous, or holy. The fall introduced unqualified ruin.

Person of Christ. — The Catholic doctrine.

Election. — As regards the doctrine of grace, they hold a modified Calvinism, denying as well freewill as reprobation, and proclaim an unlimited gospel. Election regarded as esoteric.

Justification. — The righteousness in which the believer stands is God's own: distinction between active and passive obedience of Christ demijohn; the basis of justification laid in Christ's death alone. State of Grace. — There is for the child of God "full assurance," not alone moral certainty: it is a question of nature.

Believer eternally accepted, delivered from the wrath to come. Grace, available by prayer, the only power for holiness of life. While he is bound to do good works, neglect thereof, most surely followed by discipline, does not alter his status. Self-abasement and confession of sin insinuate sense of divine forgiveness. Christ's own priesthood preserves from sin; his advocacy restores. The cleansing of sin by Christ's blood once for all accomplished; cleansing by water (the Word) company formed out of the "remnant." Scriptures. To impugn the inspiration or authority of the Protestant Bible is fatal. Every believer, a saint to begin with, sanctified practically in the truth.

Sacrifices. — They hold to (a) Baptism, as to that of infants they differ, Darby having been a Pneumatobaptist; (b) Lord's Supper, celebrated weekly. Discipline. — V. supra, and cf. Darby's "Collected Writings," vols. i., xiv. The Church. — Their doctrine is "essential to a full understanding of Brethren's position." Non-existence of the church before Pentecost. Viewed from God's side, it is the body of Christ, the Spirit's workmanship, intact; from man's side, the house of God, human workmanship, marked by failure, distinct from the "kingdom." Worship. — Of the simplest kind. No music, hymns (from a prescribed collection), praise, and prayer, as the Spirit leads. Cf. Kelly's Lecture (1870) and Reply to Rees, vindicating their practice: also his "Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer," for their disuse of the latter, conceived to be a symbol of the position and desires of the Jewish "remnant." Eschatology. — Distinction between the "second coming" of Christ to gather his saints, the "rapture" (initial translation), and his appearing for judgment (eschaton); the day of the Lord," generic. No triumphal entries will pass through the "tribulation." Premillennial advent; personal reign of Christ upon, that of the church over, the earth for a thousand years. Israel restored and converted; Christ's earthly Bride to...
administer his government of the nations under millennial position after the judgment of the wicked dead, the living nations having been judged at the beginning of the Messianic reign. The immortality of the soul vindicated as well by Darby (Collected Writings, vol. x.) as by F. W. Grant of America. Endless punishment: cf. Darby's Elements of Prophecy, Kelly's Lectures on the Minor Prophets and Revelation, as to the Renewal of the Roman Empire, Antichrist, etc.

Their testimony is in the main as to the church, without neglect of evangelization. For their attitude towards ecclesiastical communities in general, see Darby's Considerations on the Religious Movement of the Day (1879), cf. his Evangelical Protestantism and the Biblical Studies of M. Godet (1875). National churches they regard as too broad; nonconformity, as too narrow. Naturally the Evangelical Alliance has not their support. They hold the Holy Spirit's presence in the church to be characteristic of this dispensation. "Their appreciation," says Bledsoe, "of the Holy Spirit's presence, power, and guidance, is the grand and distinctive character of their theology."

In 1879 Miller wrote as follows: "In the United States 91 meetings have sprung up of late years; in Canada there are 101 meetings; in Holland, 39; in France, 103; in Switzerland, 72; in the United Kingdom, about 730, besides twenty-two countries where the meetings vary from 1 to 13." In 1883 we find Brethren already in India. Bishop Wilson of Calcutta employed a charge to his clergy for an attack upon them. In 1879, Miller: Lettres des Brethren, London, 1875, 2d ed., 1876; Bledsoe: A Brief Exposition of the Doctrines of Plymouth Brethren, London, 1884; Godet: Études de la religion d'Abel Farajji, Tunis, 1885; Wigram: The Present Question, 1848–49; Trotter: The Whole Question of Plymouth and Bethesda; Memoir of A. N. Groves, 1856; Godet: The Church of Old, London; Groves: Darbyism, its Rise and Development, Bristol, 1867; W. Reid: Literature and History of the so-called Plymouth Brethren, London, 1875, 3d ed., 1876; Bledsoe: Art. in Southern Review, Baltimore, 1877 (April); Miller: The Brethren, Their Rise, Progress, and Testimony, London, 1879; Taylor: History and Doctrines of the Plymouth Brethren, London, 1888.

E. E. Whittfield, M.A. (Oxf. member Brethren).


E. E. Whittfield, M.A. (Oxf. member Brethren).

POCOCOCK, Edward, D.D., Orientalist; b. at Oxford, 1694; d. 1701. He was educated at Oxford; elected fellow of Corpus Christi College, 1682; chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, 1630–38 (during which time he made a collection of Greek and Oriental manuscripts and coins on commission of Archbishop Laud); professor of Arabic at Constantinople, to seek for manuscripts, 1637–39; rector of Childrey, Berkshire, 1643; re-instated in his chair, 1647; professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church, 1648; and in spite of bigoted and prejudiced opposition from Roundheads, and the indifference of Cavaliers, he retained these positions till his death. He was one of the foremost Orientalists in his day. His works are numerous and valuable. His Theological Works were published in 2 vols. folio, London, 1740; with a Life by the editor, Leonard Twells. They embrace Porta Musiv (a Latin translation of Maimonides' six discourses prefatory to his Commentary upon the Mishna, 1655). English Commentaries upon Hosea (1855), Joel (1691), Micah and Malachi (1877), and a Latin treatise upon ancient weights and measures. The Commentaries formed part of Fell's projected Commentary upon the entire Old Testament. They are heavy and prolix, but learned. Pocock took a prominent part in Walton's Polyglot, furnished the collations of the Arabic Pentateuch, and was consulted by Walton at every step. (See Polyglot Bibles.) He translated Grotius' De rerum Christianae religionis (1680) and the Church-of-England Liturgy and Catechism into Arabic (1674). His chief work was his edition of Gregorii Abul Farajji historia dynastiarum, Oxford, 1663, 2 vols., Arabic text with Latin translation. For Pocock's life, see Theological Works mentioned above.

PODIEBRAD, George of, a Bohemian noble (b. 1420), who by energy and capacity rose to such importance, that, in the abeyance of the Bohemian kingdom, he was made governor in 1432. On the accession of Ladislas (in 1492) he remained the chief person in the kingdom, and on the death of Ladislas (in 1457) was elected King of Bohemia by the Diet. The reign of King George (1457–71) marks the decisive period in the religious history of Bohemia. The Hussites had been in a manner reconciled to the church by the Compacts made with the Council of Basel. On the dissolution of the council, the Papacy neither accepted nor disavowed the Compacts. Pocock first endeavored, and hoped to foster a Catholic re-action within the land, which would slowly bring back Bohemia to Catholicism. Podiebrad was the great opponent of this policy, and was the greatest statesman of his age in Europe. He wished to unite Bohemia, and organize it into a great power. This was impossible, so long as Bohemia was rent by religious discord, and, through want of Papal recognition, was isolated from European politics. Podiebrad could not make peace with the Papacy without losing his hold on Bohemia: he could not attack the Papacy without losing his political position in Germany. He accordingly engaged in negotiations with the Papacy, and skilfully managed to lead the Popes, Calixtus III. and Pius II., to think that he was more compliant than he really was. Every mark of confidence which they showed he promptly used to assure his political position abroad. On 10th of October, 1644, he refused to acknowledge him, and was the centre...
of a Catholic opposition. At last Podiebrad's diplomacy came to an end. His influence was alarmed at his increasing influence in 1462 disclaimed the Compacts, and demanded Podiebrad's unconditional obedience. At first Podiebrad temporized, then aimed a mighty blow at the Papacy. He proposed to the various courts of Europe the summoning of a parliament of temporal princes to discuss European affairs. His proposal was not agreed to, and Pius II. excommunicated him as a heretic in 1464. The death of Pius II. in the same year left the Bohemian question to a more determined but less politic pope, Paul II. Paul II. did not hesitate to abandon Bohemia to the horrors of a civil war. The war that followed was not a religious war: it was a war of conquest on the part of King Mathias. Still Podiebrad was not conquered, and died vic- torious in 1471. Nor did Mathias gain his object. His proposal was not agreed to, and Pius II. temporized, then aimed a mighty blow at the Papacy from its crusading policy, which was the one point in which it could stand at the head of Europe.


POETRY. Hebrew. See Hebrew Poetry.

POHLMAN, William John, Reformed Dutch missionary; b. at Albany, N.Y., 1812; drowned at Breach's Point, between Hong Kong and Amoy, China, Jan. 5, 1849, while sailing as missionary to Amoy. He was graduated at Rutgers College, 1834, and at the New-Brune- wick Theological Seminary, 1837; sailed as missionary to Borneo, May 25, 1838. In 1844 he was transferred to China, where, with Rev. David Abel (see art.), he established the Amoy mission.

POIRES, Pierre, b. at Metz, April 15, 1646; d. at Rheinsburg, near Leyden, May 21, 1719: the only real mystic among the French Reformed theologians. He was first apprenticed to a wood-carver, but went in 1664 to Basel, to study theology, and was in 1668 appointed preacher at Heidelberg, and in 1673 at Anwerp. Having been driven away from Anwerp, in 1676, by the war, he resided for several years in Holland and at Hamburg, until he, in 1688, retired to Rheinsburg, where he spent the rest of his life. He had studied Tauler and Thomas à Kempis, and lived in intimate friendship with Antoinette Bourignon and other mystics; his theosophy was based on sentiment, raising him above the differences of churches and creeds. His principal works are, L'économie divine, Amsterdam, 1687, 7 vols.; La paix des bonnes âmes (1687); Les principes solides de la religion (1709). He translated into Latin, Dutch, and German. He also translated the maxims of Jacob Boehme in Latin, and edited the works of Madame Guyon. [An English translation of his Divine Economy appeared Lond., 1713, 6 vols.] C. SCHMIDT.

POISSY, Conference of, 1561. To Catherine of Medici, regent of France, the death of her son, Charles IX., it appeared altogether necessary to bring about some kind of reconciliation between her Roman-Catholic and her Reformed subjects. The latter were numerous, powerful, and influential; but the very sympathy which they met with, even in the highest ranks of society, made it seem probable, that, with a little adroitness, the differences might be bridged over. A conference between the two parties was decided upon; and Poissy, an abbey in the neighborhood of St. Germain, where the court resided, was chosen as the place of meeting. On Sept. 9, 1561, the first session was held, in the presence of the king, the queen, the princes and princesses of the royal house, and a great number of the highest dignitaries of the crown, gentlemen and ladies. The Roman Catholics were represented by the cardinals of Tournon, Lorraine, Chatillon, Armagnac, Bourbon, and Guise, the archbishop of Bourdeaux and Embrun, and thirty-six bishops; the Reformed, by thirty-four delegates, among whom were Beza and Peter Martyr Vermigli. The conference was opened by a speech of the chancellor, L'Hôpital, which showed the Reformed that they did not meet their adversaries, as they had demanded and expected, on exactly equal terms; but which also showed the Roman-Catholic prelates that they were not simply sitting in judgment, "for their verdict would have no effect if it were not found perfectly impartial and just." The word was then given to Beza. He appeared at the bar in the noblemen's black dress of the day; and, when he knelt down to pray,—the prayer which is still used in the French Reformed Church at the opening of divine service,—the queen also knelt, and the cardinals arose and uncovered. He made a long speech, and gave a succinct representation of the Reformed faith, in order that people might understand both the points of difference and the points of agreement between the Reformed and the Roman-Catholic churches. The speech was cool and calm and conciliatory; and it was listened to with breathless attention, its delivery being disturbed only at one single point. When Beza, in developing the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, used the expression that the body of Christ was as far from the bread as the highest heavens are from the earth, Cardinal Tournon jumped to his feet, and cried out, "Blasphem mixture!" and such a tumult arose among the prelates that the queen herself had to interfere, and impose quiet. Beza, however, remained calm, and continued his speech, which the next day was printed, and distributed by the thousands among friends and foes. On Sept. 16 the second session was held. Cardinal Lorraine answered Beza. His speech was proud, but adroit and loveable; he dwelt on transubstantiation and the mass; and, when he spoke of the bodily presence, he used terms which remind one of those of Luther. But he
refused to give the Reformed, or anybody else, a copy of his speech; and the Roman-Catholic prelates, throughout the discussion in public. The following sessions (Sept. 24, 26, etc.) were consequently held in private; only the princes and the prelates and the Reformed delegates being present. In the session of Sept. 26, Cardinal Lorraine very cunningly proposed that the Reformed should subscribe the Confessio Augustana; it was, indeed, his general policy to show off the difference which existed within the Protestant camp. But the Reformed as cunningly met the feint, urging that it would be of no use for them to subscribe the Confessio Augustana unless the Roman Catholic also subscribed. In the same session a mixed committee was formed, and charged with the drawing-up of a formula consensus, which should be accepted by both parties. The committee actually succeeded in arriving at an agreement; and its formula consensus, though very vague and ambiguous, was accepted, not only by the court, but also by Cardinal Lorraine, who declared "that he had never had another faith." The doctors of the Sorbonne, however, rejected the formula as heretical; and, in the session of Oct. 6, the Roman-Catholic party presented a strict Roman confession, which they demanded that the Reformed should subscribe. In the final session of Oct. 17 they went even farther, and demanded that all the churches and all the church-property which the "heretics" had taken possession of in the various provinces should be restored. During the month which the conference lasted, a re-action took place in favor of the Roman Catholics. The financial pressure finally compelled the king to yield to their demands. He needed money, and the Roman-Catholic clergy was the only body within the state rich enough to furnish the funds. Nevertheless, the Conference of Poissy gave the Protestants of France an opportunity of publicly vindicating their religious views; and the edict of Jan. 17, 1562, formally recognized the Protestant religion, so far as it gave the Protestants a right to meet for worship unarmed, and outside of walled cities. See Polen: Geschichte des franz. Calvinismus, 1857, 2 vols.; Fuau: Histoire de la religion (Stanislaus Lutormiski), and found many adherents in the country. Dantzitz exposed the cause of Luther in 1518; and, though fearfully punished in 1526 by Sigismund I., it could not be made to submit. Most of the great cities, both in Poland Proper and in Lithuania, followed the example; and when, in 1529, a papal legate undertook, in accordance with a royal decree, to publicly burn the works of Luther at Thorn, he was stoned out of the city. In 1544 the Swiss Reformation was first made known in the country (Stanislaus Latischinski), and found many adherents, especially among the nobility; and in 1556 John a Lasco began his great work of organizing the Evangelical Church of Poland. Meanwhile the Roman Catholics were forming a national church. They found an energetic and able leader in Hosius, Bishop of Breslau, afterwards of Ermeland. Nevertheless, they could not prevent the diet of
POLLE, Reginald, Archbishop of Canterbury; b. probably in Lordington, Sussex, March, 1500; d. at Lambeth, Nov. 18, 1558. His mother was a niece of Edward IV., and governess of the eldest daughter of Henry VIII. Pole was brought up at the king's expense, educated at Oxford, although vacillating upon other points, he always held firmly to the defence of the papal authority, although he was not ordained until his elevation to the archiepiscopal throne. In 1520 he was sent to Italy to continue his studies; returned, 1523. In 1528 Henry used him as agent to procure from the Paris university a favorable opinion upon the divorce from Catherina of Aragon. In order to avoid any public expression of opinion upon the matter, on his return he retired to the monastery at Shrew, and there prosecuted theological studies. In 1531 he declined the archbishopric of York, and in the next year left England. In 1535, on the king's demand for a definite expression of opinion upon the divorce and upon the king's supremacy over the church, he wrote De unione ecclesiae, in which he not only uttered a judgment adverse to the king upon both, but heaped abuse upon his opponents. The book, of course, filled Henry VIII. with astonishment and rage. He ordered Pole to appear in person before him to answer for his deed. This Pole declined to do, but told the king to reply to the book if he pleased; and the Bishop of Durham undertook the task. Pole's motive in thus bringing forward the introduction of the papal authority was, he knew, there was much dissatisfaction in England with Henry's doings: he hoped to head the party to put Edward IV. on the throne, and thus bring England on the side of the emperor. He probably also desired to marry the cousin of the emperor, the Princess Marie, the daughter of Catherina of Aragon. On the day of the introduction of the Pope, Paul III.; made a cardinal; sent (1537) as legate to the Netherlands, and given much to do in preparing the revolt which was to dethrone Henry. The scheme came to nothing; and Pole found himself generally considered as a traitor, and as such he was mistrusted by both Francis I. and Charles V. The Pope, however, treated him kindly, and sent him (June, 1538) as legate to Toledo, and later (1541) to Viterbo. In the autumn of that year Henry VIII. took Pole's commission as legate to England (the Countess of Salisbury) and his brothers into prison, and in 1541 executed them all, except the youngest brother, on charge of treason. In 1554, on the coronation of Mary, Pole returned to England as legate; entered heartily into the work of restoring the papal authority in England; was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury (March 22, 1558), and during his brief authority put to death as heretics five bishops, twenty-one priests, eight nobles, eighty-four artisans, a hundred peasants, twenty-six women; removed the bones of Peter Martyr Vermigli from Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, to unconsecrated ground; exhumed the bodies of Butzer and Fagius, which had long rested in Cambridge, and burnt them. Yet Pole had been himself charged with heresy. To him it had been attributed the famous book Del beneficio di Gothi Christi confessione. He was more than suspected of maintaining the Lutheran justification by faith; and his election as pope, on the death of Paul III. (1549), when he really had received the majority of votes, was prevented by the charge of heresy brought by his foe, Caraffa; and, when the latter became Paul IV. (1555), he withdrew Pole's commission as legate to England (May, 1557), and summoned him to Rome to appear before the tribunal of the Inquisition. Death intervened before the order could be obeyed, but the Inquisition called him a heretic. Carneascelli says of Pole, that "in Rome he was considered a Lutheran, in Germany a papist, at the Flemish court to belong to the French party, at the French court to the imperial party." It was characteristic of him to try to please all parties. But, although vacillating upon other points, he always held firmly to the defence of the papal authority, and to his desire to bring England in unconditional surrender to the Continen. He seems not to have realized what he could to bring this policy into action; but the temper of the English people, the death of Charles V., and the fanatical zeal of the Pope, must have opened his eyes to its impossibility.

most effect. And again: conscious method is the beginning of science; not that polemics, though practised with great skill as an art, ever in antiquity developed into a systematic theory, a science; science is reached that stage; and it was not until the Reformation had furnished new and violent impulses, that the need of a complete theory of the art of polemics was felt. Hints of the kind are scattered through the works of Martin Chemnitz, Bellarmin, Hulin, and others; but the Jesuits were the first to give systematic representations of the method of polemics: hence they were called "Methodists." The Protestants followed the example, and a considerable literature soon grew up. See Abraham Calovius (Synopsis controversiarum, 1855) on the Protestant side, and Vitus Pichler (Theologia polemica, 1738) on the Roman-Catholic side. By Schleiermacher, finally, polemics was incorporated with the theological system as a part of philosophical theology. See his Darstellung des theologischen Studiums (Berlin, 1811), and more especially the work of his disciple, Sack: Christlied Polemik (Bonn, 1838).

As the systematization of the various theological systems has varied, the place of polemics in the system has, of course, also varied. See Pelz: theolog. Encyclop., Hamburg, 1843; and J. P. Lange: Christl. Dogmatik, Heidelberg, 1849-52, 3 vols., etc. Such a change, however, does not materially alter its scientific character.

POLENTZ, George of. See George of Polentz.

Poliander, Johann, b. at Neustadt, in the Palatinate, 1457; d. in Königberg, 1541. He studied at Leipzig; was rector of the Thomas school there, 1516-22, and acted as secretary to Eck during his famous dispute with Luther, in 1519, but was converted by Luther's argument, embraced the Reformation, and was in 1525 appointed preacher in Königberg, where he spent the rest of his life. He was very active in introducing the Reformation in Prussia, and is the author of the celebrated hymn, Nun lob mein Heil'gen, etc.

POLITY, as applied to the church, means government or administration of the church, so far as it fixes it, both in its pontifical and in its church history, at 166; Jerome, at 167. In the chronology appendix to the Acts, Statius Quadratus is mentioned as proconsul of Asia; and, in his Chronicle and in his church history, at 166; Jerome, at 167. In the chronology appendix to the Acts, Statius Quadratus is mentioned as proconsul of Asia; and, in his Chronicle and in his church history, at 166; Jerome, at 167.
Selvissimply statethat the martyrdom took place on a series of ingenious hypotheses. Quadratus, of the school of Irenaeus, was first published in Latin by Faber Stapulensis while Anicetus was bishop; and it rests merely on a series of ingenious hypotheses. Quadratus was only mentioned in the chronological appendix, and that appendix is most probably a later and consequently worthless addition. The Acts themselves simply state that the martyrdom took place on Saturday, the 10th of Nisan; and the 16th of Nisan was a Saturday, both in 186 and in 155.

Of the letters of Polycarp, all have perished, with the exception of one to the Philippians. It was first published in Latin by Faber Stapulensis (1498), then in Greek by Halloix (1633), and afterwards often: the best edition is that by Zahn. As it contains a direct reference to the letters of Ignatius, all critics who reject those letters as spurious have tried to make its genuineness suspected. It was known, however, to, and accepted by, Irenaeus, Eusebius, and Jerome; and it is difficult to understand how a spurious letter of Polycarp could have been brought into general circulation at the time when Irenaeus wrote (about 180), and still more difficult to understand how it could be accepted by him, the pupil of Polycarp.

Polycarpus was one of the most prominent of the exegetes of the Antiochian school. Of his life nothing further is known. He wrote Commentaries on Job, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But, though he was never formally condemned, he was nevertheless considered a heretic; and of his Commentaries, only fragments appear side by side. They have existed from very early times, perhaps from the period immediately following the return from the Babylonish captivity, when there are traces of a combination of the original Hebrew text and a Chaldean Targum. There is, in the Barberini Library at Rome, a Samaritan Pentateuch Triglot, which dates from the middle age, and contains the original Hebrew text, the same translated into the Samaritan dialect of the first Christian century, and also into Arabic. In respect to the New Testament, the necessities of the peoples to whom the gospel was carried obliged early translations from Greek, and led to the separation of diatogs, in which were the original text and the vernacular version. Of this class there are some of which E. Caesare (the name Complutensian), from 1513 to 1517, 6 vols, folio), one of the rarest and most famous of printed works, prepared, under the care of Cardinal Ximenes (d. 1517, see art.), by famous scholars, among whom the work was thus divided: the Hebrew and Chaldee texts were edited by three converted Jews, Alphonso of Alcala, Paul Coronell of Segovia, and Alphonso of Zamora; the Greek and Latin texts, by Demetrius Dukas of Crete, Elias Antonius of Lebrixa, Diego Lopez de Zuniga (Stunica), Fernando Nunez de Guzman, and others. Begun in 1502, in celebration of the birth of an heir to the throne of Castile, Charles V. (Feb. 24, 1500), it was carried through the press of Arnaudo Guillermo de Brocario, at Alcala de Henares, the Complutum (the name of the name Complutensian), from 1513 to 1517, but not published until 1520, by special permission of Pope Leo X. (March 22, 1520). The delay enabled Erasmus to have the glory of editing the first Greek Testament published (1516). The Complutensian Polyglot is in six folio volumes, one to the Old Testament; the fifth, the New Testament (the printing of which was finished Jan. 10, 1514,
the type is large and peculiar); and the sixth, a Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon, with grammars, etc. (This volume was printed second, and was later separately published under title Alphonsi Zan- moriensis Introductiones hebraice. Complutum, 1523 and often.) The entire work of printing was stopped in 1562, and 10 folio volumes were published. Nothing is known respecting the manuscripts from which the work was derived, and the principles upon which it was given, (1) The Hebrew text of the Old Testament; (2) The Targum of Onkelos to the Pentateuch; (3) The Septuagint; (4) The Vulgate; (5) The Greek New Testament. (This position of the Vulgate the editors "compare to the position of Christ as crucified between two thieves,—the un-believing synagogue of the Jews, and the schismatical Greek Church.") The Targum and Septuagint are accompanied by literal Latin translations. The Septuagint then appeared for the first time, and not very correctly; but the Vulgate had often been printed previously, and the Hebrew titles were in Greek. It was greatly to be desired that there was definite information respecting the manuscripts from which the work was derived, and the principles upon which it was carried on. Nothing is known respecting the manuscripts for the Greek New Testament, except that they were from the Vatican Library, judging from the character of the text, were late, and, after use, were returned.1 The New-Testament Greek differs considerably from Erasmus', but little more correct, and presents some egregious defects, especially in the Apocalypse. Of the Polyglot, six hundred copies were printed, three upon vellum.

II. THE ANTWERP POLYGLOT (Antwerp, 1569-72, 8 vols. folio), also called Biblia Regia (Royal Bible), was ultimately issued at an expense to Philip II. of Spain of two thousand ducats yearly. Its originator was Christophe Plantin, the famous Antwerp printer, who, perceiving that the cost could not be borne by him, applied to the king. The latter not only cheerfully responded, but sent Benedict Arias Montanus (see Arias) from Spain to Antwerp to superintend the undertaking. Among his assistants were Andre Maes (Masius), Guido and Nicolaus Fabricius, Augustinus Hunnaeus, Cornelius Gudanus, Johann of Haarlem, and Franz Raphelang, Plantin's son-in-law and successor. This Polyglot, besides all that is in the Complutensian, presents Chaldee Targums upon the whole Old Testament (except Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles), and the Peshito with Latin translation: the latter is printed both with Syriac and Hebrew letters. Five of the eight volumes contain the texts; two, a Hebrew lexicon by Santes Pagninus, a Chaldee Syriac lexicon by Guido Fabricius, a Syriac grammar by Masius, a Greek vocabulary, grammar, a number of archaeological treatises under allegorical names by Arias, and, moreover, a number of brief philological and critical notes. The last volume contains a reprint of the Hebrew and Greek texts (except the Apocrypha), with an interlinear translation, which is partly the Vulgate, and partly the version of Pagninus, corrected by Masius, and printed several times. It was made by Louis XIV. a councillor of state on Dec. 16, 1645, but was dismissed in 1657, when the number of councillors was reduced; and died July 10, 1674. During his lifetime (1669) three Dutch printers issued some copies of his Polyglot, with a new titlepage, and a dedication to Pope Alexander VII., as if it were a new work.

The new title calls it Biblia Polyglotta. For an account of the Paris Polyglot, see Le Long: Discours historiques sur les principales editions des Bibles Polygiottes, Paris, 1713, pp. 104-204.

IV. THE LONDON POLYGLOT (London, 1654-57, 6 vols. folio) is the most important, the most comprehensive, the most valuable (critically speaking), and the most widely spread of the Polyglots. It was edited by Brian Walton, printed by Thomas Roycroft, and dedicated, first to Oliver Cromwell (1657, these are the so-called "Republican" copies), and then afresh (1680), in different language, to Charles II. (these are the so-called "Loyal" copies, and are by far the more numerous). Cromwell practically proved his interest in Walton's scheme by allowing the paper for it to be imported free of duty,—a service acknowledged in the original preface. In the "Loyal" copies, however, this acknowledgment is withdrawn, and Cromwell is spoken of as "the great Dragon." It was published by subscription,—probably the first work in England so published,—at ten pounds a set. Twelve copies of the Polyglot were printed upon large paper. Walton had the assistance of all the learned men in Eng-

---

1 Tregelles, Printed Text, etc., pp. 15-18, gives an official list of manuscripts used in the other parts of the Polyglot.
POLYGLOT BIBLES

land, particularly the Orientalists, of whom the most famous were Edmund Castell (Castellus), Edward Pocock, Thomas Hyde, Dudley Lofftus, Abraham Wheelock, Thomas Graves (Gravina), and Samuel Clark (Clericus). It is said that an offer was made Le Jay for six hundred copies of his (Paris) Polyglot at half-price, for circulation in the London Polyglot; and that after this offer, that the plan of a polyglot which should greatly exceed the Paris in convenience and value, but be much less expensive, was formed. The first four volumes contain the Old Testament in the following forms: Hebrew text, with the Antwerp Latin interlinear; the Samaritan Pentateuch; the Septuagint, from the Roman edition of 1587, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus; the fragments of the Itala, collected by Flaminius Nobilius; the Vulgate according to the Roman edition, with the corrections of Lukas of Brugge; the Peshito, with translation of some Syriac apocrypha, — a much better text than the Paris; the Arabic version; the Targums from Buxtorf's edition; the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch; and, finally, Psalms and Canticles in Ethiopic. All these texts other than the Vulgate are accompanied by Latin translations, and appear side by side. In the fourth volume are the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan and of Jerusalem, upon the Pentateuch, and also a Persian translation of the same book. The New Testament is in the fifth volume. The Greek text is that of Stephen's folio of 1550, with critical apparatus, including the readings of Codex A, D (1), D (2), Stephen's margin, and eleven cursive manuscripts collated by or for Archbishop Ussher, and furnished with Arias's Latin translation. Besides the Greek original, are the Peshito, Vulgate, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions, for the Gospels also a Persian version; each with a literal Latin translation. The sixth volume contains various readings and critical remarks. The whole work is appropriately introduced by Walton's Prolegomena, in which the subjects of Bible text and versions are discussed with marked ability; indeed, this part was repeatedly separately published (e.g., Leipzig, 1777, ed. J. A. Dathe; Cambridge, 2 vols., ed. F. Wurcz, 1796, folio; and, finally, such curiosities as the Lord's Prayer in a hundred and fifty languages, edited by Chamberlayne, 1718; J. Adelung's Mikrotaides (Berlin, 1806-17, 4 vols.), in which it appears in nearly five hundred languages and dialects; and H. Lambec's Psalm 104 im Urtext mit seiner Uebertragung in 11 Sprachen als Specimen einer Psalm-Polyglotte (Köthen, 1888).

POLYTEHISM.

The principal question relating to this subject is that of the origin of polytheism. The circumstance that polytheism so often has developed into pantheism, as, for instance, among the Hindus and the Greeks, seems to designate it as the primitive form of all religion; so that even the biblical monotheism might be considered as having grown up from it. The Bible itself, however, is far too different from containing such a view. Neither Gen. iv. 26, nor Exod. vi. 3, contains any reference to a previous polytheism. Neither the Pentateuch nor the prophets show the least trace of an original polytheism. Jehovah-Elohim was with the patriarch before as after Noah; and it was he who revealed himself on Mount Sinai, and made his sole worship the first commandment. The polytheism of heathendom is, indeed, in the Bible, considered a desertion from the one true God. The narrative in Gen. xi. of the building of the Tower of Babel, and the divine judgment which befell that undertaking, is a record of the separation, not only of languages and nations, but also of religions, and has been so considered by the earliest Christian writers (Orig. contra Celsum, i. v.; August. De civ. Del. vi. 6) and by the latest (Schevilling: Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie; Kuntz: Geschichte des alten Bundes; Kaufen: Die Spracherreinigung zu Babel, 1861; M. A. Strobel: Die Entstehung der Völker, 1868). Further on in the Old Testament, the gradual development of polytheism from the primitive monotheism may be learned from the history of Abraham; for El Shaddai of the Midianite heathenism, strove to keep his people from the abomination of ancestral worship, shows that all spirit-worship presupposes a supreme spirit, without which the whole spirit-world would perish at once. See E. Faber: Introduction to the Science of Chinese Religion, Hong Kong, 1878; and J. Happel: Die chinesische Reichsreligion, Leipzig, 1882. Still more untenable, and still more insufficient to explain the facts of history, proves, on closer examination, the third theory,—the so-called Sabeism, or star-worship. It was first set forth by the French astronomer Dupuis, in his Origine de tous les cultes, ou Religion universelle, Paris, 1794, 12 vols.; and it has afterwards been adopted, under various modifications and restrictions, by nearly all philosophers who have engaged in the study of religion with an astronomical basis, such as the Babylonian, Phenician, and others. It is evi-
POOMFRET.

POOLE.
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POMFRET, John, a moral and sacred poet; was b. probably at Luton, Bedfordshire, 1671, and d. in London, 1708; educated at Cambridge, and held the living of Malden, Bedfordshire. His Poems appeared 1699, 10th ed., enlarged, 1736. Southey called him "the most popular of the English poets," and said, "Perhaps no composition in our language has been oftener perused than Pome's Choice." F. M. BIRD.

POMPONATIUS, Petrus, b. 1462; d. 1524; descended from a noble family in Mantua; studied philosophy and medicine at Padua; taught afterwards there, and at Ferrara and Bologna; and was one of the most celebrated teachers of philosophy in his time. From Aristotle he drew conclusions which stood in direct opposition to the tenets of Christianity; but he escaped ecclesiastical interference by declaring that his propositions were true only in philosophy, and that personally he accepted the revealed and inspired truth of religion and science; and his views found great favor in his time. His principal works are, De immortalitate animae (in which he denies the immortality of the soul on philosophical grounds, while he accepts it as a revealed truth), De incantationibus, and De fato, both of which stood in direct opposition to the church. Thus he established a conscious and sharply defined antagonism between faith and intellect, religion and science; and his views were demonstrably ancient; and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, was by far the grossest and most corrupt." A penetrating criticism of Sabeism shows, that, behind the star-worship, there always stands a derivative form of monotheism, heathenism, which again refers back to a pure, primitive monotheism. See MAX MÜLLER: Introduction to the Science of Religion, London, 1873; and L. KRUMMEL: Die Religion der Arier nach den indischen Vedas, Heidelberg, 1881. ZÖCKLER.

PONTIFICALdenotes any thing belonging to the Bishop of Rome; and Pontifical, from the vestments he is to wear, to the rites he has to perform. In order to establish uniformity throughout the church, Clement VIII. charged a committee with drawing up a regulative in accordance with the best information on the subject which could be obtained; and on Feb. 10, 1556, the Pontificale Romanum was formally confirmed. The Pope also ordered that it should never be changed; but the printing of it was so careless, that, in 1644, Urban VIII. had to issue a new official edition of it.

POOLE, Matthew, b. at York, Eng., 1624; educated at Emmanuel College, in Cambridge; he became minister of St. Michael-le-Quernes, London, in 1648, and devoted himself to the Presbyterian cause. In 1654 he published The blasphemer slain with the sword of the Spirit, against John Biddle, the chief Unitarian of the time. In 1658 he published a Model for the maintaining of Students, and rates, best Constitution at the universities. In the same year he published Quo Warranto; or, a moderate inquiry into the warrantableness of the preaching of unordained persons. In 1662 he was ejected from his charge, for nonconformity, and devoted himself to bibli- cal studies. The fruit of these was produced, in 1668, in the Synopsis Criticorum (6 vols. folio), a monument of biblical learning which has served many generations of students, and will maintain its value forever. Many subsequent editions have been published at Frankfort, Utrecht, and elsewhere. He was engaged, at his death, on English Annotations on the Old Testament, and proceeded as far as Isa. lviii. His friends completed the work; and it was published (London, 1685, 2 vols. folio), and passed through many editions. Poole also took part in the Romish Controversy, and published two very effective works: The Nul- lity of the Romish Priest, with the Doctrines which have proceeded from thence, etc. (London, 1696), and Dialogues between a Popish Priest and an English Protestant (1867). On this account he was greatly hated by the Papists, and his name was on the list of those condemned to
death in the Popish Plot. He retired to Amsterdam, and died in October, 1679. Few names will stand so high as Poole's in the biblical scholarship of Great Britain. See Non-Conformist Memorial, London, 1862, i. p. 167, and an account of the life and writings of Matthew Poole, in the Ann. of the Congr. vol. iv., Edinb., 1861. C. A. Briggs.

POOR, Daniel D., Congregational missionary; b. at Danvers, Mass., June 27, 1789; d. at Mempo, Ceylon, Feb. 2, 1855. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1811, and Andover Seminary, 1814; sailed from Newburyport, Mass., for Ceylon, Oct. 23, 1815; returned home in 1849; went back to Ceylon, 1850. He was very successful in missionary labor. From 1823 to 1836 he was in charge of the mission seminary at Baticotta; from 1836 to 1841, at Madura on the mainland, where, in his first year, he opened thirty-seven schools. From 1841 to his death, he labored in Ceylon. See Sprague: Annals of the American Pulpit, ii. 617.

POOR MEN OF LYONS. See WALDENSES.

POPE, The. The word "pope" is the Latin papa, from the Greek πατρας, and means "father." It was anciently given to all Christian teachers, then to all bishops and abbots, then limited to the Bishop of Rome and the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. In the Greek Church to-day it is the customary address of every secular priest. The name appears, as first applied to the Bishop of Rome, in the letter of a deacon, Severus, to Marcellinus (296-304); was first formally adopted by Siricius (Bishop of Rome from 384 to 398), in his Epist. ad Orth. prot.; officially used since Leo I. (440-461); and declared the exclusive right of the papacy by the decree of Gregory VII. (1073-85).

Besides this title, the Pope is called Pontifex Maximus (literally, "chief bridge-builder"), in imitation of the Roman emperors, who united civil and religious functions; Vicar of St. Peter (Boniface, in 722, named the Pope this); Vicar of Jesus Christ, or of God (so, first, Innocent III., 1198-1216). The popes since Gregory I. (900-4) call themselves Servant of the servants of God (Servus servorum Dei).

The Pope dresses ordinarily in a white silk cassock and rochet: hence the expression "white pope," in contrast to the "black pope," the general of the Society of Jesus. Over this white dress he throws a scarlet mantle. When celebrating mass, he changes his gown according to the season of the church year: thus at Whitsuntide he wears a red; on Easter-Eve, black; at Easter, white; in Lent and Advent, violet. His insignia consist of the pallium (see art.) which the Pope alone can wear on all occasions, the metropolitansin only in their dioceses; the straight staff (pedum rectum), without a crook, surmounted by a cross; and the tiara, a mitre (see art.) surrounded by a triple crown. He receives the latter at his coronation, from two cardinal deacons, who put it on his head, saying, "Receive the tiara ornamented by the three crowns, and know that you are the father of bishops and kings, the earthly governor of the world, the vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be honor, world without end." The official letters of the Pope are briefs or bulls (see art.).

"The Pope, as head of the church, acts successively as Bishop of Rome (the diocese compr-
461-468  . . . . Hilarious.
468-483  . . . . Simplicius.
483-492  . . . . Felix III.
492-496  . . . . Anastasius II.
496-498  . . . . Symmachus.
498-514  . . . . Peter, Sept. 17
514-523  . . . . John I.
523-526  . . . . Pelagius II.
528-530  . . . . Boniface III.
530-532  . . . . Boniface IV.
532-534  . . . . Leo II.
534-555  . . . . Vigilius.
535-537  . . . . Boniface V.
537-555  . . . . Pelagius I.
555-560  . . . . John III.
560-574  . . . . Honorius I.
574-577  . . . . John IV.
577-585  . . . . Leo III.
585-586  . . . . Benedict II.
586-590  . . . . John V.
590-593  . . . . Paschal.
593-595  . . . . Sergius II.
595-599  . . . . Constantine I.
599-602  . . . . Leo IV.
602-608  . . . . Saint Martin I.
608-610  . . . . Eugenius I.
610-613  . . . . Vitalianus.
613-616  . . . . Adeodatus.
616-619  . . . . Donus or Donatus I.
619-622  . . . . Leo II.
622-626  . . . . Benedict III.
626-629  . . . . Benedict IV.
629-632  . . . . Leo III.
632-638  . . . . Sergius III.
638-640  . . . . Stephen II.
640-642  . . . . Stephen III.
642-646  . . . . Paul I.
646-648  . . . . Leo IV.
648-652  . . . . Stephen IV.
652-655  . . . . Adrian I.
655-657  . . . . Leo V.
657-659  . . . . Stephen V.
659-663  . . . . Leo VI.
663-665  . . . . Stephen VI.
665-669  . . . . John V.
669-672  . . . . Paschal I.
672-674  . . . . Leo VI.
674-676  . . . . Hadrian III.
676-680  . . . . Stephen IX.
680-683  . . . . Leo VII.
683-685  . . . . Benedict II.
685-687  . . . . Paschal II.
687-689  . . . . Martin I.
689-691  . . . . Leo VIII.
691-693  . . . . Stephen VII.
693-695  . . . . Hadrian II.
695-697  . . . . Leo IX.
697-699  . . . . Alexander III.
699-701  . . . . Hadrian III.
701-703  . . . . Stephen IX.
703-705  . . . . Leo X.
705-707  . . . . John XI.
707-709  . . . . Urban II.
709-711  . . . . Constantine II.
711-713  . . . . Gregory II.
713-715  . . . . Gregory III.
715-717  . . . . Zacharias.
717-720  . . . . Calixtus II.
720-722  . . . . Theodoricus.
722-725  . . . . Leo X.
725-728  . . . . John XII.
728-730  . . . . Calixtus III.
730-733  . . . . Urban III.
733-736  . . . . Clement IV.
736-738  . . . . Maximilian.
738-741  . . . . Boniface VIII.
741-743  . . . . Alexander IV.
743-745  . . . . John XXIII.
745-747  . . . . Avignon.
747-749  . . . . Urban IV.
749-751  . . . . Clement V.
751-753  . . . . John XXII.
753-755  . . . . Urban V.
755-757  . . . . Clement VI.
757-759  . . . . Boniface IX.
759-761  . . . . Alexander V.
761-763  . . . . John XXIII.
763-765  . . . . John XXII.
765-767  . . . . Urban V.
767-769  . . . . Clement VI.
769-771  . . . . Avignon.
771-773  . . . . Urban V.
773-775  . . . . Clement VI.
775-777  . . . . Avignon.
777-779  . . . . Urban V.
779-781  . . . . Clement VI.
781-783  . . . . Avignon.
783-785  . . . . Urban V.
785-787  . . . . Clement VI.
787-789  . . . . Avignon.
789-791  . . . . Urban V.
791-793  . . . . Clement VI.
793-795  . . . . Avignon.
795-797  . . . . Urban V.
797-799  . . . . Clement VI.
799-801  . . . . Avignon.
801-803  . . . . Urban V.
803-805  . . . . Clement VI.
805-807  . . . . Avignon.
807-809  . . . . Urban V.
809-811  . . . . Clement VI.
811-813  . . . . Avignon.
813-815  . . . . Urban V.
815-817  . . . . Clement VI.
817-819  . . . . Avignon.
819-821  . . . . Urban V.
821-823  . . . . Clement VI.
823-825  . . . . Avignon.
825-827  . . . . Urban V.
827-829  . . . . Clement VI.
829-831  . . . . Avignon.
831-833  . . . . Urban V.
833-835  . . . . Clement VI.
835-837  . . . . Avignon.
837-839  . . . . Urban V.
839-841  . . . . Clement VI.
841-843  . . . . Avignon.
843-845  . . . . Urban V.
845-847  . . . . Clement VI.
847-849  . . . . Avignon.
849-851  . . . . Urban V.
851-853  . . . . Clement VI.
853-855  . . . . Avignon.
855-857  . . . . Urban V.
857-859  . . . . Clement VI.
859-861  . . . . Avignon.
861-863  . . . . Urban V.
863-865  . . . . Clement VI.
865-867  . . . . Avignon.
867-869  . . . . Urban V.
869-871  . . . . Clement VI.
871-873  . . . . Avignon.
873-875  . . . . Urban V.
875-877  . . . . Clement VI.
877-879  . . . . Avignon.
879-881  . . . . Urban V.
881-883  . . . . Clement VI.
883-885  . . . . Avignon.
885-887  . . . . Urban V.
887-889  . . . . Clement VI.
889-891  . . . . Avignon.
891-893  . . . . Urban V.
893-895  . . . . Clement VI.
895-897  . . . . Avignon.
897-899  . . . . Urban V.
899-901  . . . . Clement VI.
901-903  . . . . Avignon.
903-905  . . . . Urban V.
905-907  . . . . Clement VI.
907-909  . . . . Avignon.
909-911  . . . . Urban V.
911-913  . . . . Clement VI.
913-915  . . . . Avignon.
915-917  . . . . Urban V.
917-919  . . . . Clement VI.
919-921  . . . . Avignon.
921-923  . . . . Urban V.
923-925  . . . . Clement VI.
925-927  . . . . Avignon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pope</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1227–1241</td>
<td>Gregory IX.</td>
<td>1280–1285</td>
<td>Alexander V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>Celestine V.</td>
<td>1285–1287</td>
<td>Martin IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245–1247</td>
<td>Benedict IV.</td>
<td>1288–1292</td>
<td>Honorius VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248–1254</td>
<td>Alexander IV.</td>
<td>1294–1303</td>
<td>Boniface VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254–1261</td>
<td>Urban IV.</td>
<td>1303–1304</td>
<td>Benedict XI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262–1263</td>
<td>Clement IV.</td>
<td>1306–1307</td>
<td>John XXII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265–1268</td>
<td>Clement V.</td>
<td>1314–1316</td>
<td>John XXII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268–1271</td>
<td>Gregory X.</td>
<td>1316–1323</td>
<td>John XXII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>Innocent V.</td>
<td>1324–1327</td>
<td>Urban V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276–1277</td>
<td>John XXI.</td>
<td>1347–1349</td>
<td>Nicholas V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280–1289</td>
<td>Benedict XII.</td>
<td>1353–1358</td>
<td>The See vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289–1303</td>
<td>Alexander V.</td>
<td>1362–1370</td>
<td>Urban V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303–1314</td>
<td>Clement VI.</td>
<td>1370–1378</td>
<td>Gregory XI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314–1316</td>
<td>Alexander V.</td>
<td>1378–1389</td>
<td>Urban VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316–1334</td>
<td>Innocent VI.</td>
<td>1388–1391</td>
<td>Clement VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328–1334</td>
<td>Urban V.</td>
<td>1391–1404</td>
<td>Boniface IX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1346–1348 | Eugene IV.            | 1349–1352 | Benedict XIII (deposed)
| 1349–1352 | Felix V.              | 1352–1362 | Alexander V.          |
| 1353–1362 | Calixtus IV.          | 1362–1370 | Urban V.              |
| 1358–1364 | Pius II.               | 1370–1378 | Gregory XI.           |
| 1364–1370 | Pius II.               | 1378–1389 | Urban VI.             |
| 1378–1389 | Clement VII.          | 1389–1394 | Boniface IX.          |
| 1391–1404 | Benedict XIII (deposed) | 1399–1400 | Innocent VII.         |
| 1399–1400 | Innocent VII.         | 1400–1409 | Gregory XII (deposed) |
| 1400–1410 | Alexander V.          | 1410–1415 | John XXIII (deposed)  |
| 1417–1423 | Martin V.             | 1421–1423 | Clement VIII.         |
| 1424–1429 | Eugene IV.            | 1433–1443 | Martin V.             |
| 1435–1447 | Nicholas V.           | 1443–1455 | Calixtus IV.          |
| 1448–1464 | Pius II.               | 1456–1464 | Sixtus IV.            |
| 1466–1471 | Pius II.               | 1471–1484 | Innocent VIII.        |
| 1472–1484 | Pius II.               | 1484–1492 | Innocent VIII.        |
| 1489–1493 | Alexander VII.        | 1492–1503 | Julius II.            |
| 1492–1503 | Alexander VII.        | 1503–1513 | Julius II.            |
| 1503–1513 | Julius II.            | 1513–1521 | Leo X.                |
| 1513–1521 | Hadrian VI.           | 1521–1523 | Clement VII.          |
| 1523–1524 | Clement VII.          | 1524–1549 | Paul III.             |
| 1546–1555 | Julius III.           | 1555–1559 | Paul IV.               |
| 1555–1560 | Julius III.           | 1559–1565 | Paul IV.               |
| 1559–1565 | Julius III.           | 1565–1572 | Pius IV.               |
| 1565–1572 | Julius III.           | 1572–1584 | Gregory XIII.         |
| 1584–1590 | Sixtus V.              | 1590–1600 | Gregory XIII.         |
| 1590–1600 | Gregory XIV.          | 1600–1601 | Clement VIII.         |
| 1601–1605 | Clement VIII.         | 1605–1608 | Pius VII.             |
| 1608–1611 | Pius VII.             | 1611–1617 | Alexander VII.        |
| 1617–1621 | Alexander VII.        | 1621–1625 | Alexander VIII.       |
| 1625–1628 | Alexander VII.        | 1628–1633 | Alexander VIII.       |
| 1633–1644 | Urban VIII.           | 1644–1655 | Innocent X.           |
| 1644–1655 | Innocent X.           | 1655–1667 | Alexander VII.        |
| 1657–1668 | Clement IX.           | 1667–1689 | Clement X.            |
| 1669–1689 | Clement X.            | 1689–1691 | Alexander VII.        |
| 1691–1700 | Alexander VIII.      | 1700–1712 | Clement XI.           |
| 1701–1712 | Clement XI.           | 1712–1749 | Innocent XIII.        |
| 1721–1749 | Benedict XII.         | 1748–1758 | Clement XII.           |
| 1759–1771 | Benedict XIV.         | 1761–1774 | Clement XIV.           |
| 1775–1790 | Pius VI.              | 1789–1803 | Pius VII.             |
| 1803–1823 | Pius VII.             | 1823–1829 | Leo XII.              |
| 1829–1833 | Pius VIII.            | 1833–1846 | Gregory XVI.          |
| 1846–1878 | Pius IX. (longest reign). | 1877–1878 | Leo XIII.             |

**POPE, Alexander, b. in London, May 21, 1688; d. at Twickenham, May 30, 1744; ranks as a sacred poet in virtue of his Messiah (1712), Universal Prayer (1732), and Dying Christian to his Soul (1712). The last-named, however little fitted for worship, has been constantly included in hymn-books; and extracts from the other two have sometimes been thus used. The Universal Prayer, which has offended many, is prized by others as one of the noblest of religious lyrics.**

**F. M. BIRD.**

**PORDAGE, John, one of the founders of the Philadelphia Society (see art.). b. in London, 1808; d. there 1892. He studied theology and medicine at Oxford; was curate at Reading, and then rector at Bradfield in Berkshire. Influenced by the works of Jacob Boehme (see art.), he advocated fantastic notions, by which he attracted a little group of disciples, and also reverse criticism, the result of which was his deposition from the ministry. Pordage and the little company moved from Bradfield to London. In 1655 the plague drove them out of the city, and they went back to Bradfield; returned again to London, 1670, and remained there permanently. It was in the latter year that Jane Leade (see art.) founded the Philadelphia Society, which met in Pordage's house. Pordage was their seer, and derived his teachings from revelations. He distinguished four kinds of revelations by the Spirit: (1) Visions, the lowest degree, — mere heavenly shapes, images, and forms which are spiritually perceived by the inner sense of man by the operation of the Holy Ghost; (2) Illuminations, by which the human spirit becomes aware, as if by a ray of divine light falling upon it, of the meaning of the Eternal Spirit; (3) Immediate translations of the spirit of the soul into the principium (God), when it beholds the secrets of the Trinity according to 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; (4) The descent of the Holy Spirit into the soul, completing its regeneration, strengthening its illuminated condition, and opening to the soul the glory of the New Jerusalem. He endeavored to popularize and expound Boehme's teaching. He taught, among other things, that God created eternal nature out of the eternal nothing, or chaos, and put in it all the forces by which, later on, the worlds were made. Nature is composed of the four eternal elements, — fire, water, air, and earth: "These are the materials of the substance of eternal nature." In the body of the same are the elements, salt, fire, water, and oil, light, air, a crystal, transparent earth, and a fifth substance, which results from the interworking of all these elements. Out of the "four eternal elements" and the three eternal principia (phosphorus, salt, mercury) was the angelic world.
brought in an instant at the divine command. It has three divisions,—the external court, the inner court, and the Holy of Holies. It is made up of a heaven and an earth; but, instead of sunlight, it has the ineffable light of the Trinity, and, instead of stars, many "powers," which have a certain independent existence. The angels consist of three eternal things,—spirit, soul, and love. It was the disturbance of the harmony between these that caused the fall of a part of the angels. Their fall was the occasion for a new step in creation. They fell into a hell of their own making; for, having broken through the band of eternal nature, the element of fire asserted itself, and enclosed them. They have a "tincture" by which they destroy human souls. As the opposite to the fallen angels' world, God made a world of light and love, called in Scripture "paradise." By wisdom (sophia) the first Adamic man was made out of the substance of all things. He was bisexual; but out of him, by the "female tincture," Eve was formed.

PORTOPPIDAN, Erik Ludvigsen, b. at Aarhus, Denmark, Aug. 24, 1838; d. in Copenhagen, Dec. 20, 1794. He studied theology in Copenhagen, visited Holland and England, and was appointed professor of theology in Copenhagen, 1783, bishop of Bergen in Norway, 1787, and chancellor of the university of Copenhagen in 1755. While tutor in the house of the Duke of Holstein-Ploen, he came in contact with the pietist movement of Halle; and he represents that movement in the history of the Danish Church. He wrote an explanation of Luther's Catechism, which was generally used as a text-book in Denmark and Norway till the second decade of the present century: _Mendoza_, a theological romance in 3 vols., 1742-43; _Annales ecclesiae danicae_, 4 vols. in quarto, 1741-53, etc. He also wrote, and not without success, on history, geography, natural science, and political economy.

PORPHYRY. See NEO-PLATONISM.

PORTER, Ebenezer, D.D., Congregationalist; b. at Cornwall, Conn., Oct. 5, 1772; d. at Andover, April 8, 1834. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1792; ordained, Sept. 6, 1796, pastor in Washington, Conn.; and Bartlett, professor of sacred rhetoric in the Andover Theological Seminary, from April 1, 1812, until 1832. During this period, so popular and honored was he, that he received calls to the presidency of the universities of Vermont (1810) and of Georgia (1817), and to Hamilton (1817), Middlebury (1817), and Dartmouth (1821) colleges. He resigned the professorship of divinity at Yale College (1817). All these calls he respectfully but firmly declined. In 1827 he accepted the newly formed office of president of the Andover Theological Seminary. For the last twenty years of his life he was more or less an invalid. He published _Young Preacher's Manual_, 7th ed., 1821; _College life and its Fellows_, 1821; _Selected and Revised_, Boston, 1819, 2d ed., New York, 1829; _Lecture on the Analysis of Vocal In-
against the idea of an opus operatum, with its
grave protest against the frivolous enjoyment of
the Lord's Supper, it was a direct assault on
Jesuitism. He was summoned to Rome, but he
did not go. It must not be understood, however,
that there was any thing subversive, or even
reformatory in the strict sense of the word, in
the activity of Port Royal. On the contrary, in
spite of its views as to sin and grace, it was,
from the very first, averse to Protestantism; and it
remained true to its instincts to the very last. It
stood firmly planted on Roman-Catholic ground.
But it demanded sincerity. It wished to make
religion the root of human life, and thus it could
not fail of coming into conflict with the Jesuits.
Its adoption of the tenets of Jansen became the
occasion; and when Innocent X. issued the bull
of May 31, 1633, condemning the five propositions
of Jansen, the storm broke out. The bull was
met with decided opposition from the side of
Port Royal; and the result was, that Arnauld was
expelled from the Sorbonne, that the anchorites
were ordered to leave Port Royal des Champs,
that the schools of the institution were closed,
etc. The excommunication of the monastery
was, however, averted by the miracle of the thorn
(see p. 1753); and Pascal's Lettres provinciales
almost turned the battle into a victory. Arnauld
and the anchorites returned; and Port Royal
enjoyed peace for several years, until Louis XIV.
assumed the government in person (1660). He
was entirely in the hands of the Jesuits; and the
art. JANSENISM shows how, during the develop-
ment of the Jansenist controversy, the situation
of Port Royal became more and more critical.
In 1669 a separation took place between Port
Royal de Paris and Port Royal des Champs, to
the great financial detriment of the latter. The
king assumed the right of appointing the abbess
of Port Royal de Paris, and from that moment it
lost all historical importance. In 1673 Port Royal
des Champs was bereft of its right to receive
novices, and thereby of the very condition of life.
Finally, when the nuns refused to subscribe the
bull of Clement XI. (Vincam Domini, July 15,
1706), unless with some restrictions, the decisive
blow was struck. On Nov. 22, 1707, the monas-
tery was excommunicated; and on July 11, 1709,
the Archbishop of Paris, under whose authority
it had returned in 1627, issued an order for its
dissolution. On Oct. 29, same year, a squad of
police entered the building, and drove the
twenty-two nuns, of whom the youngest was over
fifty years old, away by force. According to a
royal order of Jan. 22, 1710, the buildings, even
the church, were razed to the ground.

LIT. — Fontaine : Mémoires pour servir à l'his-
toire de P. R., Cologne, 1838, 2 vols.; Dufossé:
Mém. pour servir à l'histoire de P. R., Cologne,
1839, Vie des religieuses de P. R. ; Racine, best edition by Menard, Paris, 1865; Guilbert :
Mémoires sur P. R. des Champs, 1755-56, 7 vols.;
Gregoire : Les ruines de P. R., Paris, 1809;
H. Reucelin : Geschichte von P. R., Hamburg,
1839-44, 2 vols.; Sainte-Beuve : Port Royal,
Paris, 1840-50, 5 vols.; Beard : Port Royal, Lon-
don, 1861, 2 vols. Th. Schott.

PORTUGAL, The Kingdom of, comprises an
area of 34,502 square miles, with 4,550,899 in-
habituates, according to the census of 1878. The state religion is Roman Catholic; and other denominations are not allowed to worship in public, though they are tolerated. Hierarchically the country is divided into four provinces,—the archbishopric of Braga, with six bishoprics; the patriarchate of Lisbon, with nine bishoprics; the archbishopric of Evora, with three bishoprics; and the archbishopric of Goa, with eight bishoprics. The clergy is paid partly by the state, partly by the congregations, and partly from ecclesiastical funds. Each ecclesiastical province has its own priest seminary, besides the theological faculty of the state university in Lisbon. During the union with Spain, in the sixteenth century, the Jews were expelled; and only a few returned, when, in 1820, the country was again opened to them. The Jesuits were expelled in 1759, and have not been allowed to return. A law of Nov. 28, 1878, makes it possible for Protestants to contract legally valid marriages in the country. Under the authority of the Episcopal Church of England, several evangelical congregations have been formed in Lisbon and Porto. Distribution of the Bible in the vernacular tongue is not prohibited, and practically a considerable amount of toleration is exercised.

F. FLIEDNER.

POSCHL, Thomas, b. at Horetz, in Bohemia, March 2, 1769; d. in a lunatic-asylum in Vienna, Nov. 15, 1837; the founder of an enthusiastic sect, the Poschlians. He was by nature sour, and addicted to mysticism and melancholy. As chaplain of Ampfelwang in Upper Austria, he began to preach strange doctrines,—that women could hear confession, and give absolution; that a certain process of purification, which produced convulsions, was necessary to salvation; that the Jews were about to be converted, after which a general emigration to the heavenly Jerusalem should take place, etc. He found many adherents; but, as singular excesses took place among them, he was arrested, and brought to Vienna, where it soon after was discovered that he was insane. Meanwhile, his adherents went so far as to commit human sacrifices, and had to be dispersed by force. See WÜRTZ: Voklabruck, Marktbreit, 1825. NUDECKER.

POSITIVISM. See Comte, Auguste.

POSSESSION, Demoniacal. See Demoniacs.

POSSEVINO, Antonio, b. at Mantua, 1534; d. at Ferrara, 1811. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1559, and was very active in combating Protestantism in the valleys of the Waldensians, in France, and in Sweden (1577-81). Gregory XIII. also used him on important diplomatic missions. Besides a great number of polemical treatises, he wrote Moscovia (Wilna, 1586) and Apparatus sacer ad scriptores vetere et novi testamenti (Venice, 1803-06, 3 vols. folio). See DVORONY: Vie de Possesin, Paris, 1712. C. SCHMIDT.

POSSIDIUS, or POSIDONIUS, Bishop of Ca
ap in Numidia; a pupil and intimate friend of Augustine; a vehement adversary of the Donata
tionists; was at the Council of Carthage, 411, and at the synod of Mileve, 419 (Mansi: Coll. Conc., IV. 51 and 335). In 437 he was banished by Genseric. The year of his death is unknown. He is the author of a very valuable Vita Augustini, generally printed together with Augustine's works, in the A. S. Boll. Aug. T. VI., p. 427 sqq., and separately edited by Salinas, Rome, 1731, 2d ed., Augsb., 1788. HAUCK.

POSTEL, Guillaume, b. at Doleric, in Normandy, May 28, 1503; d. in the monastery of St. Martin des Champs, near Paris, Sept. 6, 1581. He pursued his studies under many troubles, and led an exceedingly erratic life; united Constantinople (whence he brought back a number of valuable Arabic and Syriac manuscripts), Vienna (where he aided Widdmanstadt in his edition of the Syriac New Testament), Venice (where he was arrested by the Inquisition, but released as a fool), Rome (where he entered the order of the Jesuits, but was expelled on account of his scientific vagaries, Paris (where he lectured to immense audiences, on mathematics, Oriental languages, and philosophy). He was, indeed, a great Oriental scholar; but his works (De rationibus Spiritus sancti, La doctrine du siecle dore, De orbis terrae cordina, etc.) are full of strange eccentricities.

POSTIL (postilla), in mediaeval Latin, meant a continuous series of notes to the text of the Scriptures, and was thus called because following after the words of the text, post ilta. It seems to have originated in the time of Charlemagne: at least, the Homiliarium of Paulus Diaconus was called a postilla. Afterwards the word came to mean a collection of sermons; as the postils of Luther, Corvinus, Brenz, and others. Medieval Latin had also a verb postillare: thus it is said of Nicholas of Lyra, on his tombstone, postillavit Biblia.

POTTER, Alonzo, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the diocese of Pennsylvania; b. on the sixth day of July, 1800, in La Grange, Dutchess County, N.Y.; d. on shipboard, in the harbor of San Francisco, July 4, 1865. He was the sixth child of Joseph Potter, whose ancestors emigrated from England in 1640, and settled in Rhode Island. Though his parents were members of the Society of Friends, yet two of Joseph Potter's sons, Alonzo and Horatio, became, respectively, bishops of the two largest dioceses in the United States,—Pennsylvania and New York. When, in 1848, Potter entered the college at Schenectady, then under the presidency of the Rev. Ephraim Nott; and all through his connection with Union College, till he graduated with the honors of his class, in 1818, he took the first rank in scholarship.

Immediately after his graduation he visited Philadelphia; and while in that city he was baptized in St. Peter's Church by Bishop White, and shortly after was confirmed in Christ Church by the same bishop. Here he began his studies for the sacred ministry, under the direction of Bishop White and the Rev. Samuel IL Turner, D.D.; but he was soon recalled to Union College as a tutor, and in about a year later he was chosen professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the same college. Thus, like Edward Everett, he became a professor the same year that he came of age,—in 1818. His mind matured, and successfully sustained through life.

On the 1st of May, 1822, he was ordained deacon by Bishop Hobart, and two years later was advanced to the priesthood by Bishop Brownell. That same year he married Sarah Maria, only daughter of President Nott, "a lady of superior
POTTER. 1875 POTTERT.

mind, exceeding loveliness of character, and elegant accomplishments."

The relations into which, by his college duties and domestic ties, he was brought with Dr. Nott, were of great service to him in shaping his mind and studies, and, indeed, his whole future life. In 1825, when Hobart College, Geneva, needed a president, Professor Potter was chosen, but declined to accept the office.

The next year he was elected rector of St. Paul's, Boston, Mass.; and such were the peculiar circumstances of the case, that he felt constrained to accept the call, though at a great sacrifice of personal and domestic comfort. Under his wise administration the parish soon took the first rank among the churches, and the young pastor became a moral and intellectual power in that city.

Ill health compelled him to resign his place in 1831; and he returned to the quiet of the professor's chair in Union College, and was shortly after chosen vice-president of the college. In 1838 he was elected with great unanimity, by the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts, assistant bishop. He was in Europe at the time, but declined the high honor, as he had previously refused to allow his name to be used as a candidate for the episcopate of Western New York; and, later still, he declined a similar overture from the new diocese of Rhode Island. Seven years later, during which time his reputation rose higher and higher above his college horizon, he was chosen bishop of the diocese of Pennsylvania; and he was consecrated in Christ Church, Philadelphia, on the 23d of September, 1845. The whole State of Pennsylvania soon began to feel the influence of his unremitting zeal and labors.

He was so generous in his sympathies, so practical in his plans, so wise in administering his high office, so skilful in calling around him the best elements, both lay and clerical, as co-workers with him, and so really great in his mental and moral character, that the church rapidly rose into prominence and power. In the second year of his episcopate he inaugurated the convocation system, which did so much to unify the clergy, and concentrate their power. In his fifth annual address he brought forward his project for a "church hospital," the result of which is seen in the best appointed hospital-building in the whole State, and which is now one of the noblest institutions in Philadelphia.

Shortly after, he urged upon the convention the subject of a "training-college;" and out of this has grown that beautiful building known as "The Philadelphia Divinity School," with its corps of able professors, and a long list of distinguished alumni, occupying some of the highest places in the church.

He was one of the foremost to establish "young men's lyceums," and "popular lectures," and "workingmen's institutes." To perfecting these important agents for healthful public instruction to the industrial classes, he devoted much time and thought; and their success was largely due to his wise suggestions and well-laid plans.

He also took a deep interest in the temperance question; and by his personal example, and brave but judicious words, he ever upheld that cause, and backed it up with all his weighty counsel and influence. In the cause of education he was one of the foremost minds. His long experience, and breadth of view, gave much strength to his counsels; and in the University of Pennsylvania, and all over the State, and, indeed, in the country at large, he was felt as an educational power.

His active energies were ever on the outlook for wholesome and needful work; and hence he was constantly called upon by various bodies of his fellow-men, and by various charitable and religious organizations, to act with them on boards and committees and platforms; and everywhere he was welcomed as one wise in council, and earnest in action, and thorough in whatever he did. As a lecturer, Bishop Potter was unrivalled. This was shown by the wonderful ability which he displayed during the several years (1845-58) in which he was engaged in delivering his sixty "Lowell Lectures" in Boston. These lectures, compassing almost the whole circle of philosophy, were delivered within the written page, and with but occasional use of a few brief notes; yet, by common consent of the best thinkers who heard them, they were regarded as masterly, both in the grasp and treatment of the various topics which he handled.

He was also very prominent in all philanthropic and missionary work, both at home and abroad. As a patriot, he stood unflinching amidst the most trying ordeals,—a staunch Union man, laboring with voice and pen for his whole country; and, in all his utterances during the civil war, he blended the breadth of the statesman, the heart of the philanthropist, and the faith of the Christian.

In 1858 he suddenly broke down, and was obliged to spend a year and more abroad. In 1858 the convention elected the Rev. Dr. Bowman as assistant bishop, which relieved Bishop Potter of many duties. For a time, and under the stirring events and stimulus of the civil war, he seemed to rally; but, after the death of his second wife, he was again suddenly stricken down. The assistant bishop, on whom he leaned, was also suddenly taken away by death; and though another assistant bishop was elected in 1861 (the Rev. William Bacon Stevens, D.D.), yet it was evident that his fifth annual address had been done. In March, 1865, he sailed for California, via Brazil and the Straits of Magellan, having for fellow-passengers to Rio Janeiro Professor Agassiz and a party of scientists en route to Brazil. At Panama the bishop went on shore to consecrate a church at Aspinwall, on the east side of the Isthmus, and there contracted a fever, of which he died, on board the steamship "Colorado," in the harbor of San Francisco, on the morning of the 4th of July, 1865.

His character was noted for its massive quietness and its thorough solidi. His life was as clear and honest as the day. His words were always sound and potential. He was a man of large domestic affections and sympathies; and his Christian character was that of a humble but strong believer in Jesus, ever seeking to know and do the Master's will.
His remains lie interred in Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia; but his monuments are the noble institutions which he founded, the far-reaching plans which he inaugurated, and that wise and well-learned bishop. His Life was written by Rev. Dr. M. A. DeW. Howe, Philadelphia, 1871.

---

POULTAIN, Nicolas, b. at Mensils, in the department of Seine-Inferieure, Jan. 13, 1807; d. in New-York City, Sept. 15, 1864. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, 1819, and from Princeton Theological Seminary, 1823. He was pastor in Natchez, Miss., 1823-35, and in New-York City from 1836 till his death (Duane-street Church, 1836-44; University-place Church, 1845-64). He was an eminent preacher, a leader in religion and philanthropy, a beloved pastor and friend. He had a memorable controversy with Bishop Wainwright, on the claims of Episcopacy (No Church without a Bishop, New York, 1844, published also published simple and addresses. See Allibone : Dictionary of British and American Authors, s.v.

POULAIN, Baden, mathematician; b. in London, 1786; d. there June 11, 1860. He was educated at Oxford; entered holy orders, but had no charge; was Savilian professor of geometry in his alma mater, 1827-54, when he removed to London. He wrote received it termed clinics, as having received only an irregular, or sick-bed baptism; and they were denied admission to the higher offices of the church. Yet there were exceptions. Novatian, who had received only clinical baptism, was ordained presbyter in Rome, and was viewed as the candidate of a party to the papal chair. Immersion still remains the usage of the Greek Church; and, says Stanley, "the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." It long remained the ordinary usage of the Church of Rome. Referring to baptism, Jerome, in the fourth century, says, mergitur; and Ambrose, necesitabat. In the fifth century Augustine says, demersimus, Leo the Great, demersio; and Maximus of Turin, mergitur. Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, says, mergit: Alcuin, in the eighth, submersio; Hincmar of Rheims, in the ninth, mergitur; and Lanfranc of Canterbury, in the eleventh, immersio. In the twelfth century Abelard says, mergere; Anselm, mergitur; and Bernard of Clairvaux, mergere. And Thomas Aquinas, as late as the middle of the thirteenth century, held the custom to be the older and better usage, but allows pouring and sprinkling as valid.

But, when pouring had for many centuries been permitted in cases of necessity, its superior convenience furnished a temptation to a free construction of the term "necessity," and to the substitution of affusion for immersion in cases where the strict necessity did not exist. The existence of this inclination is revealed by laws which condemned it. For example, the Council of Chelsea, in 816, decrees as follows: "And let the presbyters know, that, when they administer holy baptism, they may not pour water on the heads of the infants, but the infants must always be immersed." But, by the beginning of the fourteenth century (the time varying in different countries), the practice of immersion had, throughout most of Western Europe, fallen into disuse, and affusion had come to be employed, not only in cases of necessity, but as the ordinary usage.

The pouring of water on the head is the usual act of baptism in the Church of Rome and the Protestant communions. Sometimes, especially in Protestant circles, a mere sprinkling is used, or a simple touching of the forehead with the moistened finger. What is the origin of the custom? In the Apostolic Church the regular baptism was by immersion. The oldest undisputed mention of pouring is found in the Epistle of Cyprian to Magnus, about 250 A.D. Certain ones converted in sickness, when immersion was out of the question, had received merely a pouring (non loti, sed manu); and it was denied that they were Christians in good and regular standing (legitimi Christiani). Cyprian, after referring to certain Old-Testament sprinklings, gives his opinion, that, "in a case of strict necessity," pouring or sprinkling may be accepted as valid baptism. He speaks, however, very diffidently. His language is, "So far as my poor ability comprehends the matter, I consider," etc.; and "I have answered so far as my poor and small ability is capable of doing." He declares that he does not wish to prescribe to other ecclesiastics what they shall do about recognizing the validity of pouring and suggests that those who are not satisfied with their affusion shall, on their recovery from sickness, be immersed. This epistle shows, that, in his day, pouring or sprinkling was uncommon, and was used only when immersion was impracticable.

For a long time pouring was considered as of doubt whether it was held as a sin, and was received it were termed clinics, as having received only an
PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PRAYER.

science and theology. Among the latter may be mentioned Connection of Natural and Divine Truth, London, 1838; Tradition Unveiled, 1838 (Supple-

ment, 1840); The Unity of Worlds and of Nature, Three Essays, on the Spirit of Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation, 1855, 2d ed., 1856; Christianity without Judaism, 1857; The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation, 1859 (the three vols. form a series). But his views obtained widest currency in the famous Essays and Reviews (Lon-
don, 1860), to which he contributed an essay On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity. His position was in the main rationalistic. He re-

jected miracles on the ground that they were out

of harmony with the methods of God's government; and, moreover, an examination of evi-
dence for those said to have happened shows that they are insufficiently attested.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY, in the widest sense

(as used by German divines), includes Homiletics, Catechetics, Liturgics, Pastoral Theology (Poi-

menics), and Theory of Church Government. See the

chap., vol.

PRADES, Jean Martin de, Abbé; b. at Castel-
sarrazin about 1720; d. at Glogau, 1782. He studied theology, but belonged to the circle of the

cupedists, and made a great sensation with

some theses in which he drew a parallel between

cures of Esculapius and the healings of Christ.

The theses having been condemned, both by the Sorbonne and by Benedict XIV., De Prades fled to Holland in 1752. On the recommendation of

Voltaire he was appointed reader to Friedrich II.,

but was afterwards banished from the court on

suspicion of having secretly corresponded with the

Duke de Broglie. He recanted, and was

made archdeacon of Glogau. He published an

Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Fleur, Berlin,

1767, 2 vols., to which Friedrich II. wrote

the preface.

PRADET, Dominique Dufour de, Abbé; b. at Al-

lanches in Auvergne, April 23, 1759; d. in Paris, March 18, 1837. Elected a deputy to the States-

General in 1789, he sided with the king, and emigrated in 1791, but returned in 1801, and was successively appointed almoner to the emperor, bishop of Poitiers, and archbishop of Malines. Sent as ambassador to Warsaw in 1812, he failed in his mission; was recalled; joined the Bourbons on the fall of Napoleon, but was

coldly received, and was even bereft of his arch-

bishopric. Under Louis XVIII. he joined the

opposition; but, after the revolution of July, he

again became a stanch royalist. Besides a num-

ber of brilliant but rather superficial polemical

treatises, he wrote Histoire de l'ambassade dans le

grand-duché de Varsovie, Paris, 1815; Quatre Con-

cordats, Paris, 1818, etc.

PREMUNIRE (literally, to defend in front of,

the opening word of the writ), a term of English
courts of law, in a certain offence, to the writ granted upon it, and its punishment. It

was originally used by Edward III. to check the

arrogant encroachments of the papal power. He

forbad (27 st. 1, c. 1), upon certain penalties, any

of his subjects, i.e., particularly the clergy, to

go to Rome there to answer to things properly

belonging to the king's court; and also the gift

by the Pope of English ecclesiastical preferments

of all grades. By these statutes Edward endeav-

ored to remove a crying evil, but in vain. Rich-

ard II. issued similar statutes, particularly one

called the Statute of Premunire, 1392, assigning the following as the punishment for the

offence: that they [the offenders] should be out

of the king's protection, attached by their bodies,
i.e., imprisoned during life, and lose their lands,
goods, and chattels. Henry IV. and later sover-
eigns have given the same name and penalty

(known as a Premunire) to different offences,

which have only this in common, that they in-

volve more or less insubordination to royal au-

thority, e.g., denial a second time of the king's

supremacy, assertion of the Pope's authority, ref-

usal to take the oath of allegiance, questioning

the right of the present royal family to the throne, affirming the king to be a heretic, refusal by a

chapter of the bishop nominated by the sovereign.

PRETORIUS is the name of two Lutheran

teachers from the sixteenth century in Ger-

many. — Adlaiu Pretoriuus, b. in Mark Branden-

burg, 1624; d. at Wittenberg, 1760; was first

professor in Magdeburg, then in Francfort-on-the-Oder, and finally professor of philosophy in Wittenberg. He is noted from his controv-

ersy with Musculus concerning the neces-

sity of good works. — Stephaniu Pretoriuus wrote

in last decades of the sixteenth century a number

of works, of which a collected edition by Joh.

Arndt appeared in 1622, and again in 1692. Mar-

tin Statiuus, dean of Danzig (d. in 1565), published

some extracts from his works under the name of

Geistliche Schatzkammer.

PRAYER. Speaking generically, prayer may be

described as the expression of our requests to God; and, in the New-Testament usage of the word, no

better definition of it can be given than that of

the Westminster Shorter Catechism: "Prayer is

the offering up of our desires unto God, in the

name of Christ, for things agreeable to his will,

with confession of our sins, and thankful ac-

nowledgment of his mercies." Jesus command-

ed his disciples to pray, and taught them how to

pray, by giving them that model which is called

The Lord's Prayer. Paul, also, exhorted the Thessalonians to "pray without

ceasing," and the Philippians to "be anxious for

nothing, but in every thing, by prayer and suppli-

cation with thanksgiving, to make their requests

known unto God;" while by their own example

the apostles generally illustrated their precepts,

called upon God in every emergency. In

the same way, the saints, under the Old-Testa-

ment dispensation, cried unto the Lord, who

heard them, and delivered them out of their dis-

tress; and the examples of Abraham's servant,
of Jacob, of Moses, of David, of Solomon, of

Elijah, of Hezekiah, of Isaiah, and all the proph-

ets, may be cited as confirming and authenticating

the duty.

But, while all this is true, objections more or

less serious have been made to the assertion that

"men ought always to pray, and not to faint." These may be reduced to two classes,— the

theological and the philosophical. The theo-

logical is to the effect, that, as God is unchangeable in his purposes, it is useless to appeal of men can avail to alter his determina-

tion. To meet that, some have alleged that the
only effect of prayer is to be looked for in the heart of the suppliant. It avails, they assert, not to secure objective benefits, but simply to bring the spirit of the petitioner into harmony with God. Now it cannot be denied that true prayer has such an effect upon the soul; but then, it has so only in the souls of those who believe that God is able and willing to give them that which is best for them. Men will not continue to ask blessings if they suppose that the only good they are to derive is that they shall be brought to resignation and to peace; and so the experience of the subjective benefits of prayer depends on the belief in its objective power. The true answer, therefore, to the objection which we are now considering, must be sought elsewhere; and it is to be found in the fact, that the prayer of the suppliant enters into the purpose of God in connection with the bestowment of his blessings. It is his will to give benefits to his people as answers to their prayers; and along with every promise there is the implied condition, “I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel to them.” This principle is based on the uniformity of the operations of nature, and the allegation, that no answer to prayer can be made, except by miracle, which it would be absurd to expect. To this it might be enough to reply, that the impulse of the human breast to pray is incorruptible, and that, in taking account of nature, we must by no means lose sight of the nature that is within ourselves. But, going farther into the subject, we may ask, What, in such a connection, is meant by “laws of nature”? The Duke of Argyle, in his admirable volume on The Reign of Law, has enumerated five distinct senses in which the term “law” is used by good and reputable writers; but for our present purpose it will be enough to speak only of one. In its physical sense, a law is the formulated expression of an observed invariable sequence of certain consequences from certain antecedents. In this sense, a law is a human inference from the observation of the operations of nature, and, as Sir John Herschel has said, “has relation to us as understanding, rather than to the universe as obeying, certain rules.” They are not enactments which nature is bound to obey, but rather the generalized formulae of the observations which men have made of what they call the operations of nature; or, as believing in a personal God, we prefer to put it, they are the classifications of men’s observations of God’s methods of operation in the universe. They are thus limited to the sphere that is within the range of human investigation, and they tell us absolutely nothing of God’s method of working in that region that is beyond the observation of man. Now, it is quite conceivable, that, in that upper region, God may so work upon the lower, as through the ordinary operations of things, and without any miracle, to answer prayer. This is substantially the answer given by Chalmers to the objection now before us. McCosh, however, prefers to say that God has so adjusted the laws of nature, that he can, through them, and not in contravention of them, answer prayer. Within a limited sphere, the man may grant the request of another in this way, through the operation of natural laws; and what is possible to the creature within a certain area is surely possible to the Creator throughout his own universe. How this is done we may be unable to determine; and we must acknowledge the truth of Isaac Taylor’s words, “This is indeed the great miracle of Providence, that no miracles are needed to accomplish its purposes.” (See on this subject the second chapter of the second book of The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral, by James McCosh, D.D., LL.D.) We must distinguish between law and force. Force is the energy which produces the effects, but law is the observed manner in which force works in the production of these effects. If, therefore, in the last resort, that force be the volition or power of a personal, omnipotent Being, whom we call God, where is the impossibility, or even difficulty, involved in the supposition that he may exert that force through his own appointed modes of operation for the hearing of prayer? When God created the world, he certainly did not shut himself out of it; and he who gave the universe its laws, or rather, whose philosophical objection is based on the uniformity of the operations of nature, and, as Sir John Herschel has said, “has relation to us as under- standing, rather than to the universe as obeying, certain rules.” They are not enactments which nature is bound to obey, but rather the general- ized formulæ of the observations which men have made of what they call the operations of nature; or, as believing in a personal God, we prefer to put it, they are the classifications of men’s observations of God’s methods of operation in the universe. They are thus limited to the sphere that is within the range of human investigation, and they tell us absolutely nothing of God’s method of working in that region that is beyond the observation of man. Now, it is quite conceivable, that, in that upper region, God may so work upon the lower, as through the ordinary operations of things, and without any miracle, to answer prayer. This is substantially the answer given by Chalmers to the objection now before us. McCosh, however, prefers to say that God has so adjusted the laws of nature, that he can, through them, and not in contravention of them, answer prayer. Within a limited sphere, the man may grant the request of another in this way, through the operation of natural laws; and
that, the more water is drawn off, the faster the engine goes. But when a fire occurs, some one in the city touches a spring, which rings a bell in the engine-room; on hearing which, the engineer, by the turning of a lever, causes the engine to move with such rapidity as to charge the mains to their greatest capacity, so that when the hose is attached to the plugs, water is sent to the top of the loftiest building in the place. Thus an extraordinary demand is met through the ordinary channel. And, if this can be accomplished by human skill in a single instance, who shall say that the all-wise God has not adjusted the usual operations of his universe so as to admit of his meeting unusual emergencies through them?

But it is needful now to look at some of the statements of the word of God upon the subject of prayer in general. The "charter" of a Christian's liberty regarding it may be found in the words of Christ himself, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." (Matt. vii.7,8). But here, again, difficulty emerges; and, on the other, there are some who insist that these are mere words of comfort. For, on the one hand, there are some who say, "We have asked, and we have not received;" and, on the other, there are some who insist that the terms shall be interpreted in the largest sense, and must be held as meaning that God has promised to give whatever his people choose to ask. Now, if these were the only words bearing on the subject which the Bible contains, there might be some ground for the despondency of the first class of objectors and for the fanaticism of the second. But we must interpret them in harmony with other declarations; and, when we do that, we get the full teaching of the Scriptures on the point. Now, it is said by James, "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it on your lusts." And the Lord himself has put the condition thus: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." and again, in the Thirty-seventh Psalm, "Delight thyself also in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart." So, also, it is written, "When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have sinned against any;" that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses." Moreover, it must not be forgotten, that in the word of God we have accounts of prayers offered for certain things which the suppliants, though they were sincere, did not receive. Thus, David prayed for the life of his child, but the child died; and Paul besought the Lord thrice that his thorn in the flesh might depart from him, and received an answer, indeed, but not the thing which he requested. While, again, we read that God gave Israel a king in his anger; and, on another occasion, that "he gave them their request, but sent leanness into their souls." From all these passages, then, it appears that the universal promise is accompanied by certain indispensable conditions. These connect themselves, first, with the character of the suppliants, for God must delight himself in God, and abide in Christ; second, with the nature of his request, for that must be agreeable to the will of God; and, third, with the purpose and prerogative of God himself, for the end of his existence is not simply to answer prayer: but he uses his prerogative in the answering of prayer, for moral purposes, making his treatment of their petitions a part of the education to which he submits his people, and by which he trains them into holiness of character. It would be easy to dwell on each of these three conditions, and to show their great importance; but we content ourselves here with pointing out merely that they are conditions which everywhere and in all circumstances qualify the promise of universal answer to prayer. Now, when these things are remembered, it will be seen how utterly impossible it is for men to gauge the value of prayer by any merely human test. The demand made for that a few years ago, only revealed the shallow views entertained upon this subject by those who made it; though perhaps it was provoked by the extravagant and unscriptural things said by many who thought that they were exalting prayer. For how shall any test that men can apply determine when a true prayer is offered? How, again, shall any such gauge reveal whether the expression of our heart to God approves? And where are the delicate instruments which shall indicate or measure the results on the character of the suppliants, which are produced, sometimes by the denial, and sometimes by the granting, of their requests?

We have left ourselves little space for the consideration of the constituent parts of which prayer is composed; but that is the less to be regretted, as the controversies of the present time have left them, for the most part, severely alone. They are, ADORATION, or the ascription of praise to God, of which the best Liturgy of direction is to be found in the Book of Psalms; THANKSGIVING for mercies received, an act which recognizes the goodness of God in our daily lives, alike in the bestowment of temporal things and the granting of spiritual blessings; CONFESSION OF SINS, or the acknowledgment of our guilt as before God, not because he is not already well acquainted with it, but in order, that, by bringing it out before him, we ourselves may see how great it is, and may hate sin with a perfect hatred; PETITION, wherein we make known our requests unto God for spiritual and temporal things for ourselves and for others. In reference to all these, the grand indispensable things are, that the suppliants be sincere, not using words to which he attaches no meaning, or confessing sins of which he does not feel the guilt, or asking things which he really does not wish to receive; and that he approach God through Jesus Christ, the great and only Mediator. He who so pours out his heart before the Lord — observe, it is the heart that he is to bring, not the lip, and the heart is to be poured out, so that nothing of burden or of gratitude is left unspoken — will surely be blessed; for the whole matter of duty and promise is comprised in the words of Paul, "Be anxious for nothing; but in every thing, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

Prayer, Book of Common. Although the service-books of the English Church before the Reformation were mostly in Latin, English prayers, originating, probably, in still simpler manuals of great antiquity, were in use at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The Portiforium secundum umum Sarum, i.e., the Breviary, is clearly the basis of the Book of Common Prayer, and was called in Portory, "Porteain," "Portuia," "Portuia," and "Portoos." This Prayer of Salisbury Use (about A.D. 1400) contains in English, (1) Matins and Hours of our Lady; (2) Evensong and Compline; (3) The vii. penitential psalms; (4) The xv. psalms; (5) The Litany; (6) Placebo; (7) Dirge; (8) The psalms of commendation; (9) Pater noster; (10) Ave Maria; (11) Creed; (12) The ten commandments; (13) The seven deadly sins. Marshall's Prymer (ante 1530 and 1535), suppressed on account of its aggressive sentiments, and Hilsey's Prymer (1539), more conservative, and set forth at the commandment of Cromwell, led the way, with others, for The Prymer set forth by the King's Majesty (1545), which omits Nos. 4, 6, 10, and 13 of the aforesaid contents, and adds to the rest the Kalender, the Injunction, the Salutation of the Angel, certain graces, the psalms of the Passion, the Tunes, and other "godly prayers." The Litany contains certain petitions requesting "the prayers of angels, saints, and martyrs," "to be delivered from the tyranny of the Church of Rome;" and the Dirge, or dirge, has prayers for the dead. The former was compiled by Cranmer from the old litanies and the litany prepared by Melanchthon and Bucer for Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, 1549. Before the Prymer of 1545, conversation had authorized, in 1537, The godly and pious Institution of a Chrysten Man, containing the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, Creed, Decalogue, and the seven sacraments, etc., in 1543 the same, corrected and altered, entitled A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Chrysten Man. The former was called "The Bishops' Book;" the latter, "the King's Book;" and both, with the Articles of 1536, contain the authoritative opinions of the Church of England during Henry VIII.'s reign, and exhibit, on the whole, a retrogression in matters of doctrine. See Formulary, etc., Oxford, 1825. A commission, including Cranmer, Goodrich, Holbeck, Day, Skip, Thirlby, Ridley, Cox, May, Taylor, Haines, Robertson, and Redman, appointed in 1547 to revise the Church-Service, published March 8, 1548, as a first installment, The Order of the Communion, framed in its new portions on Hermann's Consultation, from which the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Comfoatable Words are derived. It was a tremendous step in the direction of reform; for it ordered the communion to be solemnized in English, and to be placed in the priests' hands. The Litany stood after the communion office, was not ordered to be used on Sundays, and contained a petition for delivery from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, while it omitted a hundred and sixteen addresses to the apostles, the Virgin, and the saints. The Communion Office began with an introit, and omitted the Decalogue; the Virgin was mentioned by name in the praise given for the saints; the sign of the cross was used twice in the consecration of the elements, and the formula of their presentation contained only the first clause of that now in use; water was mixed with the wine. In the Baptismal Office, forms for exorcism, anointing, and true immersion, were provided. In the offices for Confirmation, Matrimony, and the Visitation of the Sick, the sign of the cross was retained; in the first, the catechumen made no promise; in the second, money was given to the bride, and, in the third, the sick might be anointed: the Burial-Service contained a prayer for the person deceased, and a special service for communion. In the Preface the compilers state that the book was designed to establish uniformity of worship for the whole realm, to simplify it, to provide for the use of the whole Psalter, and the reading of "the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof," so that nothing should be read but "the very pure word of God,—the holy Scriptures,—or that which is evidently grounded upon the same," and "in the English tongue." The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, in the Prayer-Book of 1549, were almost identical with those in the Salisbury Hours, but much of the new matter introduced was taken from Hermann's Consultation. The rubric and use with regard to dress were, that priests should wear the surplice in parish churches, adding the hood during the sermon; and in cathedrals, that the bishop, at the communion, should wear a surplice or alb, with a cope or vestment, besides his rochet, and carry a pastoral staff himself, and if it borne by a chaplain, and the officiating priest wear a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope, the assisting ministers to appear in albes and tunicles. The ordinal, entitled The Forme and Manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons (1549), was published separately, and differed from the present office on these chief points: it began with an introit, required deacons to wear albes, and the one reading the gospel a tunicle; the bread and chalice, as well as the Bible, to be placed in the priests' hands, and the pastoral staff to be committed to his bote. "To be a shepherd to the flock of Christ" was the bishop's function on the bishop's neck. The office of 1549, slightly changed, was adopted in The Second Liturgy of Edward VI.
The revised book of 1552 brought the following most important changes: it introduced, (1) the sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution, at the opening of the service; (2) the Doxology in the communion-office; (3) the use of the Litany on Sundays. Of these, 1 and 2 are thought to have been taken from Vallerandus Pollanus. It omitted, (1) In the Communion-Service, the Introit, the name of the Virgin, the Thanksgiving for the Saints, the Sign of the Cross in Consecration, the Invocation of the Word and the Holy Spirit, the Admixture of water with wine, and the first clause of the present form at the delivery of the elements; (2) In Baptism, the form of exorcism, the anointing, the use of chrism, and the trine immersion; (3) In Confirmation, the sign of the cross; (4) In Matrimony, the sign of the cross and the giving of money; (5) In the Visitation of the Sick, the allusion to Tobias and Sarah, the anointing, and the directions about Private Communion; (6) In the Burial-Service, the prayers for the dead and the Eucharist. The rubric concerning vestments forbade the use of albe, vestments, and cope, and required the bishop to wear only a chasuble at all times except solemnly. The most important change was doctrinal, and referred to the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements as not differing from his presence to the prayers of believers. As the influence of Luther's Service of 1533 colored the first Liturgy of 1552, so that of Bucer, Peter Martyr, Pollan- dus, and John à Lasco, may be traced in the second Liturgy of 1552.

The Liturgy of Elizabeth (1560) agreed substantially with the book of Edward VI., 1552, except with one alteration, or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the Visitation of the Sick, the allusion to Tobias and Sarah, the anointing, and the directions about Private Communion; (4) The exhortations in the communion-service were altered; the rubrics relating to the offertory, the placing of the bread and wine on the table, and their disposition, directing the form of consecrating additional bread and wine, and the covering of the elements, were added; the last clause respecting departed saints was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant; and in the Order in Council (1562), at the end of the office, the phrase "corporal presence" was substituted for "real and essential presence;" (5) Among the more important additions in the rest of the book are the Office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years, the Form of Prayer to be used at Sea, new psalms in the Churching Service, and the last five prayers in the Visitation of the Sick.

There have been four Acts of Uniformity, — 1543, 2 and 3 Edw. VI., c. i.; 1552, 5 and 7 do., repealed in 1559; 1559, 1 Eliz. c. ii., not repealed; and 1662, 14 Carol. ii. The last two are often printed in the beginning of the Prayer-Book. The four services, until 1559 annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, known as the State Services, by the authority of an order from the sovereign in council, repeated at the beginning of the reign of James I. (1604), are of doubtful legality. Among the most important were the insertion of the term "lawful minister" in the rubrics of the office of Private Baptism, restricting the administration to the minister of the parish, or some other lawful minister; the addition to the Catechism of the Explanation of the Sacraments (attributed to Dr. John Overall), and, to the Occasional Prayers, certain Forms of Thanksgiving answering to the Prayers for Rain, etc. The charge brought against Archbishop Laud, of having corrupted the text of the Liturgy, is utterly unfounded (Lathbury: History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 225-227). In 1645 (Jan. 3) Parliament took away the Book of Common Prayer, and established The Directory, which rejected the Apocrypha, discontinued private baptism, sponsors, the sign of the cross, the wedding-ring, and private communion, removed the communion-table into the body of the church, abolished saints' days and vestments, the burial-service, and the public recitation of the Decalogue and of the creeds, though the Decalogue and the Apostles' Creed were subsequently supplied. It is reprinted in Reliquiae Literarum et Historiae, and in Clay, Book of Common Prayer illustrated, App. ix.-xi.)

The last revision of the Liturgy was made in 1662. Among the important changes were, (1) The extracts from the Bible — except the Psalter (which is Coverdale's text of 1539), the Decalogue, and the Sentences in the communion-service — give the text of the Authorized Version; (2) The separate printing of the Order for Morning and Evening Service, with the introduction of the last five prayers from the Litany, and of the Occasional Prayers, augmented by a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the Ember weeks, the prayers for Parliament and All Conditions of Men, as well as by the General Thanksgiving, and a Thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home; (3) Some new collects, epistles, and gospels were supplied, and verbal changes made; such as "church" for "congregation," and "bishops, priests, and deacons," for "bishops, priests, and ministers;" (4) The exhortations in the communion-service were altered; the rubrics relating to the offertory, the placing of the bread and wine on the table, and their disposition, directing the form of consecrating additional bread and wine, and the covering of the elements, were added; the last clause respecting departed saints was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant; and in the Order in Council (1562), at the end of the office, the phrase "corporal presence" was substituted for "real and essential presence;" (5) Among the more important additions in the rest of the book are the Office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years, the Form of Prayer to be used at Sea, new psalms in the Churching Service, and the last five prayers in the Visitation of the Sick.

There have been four Acts of Uniformity, — 1543, 2 and 3 Edw. VI., c. i.; 1552, 5 and 7 do., repealed in 1559; 1559, 1 Eliz. c. ii., not repealed; and 1662, 14 Carol. ii. The last two are often printed in the beginning of the Prayer-Book. The four services, until 1559 annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, known as the State Services, by the authority of an order from the sovereign in council, repeated at the beginning of the reign of James I. (1604), are of doubtful legality. Among the most important were the insertion of the term "lawful minister" in the rubrics of the office of Private Baptism, restricting the administration to the minister of the parish, or some other lawful minister; the addition to the Catechism of the Explanation of the Sacraments (attributed to Dr. John Overall), and, to the Occasional Prayers, certain Forms of Thanksgiving answering to the Prayers for Rain, etc. The charge brought against Archbishop Laud, of having corrupted the text of the Liturgy, is utterly unfounded (Lathbury: History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 225-227). In 1645 (Jan. 3) Parliament took away the Book of Common Prayer, and established The Directory, which rejected the Apocrypha, discontinued private baptism, sponsors, the sign of the cross, the wedding-ring, and private communion, removed the communion-table into the body of the church, abolished saints' days and vestments, the burial-service, and the public recitation of the Decalogue and of the creeds, though the Decalogue and the Apostles' Creed were subsequently supplied. It is reprinted in Reliquiae Literarum et Historiae, and in Clay, Book of Common Prayer illustrated, App. ix.-xi.)

The last revision of the Liturgy was made in 1662. Among the important changes were, (1) The extracts from the Bible — except the Psalter (which is Coverdale's text of 1539), the Decalogue, and the Sentences in the communion-service — give the text of the Authorized Version; (2) The separate printing of the Order for Morning and Evening Service, with the introduction of the last five prayers from the Litany, and of the Occasional Prayers, augmented by a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the Ember weeks, the prayers for Parliament and All Conditions of Men, as well as by the General Thanksgiving, and a Thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home; (3) Some new collects, epistles, and gospels were supplied, and verbal changes made; such as "church" for "congregation," and "bishops, priests, and deacons," for "bishops, priests, and ministers;" (4) The exhortations in the communion-service were altered; the rubrics relating to the offertory, the placing of the bread and wine on the table, and their disposition, directing the form of consecrating additional bread and wine, and the covering of the elements, were added; the last clause respecting departed saints was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant; and in the Order in Council (1562), at the end of the office, the phrase "corporal presence" was substituted for "real and essential presence;" (5) Among the more important additions in the rest of the book are the Office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years, the Form of Prayer to be used at Sea, new psalms in the Churching Service, and the last five prayers in the Visitation of the Sick.

There have been four Acts of Uniformity, — 1543, 2 and 3 Edw. VI., c. i.; 1552, 5 and 7 do., repealed in 1559; 1559, 1 Eliz. c. ii., not repealed; and 1662, 14 Carol. ii. The last two are often printed in the beginning of the Prayer-Book. The four services, until 1559 annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, known as the State Services, by the authority of an order from the sovereign in council, repeated at the beginning of the reign of James I. (1604), are of doubtful legality. Among the most important were the insertion of the term "lawful minister" in the rubrics of the office of Private Baptism, restricting the administration to the minister of the parish, or some other lawful minister; the addition to the Catechism of the Explanation of the Sacraments (attributed to Dr. John Overall), and, to the Occasional Prayers, certain Forms of Thanksgiving answering to the Prayers for Rain, etc. The charge brought against Archbishop Laud, of having corrupted the text of the Liturgy, is utterly unfounded (Lathbury: History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 225-227). In 1645 (Jan. 3) Parliament took away the Book of Common Prayer, and established The Directory, which rejected the Apocrypha, discontinued private baptism, sponsors, the sign of the cross, the wedding-ring, and private communion, removed the communion-table into the body of the church, abolished saints' days and vestments, the burial-service, and the public recitation of the Decalogue and of the creeds, though the Decalogue and the Apostles' Creed were subsequently supplied. It is reprinted in Reliquiae Literarum et Historiae, and in Clay, Book of Common Prayer illustrated, App. ix.-xi.)
every reign, with the exception of the last about to be named, have been removed by the authority of a royal warrant, dated Jan. 17, 1859. They consist of forms of prayer for, (1) The 5th of November, the Gunpowder Treason; (2) The 30th of January, the Martyrdom of Charles I.; (3) The 29th of May, the Restoration; and (4) The 29th of May, the Visitation of Prisoners. The Articles of Religion were first published in English and Latin, A.D. 1532, when they numbered forty-two, attributed to Cranmer, aided by Ridley and others. A new body of Articles, presented in 1562 by Archbishop Parker to convocation, numbered thirty-eight, and were printed the next year in English and Latin. They were again revised in 1571, when Art. 29 was re-introduced, so that they numbered thirty-nine. The Ratification, still subjoined to them, was added in 1572; and the thirty-sixth and were printed the next year in English. The Irish Act of Uniformity, 1500; (3) The Prayer-Book of 1552, not having been ordered for observance, the Irish Parliament, in January, 1551; and the Irish Act of Uniformity, 1500; (3) The Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States, the octavo edition set forth by the General Convention of 1844, published New York, 1845.


PRAYER FOR THE DEAD was offered among the later Jews (2 Macc. xii. 43-45), and from them passed into the Christian Church; but at present only a small portion of the Protestant Church, the ritualists, continue the practice. In a certain form, that of repetition of the names of classes of deceased believers before God in prayer, the practice—though of doubtful utility, and inclining toward superstition—is not in itself sinful; but as it exists in the Church of Rome it is coupled with the doctrine of purgatory, and in any case savors of the doctrine of
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prayer after death. Such prayers are first among Christian writers referred to by Tertullian (d. 200) and as a long-established custom (De exhortatione Castitatis, c. 11; De monog., c. 10; cf. De corona, c. 3, De anima, c. 58). "St. Augustine (d. 430) often alludes (e.g., De Curia pro Mort., i. 17) to the universal usage of the church to pray for all regenerates in general (i.e., the baptized, or, in what sense, prayer would be profitable and availing, depended upon the present life. And St. Chrysostom (d. 407) says (Com. in Philip. hom., 3) that "it was not in vain enjoined as a law by the apostles that a memorial of the dead should be made in the solemn mysteries, as knowing that great gain resulted to them, and great assistance" (Blunt).

But, with these writers, prayer for the dead was the natural result of the idea of the unbroken connection between all the members of Christ's body, living and dead, and probably, also, of the idea of Hades. (See Art.) The practice was not the result, but the cause, of the doctrine of purgatory. (See Purgatory.) Such prayers are found in their least objectionable form in the ancient liturgies; e.g., Divine Liturgy (1) of James (Clark's translation, pp. 23, 26, 34, 38), (2) of Mark (p. 60), and (9) of the Holy Apostles (pp. 82, 83). In the mass, prayer for the dead is an integral part. (See Mass.) In the Edward VI. Prayer-Book (1550) burial-service, there were several such prayers; e.g., "We commend into thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed . . . that when the judgment shall come, which thou hast committed to thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receive thy blessing." But the Protestant Church now well-nigh unanimously rejects the ancient usage, holding that such prayer is at best superfluous respecting the blessed dead, and utterly unavailing for the lost. On behalf of the practice, see F. G. Lee: Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed, London, 1872, new ed., 1874; H. M. Luckock: After Death, London, 1879, 3d ed., 1881.

PRAYER, The Lord's. See LORD'S PRAYER.

PREACHERS, Local. See Local Preachers.

PREACHING. The discourses recorded in Acts differ widely from modern sermons. They have no text, contain no exposition, and do not constitute part of a formal service. Scripture is quoted at length, but either by way of example, or as fulfilled prophecy. The discourse of our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 18) is no exception. For exegesis the Jewish mind was unadapted, because it could not keep strictly apart different periods. Yet the synagogue discourses were the pattern for the first Christian preaching, which, like them, consisted of free speech not preface by any form. It is evident that at first the Scripture read was exclusively the Old Testament. Justin Martyr thus describes the Christian preaching of the second century: "On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of those prophets, are read; and then, on a time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exords to the imitation of these good things" (Apol. maj., c. 67). Tertullian (d. 200), writes: "We assemble to read the sacred writings, to draw from them lessons pertinent to the times, either of forewarning or reminiscence. However it be in that respect, with the sacred words we nourish our faith, animate our hope, strengthen our confidence, and, no less through the incitements of the precepts, we create good habits. In the same place, also, exhortations are made, rebukes and sacred censures administered" (Apologit., c. 36). In the Apostolical Constitutions, ii. 57 (see Art.) mention is made of Scripture-reading, followed by discourses from a body of presbyters, each speaking in turn, and finally a speech from the bishop (the presiding officer). The instances quoted prove that in the second century there were not, properly speaking, any sermons, only exhortations. The first preacher in the modern sense was Origen (d. 254). His method was the allegorical; but so rich is his exposition, that each of his sermons is a seed-plot for other sermons. It was his learning, joined to great natural gifts, which made him so inspiring a preacher; and the fact is of interest as proving that the true sermon is the response to the church's desire to hear Bible exposition, and at the same time exhortations based directly upon Scripture. After Origen, comes that grand succession of preachers whose learning has commanded the respect even of their severest critics, and whose eloquence has stirred the feelings even of the dullest.

In the instance already quoted from Justin Martyr, "the president" delivered the discourse; and so it remained, for a long time, in the church the especial duty of the bishop to preach. There is no instance of a bishop being deposed because he could not preach, but there are several instances of presbyters being elected bishops because they could. A non-preaching bishop was somewhat disreputable. Yet even in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions (i.e.) mention is made of presbyterial preaching: indeed, many instances are recorded of deacons, such as Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 673) and Ephrem Syrus (d. 379), preaching original discourses. But the theory was, that the bishop was the preacher: if a presbyter or deacon preached, it was as the bishop's substitute. As the church grew, the demand for preaching was far more than any one man in the local church or neighborhood could meet; and therefore presbyters and deacons were more and more pressed into service, and preached regularly in places where the bishop came only occasionally. Still, the theory was kept up; and the bishop was answerable for what the presbyter or deacon said, as is clearly proved by the case of Nestorius (see Art.). Did laymen ever preach in the early church? As a general rule, no. But yet there were a few exceptions. Thus Origen, before his condemnation and excommunication, was permitted still, Constantine preached frequently to large assemblies; and one of his sermons has come down to us (Euseb. : De vita Con., iv. c. 29-34; Opp., ed. Zimmerm. "Constant. Imp. Oratio," pp. 1047-1117). Monks were not allowed to preach, because they were not until the ninth age, when regular preaching monastic orders were organized. (See DOMINIC; FRANCIS.) Preaching by women was strongly forbidden in the Catholic Church, according to Paul's explicit direction.
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(1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 19), but was a feature with the hours and even with the Montanists, much to Tertullian's dislike (De prescript., c. 41; De bap., c. 17; De celand. virgin. c. 9).

The great day for preaching was naturally Sunday; but upon many other days, as upon holy days, every day during Lent, upon every Saturday, and at festivals, it was usual practice in the early church to have sermons, and that not only in the morning. As was to be expected, the sermons were generally simple and brief, especially in the West. Those of Augustine and Chrysostom were probably as exceptional in length as they were in matter. It is probable, although there is no direct statement of it, that the clepsydra (water-clock) was used; for the usual length of the Latin homilies which have been preserved is a quarter-hour, which would indicate some way of measuring time.

Sermons were almost invariably given in churches, and as part of a service. The preacher sat upon the throne (cathedra); or sometimes, if presbyter, stood before the altar, if deacon or monk, by the reading-desk. In the fourth century the sermons were more oratorical, and then the usual place for the preacher was by the desk. The congregation stood around him, and expressed their pleasure by stamping of feet, and clapping of hands,—a practice Chrysostom vigorously deplored, a sermon which was loudly applauded.

The sermon was a feature with the hours and even with the Montanists, much to Tertullian's dislike (De prescript., c. 41; De bap., c. 17; De celand. virgin. c. 9).

The great day for preaching was naturally Sunday; but upon many other days, as upon holy days, every day during Lent, upon every Saturday, and at festivals, it was usual practice in the early church to have sermons, and that not only in the morning. As was to be expected, the sermons were generally simple and brief, especially in the West. Those of Augustine and Chrysostom were probably as exceptional in length as they were in matter. It is probable, although there is no direct statement of it, that the clepsydra (water-clock) was used; for the usual length of the Latin homilies which have been preserved is a quarter-hour, which would indicate some way of measuring time.

Sermons were almost invariably given in churches, and as part of a service. The preacher sat upon the throne (cathedra); or sometimes, if presbyter, stood before the altar, if deacon or monk, by the reading-desk. In the fourth century the sermons were more oratorical, and then the usual place for the preacher was by the desk. The congregation stood around him, and expressed their pleasure by stamping of feet, and clapping of hands,—a practice Chrysostom vigorously deplored, a sermon which was loudly applauded.

He also complains of the talking going on during preaching.

The sermons of such preachers as Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom, were delivered to large audiences, and regularly taken down by short-hand reporters. But other preachers were by no means so popular: indeed, the same complaints of long sermons, poor sermons, or no sermons, and the same exhortations to be more regular in attendance, which are now made, can be read in the Fathers.

In regard to the delivery of sermons, there was the same diversity as at present. Some sermons were read (but these were especially those of admired preachers, and they were read by deacons, instead of original discourses); some were recited memoriter; others were extemporaneous, although usually after careful preparation. This last was probably the commonest mode. Immediately before the sermon a short free prayer was offered; then came the salutation, "Peace be unto you," and the response by the people, "And to thy spirit;" the text was given out, the sermon delivered, followed by the doxology.

It is a remarkable fact, that preaching was little, if at all, cultivated in the church at Rome (Sozomen: Hist., vii. 19; Cassiodorus: Hist. tripartita). There exist no sermons of any Roman bishop prior to Leo the Great (d. 461). The example of this church was, therefore, not favorable to the practice. After the ninth century, preaching generally declined. During the middle age, in place of the sermon in the service, came, usually, a short address at the conclusion of mass. The schoolmen were not preachers for the people. The Preachers of the Church were often upon tribunes. But the age was not lacking in preachers. They belonged, for the most part, to the Dominicans and Franciscans, and either preached in monasteries, or went from place to place, now casting a cloud in a field, now in a church. Their sermons were eminently popular, full of quotation from the Bible, and of allusion to it; full of stories, fables, and parables. Many of these preachers were deeply spiritual, and earnestly desirous of benefiting their hearers.

Prominent among the medieval preachers are Anthony of Padua, who preached to fishes; Bernard of Clairvaux, who converted many to monasticism, and roused all Europe to the second crusade; Bonaventura, who, when asked by Thomas Aquinas for the source of his power, pointed to the crucifix hanging in his cell, and said, "It is that image which dictates all my words to me;" Francis Coster (1581-1619), whose stories are so striking; Berthold the Franciscan of Regensburg, the greatest of the popular preachers of the time, whose audiences numbered thousands; John of Monte Corvino, the apostle to the Mongols; Savonarola, preacher and prophet, priest and politician, saint and martyr; and perhaps, as one of the best specimens of mediaeval pulpit eloquence and unction, John Tauler of Strassburg. The latter is wonderfully tender and searching. Quaint, even grotesque, in style, it is easy to understand how profitable his preaching was. Very strange stories are told about these preachers,—how bold they were in their attacks; and how they were obeyed, even when their demands were most strenuous, as, for instance, when they exhorted their hearers to give up their jewels and ornaments; how they were reverence by king and people; how they interpreted the Scriptures correctly through their spiritual insight; and how they led holy lives,—in the world, yet not of it. But the preachers whose names have come down to us were probably exceptional, not only in ability and learning, but in grace. The generality of those who assayed to preach were probably lacking in all three; for the barrenness, the conceit, the ignorance, or the pedantry of preachers, is frequently complained of in this period. The so-called Life of Tauler, always prefixed to his Sermons, throws a flood of light upon the shortcomings of his contemporaries.

The "Reformers before the Reformation," the men who prepared the way for Luther's work, were all preachers. John Wiclif, in England, sent out his "Poor Priests," who filled the land with his doctrines. He himself preached in a learned and scholastic manner for the university of Oxford, and in a popular and hortatory manner for his congregation at Lutterworth. Johann Wessel, in Germany, was a preacher learned and popular. Peter Waldo in France, and Hus in Bohemia, spread their doctrines by preaching. The Reformers, therefore, used a familiar weapon, but they handled it with distinguished success. Unlike many of their contemporaries, they utilized preaching primarily for edification. Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Calvin, Butzer, aimed to save men and comfort them. To this end they opened to them the Scriptures. But it was not long before the Protestant ministers degenerated into disputants. The Lutheran Church was split into the rival caes. Their theology was not always that of the Lutherans; the English-speaking Protestants were divided into Presbters and Presbyterians. But it was unfortunate, to say the least, that the
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Solomon’s wealth and commercial enterprise
brought many precious stones to Palestine (1
kings x. 10 sq.). The oldest market for them
in England relapsed into torpor, John Wesley and
George Whitefield, with Jonathan Edwards and
Samuel Davies in America, and others like them
in fervor and grace, gave powerful impetus to
religion. A revival followed these efforts; and
the sixteenth century saw in Great Britain and
the United States the pulpit on the side of the
most wonderful philanthropy. Foreign missions,
missions, Bible societies, abolition of slavery, civil-service
reform, temperance, have had some of their ablest
advocates in the pulpit.
In the Roman-Catholic Church, preaching has
never been honored as among Protestants; but
under the spur of the latter it has greatly im-
poved since the Reformation. The plainest
days of this church’s pulpit-elocution were in
France, in the seventeenth century, when opposi-
tion to Protestantism was sharpest. Bossuet, Mac-
sillon, Bourdaloue, and Fénelon are the greatest
names. In England and the United States,
Romish has lately striven to equal Protestantism
in preaching. It conducts revival-meetings called
“missions.” It cultivates eloquence and rhetoric,
and provides churches with seats, unknown in
the old Roman-Catholic countries. It is said
that the Paulist Fathers in New-York City, and
other missionary orders elsewhere, preach with a
vigor and sternness equal to that of the medieval
preachers.
LIT. — AUGUSTI: Handbuch d. christ. Arch-
leipzig, 1838, 1837, 3 vols., ii. 244 sqq.;
ANNALE: Geschichtliche Geschichte d. christ. Beredt-
Leipzig, 1830, 1840, 1st part, Die ältere
zeit: J. M. NEALE: Medieval Preachers, London,
1856, new ed., 1873; S. BARING-GOULD: Post-
medieval Preachers, London, 1893; E. PAXTON
HOOD: Lamps, Pichers, and Trumpets, 1868, new
ed., 1872; BROADUS: Lectures on the History of
Preaching, New York, 1876; A. NEBE: Zur Ge-
schichte d. Predigt, Wiesb., 1879, 3 vols.; RICHARD
ROTHER: Gesch. d. Predigt von Anfang bis auf
Schelemacher, Bremen, 1891; cf. PALKER’S art.
Predigt, in HERZOG L., vol. xx. 410-429; also in
HOMILETICS.
SAMUEL M. JACKSON.
PREACHING FRIARS were the Dominicans.
See DOMINIC.
PREBEND (prebenda, “allowance”) meant,
originally, the provision or food which each monk
or cleric received from the common table; and in
that sense the term continued to be used, even
after the common life had generally been dis-
solved, and the revenues of the institution divided
among the members. The fixed income thus
formed was then called a prebend, or beneficium
prebendae, or beneficium prebendi. With respect
to the recipient, prebends were called prebendae
capitulares, or prebenda dometiarum, according as
they were given to a regular member of the chapter,
or to some dometiarum, or junior. With
respect to their size, they were divided into
majores, media, minores, and semi prebenda. The recipient
of a prebend is a prebendary. MEJER.
PRECIOUS STONES are often referred to in
the Bible. The Hebrews, at a very early
period, understood the art of cutting and engraving
gems, and attributed it to the influence of
God’s spirit (Exod. xxxi. 5, xxxv. 33). They
used them for seals and rings (Song of Songs, v.
14; Ezek. xxviii. 19), and in other ways for per-
sonal adornment. The high priest’s shoulder
pieces were adorned with two precious stones,
and his breastplate with twelve, upon which the
names of the twelve tribes were engraved (Exod.
xxxviii. 9 sqq.). The earthly temple was orna-
mated with them (1 Chron. xxix. 2; 2 Chron.
iii. 6); and so was the heavenly temple as seen
in the visions of the seer (Exod. xiv. 10; Ezek.
i. 26; Dan. x. 6; Rev. iv. 3). The foundations
of the walls of the new Jerusalem will be gar-
nished with twelve precious stones (Rev. xli. 11,
18 sqq.), which seem to be chosen with reference
to Exod. xxviii. 17-26. The following precious
stones are mentioned by name in the Bible. We
are helped in our interpretation of the Hebrew
and Greek names by the ancient versions, Josephus
(ant. III. 7,5; Bell. Jud., V, 5,7), and book
xxxviii. of Pliny’s Natural History. We can arrive
only at the probable truth about some of them.
(1) פִּלְפְלָה, the sardius, or sardonyx, so called be-
cause first found near Sardis, of a reddish color,
was very much esteemed and used. The finest
specimens came from Babylon. (2) לֹא, the
yellow topaz, which is also mentioned by Job
(xxviii. 19), came from Ethiopia, and especially
from an island in the Persian Gulf [some writers
identify this stone with the chrysolite]. (3) בַּלדְלָה, the emerald (“the glittering,” Rev. iv. 3),
was found especially in Egypt. (4) פּוֹסֶ, the car-
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bungle, was the name of several stones with a glowing red color, as of the African and Indian ruby, and the garnet; which latter is probably referred to in the Bible. (5) JOB, the sapphire (Job xxviii. 6, 15). Pliny calls it the lapis-lazuli, which, however, does not seem to be meant in the Old Testament. (6) the, the opal (Pliny). (7) the, the ligure, probably means the hyacinthe, which is found in Ethiopia, but, according to some, amber. (8) the, the agate, found in Cyprus, Syria, Egypt, etc. (9) the, the amethyst, which was much esteemed, came from India, Arabia, and Egypt. (10) the, (Ezek. i. 18; Dan. x. 6, etc.), translated beryl, is probably the chrysolite. Rosenmuller translates the word, "topaz." (11) the, the onyx, which came from the land of Havilah (Gen. ii. 12). (12) the, the much-discussed Jasper (Rev. iv. 3, xxi. 11, 19), the best varieties of which came from India. (13) the, translated carbuncle (Isa. liv. 12) and agate (Ezek. xxvii. 16). (14) the, the diamond, an apt illustration of Israel's obstinacy (Ezek. iii. 9; Zech. vii. 12), translated in the English version "adamant." See Gesser: De omni rerum fossil, genere, Zürich, 1589; Braün: De vestitui sacerdotum Hebr. Amsterdam, 1680, 2d ed., 1898; Beller:am: Urim u. Thummim, d. neuesten Gemmen, Berlin, 1824; [A. H. Church: Precious Stones in their Scientific and Artistic Relations, London, 1885].

PREDESTRUCTION. The pagan idea of fate is, generally speaking, that of an inevitable necessity, to which the will and wants of man have no other relation than that of absolute submission. It is simply a caricature of the Christian idea of predestination, lacking all true intercommunication between God and man. God is dead to man, and man is dead to God; or, still worse, the absoluteness of man corresponds to the absoluteness of the gods; and as man is under the yoke of his own senses and of the demons, so the gods themselves are in the grip of a dark destiny. It must not, however, be overlooked that there are great differences between the different historical forms of paganism, and that there is no form of paganism which is absolutely pagan, that is, completely devoid of light. Wherever, in paganism, dualism prevails, as, for instance, in Panselism, the idea of fate produces a distinction between good and evil men, between good and bad genii, nay, even between good and bad souls in the same body. The fatality of life is ascribed to the principle of evil; but, under the shield of the good genius, man can extricate himself from the meshes of fate by asceticism, by mortification of the flesh, by deadening his senses. In the pantheistic forms of paganism, fate is part and parcel of life itself. What man does is determined, and his actions and dreams are in accordance with the laws of necessity. All distinctions, consequently, between good and bad, or between happiness and misery, are merely formal, and the freedom of the will only a phenome-

The Old Testament containing not only the germs of the doctrine of election in the contra-

position of Abraham and the world, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Judah and his brethren, but also the germs of the doctrine of decrees in the lives of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and others, not to speak of the Book of Ruth and the Book of Job, those grand, representative exemplifications of divine fore-ordination, it was quite natural that the idea of divine predestination should be found both active and among the Jews, though it was very differently developed in the different systems of Judaism.

The Sadducees openly asserted that each man was the master of his own destiny; while the Pharisees, with their mechanical separation of the effects of divine blessing from the effects of human righteousness, made human destiny depend partly on divine ordination, and partly on human actions. The Essenes, finally, representing that form of Judaism which was most mixed up with paganism, considered destiny as an inevitable fate; the whole idea, however, being peculiarly mitigated by the religious quietism which characterized the sect. In this point, as in so many others, the Essenes were true Gnostics, and so are the Mohammedans, for Gnosticism is simply a blending of Christian with pagan and national elements. The Persian Gnosticism of Manes begins, and the Arabian Gnostic of Mohammed consummates, the revolt against Christ. The fate of Islam is the absolute, arbitrary despotism of Allah; and when the Koran in one place teaches the inevitableness of destiny, and in another the possibility of warding off divine punishment, it signifies only a partial abandonment of the idea of absolute necessity, with the whole scheme of salvation. Nevertheless, the doctrine of predestination, in its innumerable compass, in its infinite depth, has never lacked the testimony of the religious consciousness of the living church, its theological development has been long and laborious. As the first stage of that development, may be mentioned the Ebionitic and Judaising assertions on the one side, and the Gnostic and Manichean dreams on the other, both contradicted and rejected by the practical experience of the church,
though not yet refuted by any scientific exposition from the orthodox side. Such an exposition was first given by Augustine, and rejected by the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, who, notwithstanding, carried the controversy by the syllogisms of Arelate (472), Lyons (475), and Orange (529). A new stage in the development is indicated by Gottschalk. He made reprobation an element of predestination, and thereby, as well as by his general treatment of the subject, he caused a controversy, in which Prudentius, Ratramnus, Servatus Lupus, John Scotus, Remigius, and others, took part, and which was brought to a conclusion in a rather violent manner by the syllogisms of Chierisy (853) and Valance (855). During the middle ages the views of Augustine suffered considerable restrictions from the Thomists, and were altogether abandoned by the Scotists. His infralapsarian tenet, that God elects whom he will out of the whole mass of ruined humanity, though retained by Anselm and Peter Lombard, gradually died away, and had to be revived by Thomas Bradwardine, Wiclif, Hus, and the other precursors of the Reformation. With the Reformers, however, — Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, — Augustinianism, and generally the whole question of predestination, entered into full light, and received its confessional statement; though from that very period a striking difference becomes apparent between the Lutheran doctrine, formed by Melanchthon, represented in the Formula Concordiae, and further developed by Schleiermacher and Martensen, and the Reformed doctrine in all its different forms, — infralapsarianism, supralapsarianism, hypothetic universalism, etc.

The two great stumbling-blocks which embarrassed the theological development of the doctrine of predestination were, on the one side, a singular misconception of the divine prescience, and, on the other, inability to harmonize the idea of absolute fore-ordination with the idea of divine justice. With respect to the former point, it is evident, that when the Arminians admit the foreknowledge of God, but deny the fore-ordination, making election and reprobation depend upon faith and repentance, their conception of the foreknowledge of God is untenable; for divine prescience is something more than the prophet's knowledge of the future. With God, to know and to do are identical. The prescience of God is creative. There is, consequently, between pre-science and predestination the necessary relation of a general to a specific term. With respect to the latter point, the difficulty has been solved in various ways, of which the so-called theory of national election and individualism are the most remarkable. The theory of national election confines election to communities and nations; that is, only communities and nations are by God predestinated to have the knowledge of the true religion and the external privileges of the gospel granted or denied to them. Individualism extends predestination to individual man, but without making it absolute with respect to election or reprobation: it is still confined to the outward church and the means of grace. Both these theories represent forms of predestination and are, consequently, implicitly present in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination such as it was formed by Calvin, and set forth in the Confess. Gall. and Confess. Belg., and, in a somewhat mitigated form, in the Confess. Helvet. and the Heidelberg Catechism.

LIT. — The enormously rich literature belonging to the subject may be found in Winer: Handbuch der theol. Literatur, i. 442, and Appenz., p. 72, and in this work under the separate heads. See A. Schweizer: Die Protestantischen Centraldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der reformirten Kirche, Zürich, 1864–66, 2 vols.; and Luthardt: Die Lehre vom freien Willen, Leipzig, 1863; [J. Forbes: Predestination and Free-will, Edinburgh, 1878].

PREMILLENNIALISM (Millenarianism, Christian Chiliasm), in all its forms, makes two affirmations; viz., (1) That the Scriptures teach us to expect an age on earth of universal righteousness, called the "millennium," from Rev. xx. 1–5; (2) That this millennial age will be introduced by the personal, visible return of the Lord Jesus, to establish over the whole world a theocratic kingdom. This Christian chiliasm is to be distinguished, (1) from all forms of pseudo-chiliasm among Christians, such as teach that the saints — whether by means of material force, as the Anabaptists and Fifth-Fraternity Men, or by moral and spiritual forces, as very many moderns — shall come to rule the world before the resurrection; — this all premillennialists join the Augustburg Confession in denying; (2) from the Jewish chiliasm, as opposed to which it is held, (a) That the inheritance of the kingdom is conditioned, not by race or ritual observance, but by regeneration only; (b) That the delights and occupations of the risen saints will not be sensual, but suited to the nature of a perfectly sanctified spirit, and of a body spiritual and incorruptible; (c) That the millennial kingdom will not be final, but transitional. As to the time of the advent, premillennialists hold that it is unknown. However individuals sometimes have presumed to calculate the date, the great majority of premillennialists have deprecated such attempts as utterly unscriptural, and of mischievous tendency. It is agreed, again, that the advent is conditioned, in the purpose of God, by the preaching of the gospel sufficiently to serve the purpose of a witness among all nations: "Then shall the end come." As to the resurrection, it is believed that the resurrection of the righteous will precede that of the wicked by a period called, in Rev. xx., "a thousand years;" during which, as most understand, many not attaining the first resurrection will remain in the flesh upon the earth. As to the judgment, while prescyrchical individualism is the most remarkable. The theory of national election confines election to communities and nations; that is, only communities and nations are by God predestinated to have the knowledge of the true religion and the external privileges of the gospel granted or denied to them. Individualism extends predestination to individual man, but without making it absolute with respect to...
and ending with the resurrection and judgment of the dead, and the establishment of the "new heavens and the new earth." In this judgment-period, most agree that the Scriptures teach us to expect the following events:—First of all, immediately upon the advent of the Lord takes place "the first resurrection," or exanastasis (Phil. iii. 11), of the righteous dead, and the translation of the saints in Christ. After that is the "canon of gathering...to meet the Lord in the air," who will then be rewarded according to their works; also, with the advent, begins upon earth the last great tribulation, wherein the Lord and his risen people with him "rule the nations with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (Rev. ii. 27; Ps. ii. 9). As the final issue, Israel, previously restored, in part or wholly,—in unbelief, as most think,—to their own land, looking upon Him whom they have pierced, shall be brought to true repentance, and own the Crucified as their Messiah (Zech. xii. 10; Rev. i. 7), the hosts of antichrist be destroyed, Satan bound, and the theocratic kingdom of the Son of man established over the remnant of Israel and the escaped of the Gentiles. To the dispensation of Pentecost, in which we now live, shall then succeed the dispensation of ingathering. The Holy Ghost will be poured out as never before: as now individuals, so then whole nations, shall be saved. Yet, during this transitional millennial age, it is commonly understood that sin shall still remain upon earth, as hinted in Isa. lxv. 20, though in subordination to everywhere prevailing righteousness. When that age shall end, Satan, released, will make a last attempt to regain his lost dominion, but in vain; for he, his angels, and all of men who from the beginning had rebelled with him, raised from the dead, will then be judged according to their works, and cast into the lake of fire. The earth, renewed by fire, will then be judged according to their works; also, tribulation, wherein the Lord and his risen people with him "rule the nations with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel." The doctrine is found in the Epistle of Barnabas (chap. 19), the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Jud. 25, Benj. 10), the Shepherd of Hermas (Ps. 1, 9); was taught by Papias (Eusebius : Ecclesiastical History, ii. 39); is set forth by Justin the Martyr (Diat. 80, 81), still more fully by Ireneus (Adv. Haer. v. 23, 25-36) and Tertullian (Adv. Marc. lib. iii. 24). The first record of the doctrine was Caius, a presbyter of Rome, about the beginning of the third century, from which time, through the opposition to the Montanists, who made chiliasm a prominent article of their faith, the dislike to the gross form in which some individuals presented the doctrines, and still more through the influence of Origen and the Alexandrian allegorizing school of interpretation, chiliasm rapidly declined. In the early part of the fourth century, however, some eminent men—as, e.g., Nepos, Cyprian, Methodius, and Lactantius (Inst., vii. et seq.)—held the doctrine; but when, in Constantine, Christianity reached the throne of the Roman Empire, the church soon settled in the belief, shortly afterward confirmed by the weighty authority of Augustine, that the millennial reign, formerly expected to begin with the second advent, was really to be reckoned from the first, and was therefore a realized fact in the triumph of the Church over the heathen State. That doctrine, with unessential modifications, remained the universal faith of the church for a full thousand years, during which, premillennialism can hardly be said to have existed. With the Reformation of the sixteenth century, shortly re-appeared the ancient chiliasm hopes; as, e.g., in Piscator, Tycho Brahe, and a few others. In the next century (1627), Mr. Mede published in England his Clavis Apocalypistica, marking an epoch in the modern development of the premillennial doctrine. It had much influence; and a little later Lightfoot complains that chilastic views were then held by "very many" (Works, vol. vi. p. 169). The most of the chief divines of the Westminster Assembly (1643-49) are said by Baillie, the antichilastor of the Assembly, to have been "express chilisists." Among the English Baptists of the same period, premillennialism appears in a catechism condemned by Lord Chief Justice Hyde (1664), and a Confession of several Somerset congregations (1691). In 1685 the French divine, Jurieu, and in the eighteenth century, in England, among others, Daubuz, Sir Isaac Newton, Archbishop Newcome, Bishops Newton, Horsley, Heber, Dr. Gill, Charles Wesley, Augustus Toplady, taught, in one form or another, premillennial doctrine. In Germany, during the eighteenth century, the Berleburg Bible, with its premillenialist annotations, and, still more, the expository works of J. A. Bengel, were doing much to disseminate chilastic beliefs. With the French Revolution in the end of the eighteenth century came a great wave of interest in the study of the prophecies; and premillennialism therewith received such an impetus, that since then it has probably had more advocates of high ability.
and standing in the church than at any time since the second century. The names of Professors Delitzsch, Van Ooetersee, Von Hofmann, Auberlen, Nitzsch, Ebrard, Rothe, Lange, Christlieb, Luthardt, Gaussen, Godet, with many others, illustrate this fact. In 1870 the Free Christian Church in Basel, a great institution, organized under the auspices of the Anglican Church, adopted its confession of faith. In the United Kingdom, among dissenters, the Plymouth Brethren, as elsewhere, and a few prominent individuals in other bodies, - as, e.g., Drs. H. and A. A. Bonar, Drs. George Gilfillan, Jamieson, Fausset, and Cumming, - have advocated premillennialism; but the most in the non-episcopal communions reject it. In the Episcopal Church, however, a large proportion - according to some, the majority of the clergy - are on the premillennial side. The doctrine is taught more or less fully in the writings of Archbishop Trench, Bishops Ellicott, Ryle, Canons Birkenshaw, Hofmann, and Alford; in the latest works of Tregelles, the late Dean Alford, and many others. In America, until lately, the doctrine has been held by only a few, among whom may be named the late Dr. N. Lord, Joel Jones, LL.D., Drs. R. J. Breckenridge and Lillie. Recently, however, through the influence, no doubt, of the writings of Lange, Van Ooetersee, Auberlen, and others, and the popular teaching of Mr. Moody and other premillennial evangelists, belief in the doctrine has been spreading. In October, 1878, a public conference of premillennialists was held in New York, similar to one convened in February, 1878, in London, by Canon Freemantle, the Canon Hoare, Dr. H. Bonar, Prebendary Auriol, and others. Ten denominations were represented in the hundred and twenty-two names appended to the call for the convention, of which forty-nine belonged to various Presbyterian bodies, twenty-three to the Baptists, the remainder to the Episcopalians, Lutherans, etc. The large church of the Holy Trinity (Dr. S. H. Tyng's) was well filled throughout the three-days' sessions; and in the country at large an unusual degree of interest was awakened, as was evident both from the numerous notices and discussions in the periodicals of the time, and from the remarkably large sale of the New-York Tribune's Extra, containing the authorized report of the proceedings. In the Church of Rome, premillennialism has never maintained itself; though a very few individuals, as, notably, the Jesuit Lacunza and Pere Lambert, in the beginning of this century, have written on that side. The same remark may be made of the Greek Church also, though even in Russia there are a few individuals and sects who make the premillennial advent a part of their creed. Occasionally, some holding this doctrine have gone to fantastic excesses; as in the case of some of the followers of Edward Irving in Scotland, and many disciples of Mr. W. Miller in America, led astray by his calculation of the time of the advent in 1843. More recent developments of the same kind may be instances in the so-called "Overcomers" of America and the Hofmannite German "Adventists" have departed from the Catholic faith in denying the conscious life of the soul between death and the resurrection, and teaching the total annihilation of the impenitent. A few others have connected with chiliasm the doctrine of universal restoration, as Jukes (Restitution of all Things, London, 1877). But premillennialists generally differ in nothing from other evangelical Christians as to the fundamentals of faith or practice. In the work of home and foreign evangelism they appear to be specially active.

PREMONSTRANTS. 1890

PREMONSTRANTS, or PREMONSTRATENSIANS, is the name of a monastic order founded by Norbert in the first half of the twelfth century. The name is derived from Prémontré (Prémonstratensium), a place between Rheims and Laval, where its first monastery was founded in 1121. It spread through all countries, and had at one time a thousand and five hundred female abbeys. It was then divided into thirty provinces, or "circariae," with a circator at the head of each. The abbeys of Prémontré, St. Martin, Floreffe, and Cuisy, the four oldest monasteries, enjoyed the highest authority: they exercised a general right of visitation. The abbot of Prémontré stood at the head of the whole order as a kind of general. The province of Saxony held a prominent position in the order. Hubert of Magdeburg, had thirteen abbeys and the cathedral chapters of Magdeburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg, and Ratzeburg, under his authority: the four latter episcopal sees were consequently almost exclusively occupied by Premonstrants. The rules were those of Augustine. The religious practices were severe. Flesh was altogether forbidden. Fasts were frequent, also scourings.

Norbert of Gennep was born at Xanten, on the left bank of the Rhine, in the duchy of Cleve, and died at Magdeburg, June 6, 1134. He was a relative of the emperor, Henry V., held several rich benefices, and led a gay life until 1115, when he was converted. He left his court costume in sheepskins, and walked about barefooted among the poor people, preaching and teaching. In accordance with a vision, the valley of Coucy (Pratum monstratum, or Preamonstratum) for the site of the first monastery. Honorius II. confirmed the order by a bull of Feb. 16, 1126; and his severity brought him into manifold conflicts and losses, which made reforms and restrictions necessary; and when, finally, decay set in, the collapse followed swiftly. See Hugonis annales ord. Pream., Nancy, 1784; and Winter: Die Prämonstratenser des 15. Jahrhunderts, Berlin, 1865.

Elizabeth, b. at Devon, Oct. 26, 1818; d. at Dorset, Vt., Aug. 13, 1878. She was the youngest daughter of Dr. Edward Payson. While a young girl, she began to write for The Youth's Companion. In 1845 she was married to the Rev. George L. Prentiss, then just ordained as a pastor in New Bedford, Mass. In 1861 she removed to New York, where her husband became successively pastor and theological professor. In 1888 she accompanied him abroad, and spent two years there, mostly in Switzerland. Between 1868, when her most popular juvenile work (Little Susy's System and Letters) was published, and 1878, the year of her death, more than twenty different volumes appeared from her pen, among them two other Susy books, The Flower of the Family, Henry and Bessee, The Persics, Fred and Maria and Me, Little Lou's Sayings and Doings, Stepping Heavenward, Aunt Jane's Hero, The Home at Greylock, The Story Little told, Urban and his Friends, Nidworth, and Golden Hours, or Hymns and Songs of the Christian Life. It is estimated that more than two hundred thousand copies of these works have been sold in America. Many of them were reprinted in Great Britain, and have a wide circulation there. The Flower of the Family, Stepping Heavenward, and several others, were translated into French and German, and passed through successive editions.

Of all Mrs. Prentiss's writings, Stepping Heavenward has made the strongest impression. More than seventy reprints have appeared in English and four reprints in America. It was reprinted in England by five different houses. It was issued by Tauchnitz, in his Collection of British Authors; and the German translation is now in its fourth edition. For further notices of Mrs. Prentiss's books, see The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss, edited by her husband (New York, 1882, eighth thousand, June, 1888), pp. 281, 282, also pp. 568-573; and for a characterization of her writings, as also a vivid sketch of her personal and religious traits, see Dr. Vincent's Memorial Discourse, pp. 559-568 of the same work.

PREBYSER AND THE PRESBYTERATE.

Age should always bring experience, and command respect and influence. The Ephoría of the Spartans, and the Senatus of the Romans, derived their names, original membership, and political import, from the age of their members. So, under Moses and afterwards, the "elders" of Israel were the people's chosen representatives and governors, because of their years (Exod. iii. 16, xii. 21; Num. xi. 16 sqq.; Josh. vii. 6; 1 Sam. viii. 4; Jer. xxix. 1, etc.). The members of the Sanhedrin and of the local courts among the Jews were "elders." From the Old-Testament to the New-Testament church the eldership was naturally introduced. The subsequent history of the eldership may be divided into three divisions: I. Apostolic, II. Reformed upon Calvinistic principles, III. Modern.

I. APOSTOLIC. — Elder and bishop were different names for the same office. The origin of it was when the seven were chosen by the Jerusalem Church, at the suggestion of the apostles (Acts vi. 1 sqq.) It is a mistake to follow, as is commonly done, the error of Cyprian (Ep. III. 5), and assert that the seven had no other office than that of the so-called deaconate; for they are never called deacons in the Acts, and their duties were those of a service of table. The apostolic church need not have been alike universal in its organization. In the local churches the presbyterate may have been a matter of great political and social importance. The word may have been assumed by the people's chosen representatives and governors, or the council of the family. Incumbents (including priests, parochial superintendents, and district superintendents) are called presbyters in the Church of England. It is a mistake to suppose that the word presbyter is used of all the members of the presbytery, as such is in Acts xi. 30, in connection with the
church at Antioch, whose elders sent the money collected for the relief of the Judean brethren,—precisely the sort of work committed to the seven. It was the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem who debated the great question of Christian liberty: ecclesiastical or temporal concerns. Again: the elders were present when Paul made his report in Jerusalem concerning his last missionary journey (Acts xxii. 18 sqq.). Further: it was the elders who were commissioned by James (v. 14 sqq.) to pray over the sick, and anoint them with oil. In the Gentile Christian world, also, elders were prominent persons. Paul ordained such in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch (Acts xiv. 23); tenderly addressed and earnestly counselled those of the Ephesian Church (xx. 17 sqq.); and in his epistles, by wise and minute directions, showed these officers how they were to fulfil their duties, both governmental and directly spiritual, in a word, pastoral (1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 1 sqq.; Tit. i. 6 sqq.).

Peter gives similar directions (1 Pet. v. 1–4). But Paul's remark, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour," (1 Tim. v. 17), does not imply two classes of elders, the "teaching" and the "ruling," for there was only one class, but rather that each elder, according to his aptitude and training, was to give himself to his special work, whether teaching or ruling, and also, that, although teaching was part of the office, every elder was not called upon to teach. In similar strain, Heb. xiii. 7, 17 speaks of the teaching of the elders, and their care for the souls of their constituency.

From these passages a clear idea of the nature of the duties of the primitive elders can be formed. They taught publicly; but this was not the whole of their work. They governed, as well as instructed. They were neither merely representatives of the congregation, nor merely preachers and teachers, nor pre-eminently organs of ecclesiastical discipline. They were, as termed it, neither lay-elders, because the distinction between laity and clergy had not yet been made. They stood in and at the same time over the congregation; in it, because they belonged originally and constantly to it; over it, because they exercised the right and duty of oversight and guidance. They were, as a rule, chosen by the congregation, as were the seven (Acts vi., cf. xiv. 22), under divine direction (xx. 28). Even in the process they were pointed by the apostles, or at their command (Tit. i. 5), there was presumably co-action on the congregations' part.

A crisis in the development of the presbyterial office and the constitution of the congregation came about 97 A.D., when Clement of Rome, in the form of a letter of indisputable honor in the Epistle to the Corinthian Church, wherein he appeals to the Old-Testament distinction between clergy and laity (chap. xii. sqq.) as a valid reason for the existence of the same distinction in the Christian Church, and, on the ground of it, calls the rebellion against the elders, which had broken out in the Corinthian Church, an attack upon divinely constituted authority. The epistle proves that already the primitive idea of the eldership had undergone a change, and that elders would speedily be a class distinct from the laity, having exclusive spiritual and household jurisdiction. Not only Clement but Polycarp (Epist., chap. vi.) has any thing to say about teaching-elders. Indeed, from their time may be dated the beginning of the transformation of the eldership into a hierarchy.

II. REFORMED ELDERSHIP UPON CALVINISTIC PRINCIPLES.—All the Reformers desired to restore to the congregations their primitive rights; but they differed very much as to methods. Luther taught the priesthood of all believers, and the people's right to call, install, dismiss, and indict their ministers. The power of the keys was also theirs. Yet neither Luther nor Melanchthon, nor any other Wittenberg Reformer, restored the eldership. Indeed, Luther maintained, that, besides preaching, there was only the care of the poor to be provided for through an ecclesiastical office. (See art. LUTHERAN CHURCH.) The restoration of the eldership came from Oecolampadius of Basel; and it was Calvin who first set forth the idea in a thoroughly practical form. This was in Geneva (1541). He was not able, it is true, to carry his ideas upon this subject to their full development, because politics interfered; but he accomplished this organization,—the elders came next to the pastors and teachers, and constituted the third official rank; the deacons, the fourth. The elders were elected by the Council of State, with the advice of the ministers, and the list was presented to the Council of Two Hundred for its approval. The elders were to be twelve in number,—two to belong to the Little Council; four, to the Council of Sixty; and six, to the Council of Two Hundred. Each elder was given a section of the city to inspect as to its moral conduct; and the body, with the six ministers, constituted the consistory, which dealt with all cases of ecclesiastical discipline.

Calvin's idea of the eldership was adopted in France and Scotland, and sporadically in Germany. In Paris the first consistory, composed of the minister and several elders and deacons, was formed 1555, and afterwards a number of congregations took up the plan. At first the consistories had unlimited authority, but their power was curtailed by the synod of 1559. In Geneva the elders were chosen for life; in France, for much shorter times. Their duties were to govern and conduct the congregation: the direct care of souls was relegated to deacons. In Scotland the presbyterate was set up in 1559, and declared to be of scriptural authority, and to rank equal with the ministry, the clergy-elders standing on the level of the ruling elders, as a spiritual office. The elders, with the minister, visited the sick, and examined intendant communicants, constituted with him and under his presidency the kirk-session, and finally elected their own successors.

The eldership of the sixteenth century was not apostolic, although its defenders appealed directly to Scripture, and thought to copy the primitive church, for the reason, that, in the apostolic church, the elders had the entire government of the congregation, and the preachers were not next to them or above them, but simply members
of the congregations,—perhaps elders, perhaps not; for as yet the order of preacher had not been developed.

The presbyterian polity spread from Scotland into England, and in Germany was adopted, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by many Lutheran churches on the Lower Rhine and in Westphalia, and received the cordial approval and advocacy of Spener.

III. Modern.—The presbyterian polity has in this century spread very widely. In Prussia it was introduced in many hundred congregations (June 29, 1850, and Sept. 10, 1873); and the same is the case with Bavaria, Braunschweig, and other provinces of the empire. The polity is to be distinguished from that of Independency or Congregationalism, and from lay-government pure and simple (Erastianism). The true eldership has these marks: (1) Distinction between and separation of the civil and ecclesiastical affairs in reference to the congregation and its officers; (2) Organization of the congregation, so that certain members be set apart for the performance of certain duties and the enjoyment of certain privileges; (3) The elders are intrusted, along with the minister, with the spiritual care, the temporal affairs, and the legal representation of the congregation. See Presbyterianism. G. V. Lechler.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. I. In Scotland.

(1) CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. The following article will be dedicated to some account of, (1) the history, (2) the constitution, and (3) the present condition, of the Scottish Church.

1. History.—The Church of Scotland came into existence in the year 1560. It can hardly be said, certainly, to have been legally established in that year. The formal ratification of Presbyterian church government in Scotland did not take place until 1592, when the celebrated act of the Scots Parliament was passed, which has been commonly known as the Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland. In 1560, however, the foundations of the church were practically laid. It was on the seventeenth day of August of that year, that "the Scots Confession," drawn up at the request, and read aloud, clause by clause, in their hearing, was solemnly ratified by the Three Estates of the realm. Its ratification was carried by an overwhelming majority. "Of the temporal estate," says Knox, in his History of the Reformation, "only voted in the contrary the Earl of Atholl and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting they produced no better reason, but we will believe as our fathers believed." He goes on, "The bishops (papistical, I mean) spoke nothing. The rest of the whole Three Estates by their public votes affirmed the doctrine."

It has sometimes been maintained that the Reformed Church of Scotland may claim even an earlier commencement than the year 1560, and may, indeed, as some have argued, be traced back to the first introduction into the country of Christianity itself; the early Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Columba, being, as is alleged, essentially Presbyterian. The early Celtic Church certainly was not episcopal; nor, above all, had that church any subordination to the Roman pontiff. But the resemblances to the church of John Knox, found in the monastic establishments over which the abbot-prebysy of Iona so long ruled, are by no means complete; the Celtic ecclesiastical system being, as Dean Stanley has said (Church of Scotland, p. 29), "as unlike presbyterianism as it is unlike episcopacy." And especially when we consider that a strictly Romanist Church, as introduced by David I., had interrupted for four hundred years the doctrine and practice of the earliest forms of Scottish Christianity, the theory of what is called the continuity of the Church of Scotland must, upon the whole, be set aside as untenable.

The new church, though succeeding a religious establishment very differently situated, entered on its career with miserably inadequate provisions for its material support. The endowments of the Roman-Catholic Church had been enormous. It has been estimated, that, previous to the Reformation, not less than one-half of the entire landed property of Scotland was in the hands of ecclesiastics; and that, including all sources of income, the actual revenues of the Romish Church must have exceeded two hundred and fifty thousand pounds a year. The proposal of John Knox and the other leaders of the Protestant party, as to the disposal of property admitted on all hands to be ecclesiastical property, will be found in the First Book of Discipline, chap. v. That scheme was not only, as regards its originators, remarkably disinterested, but, both in its general conception and in its details, wise and statesmanlike. It was to the effect that the revenues of the church should be devoted to three objects, all of them more or less contemplated by the original donors of church property in Scotland; namely, (1) the sustentation of the ministry, (2) the education of the people in schools and universities— the education to be of the most liberal description, and (3) the relief of the poor. Patriotic as was this great scheme, it met with nothing but ridicule from the members of the Scottish Parliament. Nevertheless, however, the foundations of the Church of Scotland were practically laid. Its ratification was carried by an overwhelming majority. "Of the temporal estate," says Knox, in his History of the Reformation, "only voted in the contrary the Earl of Atholl and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting they produced no better reason, but we will believe as our fathers believed." He goes on, "The bishops (papistical, I mean) spoke nothing. The rest of the whole Three Estates by their public votes affirmed the doctrine."

It has sometimes been maintained that the Reformed Church of Scotland may claim even an earlier commencement than the year 1560, and may, indeed, as some have argued, be traced back to the first introduction into the country of Christianity itself; the early Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Columba, being, as is alleged, essentially Presbyterian. The early Celtic Church certainly was not episcopal; nor, above all, had that church any subordination to the Roman pontiff. But the resemblances to the church of John Knox, found in the monastic establishments over which the abbot-prebysy of Iona so long ruled, are by no means complete; the Celtic ecclesiastical system being, as Dean Stanley has said (Church of Scotland, p. 29), "as unlike presbyterianism as it is unlike episcopacy." And especially when we consider that a strictly Romanist Church, as introduced by David I., had interrupted for four hundred years the doctrine and practice of the earliest forms of Scottish Christianity, the theory of what is called the continuity of the Church of Scotland must, upon the whole, be set aside as untenable.

The new church, though succeeding a religious establishment very differently situated, entered on its career with miserably inadequate provisions for its material support. The endowments of the Roman-Catholic Church had been enormous. It has been estimated, that, previous to the Reformation, not less than one-half of the entire landed property of Scotland was in the hands of ecclesiastics; and that, including all sources of income, the actual revenues of the Romish Church must have exceeded two hundred and fifty thousand pounds a year. The proposal of John Knox and the other leaders of the Protestant party, as to the disposal of property admitted on all hands to be ecclesiastical property, will be found in the First Book of Discipline, chap. v. That scheme was not only, as regards its originators, remarkably disinterested, but, both in its general conception and in its details, wise and statesmanlike. It was to the effect that the revenues of the church should be devoted to three objects, all of them more or less contemplated by the original donors of church property in Scotland; namely, (1) the sustentation of the ministry, (2) the education of the people in schools and universities—the education to be of the most liberal description, and (3) the relief of the poor. Patriotic as was this great scheme, it met with nothing but ridicule from the members of the Scottish Parliament. Nevertheless, however, the foundations of the Church of Scotland were practically laid. Its ratification was carried by an overwhelming majority. "Of the temporal estate," says Knox, in his History of the Reformation, "only voted in the contrary the Earl of Atholl and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting they produced no better reason, but we will believe as our fathers believed." He goes on, "The bishops (papistical, I mean) spoke nothing. The rest of the whole Three Estates by their public votes affirmed the doctrine."

It has sometimes been maintained that the Reformed Church of Scotland may claim even an earlier commencement than the year 1560, and may, indeed, as some have argued, be traced back to the first introduction into the country of Christianity itself; the early Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Columba, being, as is alleged, essentially Presbyterian. The early Celtic Church certainly was not episcopal; nor, above all, had that church any subordination to the Roman pontiff. But the resemblances to the church of John Knox, found in the monastic establishments over which the abbot-prebysy of Iona so long ruled, are by no means complete; the Celtic ecclesiastical system being, as Dean Stanley has said (Church of Scotland, p. 29), "as unlike presbyterianism as it is unlike episcopacy." And especially when we consider that a strictly Romanist Church, as introduced by David I., had interrupted for four hundred years the doctrine and practice of the earliest forms of Scottish Christianity, the theory of what is called the continuity of the Church of Scotland must, upon the whole, be set aside as untenable.

The new church, though succeeding a religious establishment very differently situated, entered on its career with miserably inadequate provisions for its material support. The endowments of the Roman-Catholic Church had been enormous. It has been estimated, that, previous to the Reformation, not less than one-half of the entire landed property of Scotland was in the hands of ecclesiastics; and that, including all sources of income, the actual revenues of the Romish Church must have exceeded two hundred and fifty thousand pounds a year. The proposal of John Knox and the other leaders of the Protestant party, as to the disposal of property admitted on all hands to be ecclesiastical property, will be found in the First Book of Discipline, chap. v. That scheme was not only, as regards its originators, remarkably disinterested, but, both in its general conception and in its details, wise and statesmanlike. It was to the effect that the revenues of the church should be devoted to three objects, all of them more or less contemplated by the original donors of church property in Scotland; namely, (1) the sustentation of the ministry, (2) the education of the people in schools and universities—the education to be of the most liberal description, and (3) the relief of the poor. Patriotic as was this great scheme, it met with nothing but ridicule from the members of the Scottish Parliament. Nevertheless, however, the foundations of the Church of Scotland were practically laid. Its ratification was carried by an overwhelming majority. "Of the temporal estate," says Knox, in his History of the Reformation, "only voted in the contrary the Earl of Atholl and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting they produced no better reason, but we will believe as our fathers believed." He goes on, "The bishops (papistical, I mean) spoke nothing. The rest of the whole Three Estates by their public votes affirmed the doctrine."

It has sometimes been maintained that the Reformed Church of Scotland may claim even an earlier commencement than the year 1560, and may, indeed, as some have argued, be traced back to the first introduction into the country of Christianity itself; the early Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Columba, being, as is alleged, essentially Presbyterian. The early Celtic Church certainly was not episcopal; nor, above all, had that church any subordination to the Roman pontiff. But the resemblances to the church of John Knox, found in the monastic establishments over which the abbot-prebysy of Iona so long ruled, are by no means complete; the Celtic ecclesiastical system being, as Dean Stanley has said (Church of Scotland, p. 29), "as unlike presbyterianism as it is unlike episcopacy." And especially when we consider that a strictly Romanist Church, as introduced by David I., had interrupted for four hundred years the doctrine and practice of the earliest forms of Scottish Christianity, the theory of what is called the continuity of the Church of Scotland must, upon the whole, be set aside as untenable.
try, with innumerable filthy and execrable sins" (Diary, 129). Knox speaks in terms of scathing indignation. "Some [of the laity] were licentious," he says; "some had greedily gripped the possessions of the church; and others thought they would not lose their part of Christ's coat. ... The only gain was not to be found in the house of Christ Jesus, and refused to subscribe the Book of Discipline, was the Lord Erskine; and no wonder for ... if the poor, the schools, and the ministry of the church, had their own, his kitchen had lacked two parts of that which he now unjustly possessed." (History, vol. ii. p. 128.)

The same narrowness of means, hampering all her operations, has characterized the Church of Scotland from first to last.

Nor has the Church of Scotland had, upon the whole, other than a troubled career. Robert Wodrow calls his history, which extends from the Restoration to the Revolution, a History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland; and the same description might, without violence, be applied to a much more extended period of Scottish church history. Her motto, Nec tamem consummatum, itself, indeed, implies that she has always been exposed to, no less than that she has always survived, trial and suffering.

Notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which she has thus labored, through the limitation of her resources and other hindrances, the Church of Scotland has not throughout her history been behind other churches in the work which she has accomplished. She has been, no doubt, excelled by the Church of England, and also by the Church of Rome, in her labors for the promotion of learning, at least in its highest departments, and especially as regards the number of men occupying a pre-eminent position in arts and literature, who have belonged to her communion, and been fostered by her institutions. But, even with relation to the encouragement of learning, she has not been altogether unentitled to honorable recognition; numbering, as she has done, among her sons, from the first,— that is, even in the sixteenth century itself,— men like George Buchanan, Andrew Melville, Andrew Melville, and others of the most accurate and elegant scholars of their age, as tried, too, not by Scottish standards, but by the standard of those foreign universities in which most of them prosecuted a great part of their studies. In the seventeen century, again, Dr. Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk,— "Jupiter Carlyle,"— speaking of his own contemporaries, boasts, not without reason, that there were few branches of literature in which ministers of the Scottish Church did not excel (Autobiography, p. 561). So it has always been. Nor, when referring to her services to learning, must we forget the proposals of the Reformed Church of Scotland in The First Book of Discipline, already referred to, for a scheme of national education, which is now, in the nineteenth century, only beginning to be thoroughly appreciated; or the system of parish schools, introduced by the Privy Council and at superintendence of the Church, as well as carried out under her superintendence, and which has had so much to do with the high character and the remarkable success in life for which, for so long a period, Scotchmen have been distinguished in all parts of the world. The Church of Scotland, however, has done still greater work. A Christian church mainly exists for the religious instruction, comfort, and edification of the people, and for the extension beyond her own bounds of the blessings of the gospel of Christ. And, judging especially from statistics professional, it be found that, in the course of this article, no church, it is believed, can appeal with more confidence to the diligence, fidelity, and success with which, in their every-day labors, the ministers and members of the Church of Scotland have fulfilled their supreme duties.

The principal events of the history of the church from the Reformation to the present times may be very briefly recapitulated. On the 20th of December, 1560, the first General Assembly met in Edinburgh. There were forty-one members, of whom only six were ministers. Its chief business related to the external organization of the infant church. In the same year, the Book of Policy, or First Book of Discipline, was prepared, and laid before the Privy Council, who, however, never gave that document, as a whole, their formal approval. The principal reasons have been already noticed.

Many of the church at its first beginnings accepted presbyterianism as its system of church government, having been, indeed, both in doctrine and in policy, formed on the model of the Genevan Church, from which its most influential leaders had received their own religious and ecclesiastical principles. The great controversy, however, as to episcopacy, which continued to trouble the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Revolution, very soon broke out. It originated with the nobles, whose personal interests were bound up with the maintenance of nominal, or, as they were called in allusion to an old rustic device for making cows give milk, "tulchane" bishoprics. Episcopacy was afterwards adopted, for a different reason, by James VI. and his immediate successors, who (at least as regards James himself and his son Charles I.) appear to have been chiefly influenced by the belief that there was a natural affinity between prelacy and monarchy. At the time of the Reform, the bishops, now disestablished, their nominal titles and also a large part of their stipends; the expectation being, that, as these men died out, the last traces of the old system would gradually disappear along with them. But in 1572, when this natural termination of the older incumbencies began to take effect, a convocation of the church at Leith was persuaded, for the reasons already stated, but under the pretext of the minority of the king, to postpone the abolition of episcopacy. It must be acknowledged that the Leith ordinances were, in an evil moment, consented to by John Knox and other leaders, as well as by the General Assembly. The retrograde movement in question was for a time arrested by the influence of Andrew Melville. Melville, laden with scholastic honors, returned from the Continent (where he had during the last ten years been completing his university education) in the year 1574, and at superintendence of the Church, not only, like John Knox, as ineptidden, but as, in its own nature, contrary to the Scriptures. In 1580, under Melville's influence, the General Assembly "founded and declared the pretended office of a bishop to be unlawful, having
neither foundation nor warrant in the word of God;" and so vigorously was this resolution acted upon, that, before the Assembly of the following year, all the bishops, except five, had sent in their demissions. In 1681 a strictly presbyterian book of policy, The Second Book of Discipline, drawn up under the king's superintendence, though never sanctioned by Parliament, nor even approved by a majority of the presbytery of the church, this document became in 1692 the basis of the celebrated act of Parliament, already referred to, which established presbyterian church government, and for the time overturned the episcopal polity in Scotland. But the recovery was only temporary. James VI. had never been a Presbyterian at heart, and his succession to the English throne in 1603 gave him a new motive for a preference which was originally due, as already suggested, to political motives. From this time he abandoned himself to the scheme of assimilating the ecclesiastical policy of his Scottish kingdom to that of England; and by means of the Fifth Articles of 1618 (ratified by Parliament in 1621), imposing a number of mediaeval festivals and ceremonies, as well as by the previous act of 1606, restoring their estates to Scottish bishops, he effectually prepared the way for certain still greater changes in the same direction, which he left to be introduced by his son. That son, Charles I., more zealous, and less astute, carried matters farther than James, but brought upon himself in the process the loss of his crown and his life. There is no doubt that the introduction, at the suggestion of Archbishop Laud, of the Book of Canons and the Book of Common Prayer, was the immediate occasion of the English Revolution. Another re-action occurred in 1637; and prebendery, though in an exaggerated form and under unfavorable circumstances, gained the ascendency till 1661,— the date of the Restoration. Episcopacy was in 1661 again re-established, not without, in the case of the Presbyterian Church (especially as represented by the Covenanters), the accompaniment of cruel persecution, which hardly ceased from that date till the Revolution of 1688. It must be added, that, through this whole period of nearly a hundred and thirty years,— whatever may have been the changes in the public policy of the government,— the feelings of the people of Scotland had been consistently in favor of the presbyterian forms. After the revolution settlement which restored presbyterianity on the basis of the old Scottish act of 1592, the church ceased to suffer from the controversies between prebendary and presbytery. An act of Queen Anne (1711), restoring patronage in the appointment of ministers, now became, directly or indirectly, the principal source of trouble to the church. One of its consequences was the secession of 1737, giving the seceding ministers, with their congregations, in the prebendery of Stirling (see Ebenezer Erskine and United Presbyterian Church of Scotland), which became the nucleus of the now large and important body known as the "United Presbyterian Church of Scotland." Another secession, originating in very much the same way, and eventually forming part of the same dissenting body, took place in 1745. This new secession, until its union with the seceders of 1737, took the name of "The Relief." It would be impossible, with our limited space, to go into all the details of the history of the Scottish Church in the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth centuries.

Within the latter period, incomparably the most important event was the "Disruption," as it has sometimes been called. In 1843 a large number of the ministers, and also of the laity, of the Established Church of Scotland, withdrew from the church, and formed a body of dissenters, under the name of the "Free Church." The occasion of the step thus taken by the most considerable, at least in numbers, of all the seceders who have left the Church of Scotland, was complicated, and cannot be explained without going into details for which this is not the place. The question related chiefly to the independent jurisdiction of the church; but it originated in a proposal, on the part of the church, to modify by ecclesiastical authority the law which was originally due, as already suggested, to political motives. From this time he conceded even by those who feel most strongly that the Scottish martyrs of 1640 were, to use the words of Sir William Hamilton, "martyrs by mistake;" and that the result of their action has been, not favorable, but mischievous, to the cause which they had at heart.

Among the most recent incidents in connection with the history of the Church are the resolution passed by the General Assembly in 1866, to the effect that the use of instrumental music, and other innovations in the forms of public worship, should not be opposed, unless they interfered with the peace of the church or the harmony of congregations; and the passing, in 1874, of an act of Parliament to repeal the act of Queen Anne on the subject of church subscriptions, and to substitute popular election in the appointment of ministers.

2. Constitution.— (a) The doctrine of the Scottish Church as established by law is to be found in the Confession of Faith drawn up in the time of the Commonwealth (originally as a common confession for the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland,— a scheme which came to nothing) by the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1642-49), and known as the "Westminster Confession." The original Scots Confession, prepared chiefly by John Knox, and approved by the Three Estates of the Scottish Parliament in 1560, was formally superseded in 1643 by the Westminster Symbol, first by an act of the General Assembly, passed in 1647, and afterwards by the act of the Parliament of William and Mary of 1680, re-establishing the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In this act of 1680 the articles of the Westminster Confession and "Another short form of the law of Scotland. Substantially the two confessions maintain— with, perhaps, in the case of the latter, a tendency to the more extreme form of Calvinistic theology— the same general type of doctrine. Upon the whole, too, the doctrine
is in harmony with that of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and of the other confessers of the faith.

(b) As regards church government, the Church of Scotland is, as already said, presbyterian. In some respects, indeed, it is more strictly presbyterian than the early French and Swiss churches, though to these, upon the whole, it is most nearly opposite. The Church of Scotland, after the Reformation, when the deficiency of qualified pastors to supply the vacant parishes required a special temporary arrangement, it has never, like the Continental presbyterian churches just referred to, admitted superintendents, prespositi, or inspectors as part of its organization, but has maintained presbyterial parity in the strictest sense of the term. At the same time, the Scottish Church does not now, and, as far as her legal standards are concerned, has not at any time, held extreme views on the subject of presbyterianism. It does not hold presbytery so much as Christianity to be the fundamental principle of its religious polity. In the Scots Confession of 1560, and in the Westminster Confession of 1647, it alike subordinates forms of church government to the catholic and undenominational doctrines which are common to all Christian churches. In the Scots Confession the first article is "of God," and in the Westminster Confession the same place is assigned to "the Holy Scriptures." Nor has the hypothesis of a jus divinum for presbytery—a divine institution of presbyterian church government—ever been authoritatively accepted by the Church of Scotland. So far from professing to believe that presbytery, as a system of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Christian Church, is prescribed in the New Testament, it freely acknowledges that "it does not think that any policy . . . can be appointed for all ages, times, and places" (Scots Confession, chap. xx.); and it holds that "there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the Word" (Westminster Confession, chap. i.). The view on the subject of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Church of Scotland is, as already said, presbyterian. In the Scots Confession the first article is "of God," and in the Westminster Confession the same place is assigned to "the Holy Scriptures." Nor has the hypothesis of a jus divinum for presbytery—a divine institution of presbyterian church government—ever been authoritatively accepted by the Church of Scotland. So far from professing to believe that presbytery, as a system of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Christian Church, is prescribed in the New Testament, it freely acknowledges that "it does not think that any policy . . . can be appointed for all ages, times, and places" (Scots Confession, chap. xx.); and it holds that "there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the Word" (Westminster Confession, chap. i.). The view on the subject of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Church of Scotland is, as already said, presbyterian. In the Scots Confession the first article is "of God," and in the Westminster Confession the same place is assigned to "the Holy Scriptures." Nor has the hypothesis of a jus divinum for presbytery—a divine institution of presbyterian church government—ever been authoritatively accepted by the Church of Scotland. So far from professing to believe that presbytery, as a system of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Christian Church, is prescribed in the New Testament, it freely acknowledges that "it does not think that any policy . . . can be appointed for all ages, times, and places" (Scots Confession, chap. xx.); and it holds that "there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the Word" (Westminster Confession, chap. i.). The view on the subject of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Church of Scotland is, as already said, presbyterian. In the Scots Confession the first article is "of God," and in the Westminster Confession the same place is assigned to "the Holy Scriptures." Nor has the hypothesis of a jus divinum for presbytery—a divine institution of presbyterian church government—ever been authoritatively accepted by the Church of Scotland. So far from professing to believe that presbytery, as a system of church government perpetually and universally binding upon the Christian Church, is prescribed in the New Testament, it freely acknowledges that "it does not think that any policy . . . can be appointed for all ages, times, and places" (Scots Confession, chap. xx.); and it holds that "there are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the Word" (Westminster Confession, chap. i.).

The General Assembly is the supreme court of the Church. It has not only administrative and judicial, but also, as regards ecclesiastical matters, legislative powers; these powers, however, being only exercised with the express concurrence of a majority of the presbyters of the church, and in conformity with a constitutional law known as "the Barrier Act." The General Assembly is always jealous of its privileges as an ecclesiastical court, and especially of any encroachments by the State on its spiritual independence. It is dignified, however, in all its meetings by the presence of a representative of the crown; this practice being followed in conformity with a provision of the celebrated Act of the Scottish Parliament of 1502. The "Commissioner," who represents the crown on these occasions, is also, in obedience to the same act, required to appoint by royal authority the time and place
of the next meeting of the assembly,—a ceremony which follows a similar appointment, first of all made by the moderator of the assembly in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ; the difference, of course, a relic of a thousand conflicts in former times between Church and State.

(c) With respect to ritual, the Church of Scotland does not, any more than in the case of church government, profess, except as regards general principles, and such positive institutions as the sacraments and Christian prayer, to have the explicit direction of Holy Scripture. It holds that order in ceremonies is not expressly prescribed in the New Testament; in most of the details of public worship little more being authoritatively laid down by Christ or his apostles than that God should be worshipped in spirit and in truth, that all things should be done decently and in order, and that all things should be done to edification (comp. Scots Confession, chap. xx.; Westminster Confession, chap. i.). It professes, however, to lean to simplicity, and to the imitation, as far as possible, of the example of Christ and his apostles, thus having always shown a strong objection to idolatrous or superstitious observances in the worship of God. It must be added that there are no liturgical forms of prayer in the Church of Scotland. At the time of the Reformation, that church, it is true, adopted, as a prayer-book the Book of Common Order,—a formulary which had been introduced in the church of Geneva when John Knox was its minister. The Book of Common Order is, accordingly, commonly known as Knox's Liturgy. But this prayer-book differs from other liturgies as being rather an optional than a compulsory form of public service, and admitting, to a considerable extent, of extemporary prayer. The rubric in every case is, that the service shall be "either in these words following, or to the like effect." The Book of Common Order appears to have continued in force, and (though there is some difference of opinion on the subject) to have been more or less regularly used in the Church till the time of the Commonwealth. At that period it was, like the old Scots Confession, formally superseded by an act of the General Assembly. The rule substituted was The Directory. The full title of this new formulary is, The Directory of the Public Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, approved by an act of the General Assembly and an act of the Scottish Parliament, both passed in Anno 1645. This Directory is, as its name imports, not a form of prayer, but a help to uniformity of worship. "Our meaning," says the Church, "is that general heads, the sense and the scope of the prayers, and other parts of public worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance of the services of God." For a very long time, neither the Book of Common Order nor the Directory of Public Worship has been practically enforced in the services of the Church of Scotland. As to its substance, however, the Directory fairly represents the usual practice since the period of the Revolution settlement of 1689. But as Dr. George Hill, in his Institutes, says, "The lapse of time and the change of circumstances have introduced various alterations." In the present day the tendency is to increased decorum and reverence in the worship of God, perhaps, at least, in some sympathy with the ritualistic spirit which has been so widely manifested in the sister kingdom.

(d) The rules with respect to the ministry of the Scottish Church deserve special notice. It is required of candidates for the ministry, that they should attend at a university for at least seven years,—four years in the arts classes, and three in the classes of the faculty of theology; entrance examinations, conducted by a synodical board, being exacted for the latter course, and that course being also necessarily followed by an examination for license before a presbytery. Appointments used to be made by "lay patrons," including the crown, and many of the principal nobility and landed proprietors, under certain conditions which were intended to prevent the intrusion of unqualified or unacceptable presentees. Since 1672 the appointment has been, by an act of Parliament, transferred simpliciter, to the church, on the recommendation of the members of the apostolic church. There has always been a strong objection to idolatrous or superstitious observances in the worship of God. It must be added that there are no liturgical forms of prayer in the Church of Scotland. At the time of the Reformation, that church, it is true, adopted, as a prayer-book the Book of Common Order,—a formulary which had been introduced in the church of Geneva when John Knox was its minister. The Book of Common Order is, accordingly, commonly known as Knox's Liturgy. But this prayer-book differs from other liturgies as being rather an optional than a compulsory form of public service, and admitting, to a considerable extent, of extemporary prayer. The rubric in every case is, that the service shall be "either in these words following, or to the like effect." The Book of Common Order appears to have continued in force, and (though there is some difference of opinion on the subject) to have been more or less regularly used in the Church till the time of the Commonwealth. At that period it was, like the old Scots Confession, formally superseded by an act of the General Assembly. The rule substituted was The Directory. The full title of this new formulary is, The Directory of the Public Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, approved by an act of the General Assembly and an act of the Scottish Parliament, both passed in Anno 1645. This Directory is, as its name imports, not a form of prayer, but a help to uniformity of worship. "Our meaning," says the Church, "is that general heads, the sense and the scope of the prayers, and other parts of public worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance of the services of God." For a very long time, neither the Book of Common Order nor the Directory of Public Worship has been practically enforced in the services of the Church of Scotland. As to its substance, however, the Directory fairly represents the usual practice since the period of the Revolution settlement of 1689. But as Dr. George Hill, in his Institutes, says, "The lapse of time and the change of circumstances have introduced various alterations." In the present day the tendency is to increased decorum and reverence in the worship of God, perhaps, at least, in some sympathy with the ritualistic spirit which has been so widely manifested in the sister kingdom.
also contains some particulars as to the work of the church.

The church supports 77 unendowed churches and 51 mission-stations. During the last eight years 110 additional churches have been built, at an estimated cost of upwards of £800,000, and providing accommodation for upwards of 80,000 sitters. The home mission committee of the church expends on objects such as these a large annual revenue. In 1880 the sum was £15,688, the whole amount drawn from the voluntary liberality of the church. Again: under the auspices of the endowment committee, the church is at this moment widely extending its old parochial organization by providing permanent endowments for unendowed churches. By the zealous labors of the committee in question, and the liberality of members of the Established Church, no fewer than the large number of 812 new parishes, with regular endowments, have been created since the year 1845, the expense amounting to at least £22,000,000 sterling. In 1880 the revenue of the endowment committee was £15,688.

Of the foreign missions of the church the like details might be given. The church maintains missions in India, Africa, and China, with 36 European and 280 native agents, and at an expenditure of nearly £20,000 in 1880, or £25,000, if the closely allied Jewish mission be included.

Then, in addition to these enterprises, the church undertakes partially the maintenance of religious ordinances in the colonies, more especially in Canada; and also the support of Continental mission-stations on behalf of Scotchmen who are resident temporarily or permanently abroad.

Under the heading of the voluntary liberality of the church, the following sums are noticed as raised during the nine years ending Dec. 31, 1880:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregational and charitable purposes</td>
<td>£240,525 19s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of ordinances, and supplement of stipends (exclusive of £433,423 17s. 10d. raised by rent-seats)</td>
<td>131,458 10s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (exclusive of sums raised in connection with training colleges)</td>
<td>135,009 9s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home mission-work</td>
<td>344,299 17s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church building</td>
<td>887,017 16s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment of new parishes</td>
<td>286,353 11s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign mission-work</td>
<td>21,167 16s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £2,585,702 19s. 11d.

Giving an average annual amount of: £287,638 16s. 10d.

The amount for 1880 was: £11,947 12s. 7d.

These amounts do not include a princely donation of £500,000 for church purposes from the late Mr. James Baird of Cambusdoon.


WILLIAM LEE.
(2) FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. The Free Church of Scotland claims to be the lawful descendant and heir of the Church of the Scottish Reformers and Covenanters, and in any exhaustive sketch of its history would start from the days of Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart, and John Knox. In 1643 its ministers, elders, and people, feeling constrained by a sense of duty to sustain the evangelical principles of the fathers, were obliged to form a separate organization; but clinging in all respects to the government, discipline, and worship of the church of their fathers, accepting its standards and its legislation, they protested that they represented the true Church of Scotland, unless the essence of that church were to be held to be the possession of the temporalities, or subjection to the authority of the State. As a matter of convenience, the present sketch begins with 1843; but the real history begins three centuries before.

The immediate cause of the quarrel with the State was connected with the appointment of ministers to vacant charges. It had been maintained from the earliest times, that "no minister should be intruded upon a congregation contrary to their will;" and the Legislature at various times had passed acts acknowledging this principle. At the settlement of the affairs of the Presbyterian Church under William III., in 1690, the election of ministers was placed on a comparatively popular basis. But in 1711, in the reign of Queen Anne, soon after the Scottish Parliament ceased to have a separate existence, an Act was passed by the British Parliament, hurriedly if not surreptitiously, restoring the system of lay-patronage; that is, conferring the right of nominating ministers on certain landed proprietors connected with the several parishes. The General Assembly of the Church protested for many years against this enactment; and, in the settlement of ministers, presbyteries were required to see, that, in addition to his presentation by the patron, the minister-to-be had a "call" from the people. By and by the church became more favorable to patronage; and some of the early secessions took place in consequence of certain ministers refusing to take part in what were called "forced settlements." In 1834, under the guidance of Dr. Chalmers, the Assembly passed the Veto Act, with a view to define and settle the rights of the people in the "call" to the minister, without overturning the rights of the patrons. This Act provided, that if a majority of male heads of families, being communicants, objected to the person nominated by the lay-patron, the presbytery were to take no steps for his ordination, but intimate to the patron that the parish was still vacant. Lord Kinnoul, patron of the parish of Auchterarder, and Mr. Robert Young, his agent, who had most unanimously by the people, feeling aggrieved by the operation of the Veto Act, went to the civil courts to insist on what they termed their patronial rights. The civil courts decided in favor of the patron and his presents. But, besides deciding that the emoluments of the parish belonged to the minister, the courts decreed that: the presbytery must take Mr. Young on trial, and, if found qualified, ordain him to the ministry of Auchterarder in spite of the opposition of the whole people. A great mass of tangled and troublesome litigation followed. The civil courts went farther and farther in their claims to control the church in its spiritual functions. Their demands were so extreme, and so regardless of statute rights, that in 1842 the General Assembly issued a "Claim of Right," demonstrating against the interference of the civil courts, and reciting in full detail all the invasions that had taken place, and the various statutes which had thus been overridden. Appeals were made to the government, but in vain, to introduce a measure that would put an end to the unequal collision of the ecclesiastical and civil courts. An attempt was made in the House of Commons, in the spring of 1843, to direct attention to the claims of the church; but this proposal was defeated by a great majority. When the General Assembly met in May, it was felt by Dr. Chalmers and his friends, that there was now no alternative but to cut connection with the State, and by abandoning the churches, manses, and lands, remove the occasion of all the interference of the civil courts. On the 18th of May, 1843, when the General Assembly met, but before it was constituted, the Rev. Dr. Welsh, the moderator of the preceding Assembly, laid on the table a PROTEST, in presence of her Majesty's commissioner, setting forth the wrongs of the church, and intimating the purpose of those who signed it to form themselves into a separate organization as the "Free Church of Scotland." As soon as that protest was read, Dr. Welsh and his friends left the place of meeting, and proceeded to carry out their purpose. Out of some twelve hundred ministers, four hundred and seventy adhered to the protest.

The grounds of this action were mainly two: first, the violation of the rights of the people in the appointment of ministers; and, second, the subversion of the spiritual independence of the Church, and of her liberty to obey the Head of the Church in spiritual matters. In the position which the Church took up on these grounds, it was maintained that she only followed in the wake of the great leaders of the Church in her best and bravest days,—John Knox, Andrew Melville, Alexander Cunningham, John Burnet, George Gillespie, and the like; while its attachment to evangelical truth — exemplified in the preaching and labors of men like Chalmers, Cunningham, Candlish, Guthrie, Duff, McCheyne, and many more — showed that it inherited the spirit, as well as maintained the struggle, of the fathers in other days.

The event of May, 1843, shook Scotland to its centre, and the vibrations of the movement were felt over the civilized globe. Sympathy and aid flowed in from innumerable quarters, while the people were in many instances more decided than the church. The number of disruption ministers rapidly increased from four hundred and seventy (the number of disruption ministers), and at the present day exceeds a thousand. The whole of the missionaries to Jew and Gentile, including Dr. Wilson of Bombay, Dr. Duff of Calcutta, Dr. John Duncan of Pesth ("Colloquia Peripatetica"), gave in their decrees to a small proportion of the landed gentry, and a much larger proportion of the lower, middle, and professional classes. In the Northern Highlands the people
forsook the Establishment in a mass, having often had bitter experience of the kind of ministers whom the patrons gave them. Parochial schoolmasters adhering to the Free Church were ejected from their schools. It was attempted to drive out professors who adhered to the Free Church from their chairs in the Universities; and a process for this purpose was the plan of Sir David Brewster, Principal of the United College of St. Andrews; but this attempt was not successful.

The Free Church determined to organize itself over the whole of Scotland, and, by means of a general fund and local funds, proceeded to build plain churches for the congregations, although in many places great hardship had to be endured from the stern refusal of some of the great landed proprietors to grant sites. In a short time a plan for the erection of manses was organized, and, through the great exertions of Dr. Guthrie, carried to a successful issue. Another plan, for the erection of frames for schools, was also put in execution with great success.

The various foreign missions were retained, and in lieu of the old buildings, which were claimed by the Established Church, new structures were reared. Among the chief aids in the maintenance of ordinances in the disestablished Church was the Sustentation Fund. The idea of this fund was due to Dr. Chalmers. At an early period he propounded his plan, and affirmed it as certain, that, if collectors were appointed for every district to gather in the contributions to this fund by periodical visits to the people, enough would be raised to provide a stipend of £130 sterling to each minister. The proposal was received with great incredulity at first. It turned out, however, that Dr. Chalmers was right. For several years a minimum stipend from this fund of £160 has been paid to double the number of ministers originally on the fund, while many have received a further sum in the form of surplus. In addition to what is provided from this fund, the able congregations add local supplements to the minister's salary.

The payment of £160 includes an annual contribution of £7 from each minister to a Widow's and Orphan's Fund. This fund now gives to every minister's widow, fifty shillings a year, and to every minister's orphan (up to the age of eighteen), a yearly allowance of £24 where the mother is alive, and £36 where the mother is dead.

It would be out of place in this brief sketch to enter into detail on the work in which the Free Church has been engaged since 1843. Some of the most characteristic of her labors may be briefly referred to.

1. Home Evangelization.—This work was followed out in two departments. First, when the disruption occurred, it was the endeavor of the church to secure that the gospel should be preached as far as possible to every soul. There were considerable districts of the country where clergy of the "moderate" or Arminian type had long been settled; and the custom which forbade any minister to preach in the parish of another without his consent excluded those who were known as presbyterian, or distinguished as evangelical. A great amount of ignorance and spiritual deadness prevailed in these districts. Now that the way was open, the Free Church endeavored to plant men in such districts of a more distinctively evangelical and earnest type. It was attempted to make the gospel known in all quarters by means of a settled ministry, when practicable, or by means of occasional visits from ministers, and others of evangelistic gifts and character.

The other department of home-mission work was among the largest in towns and other populous places. Before the disruption, Dr. Chalmers and his friends had had their attention turned very earnestly to the vast number of persons in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other large towns, who had been suffered to fall into a state of complete neglect of Christian ordinances. As soon as the hurry of the disruption was over, Dr. Chalmers set himself to show what could be done in the way of reclaiming a neglected district, by organizing what he called a territorial mission, and thereafter a territorial ministerial charge, in the West Port of Edinburgh. His plan was to select a limited territory of about two thousand souls, and divide it among a number of visitors, each of whom was to take care of a small number of the people, and try to get them to connect themselves with the mission. A missionary minister and a schoolmaster were appointed for the whole, and by God's blessing the scheme was a great success. Many churches in the poorer districts of our cities have been erected on the same principle. All along, the Free Church has been prominent in home evangelistic work. Revival movements under suitable men have been greatly promoted by the Free Church. The late Mr. Brownlow North was recognized as an evangelist by the General Assembly; and movements like that of Messrs. Moody and Sankey have had many of their most energetic supporters and helpers from among her ministers and people.
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States (North and South), England, Wales, Ireland, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, Prussia, Hungary, Bohemia, Norway, Turkey, Asia Minor, Cape Colony, Natal, Australia, and New Zealand.

3. Foreign Missions.—The adherence of all the missionaries to the Free Church, as well as the influence of the current of evangelical life which fell so peculiarly on that church, led to a prominent place being given to foreign missions. The church in Scotland, by Lord Elgin, was vigorously prosecuted. The rearing of native laborers in well-equipped Christian schools of Western learning has always been a chief aim of the church. It must be owned, that, in this field, the efforts of the church have not yet equalled the greatness of the enterprise. Besides missions in India, there are missions in Caffraria, Natal, and at Lake Nyassa in Africa, in the New Hebrides Islands, and in Syria. The Free Church is also associated with the English Presbyterian Church in a vigorous mission to China. The institution of a chair of missionary theology in 1867 was designed to call teachers an interest in missions, and to quicken their zeal for the foreign field; but it can hardly be said that as yet the results have come up to the hopes of the founders.

4. Colonial Churches.—A committee for promoting the welfare of colonial churches was in operation before the disruption: this department of work, however, has been prosecuted with more vigor since that event. One thing that has given additional interest to the colonies is the fact that not a few ministers have gone to them as their fields of labor. Though England does not fall under this category, yet it is worthy of note that the ranks of the Presbyterian Church there were largely recruited by Free-Church ministers; so that a new vigor was communicated, by the disruption, to Presbyterianism in England. The church in Canada, as well as the church in Australia and the church in New Zealand, profited by the same event. Several professors of divinity were sent out to the colonial churches. In other cases, ministers were furnished for important charges. The plan of a sustentation fund has been tried, with no small success, in several of these colonial churches. In other ways the influence of the Free Church has been evinced in the increased life and energy which many of them have shown.

5. Evangelization in the European Continent.—The energies of the Free Church have found a very congenial field on the continent of Europe. The ostensible object has been to look after Scotland, and New England, or residing there for a time; but the stations thus established have served as evangelical centres, from which, in various ways, light has been able to enlighten the surrounding darkness. In many of the towns of Italy the stations of the Free Church have been, after the Waldensian missions and of other efforts to spread the gospel among the Italian people. In the south of France, too, an important influence has been exerted of a similar kind. In Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Malta, Gibraltar, and Switzerland, stations have been maintained. By means of bursaries, the Free Church is enabled to invite to her theological institutions young men from various Continental countries and from places more remote. The direct evangelistic work of the evangelical churches is encouraged by grants-in-aid.

6. Church Union and Co-operation.—Soon after the disruption, the Free Church received into her communion one of the smaller sections of the secession,—that with which the late Dr. McCrie was connected. For ten years negotiations were carried on between the Reformed, the Free, and the English Presbyterian churches, with a view to union. The great majority of the Free Church favored this union; but a determined minority opposed it, and threatened to secede if it were carried out. In consequence of this, the negotiations came to an end; but a union was effected between the Free Church and the majority of the Reformed, or Cameronian. The Free Church in her Assembly has always welcomed ministers from other evangelical churches, and given them opportunities of being heard. Her connection has been peculiarly intimate, in many theological seminaries, with the English and Irish Presbyterian churches and with the English and Irish Presbyterian churches. The Free Church has always encouraged union among the different Presbyterian bodies in the colonies, although minorities have sometimes been against such movements.

7. Care of the Young.—The Free Church felt specially called on to take up, as a legacy from the founders of the Reformed Church of Scotland, "the godly upbringing of the young." The scheme for five hundred day schools, already referred to, was designed, partly to provide for the ejected schoolmasters, and partly to secure more attention to the religious element in education. For many years, under the convenership of Dr. Candlish, the Free Church was very zealous in promoting primary education. Three normal colleges were established for the training of teachers,—at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen: these are still in full and efficient operation. But the education scheme was never very popular. The church always expressed her readiness to merge her own scheme in a general system for national education, and a few years ago this was actually done. Most of her school-buildings were given up to school-boards for national education. A large establishment of Sabbath schools is connected with the Free Church, all under the kirk-sessions of the various congregations. In 1880-81 the number of teachers was 16,296, and the number of scholars, 152,101. Of Bible or senior classes, mostly taught by the ministers, there were reported 1,205, and scholars, 44,305. In this department the Free Church has been specially active of late. A committee, appointed by the General Assembly, for the "welfare of youth," prescribes certain books and subjects for competition every year: members of Bible-classes are encouraged to compete. In 1880-81 the total number who obtained prizes or certificates (their examination-papers showing a value of not less than fifty per cent) was 983.

8. Financial Administration.—The Free Church has gained no little notice for the systematic thoroughness of her financial administration and the large sums of money which she has raised for her various objects. The total raised during the year
1880–81, for the various objects promoted by the church, was as follows:

1. Sustentation Fund: £174,941 7s 6d.
2. Local Building Fund: £80,388 15s 0d.
4. Missions and Education: £90,220 10s 9d.
5. Miscellaneous: £44,351 14s 9d.

Since 1843 the entire sum raised by the Free Church, for all purposes, up to March, 1881, amounted to £1,454,117 17s 2d.

The present number of ministerial charges is 1,070.

The present number of communicants was:—
- 304,000
- £90,335 1s 4d.

The Free Church, throughout her career, has aimed to combine the spirit and convictions of the old Reformers and Covenanters with adaptation to modern wants and a progressive attitude, wherever progress is lawful. The conservative element has in practice had no little influence in checking progressive tendencies. For the most part, the Calvinistic creed has been held and preached as the true faith both by ministers and people. The Free Church gave up connection with the State, it was on the ground that the existing alliance of the Established Church with the State ought to be dissolved, so that all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland might be on a common brotherly level.

The Free Church has had not a little internal agitation and discussion. The last of her agitations was in the Robertson Smith case. On the one side, it was contended that the Church ought not to lay a violent arrest on the fullest discussion of certain critical questions raised by Mr. Smith, connected with the origin and date of Old-Testament books. On the other side, it was contended that any toleration of Mr. Smith's views was tantamount to giving up the authority and inspiration of Scriptures, and by others, that whatever might ultimately be found to be true on the disputed questions, the Church ought not to take the responsibility of Mr. Smith's views, as she would be doing if she were to continue him in his chair. It was this last view that obtained.
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The members of both the Burgher and Antiburgher churches were, in the first two decades of the century, frequently brought together for the furtherance of the great objects of the Bible and missionary societies, and were led to hold meetings for united prayer. The outcome was a desire for reunion, which, in many quarters, and that led in September, 1820, to the formation of the United Secession Church, which continued under this name till 1847. At the division, as we have seen, the number of congregations was 40; at the re-union it had risen to 262, of which 139 were connected with the Burghers, and 123 with the Antiburghers; and within twenty years a hundred new congregations were added to the aggregate. From 1840 to 1845 the peace of the church was disturbed by a controversy on the atonement, which though attended at the time with some acrimonious things, and resulting in the expulsion from its fellowship of James Morison, now well known as an admirable exegetical scholar, did much to clarify the theological atmosphere, not only of the denomination, but of Scotland. Meanwhile other matters were not lost sight of; for, at the time of its junction to the Relief Church, the United Secession was raising annually for all purposes above £70,000. It had a band of 80 missionaries and teachers in foreign lands, a theological seminary with 4 professors and 95 students, and 65 licentiates.

Relief Church.—But we must now go back, and trace the rise of the Relief Church, which had been running its course parallel to those of the other seceding communities for nearly a hundred years. It had its origin in 1732, in the deposition, from the ministry of the Church of Scotland, of Thomas Gillespie, minister of Carnock, for refusing to take part in the installation of a pastor whom it was determined to thrust into the parish of Inverkeithing against the will of the people. To this sentence, Gillespie meekly bowed, and removed to Dunfermline, where he gathered round him a congregation, and where for six years he stood alone, having ecclesiastical connection with none of the existing denominations. At the end of that time he was joined by Thomas Boston of Oxnam, son of the famous author of The Fourfold State; and in 1761 the first Relief Presbytery was formed, taking the name of "Relief," because its purpose was to furnish a refuge to those who were oppressed by patronage. In 1794 the presbytery, now swollen into a synod, sanctioned a hymnbook, for congregational praise; and in 1823 it established a theological seminary, for the education of its ministers, who had up till that time been required to attend the Divinity Hall in the National Church. Its polity, as well as that of the Secession Church, was Presbyterian; its creed, Calvinistic; and its spirit, catholic. Indeed, in this last respect it was ahead of all its Presbyterian contemporaries, for Gillespie had been trained by Pilsen and in both he received from him the principle of Christian communion; so that, at his first dispensation of the Lord's Supper, after his deposition, he could say, "I hold communion with all that visibly hold the Head, and with such only;" and he invited all such to unite with him in the observance of the ordinance. He was thus in advance of those who restricted their fellowship only to such as agreed with them in matters of covenanting, and the like, and could not conscientiously occupy a platform so narrow as that of either of the branches of the Secession. But in 1847 the Secession herself had come up to this same catholicity, and the union was effected with great enthusiasm, and has resulted in the richest blessing. The Relief Church numbered at that time 7 presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 members.

Since 1847 the course of the United Church has been one of almost uninterrupted progress. Negotiations for union with the Free Church were begun in 1862, and continued for ten years; but they were ultimately abandoned, without any other issue than the adoption of a Mutual Eligibility Scheme, which permitted a congregation in either denomination to call a minister from the other. Beyond Scotland, however, a union was effected; for in Liverpool, on the 18th June, 1876, ninety-eight congregations of the United Presbyterian Synod, whose location was in England, were formally joined to the English Presbyterian Church, making together "The Presbyterian Church of England." Yet, notwithstanding that apparent diminution of strength, the statistics presented in 1882 gave the following particulars: Presbyteries, 80; congregations, 561; members in full communion, 174,557; income for congregational purposes, £250,927 3s. 6d.; for missionary and benevolent purposes, £22,581 17s. 4d.; total, £273,459 10s. 6d., which is exclusive of £50,271 7s. 6d., reported as from legacies. In addition to its home operations, the United Presbyterian Church has foreign missions in Jamaica, Old Calabar, West Africa; Rajpootana, India; China; and Japan; in which, according to the report of 1888, there are 71 regularly organized congregations with an aggregate membership of 10,806 and nearly 2,000 catechumens. The total income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1882 amounted to £23,530. In its Basis of Union it solemnly recognized the duty "to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of the gospel at home and abroad;" and it has faithfully discharged that conviction, and is probably doing more for the diffusion of the gospel throughout the world than any other denomination of its size, with the exception of the Moravians.

Doctrinal Position.—In the Basis of Union just referred to, the doctrine of the United Presbyterian Church was thus defined:

"I. The word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice. II. The Westminster Confession
of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are
the sacred ordinances of this church, and contain
the authorized exhibition of the sense in which we
understand the Scriptures, it being always
understood that we do not approve of any thing in
these documents which teaches, or may be supposed
to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant
principles in religion. And 'The term of membership
in the profession of the church, and of Christ's
mediation which is held by this church, a profession
made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and
discipline.' Members on their admission; but elders and minis-
ters are required to answer the questions prescribed
in a form published for ordination and license; and among
these, up till May, 1879, was one question which read thus: 'Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Cate-
chisms as an exhibition of the sense in which you
hold the Scriptures; it being understood that you are
not required to approve of any thing in these docu-
ments which teaches, or may be supposed to teach,
compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles
in religion? But at the meeting of synod of 1879 it
was directed that the question of the latter clause
should be as follows: 'This acknowledgment being
made in view of the explanations contained in the
declaratory act of synod there am'n.' At the same
meeting a declaratory act was adopted; and as its im-
portance is great, not only intrinsically, but because
it is the first attempt to widen the basis of doctrinal
subscription in a Presbyterian church, we give it
here entire:—

'Whereas the formula in which the Subordi-
nate Standards of this church are accepted requires
assent to them as an exhibition of the sense in which
the Scriptures are understood; whereas these Stand-
ards, being of human composition, are necessarily
imperfect, and the church has already allowed ex-
ception to be taken to their teaching, or supposed
teaching, on one important subject; and whereas
there are other subjects in regard to which it has
been found desirable to set forth more fully and
clearly the view which the synod takes of the teach-
ing such a condition of man's nature as would affect
the mediation of Christ and by the grace of his Holy
Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how it pleas-
eth him; while the duty of sending the gospel to the
heathen who are sunk in ignorance, sin, and misery,
is clear and imperative; and while the outward and
ordinary means of salvation for those capable of
being called by the Lord are the ordinances of the
gospel: in accepting the Standards it is not required
to be held that any who die in infancy are lost, or
that God may extend his grace to any who are
without the pale of ordinary means, as it may seem
good in his sight.'

'5. That in regard to the doctrine of the civil ma-
strate, and his authority and duty in the sphere of
religion as taught in the Standards, this church holds
that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head
over all things to the church which is his body; 'disapproves of all com-
 pulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in
religion: and declares that she does not require
approval of any thing in her Standards that
teaches, or may be supposed to teach, such prin-
iciples.

'6. That Christ has laid it as a permanent and
universal obligation upon his church at once to main-
tain her own ordinances, and to 'preach the gospel
to every creature;' and has ordained that his people
provide by their freewill offerings for the fulfilment
of this obligation.

'7. That, in accordance with the practice hitherto
observed in this church, liberty of opinion is allowed
on such points in the Standards, not entering into
the convenient acts of synod established, as the
'six days' in the Mosaic account of the creation;
the church guarding against the abuse of this liberty
to the injury of its unity and peace.'

In general matters the United Presbyterian
Church has been very progressive. She was the
first among the Scottish Presbyterians to intro-
duce hymns other than the paraphrases into pub-
lic worship, and after many debates she conceded
the liberty to use instrumental music in her ser-
vices some years ago.

Government.—The government is Presbyterian.
Each congregation elects its own minister and
elders, who together constitute the session. The
arrangement of the temporal affairs is deputed to
a body of managers chosen for the purpose by
the members; but these have no spiritual over-
sight of the church. The presbytery consists of
the ministers and one elder from each session in
a specified district; and the synod consists of the
aggregate of the presbyteries. Mere ordination
does not confer the right to a seat in presbytery or
synod. The minister is a member as a pastor;
equals being called by the Lord are the ordinances of the
gospel: in accepting the Standards it is not required
for synod, and unless in the case of a pastor-emeritus, who
remains as a colleague to a junior brother, and
in those of the professors of theology and mission
secretaries, no minister without charge is a mem-
er, either of presbytery or synod. Frequent
efforts have been made to divide the synod into
provincial bodies, and make the supreme court
a general assembly; but the democratic spirit of
the denomination has always defeated these, al-
though it has been felt that a synod composed of
more than a thousand members is not perfectly
adapted to deliberation. Still it has worked well
on the whole in the past, and there seems to be
at present no disposition to change.

Theological Education.—Up till 1876 the meet-
ings of the theological seminary, or hall, were
held in Edinburgh every year during the months of
August and September; and students having
first passed through a full literary curriculum at
one or other of the national universities, and hav-
ing been examined for admission, were required
to attend for five sessions, while the professors,
retaining their pastoral charges, gave up these
two months annually to the work of tuition; and
during the other months of the year the students
were required to perform certain specified exer-
cises, and undergo certain examinations, under
the inspection of their respective presbyteries. This plan was suited to the circumstances of the church in its earlier years; but a new scheme of education, bringing it more into line with other denominations, was adopted in 1876, when it was decided that the professors should be loosed from the pastorate; that the session should consist of five months, from November to April; and that the course should consist of three full sessions. There are five theological chairs,— apologetics, pastoral training, church history, New-Testament literature and exegesis, and Hebrew with OldTestament literature and exegesis. The men who now hold these appointments are worthy to be the successors of Lawson, the Browns (grandfather and grandson), Dick, Eadie, and others who have made the name of the Secession Church honorably known in many lands. WILLIAM M. TAYLOR.

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF SCOTLAND (from The Scottish Church and University Almanac, 1889).

THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Synods .......................... 16
Presbyteries ......................... 84
Parishes ............................. 1,283
Unendowed churches, preaching and mission stations ....... 280
Ministers [Estimated— En.] ....... 1,470
Communicants, per parliamentary return of 1878, 813,785
Christian liberty for all objects in 1881 ... £281,503.18.0

THE FREE CHURCH.

Synods .................................. 16
Presbyteries ........................ 73
Ministerial charges ................. 1,000
Ministers ............................... 1,070
Christian liberty for all objects (1881-82) £607,680.14.5

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Presbyteries ..................... 80
Congregations ................. 651
Ministers .................... 587
Presbytery .......................... 88
Members ............................ 174,557
Income for all objects from all sources £383,730.8.4

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Synod ..................................... 1
Presbyteries ..................... 15
Churches (1 vacant) .......... 14

SYNOD OF UNITED ORIGINAL SECEDERS.

Presbyteries ..................... 4
Churches (6 vacant) .......... 30

EVANGELICAL UNION AND AFFILIATED CHURCHES.

Churches (13 vacant) .......... 90

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

Dioceses .............................. 7
Churches and stations ........... 238

BAPTIST UNION OF SCOTLAND.

Churches ................................ 84

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES IN SCOTLAND.

Ministers ......................... 85

WESLEYAN METHODISTS.

Chapels .................................. 26

ROMAN-CATHOLIC CLERGY IN SCOTLAND.

Dioceses ................................ 8
Churches ............................ 183

II. In England. The Presbyterian Church of England differs in its history from that of Scotland. From Knox to Chalmers, the latter was a Reformation Church, which for three centuries was more thoroughly national than any other; whereas the other never reached the same depth or extent of influence in any period,— its rise, its height as the National Church of England, its decay, its revival.
For twenty years Presbyterianism was the National Church. Its framework was set up chiefly in London and Lancashire, and partially over the country. It was a time of much noble work, particularly under Howe and Bates. Till 1688 Presbyterianism was a time of winning souls, and Cromwell did not like Presbyterianism, because it adopted the intolerant principles of an Established Church, from which no church, either in England or New England, was in that age altogether free; and the old Episcopal Church waited its time.

That time soon came. Presbyterianism was disestablished, and on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, two thousand ministers, most of them Presbyterian, were ejected. Among them were Baxter, Howe, and Bates. Till 1688 Presbyterianism was the first of civil and religious rights. It did not fight in England a Drumclog or Bothwell Bridge: it did not flee to the hills and moors, as in Scotland. It was too passive, and so became feebler.

3. For, when the Revolution of 1688 came, it had grown practically independent in church administration, and never at heart regained its old fervor. Then came worse decay. It felt the enfeebling religious atmosphere of the next, the eighteenth century, and, like all the other churches, succumbed to doctrinal error and practical indifference, till, in England, Presbyterianism and Unitarianism became synonymous.

4. But during those last forty years a new spirit revived; the old Puritan Presbyterianism lived in many native churches; was strengthened by like-minded Scotchmen coming to England; till at last the two classes of congregations—those connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and those which after the disruption in 1843 formed one English Presbyterian synod—joined together in 1877 under the name of the Presbyterian Church of England." This union, which doubled the strength numerically of the united church, far more than doubled its moral energy and helpfulness. Since the union, its growth has been more elastic, organized, and conspicuous. Even before the union, Presbyterianism stood higher in relative increase of numbers than any other denomination in England. We give the latest statistical returns, those of the year 1881: Congregations, 275, of which 75 are in the presbytery of London, an enormous increase during twenty years; 264 ministers with charges, 31 without charges, 21 probationers, 56,399 communicants, 6,216 Sabbath-school teachers. In 1882 the theological college had three professors, one tutor, twenty-three students. One special department, the Sustentation Fund, has yielded to every ordained minister a minimum stipend of £200 yearly, the largest minimum amount in any English denomination; and this minimum sum will likely, and soon, be increased. Total amount collected in 1881 was £208,020; average stipend in England, £200; in London, £304; in Liverpool, £414.

One of the noblest and most vigorously prosecuted enterprises of the church is the China Mission. Its first missionary was W. C. Burns, a man of the highest heroic and saintly type, whose place has been filled by a succession of men and women of like spirit. Burns bad for a time little outward success, but it increased greatly before he died; and the seed he sowed has grown into a rich harvest. In 1851 there were 27 missionaries, 94 native missionaries, 94 stations, and 2,570 members; grow-...
tract of land near the mouth of the Merrimack River was selected by their agent for the Presbyterian settlement. The immigrants embarked from Scotland, and had traversed half the width of the Atlantic, but were driven back by adverse storms, and abandoned the enterprise. Presbyterianism proper was thereby put back in its American development half a century.

Many of the New-England ministers and people, at that early period, were neither Presbyterians in principle, or well disposed to such as were. The Cambridge (1648) and the Boston (1662) synods made provision for ruling elders in the churches, and favored the consociation of the churches. They were rigidly opposed to Independency, and aimed to establish "a sweet sort of temperament between rigid Presbyterianism and levelling Brownism."

When the "Heads of Agreement" between the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers were assented to at London, A.D. 1690, Cotton Mather affirmed (Magnalia, ii. 299) that the same "union hath been for many lustres, yes, many decades of years, exemplified in the churches of New England, so far that I believe it is not possible for me to give a truer description of our ecclesiastical constitution (A.D. 1718) than by transcribing thereof the articles of that union." Their platform was so akin to Presbyterianism, that "the Presbyterian ministers of this country," Mather says, "do find it no difficulty to practise the substance of it in and with their several congregations."

Writing to Rev. Robert Wodrow, a Presbyterian minister in Scotland, Aug. 8, 1718 (Wodrow: Miscell. ii. 424), he says, "We are comfortably with great numbers of our oppressed brethren coming over from the north of Ireland unto us." They were Presbyterians. "They find so very little difference in the management of our churches from theirs and yours as to count it next unto none at all. Not a few ministers of the Scotch nation coming over hither have herebefore been invited unto settlements with our churches."

A considerable number of Presbyterians, both ministers and people, it thus appears, emigrated from Great Britain and Ireland to New England during the troubles of the seventeenth century, and were absorbed in the Congregational churches, at that time differing but little, as they thought, from Presbyterian churches. Particularly was it so with the Connecticut churches, where Consociationism, a modified form of Presbyterianism, had generally prevailed. The Hartford North Association, in 1799, affirmed "that the constitution of the churches in the State of Connecticut is not Congregational, but contains the essentials of the government of the Church of Scotland, or Presbyterian Church in America;" and "the churches in Connecticut are not now, and never were from the earliest period of our settlement, Congregational churches." They were often spoken of as Presbyterian churches.

Colonies from these churches planted themselves, at an early day, on Long Island and in East Jersey; and the churches which they organized — Southampton (1840), Southold (1841), Elizabeth (1821) and New York (1826) — eventually became Presbyterian, almost as soon as they had the opportunity. The church of Jamaica, on Long Island (1662), claims to have been a Presbyterian church at its organization.

The First Presbyterian Church in America. — The persecutions of the Presbyterians in Scotland and Ireland, during the later years of Charles II. (1670–85), compelled many of them to seek rest beyond the seas. The standing order in New England, both civilly and ecclesiastically, was Congregationalism. In the province of New York, the Dutch were of the Holland type of Presbyterianism, and only the Church of England was tolerated among the English. In Virginia also, none but Episcopal churches were recognized by law. A more liberal policy prevailed in East and West Jersey, in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. Very naturally, therefore, these emigrants sought refuge where they would be free to exercise their religion; and Presbyterian settlements were formed in these sections in the latter half of the seventeenth century, few and feeble at the best.

Application for a minister was made (1680) to a presbytery in the north of Ireland by one of these companies; and in 1683 the Rev. Francis Makemie was ordained, and sent as a missionary to these scattered sheep in the great American wilderness. He settled at Rehoboth in Maryland, and gathered the people, there and in other settlements round about, into Presbyterian churches. Other ministers were sent out, and were welcomed. Some few came to them also from New England, and took charge, here and there, of a Presbyterian church.

The First Presbytery. — At the opening of the eighteenth century these seven ministers — Makemie, Davis, Wilson, Andrews, Taylor, Macnish, and Hampton — met together (1705) in the Presbyterian church of Philadelphia, Penn., and constituted the Presbytery of Philadelphia, — the first in the New World. The American Presbyterian Church had now taken form, and entered upon a career of widely extended power and usefulness. It was destitute of patronage, and of feeble resources. It was strong only in faith and godliness.

The First Synod. — In 1710 the presbytery numbered eleven ministers. Makemie and Taylor had just died; and Smith, Anderson, Henry, and Wade had been received, in addition to Boyd, whom they had ordained in 1706, — the first Presbyterian ordination in America. They had a small congregation at Elizabeth River, Va., four in Maryland, five in Pennsylvania, and two in New Jersey. Six years later (Sept. 22, 1716), they resolved themselves into three presbyteries, — Philadelphia, Newcastle, and Long Island, — and thus constituted the synod of Philadelphia. The churches had increased to seventeen. In the Province of New York they had five churches, — New York, Newtown, Jamaica, Setauket, and Southampton; in New Jersey, four churches, — Newark, Freehold, Coltsville, and Toms River; in Pennsylvania, two churches, — Philadelphia and Abington; and, in the regions beyond, six churches, — Newcastle, Pathuxent, Rehoboth, Snowhill, White-Clay Creek, and Appoquinimink. The two vigorous churches of Elizabethtown and Newark, N. J., were soon placed under the care of Jonathan Dickinson and Joseph Webb.
the first ten years twenty-seven had been enrolled, of whom five had died, and three had withdrawn.

Adoption of Doctrinal Standards. — The progress of the church from this date was steady, if not rapid. In 1729 the synod numbered twenty-seven ministers. Fifty-six had been enrolled since 1705, of whom fourteen had died, and fifteen had left the connection. No action had thus far been taken, so far as the records (of which the first leaf is lost) show, in respect to the formal adoption of any standard of doctrine or written creed. As the Church of Scotland had, from the days of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1648), adopted and professed faith in their Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and as so large a portion, both of the ministers and people, were of Scotch origin, it is to be presumed that both the first presbytery and the synod had adhered to these standards of faith and worship.

But the times called for a decided and open expression of their faith. The alarming prevalence of Arminianism, Pelagianism, Arianism, and Socinianism, among some of the Reformed churches of Europe, and even in Scotland and in the American churches, the doctrine of ordinational liberty was in its infancy, the true system of Christiandoctrine; "agreeing, further, that no one should be ordained to the ministry, who had any scruples, or any partsof the Confession, save "only about Articles not essential and necessary to doctrine, worship, and government." It was also agreed, that, in respect to such differences, they would treat one another with all due forbearance and kindness. The First Disruption. — A considerable diversity of theological and ecclesiastical views was developed in these discussions and in subsequent meetings of the synod. A large proportion of the ministers were of foreign birth and education. The native ministry were, for the most part, from New England. The former obtained the appellation of the "Old Side," or the "Old Lights:" the latter were the "New Side," or the "New Lights." They differed as to the essential qualifications of candidates for the ministry, and the matter and style of pulpit ministrations. The Old Side laid the greater stress on the importance of rigorous discipline, and the New Side insisted more on experimental piety. The former were rigid in their demands for a full term of study; the latter, in the exigencies of the country and times, were ready to make large exceptions in the case of such as had considerable gifts and graces. A period of unwonted religious interest and of spiritual revival followed. Not a few of the churches in and out of New England were favored with special manifestations of divine grace. Large demands were made upon the ministry. The people were eager to hear. Popular preachers and exhorters were at a premium: they were sent for from every quarter. It was a "Great Awakening." That singularly gifted evangelist of the Church of England, George Whitefield, came to America, and traversed the Atlantic coast from Georgia to New Hampshire, preaching everywhere. Great crowds attended his ministrations. The New Side churches were opened to him, and their ministers affiliated with him. The Old Side, if not opposed to the movement, were suspicious and apprehensive, and, for the most part, stood aloof both from Mr. Whitefield and the work. At the meeting of the synod in 1740, the two parties came into collision in respect to some alleged irregularities on the part, principally, of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, or some of its prominent members. An open rupture ensued in 1741, and the offending presbytery withdrew. After repeated but futile attempts by the more moderate brethren to allay the irritation, and to reconcile the conflicting parties, the synod itself became divided. A considerable number of ministers and churches, including the presbyteries of New York and New Brunswick and a part of that of Newcastle, withdrew in 1746, and organized the synod of New Brunswick, as the Old-Side synod, — in rivalry, and not in correspondence, with the Old-Side synod of Philadelphia.

The Healing of the Breach. — The latter, at the disruption, was the larger body; but the former had the larger sympathy of the people, and rapidly increased in numbers, in resources and influence. The breach was healed in May, 1758. The New Side brought into the union seventy-two ministers and six presbyteries; the Old Side, twenty-two ministers and three presbyteries. The synod of New York and Philadelphia, as the united synod was called, had more than a hundred churches under its care.

In the political agitations that convulsed the British Colonies in America during the next twenty-five years, resulting in the War of the Revolution and the independence of the United States, the Presbyterian Church was a unit in the assertion and defence of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and contributed largely towards the triumph of the patriots.

The First General Assembly. — Shortly after the return of peace, measures were taken by the synod for a still further development of Presbyterian principles. The church had been greatly prospered. It was time that a general assembly, as in the Church of Scotland, should be instituted. Three years (1785-88) were given to the careful preparation and adoption of a constitution. The sixteen presbyteries of 1768 were distributed into four synods, — New York, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas. A general assembly, composed of commissioners (ministers and elders in equal numbers), from the presbyteries, met at Philadelphia, Penn., in May, 1789. The first Congress of the United States were then holding their first session at New York. The two bodies, as well as their constitutions, are coeval.

In 1779 four of the ministers had withdrawn, on the plea of larger liberty, from the synod, and had (1780) organized the independent presbytery of Morris County. An associated presbytery was formed in 1792, a third in 1793, and a fourth in 1807. They were known as the Associated...
Presbyteries of Morris County and Westchester, the Northern and the Saratoga Presbyteries. At the end of a single generation they had ended their course, and been absorbed by other bodies.

**Plan of Union.** — Before the close of the century, the church had extended itself far to the south and west. Its missionaries went everywhere, proclaiming the word and gathering churches. To prevent collision with the missionaries from New England, the General Assembly of 1801 entered heartily into a "Plan of Union" with the conso ciated churches of Connecticut, providing for the orderly organization of churches in settlements of commingled Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and the institution of pastors. The happy influence of this fraternal plan was felt in a large part of the new towns in the States of New York and Ohio, where the two streams of emigration flowed side by side. The church now numbered twenty-six presbyteries, three hundred ministers, and nearly five hundred congregations.

**The Cumberland Offshoot.** — A special manifestation of divine grace marked the opening of the present century. The Assembly of 1803 testified that there was scarcely a presbytery from which came not the glad tidings of the prevalence and power of the Great Revival. In some parts of the land, particularly in Kentucky, it was characterized, to some extent, by peculiar physical effects known as "bodily exercises." The great demand for preachers brought forward a considerable number of exhorters and evangelists, of very limited education, but of special gifts as public speakers. One of the presbyteries was censured by its synod for giving a regular license to some of these exhorters. Dissatisfied with this action, several of the ministers withdrew, and organized (Feb. 4, 1810) an independent body called the "Presbytery of Cumberland," which has now grown to be one of the largest bodies of Presbyterian churches in America. (See Cumberland Presbyterian Church.)

**Doctrinal Disaffections.** — Soon after the second war with Great Britain (1812-15), another period of religious prosperity gave much enlargement to the church. Associations for the diffusion of religious tracts and books, and for missions at home and abroad, were extensively patronized. The system of African slavery was condemned (1818) by the Assembly. Much fear was expressed in relation to the spread of "New Divinity," or Hopkinsianism from New England. Gradually a New School party was developed, and was increasingly antagonized year by year by the Old School portion of the church.

These tendencies were aggravated during the revival period of 1827-33, during which the churches were greatly enlarged and multiplied. In some sections, doctrines were advanced, and measures adopted, that were regarded with precise cautions by the Old School party. Great apprehensions were expressed of danger to the faith by the spreading of New Haven Theology. Albert Barnes at Philadelphia, and Lyman Beecher at Cincinnati, were both subjected to trials and censure by their presbyteries, but were allowed of the asylum of the General Assembly. The whole church was agitated by the controversy.

Just at this time, too, the question of slavery came to the front by the organization of the American Anti-Slavery Society, greatly disturbing the churches in the Southern States, and aggravating the growing feeling of jealousy and opposition between the two parties in the church.

**The Great Disruption.** — At the meeting of the assembly in May, 1837, the Old School party, finding themselves in the second time only with in seven years in the majority, took advantage of the occasion to exclaim, simply by an act of power, irrespective of constitutional limitations of that power, three of the synods in Western New York, and one in Ohio, with all their churches and ministers. Other measures were enacted greatly obnoxious to the minority. Great excitement followed. The whole church was agitated. A convention of the aggrieved was held at Auburn (August, 1837), N.Y., and measures taken to resist the wrong. At the assembly in 1838 the New School party demanded the enrolment of the commissioners from the four exscinded synods. It was refused. The two bodies separated, and two assemblies were organized. The church was hopelessly divided. The property question, after a jury trial, was decided in favor of the New School Assembly; but the decision was overruled on some points of law by the court in bank, and a new trial granted. No further action was taken, and each body went on its separate way.

The whole American people were agitated in 1850, and for several subsequent years, by the Fugitive-slave Law enactment, and the question of the extension of slavery into the new Territories and States. The New School assemblies sympathized with the opponents of these measures; and in 1856 at New York, and in 1857 at Cleveland, gave decided expression to these views. In consequence, several Southern presbyteries withdrew, and organized the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, which a few years later effected a union with the Southern Presbyterian Church. (See next art.)

**Early in 1851 the Southern States seceded, and the great civil war (1861-65) followed.** The Old School Assembly of 1861, at Philadelphia, took up the ground in behalf of the Southern Church, and the New School Assembly also did. The Southern commissioners in the Old School Assembly took offence, and withdrew. In the following year (1862) the Southern presbyteries separated themselves wholly from the Northern churches, and formed a distinct church represented in their own General Assembly. (See next art.)

**The Re-union of the Church.** — Thus providentially the disturbing element, that, more than all things else, had occasioned the disruption of 1838, was now eliminated from both branches of the church. The complete abolition of slavery, that resulted from the North's decision, put an end to all further controversy between the two bodies on this long-verified question. Gradually they had learned to regret their former virulence. A new generation had come to the fore. The war had united the North in a common cause. The New School had put aside their soundness in faith, and vindicated their Presbyterians' union. The old affinities of a common inheritance began to assert themselves. A system of correspondence between the two assemblies was instituted in
1862. Together they sat down (1863) at the table of their common Lord, at St. Louis, Mo., and put the seal to a joint commission. A joint commission was at the same time appointed to consider and propose a plan of re-union.

The two assemblies met at New York in May, 1869, and each of them gave their cordial assent to a series of propositions for the merging of the two organizations into one. These proposals were carried with unanimity, as was the plan of the adjourned meetings of the two assemblies the next November, at Pittsburgh, Penn., the returns from the presbyteries showed an overwhelming majority of each body in favor of the re-union. Thus happily the breach was healed.

The disruption had continued the lifetime of a generation. In May, 1870, the first re-united Assembly met at Philadelphia amid the thanksgivings of the whole church and the congratulations of the sister-churches of the entire world. It was an unparalleled event. The little one had become a strong nation. In 1877, the year previous to the disruption, the churches numbered 2,140; the churches, 2,865; and the membership, 220,537. In 1870 the ministers numbered 4,238; the churches, 5,744; and the membership, 5,143; the churches, 5,744; and the membership, 592,128. The contributions to the work of home missions for the year 1882-83 were $504,795.61; the schools force is 654,051. The average annual admission for the year 1882-83 was $648,303.19. Its Sunday-school force is 654,051. The average annual admission for the year 1882-83 was $504,795.61.

The Outlook. — The union came none too soon. The people were prepared for it, had long demanded it. The old controversies had died; the prejudices of the past had been buried. Fraternity and unity had taken the place of rivalry and discord. The church has proved itself one in faith and order. The former lines of demarcation have been blotted out. New life has been put into all its activities. The progress of the denomination since 1870 has been marked and gratifying. The ministers in 1882 numbered 5,143; the churches, 5,744; and the membership, 592,128. The contributions to the work of home missions for the year 1882-83 were $504,795.61; to foreign missions, $648,303.19. Its Sunday-school force is 654,051. The average annual admission for the year 1882-83 was $504,795.61.

The last General Assembly met May 17, 1888, at Saratoga Springs, N.Y. It was the largest since the reconstruction in 1870. Its whole spirit was exceedingly hopeful and aggressive. Fraternal relations with the Southern Church, the initiative of which was taken the year before, were now fully established by the mutual interchange of delegates, whose reception gave occasion, in both assemblies, to the most hearty congratulations, and to devout thanksgiving. The Book of Discipline, revised by an able committee appointed in the year 1879, was cordially approved, and unanimously commended to the presbyteries for their adoption. A new board for aiding colleges and academies, with a view to an abundant supply of candidates for the ministry, was created with much enthusiasm. The relations of the board of home missions to the presbyteries were, and probably for all years of its existence, less friction, happily adjusted. Perfect harmony pervaded the councils of the assembly, indicative of undivided counsels in doctrine and a healthful growth in church extension.

The church is now, more than ever, thoroughly organized for aggressive work, having its own boards and commissions, through which it operates in advancing the work of missions at home and abroad, in the building of church-edicifies, in the publication and diffusion of a religious and denominational literature, in providing for the relief of its aged persons, in promoting the work of educating its children, and in training a godly and scholarly ministry for its pulpits and missions. It has founded and built up colleges all over the land. It has planted and liberally endowed theological seminaries that have no superiors in the world. — Princeton, Union (New York), Auburn, Allegheny, Lane (Cincinnati), North-Western (Chicago), Danville, and San Francisco. It has schools for the education of German preachers at Bloomfield, N.J., and Dubuque, I.o.; and of colored preachers, at Lincoln University, Penn., and Charlotte, N.C. It has schools for the education of German preachers at Bloomfield, N.J., and Dubuque, I.o.; and of colored preachers, at Lincoln University, Penn., and Charlotte, N.C.
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North and South, a question upon which the most eminent statesmen had been divided in opinion from the time of the formation of the Constitution; viz., whether the ultimate sovereignty, the *jus summum imperii*, resided in the people as a mass, or in the people as they were originally formed into Colonies, and afterwards into States.

Presbyterians in the South believed that this deliverance, whether true or otherwise, was one which the Church was not authorized to make, and that, in so doing, she had transgressed her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State. Their views upon this subject found expression in a quarter which relieves them of all suspicion of coming from an interested party. A protest against this action was presented by the venerable Charles Hodge, D.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary, and by forty-five others who were members of that Assembly.

In this protest it was asserted, "that the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, in our judgment, is undeniable. It not only asserts the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Constitution of the Church, and usurped the church-membership, has, in our judgment, violated the Constitution or laws of the several States to the extent of coming from an interested party. A protest

from the General Assembly aforesaid was imperatively demanded, not in the spirit of schism, but for the sake of peace, and for the protection of the liberty with which Christ had made them free.

Accordingly, ninety-three ministers and ruling elders, who had been commissioned for that purpose, met in the city of Augusta, Ga., on the 4th of December, 1861, and integrated in one body, under the title of "The General Assembly of the Confederate States of America," adopting at the same time as their constitution the standards of the South, under which they had always held.

After the close of the war, the name of their church was changed to that of "The Presbyterian Church in the United States."

2. **Union with Other Churches.** — An organic union was formed with the United Synod of the South, by which 190 ministers, 190 churches, and 12,000 communicants, was received. This union was effected after careful conference between committees appointed in 1863, and full deliberation by the two bodies in the year following.

In 1869 the synod of Kentucky, which had separated from the Northern Assembly in 1867, was received, including 75 ministers, 137 churches, and 13,540 communicants. In 1874 the synod of Missouri, which had also separated, in like manner was received, including 67 ministers, 141 churches, and 8,000 communicants. In addition to these was the accession of the presbytery of PatapSCO, in 1867, consisting of 6 ministers, 3 churches, and 576 communicants, formerly connected with the synod of Baltimore.

3. **Benevolent Operations.** — The Southern General Assembly does not conduct its benevolent work by means of boards empowered to plan and direct what shall be done, but by committees, of which their respective secretaries are *ex officio* members, all elected annually by the assembly, directly responsible to it, and acting as executive agents under its instructions.

(1) **Foreign Missions.** — The whole missionary force consists of 106 persons, of whom 15 are native ordained preachers, and 34 are native assistants, variously employed. The missions are established in China, South America, Greece, Italy, Mexico, and among the Choctaw and Cherokee Indians. In the Empire of Brazil there is a flourishing college, under the control of the missionaries, to which the sons of many gentlemen of the National Church are sent, not because of any sympathy with Protestantism, but because of the intrinsic value of the education to be obtained there.

The receipts for 1882-83 from all sources were $69,000, of which the Sabbath schools contributed nearly $7,000.

(2) **Home Missions.** — This field is of vast extent, and becoming more important every day because of the steadily rising tide of immigration from Europe and the Northern States. Contributions to home missions are distributed among what is called Sustentation, the Evangelistic Invalid Fund. The total receipts for all the departments of home-mission work for 1882-83 amounted to $57,000, a gain of $13,000 over the previous year. This agency has not only strengthened many weak churches, but has aided in the organization of others in destitute places, and has been one of the most efficient instrumentalities in advancing the progress and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church in the South.

(3) **Publication.** — This enterprise was overtaken by a great financial trouble in 1877, but is now emerging from its embarrassments. The receipts from churches, Sabbath schools, and all other sources, for 1882-83, amounted to $14,000.

(4) **Education.** — The whole number of students aided in 1882-83 in their preparation for the ministry was 193, from 41 presbyteries. Aggregate receipts for 1882-83, $13,000.

4. **Institutions of Learning.**

(1) **Union Theological Seminary,** in Prince Edward County, Va.; established in 1821, under the care of the synods of Virginia and North Carolina; the Assembly having given it about 43.000. This institution is now in the hands of 14 ministers, 190 churches, and 12,000 communicants, was received. This union was effected
The total amount of investments reported in April, 1883, was $261,000, yielding an income of $15,000.

(2) Theological Seminary at Columbia, S.C., under the care of the synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama; the Assembly having a supervision, as with Union Theological Seminary, Virginia. This institution, which was closed for two years, was re-opened in September, 1882, with encouraging prospects of future prosperity. Number of professors, 4. The venerable Dr. George Howe died in April, 1883, after having been an instructor in this seminary for fifty-two years.

(3) Institute for Training Colored Ministers.—Established in Tuscaloosa, Ala., in 1877. Professors, 2; students, 31. This institution is steadily growing in the confidence of the church and in the appreciation of the colored people.

(4) Other Institutions, not Theological, but acknowledged by the Presbyterian family, are Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia; Davidson College, North Carolina; Adger College, South Carolina; Central University, Kentucky; Westminster College, Missouri; South-Western Presbyterian University, Tennessee; King's College, Tennessee; and Austin College, Texas.

5. Church Principles.—Holding, in common with other branches of the Presbyterian family, the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, the Southern Church lays special emphasis on the following points:

(1) A Faithful Adherence to the Constitution.—While allowing a just liberty of explanation according to the well-known traditions of Presbyterian history, latitudinarianism is carefully excluded.

(2) The Spirituality of the Church.—"Synods and Councils are to handle nothing but which is ecclesiastical!"

(3) Ecclesiastical Power.—"While the source of power, in all the courts alike, is Jesus, who rules in them and through them, yet the Constitution, in accordance with the word of God, assigns the courts respectively their several powers and duties, and prescribes the mode in which these powers are to be exercised. Therefore the claim by any court to exercise powers not assigned to it is a breach of the Constitutional Covenant between the several parties thereto."

7. Extent of the Church.—At the time of organization in 1801, the General Assembly included 10 synods, 47 presbyteries, about 700 ministers, 1,000 churches, and 75,000 communicants, about 10,000 of which were of the African race. It was formed out of elements which were mostly among the oldest in the history of the Presbyterian communion in this country; carrying with it the survivals of the first Reformed Presbytery of North America was constituted in 1798 in the city of Philadelphia; and the synod was constituted in the same city in 1809.

With the exception of an unfortunate division, which took place in 1883, with reference to the relations of the members of the church to the civil institutions of the country, the growth of this small Presbyterian church has been steady although not rapid. The church has 22 ministers, 10 presbyteries, 124 congregations, and 10,700 members. The contributions reported in 1882 were at the rate of $18 per member to all purposes, $1.50 per member to foreign missions, and $2.50 to home missions. It has a theological seminary with 3 professors and 20 students, a college with 6 professors and 100 students, a mission school and church among the Freedmen in Selma (Ala.), a Chinese mission church and school in San Francisco, and 4 large Chinese mission schools in city congregations. The foreign mission in Latakia, Syria, has 4 missionaries, 1 physician, 3 lady-teachers, 1 native licentiate, 30 native helpers, 2 boarding-schools, 21 day-schools, 600 pupils, a congregation with 125 communicants, and a theological class with 6 students.

This church adheres to the Westminster Confession of Faith as her chief doctrinal standard, accepting it as it was originally received by the Church of Scotland; that is, with explanations as to her understanding of certain portions of the Confession concerning the power of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters. Attaching
great importance to the duty of testifying against prevalent errors as a "witnessing" church, she has published a testimony (Reformation Principles Exhibited), declaring the doctrines accepted, and also the contrary errors condemned. As the name "Covenant" indicates, and in accordance with her past history in the church, the one in which she differs from all others, is her practical protest against the secular character of the United States Constitution. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and the Reformed Church of Scotland. In this country and in the present century, the church has prepared the following statements of its present position: Reformation Principles exhibited as a Testimony, Book of Government and Discipline (revised in 1869), Covenant (sworn to by the synod in Pittsburgh in 1871).
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In point of government, this church differs in no essential element from other Presbyterian churches. More recently she has, with marked advantage, revived the office of the deacon, which had unfortunately fallen into desuetude among the Presbyterian bodies, limiting, however, the functions of this office to the oversight of the temporalities of the church. Strictly adhering to the Reformation principle, that what is not enjoined by the law of Christ requiresthem to live quiet and peaceable lives, they endeavor, in all good conscience, to conduct themselves as useful members of the Commonwealth, bearing with cheerfulness their share of the public burdens, and doing all in their power to advance the best interests of their country. They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice, deeming that when these proposed amendments to the Constitution shall have been incorporated in that document, and not until then, we shall have a true Christian government, and our beloved country be indeed a kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

LIT. — The Westminster Confession of Faith (William S. Rentoul, Philadelphia, and Scotch editions); The National Covenant of Scotland; The Solemn League and Covenant, The Form of Church Government, and Directory for Worship; The Larger and Shorter Catechisms, all these are bound together as one book. In this country and in the present century, the church has prepared the following statements of its present position: Reformation Principles exhibited as a Testimony, Book of Government and Discipline (revised in 1869), Covenant (sworn to by the synod in Pittsburgh in 1871). J. R. W. Sloane.
The execution of Charles I. and the proclamation of Charles II. as his successor to the crown of Britain followed. After the restoration of the latter sovereign, he proceeded to restore Prelacy. When the "National Covenant" was renewed, with additions. To resist prelatic innovation, and preserve and further the Reformed religion in the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was adopted, and became part of the Constitution of Britain.

About this time the term "Covenanters" began to be applied to the Reformed Presbyterians of Scotland. In 1647-48 the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, were adopted by the Reformed Church of Scotland. By the passing of several supplementary acts to the first and second Books of Discipline in 1649, the General Assembly placed the copestone upon the work of Reformation; and the covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Church stood forth, the grand outcome of persevering struggle for the church's independence and the Mediator's headship.

The execution of Charles I. and the proclamation of Charles II. as his successor to the crown of Britain followed. After the restoration of the latter sovereign, he proceeded to restore Prelacy in Scotland. The church was divided into factions, and twenty-eight years of persecution ensued. Many succumbed to the storm. A few remained faithful, and by their fidelity became the true exponents of the church's faith as held from 1638 to 1649. Among them Richard Cameron and Donald Cargill appeared prominent. In the year 1680 they published the Sanquhar Declaration, in which the ground was taken, that when a sovereign violates his solemn engagements with his subjects, and becomes a tyrant, the people are released from their allegiance, and no longer bound to support and defend him. Although the abettors of this sentiment were accused of treason, and adjudged worthy of death, in less than ten years the entire British nation indemnsed the position by the joint coronation of William and Mary in 1689; and the same principle lay at the foundation of the American Revolution in 1776. These men might be thought as a presbytery was formed in 1774, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church took her position as a distinct ecclesiastical body in North America. In 1782 this presbytery was disorganized by its union with a presbytery of the Associate Church. The result was, that a portion of the Associate Church and a large number of the people of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, did not approve of the union. The existence of three distinct organizations, instead of two, was the outcome.

At various intervals within about ten years from the above period, Revs. Reid, McGarrah, King, and McKinney, were commissioned by their respective presbyteries in Scotland and Ireland to manage judicially the concerns of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. In 1798, in the city of Philadelphia, Rev. Messrs. McKinney and Gibson, with ruling elders, reconstituted the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the States of North America. At this time the church was scattered over the United States from South Carolina to Vermont, and westward as far as the State of Ohio. The presbytery was divided into three committees. In 1806 the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was constituted in the city of Philadelphia, and the three committees of presbytery formed into presbyteries. In 1823 it was thought desirable to give the supreme judiciary a representative character. As a consequence, the General Synod was formed, the constituency of which is taken from the presbyteries according to a certain ratio. Among the members of synod, some held that the Constitution of the United States is infidel and immoral, and that Reformed Presbyterians could not consistently hold office or vote under its provisions. Others believed that it was defective, but not essentially infidel and immoral. In the synod of 1831 this matter was made a subject of discussion. But in 1838, when General Synod met, a number of ministers, with adherents, refused to discuss the subject further, and withdrew from General Synod. The synod was thus diminished in numbers.

The doctrinal principles of General Synod are embodied in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms (Larger and Shorter), and Reformation Principles exhibited. The Book of Psalms, in the
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best attainable version,—prose or metrical, or both,—is the matter of praise in this church. Sealing ordinances are extended only to those who subscribe to the symbols of the church's faith, and submit to her authority.

The design of this is, not to unchurch any other denomination of Christians, but to maintain good order. Qualifications for membership, the training of children, and practical godliness, have always been reckoned matters of supreme moment in this church. The General Synod is represented in the Presbyterian Alliance, and has under its care 6 presbyteries, 40 ministers and licentiates, 48 congregations, 6,000 communicants, and about 4,000 Sabbath-school scholars. To General Synod also belong one theological seminary, located in Philadelphia, and organized in 1808, and one foreign mission-station in Northern India, commenced in 1836, besides domestic mission-stations in British America and the United States.

See Histories of the Church of Scotland, Reforma-

D. STEELE.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA is descended from the Presbyterian churches of Scotland and Ireland. As early as 1742, petitions for a supply of ministers were sent from Lancaster and Chester Counties, Penn., to the Associate Presbytery, which the Revs. Ebenezer Erskine, Alexander Moncrieff, William Wilson, and James Fisher had organized at Garney's Bridge, Scotland, Dec. 6, 1733. These petitions were repeated until 1753, when the Associate Synod, which had been formed in the mean time, sent out the Revs. Alexander Gellatly and Andrew Arnott. These men came, and on the 2d of November, 1753, they organized, as they had been instructed to do, the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland.

About the year 1750, and in answer to similar petitions, the Reformed Presbyterians of Scotland sent out Rev. John Cuthbertson to the same general field. He was afterwards joined by Rev. Matthew Lind and Rev. Alexander Dobbin, from Ireland, and on the 10th of March, 1774, these three ministers constituted the Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery of America. Eight years after, or on the 15th of June, 1782, an agreement was made by all the Reformed Presbyterian and a large part of the Associate ministers and congregations to form a union. That union was consummated on the first day of the following November, in Philadelphia, by the organization of a synod, which took the names of the uniting parties, and was styled "The Synod of the Associate Reformed Church."

Some of the Associate ministers and congregations did not enter into this union, and thus there were now the Associate and Associate Reformed churches. Each has the prayers and usages largely in common with the churches from which they had sprung abroad; and for over three-quarters of a century each pursued its own course. Often, however, it was felt that churches so nearly related and of the same profession or law for officers and members, and that they ought to be organically one, and might thus accomplish far more. Accordingly, in May, 1842, delegates from the respective synods met in Phila-
delphia, and entered upon negotiations, which were carried on until May 26, 1856, when, after much deliberation and prayer, a union was happily consummated between these churches, in the City Hall, Pittsburgh, Penn., and the body thus formed was called "The United Presbyterian Church of North America."

The basis of this union, and which constitutes the standing profession of the United Church, was the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms (Larger and Shorter), and a Judicial Testimony. This testimony contains eighteen declarations, which are explanatory of the sense in which the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms are understood, and are to be maintained. Most of these are held by evangelical Christians generally; but there are five which quite largely distinguish this church from others. These are as follows:

"We declare That slaveholding, that is, the holding of unoffending human beings in involuntary bondage, and connected with it, property, and subject to be bought and sold, is a violation of the law of God, and contrary both to the letter and spirit of Christianity."

"We declare That all associations, whether formed for political or benevolent purposes, which impose upon their members an oath of secrecy, or an obligation to obey a code of unknown laws, are inconsistent with the genius and spirit of Christianity, and church-members ought not to have fellowship with such associations."

"We declare That the Church should not extend communion in sealing ordinances to those who refuse adherence to her profession, or subjection to her government and discipline, or who refuse to forsake a communion which is inconsistent with the profession that she makes, nor should communion in any ordinances of worship be held in such circumstances as would be inconsistent with keeping of these ordinances pure and entire, or so as to give countenance to any corruption of the doctrines or institutions of Christ."

"We declare That public social covenanting is a moral duty, the observance of which is not required at stated times, but on extraordinary occasions, as the providence of God and the circumstances of the Church may indicate. It is seasonable in times of great danger to the Church, in times of exposure to backsliding, or in times of reformation, when the Church is returning to God from covenanting. When the Church has entered into such covenant transactions, they continue to binding势必 to adhere to and prosecute the grand object for which such engagements were entered into."

"We declare That it is the will of God that the songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world; and, in singing God's praise, these songs should be employed, to the exclusion of the devotional compositions of uninspired men."

In due time the United Church adopted a Book of Government and Discipline and a Directory for Worship, and incorporated them with its standards. All these, viz., the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the Testimony, the Book of Government and Discipline, and the Directory for Worship, are required to be subscribed by ministers, elders, and all who become members. There is one profession or law for officers and members, and it is binding upon all alike.

In its government this church is Presbyterian. Its supreme court is a general assembly, which consists of commissioners from all the presbyteries, and meets once a year.

"We declare That the Church should not extend communion in sealing ordinances to those who refuse adherence to her profession, or subjection to her government and discipline, or who refuse to forsake a communion which is inconsistent with the profession that she makes, nor should communion in any ordinances of worship be held in such circumstances as would be inconsistent with keeping of these ordinances pure and entire, or so as to give countenance to any corruption of the doctrines or institutions of Christ."

"We declare That public social covenanting is a moral duty, the observance of which is not required at stated times, but on extraordinary occasions, as the providence of God and the circumstances of the Church may indicate. It is seasonable in times of great danger to the Church, in times of exposure to backsliding, or in times of reformation, when the Church is returning to God from covenanting. When the Church has entered into such covenant transactions, they continue to binding势必 to adhere to and prosecute the grand object for which such engagements were entered into."

"We declare That it is the will of God that the songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world; and, in singing God's praise, these songs should be employed, to the exclusion of the devotional compositions of uninspired men."

The United Church adopted a Book of Government and Discipline and a Directory for Worship, and incorporated them with its standards. All these, viz., the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the Testimony, the Book of Government and Discipline, and the Directory for Worship, are required to be subscribed by ministers, elders, and all who become members. There is one profession or law for officers and members, and it is binding upon all alike.

In its government this church is Presbyterian. Its supreme court is a general assembly, which consists of commissioners from all the presbyteries, and meets once a year.
In worship, it uses only the psalms of the Bible. Its principle is, that these psalms are the only divinely authorized matter of praise. It accepts the metrical version of the Church of Scotland, and has prepared a revised and amended one, with a hundred and thirty-eight new versions of a hundred and seventeen psalms, and a much larger variety of metres. Congregational singing is everywhere strictly enjoined.

Both parts of this church took steps early in their history for the training of an able ministry, and to them belongs the honor of organizing the first theological seminaries in this country. Those at Andover, Mass., and Princeton, N.J., were founded in 1808 and 1812 respectively; but in 1794 the Associate Church appointed Rev. John Anderson, D.D., professor of theology, and organized and located a theological seminary at Service Creek, Penn. Ten years afterwards, or in 1804, the Associate Reformed Synod appointed Rev. John M. Mason, D.D., its professor, and prepared a constitution and course of study for a theological seminary, which it located in the city of New York, and formally opened in November, 1805.

In carrying on its work the United Presbyterian Church has seven boards; viz., home, foreign, and freedmen's missions, church extension, publica
tion, education, and ministerial relief. Most of these are incorporated, and all are under the General Assembly. During the year ending May 1, 1883, this church employed under its home board 73 missionaries, aided 292 congregations in 54 presbyteries, and expended in this work $30,592.

Foreign missions have been successively carried on in Trinidad, Syria, India, Egypt, and China. Believing, however, that more could be accomplished in those countries by a united effort, this church limits its foreign work now to India and Egypt. In these two missions it has (January, 1883) 17 ordained foreign and 19 native ministers and preachers, 31 female missionaries, and 192 native teachers and helpers, a total of 259 laborers. It has 22 organized churches, 1,900 communicants, 4,681 pupils in the schools, mission property valued at $161,325, and an expenditure the past year (1882) of $77,008.86. There were 401 natives brought during the year to confess Christ, or about 23 for each of the foreign missions.

In this church the board recommends new missionaries; but in all cases the General Assembly appoints them, and directs the number that shall be sent.

The other boards are doing respectively the work their several titles imply, and at an estimated expenditure of $111,500 for this year.

In this church there are two weekly newspapers, the \textit{Christian Advocate}, and a valuable series of sabbath-school publications.

At present the United Presbyterian Church extends into 21 States, and has 1 presbytery in Canada, Egypt, and India, each. At its first General Assembly, in May, 1859, it had 5 synods, 42 presbyteries, 408 ministers, 56 licentiates, 55,547 communicants, and about $200,000 raised for its work. In May, 1883, it had 9 synods, 60 presbyteries, 730 ministers, 43 licentiates, 839 congregations, 55,445 communicants, and $930,125 contributed for its work.

Such is the United Presbyterian Church. In its place, and as a part of the visible body of Christ, it steadily holds on its way, bearing ever the banner that was unfurled at its organization, having inscribed on one side, "The Truth of God," and, on the other, "Forbearance in Love." J. B. DALES.

UNITED SYNOD SOUTH. See Presby
terian Church in the U.S. (Southern).
Messrs. McGrigor, Brown, Ross, and McCulloch were the evangelists of Eastern Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton, and New Brunswick, and formed congregations in each of these Provinces.

About 1783 Rev. George Henry, as chaplain to the colony, was attached to a small congregation in the ancient city of Quebec; and shortly afterwards Mr. Bethune preached in Montreal and in the County of Glengarry. In 1787 the first congregation, composed of pious soldiers and a few civilians, was formed in Quebec; and about 1790 a congregation was formed in Montreal, which obtained Rev. Mr. Young of the Presbytery of Albany, N.Y., as their first minister. In 1793 the first presbytery was formed, and consisted of three ministers with their elders, and was styled "The Presbytery of Montreal," claiming connection with no other church. In 1792 St. Gabriel's Church was built, which is probably the oldest Protestant church in Canada. In 1818 an attempt was made to unite all the Presbyterian congregations into one church. This laudable endeavor failed, as the ministers from the Kirk of Scotland stood entirely aloof from the movement. It was, however, the earnest and prelude to what has been achieved in later days. One party formed themselves into the United Synod; and the others constituted the three presbyteries, Cornwall, Perth, and Niagara, assuming next year the title of "The United Synod of Upper Canada."

In 1825 the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers both to the Maritime Provinces and to the Canadas, so that the number of ministers in connection with the Kirk of Scotland rapidly increased; and in 1840 the United Synod, comprising 18 ministers, joined them. In 1833 three ministers — Messrs. Robertson, Proudfoot, and Christie — went out as missionaries of the United Secession. They were soon followed by others, and in 1834 they formed the Missionary Presbytery of the Canadas. The roll contains the names of nine ministers, of whom the venerable Dr. William Frazer, for many years, and still, an efficient clerk of the highest order of the church, held the first place.

When the number of ministers had increased to 18, and congregations to 85, they formed the Missionary Synod of Canada. When the Secession and Relief churches united in Scotland, in 1847, they changed the name to "United Presbyterian Synod in Canada," embracing 29 ministers and 50 congregations.

In 1844, owing to the disruption of the Kirk of Scotland, a division took place in Canada, and 25 of the 91 ministers of the Church of Scotland in Canada separated, and formed the Presbyterian Church of Canada (Free Church). This church, fresh and vigorous, grew rapidly, and, from 25 ministers in 1844, increased to 109 in 1861, when a union was consummated between them and the United Presbyterian Church. This union, so happy in its results, led to a desire on the part of many for a still more comprehensive union, embracing the United Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton, and New Brunswick. They formed the Missionary Presbytery of Canada, which sent out many ministers and members for a united church, national in the best sense of the word, that is, including all in the land holding the same faith and polity. In 1870, besides a few congregations connected with churches in the United States of America, there were four distinct Presbyterian churches in the Dominion. Measures were then inaugurated to effect a union of them all, and this was happily consummated in 1875.

The following presents a view of the different unions which led to the last, most desirable result.

In 1817 the Burgher Presbytery of Truro and the Anti-Burgher Presbytery of Pictou united, and formed the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia.

In 1840 the United Synod of Upper Canada united with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland.

In 1860 the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia and the Free Church united, and formed one church.

In 1861 the Presbyterian Church of Canada and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada formed a union under the title "The Canada Presbyterian Church."

In 1866 a union between churches in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick formed the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces.

In 1868 the synods of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in connection with the Church of Scotland, formed one synod.

In 1875 a general union was formed of all the four churches then occupying the same field in the Provinces, — the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, having 141 ministers, 179 congregations, and 17 vacant charges; the Canada Presbyterian Church, having 356 ministers, 650 congregations, and 78 vacant charges; the Church of the Lower Provinces, having 124 ministers, 138 congregations, and 17 vacant charges; the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, having 31 ministers, 41 congregations, and 9 vacant charges.

Total number of ministers, missionaries, and probationers, 771, congregations, 1,000, and elders, nearly 4,000. The union was most hearty: only about 20 ministers in all held themselves aloof from it. The church has made marked progress since, in every element of substantial prosperity. As early as 1831, ministers were sent to the Red-River settlement; and lately, as settlers have gone thither in great numbers, the church has followed them, and there are today in Manitoba 43 congregations, to each of which are attached from one to six preaching-stations. There are 14 settled ministers and professors, over 40 missionaries, and a college, which will soon be added a theological seminary. At the meeting of the General Assembly in June, 1883, Rev. J. M. King, D.D., of Toronto, was appointed principal of the college, and professor of theology. This appointment he has since accepted.
In British Columbia and Vancouver’s Island the congregations—which have been connected with different churches in Britain and Canada—have hitherto been a part of one church of the Dominion.

In the Work of Home Missions the church is actively and extensively engaged. Over 100 weak congregations are aided in maintaining ordinances, and more than 200 stations are supplied with preaching: 64 ordained ministers and probationers, 84 students, and 36 assistants are employed. In 1882 more than $50,000 were raised for this work. In addition to this, an extensive work is carried on among the French population. 64 laborers—ministers, missionaries, teachers, colportors, and Bible women—are engaged in this branch of the work, for which more than $20,000 were expended in 1882.

The Foreign Mission Work of the church is also prosecuted with vigor, and liberally sustained. Missions in the New Hebrides, Central India, China, and Trinidad, and among the Indians in the North-west, are all in successful operation. The contribution of the church for these missions is over $50,000 annually.

In the five theological seminaries—at Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto—there are 12 professors and a number of lecturers, and more than 100 students. Besides commodious buildings, libraries, etc., endowments to the amount of half a million dollars have been raised. Nearly one-half of the ministers of the church have been trained in their own institutions.

With an earnest and devoted ministry, and ample facilities for training as many as may be required, an intelligent membership, who are becoming every year more able and more willing to contribute, with her generous, far-reaching plans for mission-work both at home and abroad, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, though as yet only in her teens, is a fair, healthy, helpful daughter in the great Presbyterian family of Christendom.

A History of Presbyterianism in Canada, in 2 vols., by Professor Gregg of Knox College, Toronto, is announced. WILLIAM ORMISTON.

VII. In Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania. See those arts.

PRESBYTERIANISM is both a faith and a form, for each of which it claims scriptural precedence and sanction.

I. Principles. — 1. Form of Government. Presbyterianism derives its name from its form of government, its presbytery (its “eldership”). The word presbyteros (“presbyter, elder”), in its several inflections, occurs in the New Testament seventy-one times. In ten or twelve instances it denotes age or social position: in all the others it indicates official position or character.

In the absence of information as to the organization of the Christian Church of Jerusalem, as well as of other particular churchcs, Presbyterianism claims that it is but fair to infer the continued prevalence of the forms to which the whole Jewish people, as well as the first converts to Christianity, had from time immemorial been accustomed. Mention is made of the occasion which gave rise to the office and work of the deacon (Acts vi. 1–6), but not of the elder. That office had long existed in connection with every worshipping congregation. It was both the most natural and the most prudent policy, in the organization of Christian churches, to conform as closely as possible to established forms and order.

In separating themselves, or in being excluded, from the Jewish synagogue, it is claimed that the converted Jews organized themselves in a Chris-
Christian synagogue, as every way adapted to promote the public worship; "the synagogue" ("the synagogue") became ἐκκλησία ("the church"), the two words denoting the same thing. The terms were interchangeable, as in Jas. ii. 2, where a Christian church is expressly called a synagogue: "If there come (εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐμαυτοῦ) unto your assembly" (Gr., synagogue).

But it is inferred, must have been the mother-church, a Christian synagogue with its πρεσβυτέρον ("its eldership and its deacons"). After this model, it is safe to say, the other churches among the converted Jews in Syria and elsewhere were constituted. So, also, when, under the preaching of the apostles and evangelists (almost all of them of Jewish parentage), churches were gathered among the Gentiles, composed, in part at least, in most cases, of Jewish converts, as well as Gentiles, they too were constituted after the same model. When Barnabas and Saul went through Asia Minor, preaching the gospel, they "ordained them elders" (Acts xiv. 23), an eldership for every congregation. Paul at Nicopolis wrote to Titus, his "own son after the common faith," and says, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Tit. i. 5) — Κρήτην ἐκκλησίαν, "the hundred-citied Crete," a presbytery or eldership, "in every city."

Presbyterianism further claims, that the ἐπίσκοπος ("the bishop") and the πρεσβυτέρος ("the presbyter") are equivalent terms, designating the same office; the former being used only in the case of the Greek or Gentile churches, and occurring but five times in the New Testament. In one of those instances it is used of Christ: in the others it is applied to the eldership individually and collectively. Paul at Miletus, on his way to Jerusalem, sends for "the elders of the church" at Ephesus, where he himself had ministered "by the space of three years," and instructs them in the oversight of "the flock over which the Holy Ghost" had "made" them ἐπίσκοποι, bishops, "overseers" (Acts xx. 28, 29).

In his Epistle to Titus, Paul gives his specific instructions as to the qualifications of the elders, whom he was to ordain in every one of the hundred cities of Crete, when a Christian church should be gathered. "If any be blameless," he says of the elders, "for a bishop must be blameless" (1 Tim. v. 2). If a man desire a work of the bishop, he must be blameless (1 Tim. iii. 1, 2). It is plainly of the presbyter, the elder, that he speaks, and not of a presbyter. In writing to the church at Philippi, he makes special mention of their "bishops and deacons" (Phil. i. 1; the elders among the Greek churches being commonly known as bishops, overseers. As Epaphroditus had succeeded Paul and Luke in the work of preaching at Philippi, it is claimed that the church of that place was in form a Presbyterian church. It is further to be observed, that these elders are in no one instance spoken of as preachers, or instructed, as Timothy and Titus were specifically, in the art of preaching. The bishops, overseers, elders, whom those preachers were to ordain in every city, were not students, scholars, young men just setting out in the world; but, on the other hand, they were men of family, citizens of the place, tradesmen, mechanics, workmen, men of business, of good repute, of note and influence among their townsmen, grave seniors, if such there were among the converts, men of good judgment, capable of giving advice (ὁδηγῶν), good, hospitable, every church meeting (Acts xx. 29), the eldership to which he appointed them, as being commonly known as bishops, overseers. As among the Greek churches, and occurring but five times in the same model, the eldership individually and collectively.
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This, then, is the claim of Presbyterianism, that the churches of the apostolic age were served by three classes of officers, — elders and deacons. Eventually the evangelist, or missionary, became a stationary and fixed officer, not unlike in character any of the elders occupied that position; so that each church had its ἀρχιερεῖον ("angel, herald, preacher"), as in the case of the seven churches of Asia (Rev. ii., iii.). As the chief overseer of the church or congregation, he came to be known distinctively as διάκονος ("the bishop"); but he was the bishop of only a single church, of only one town or city. Every town or city had its own church, its own bishop. The bishops of the early ages were as numerous as the churches, residing often not more than five or six miles apart, and counted by hundreds along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, in Italy, and in Spain. They were simply what the Presbyterian pastor now is.

Such are the grounds, in general, with some possible variations, on which Presbyterianism claims to be both primitive and apostolical, as conforming more closely to the New-Testament pattern than any other form of church order. It is affirmed by some, that this form of church government is authoritatively and exclusively enjoined in the Scriptures; that it is therefore of universal obligation, and that no other is of divine right. They claim to be "jure divino Presbyterians." The great body of Presbyterians, however, are content to claim simply that their views are clearly sanctioned by Scripture.

In common with all the churches of the Reformation, Presbyterianism abjures the Papacy, with its viceroyalty, its infallibility, its decretales, its mariolatry, and its masses, as a monstrous innovation on the truth and simplicity of the gospel, and as treason to the Great Head of the church.

In common with Independency and Congregationalism, it maintains the purity of the gospel ministry in opposition to every form of Prelacy. It discards the High-Church dogma of "apostolical succession." It teaches that the apostles, as such, had not a successor for the leadership of the New Testament is not a priest; that the ministry of the Christian church are sacerdotal neither in name nor in authority. They are simply servants of Christ and of his people, heralds of the cross, preachers of the gospel, not lords over God's heritage, yet, in the truest sense, successors of the apostles. They are all brethren, and Christ alone is their Lord and Master.

Presbyterianism claims to be the primitive Episcopacy, and abjures the exclusive Episcopacy of Prelacy as a corruption, as a usurpation of prerogatives on the part of metropolitan and other pastors, to a degree, in the pretensions of patriarchs, and culminating in the tyrannical arrogation of the Bishop of Rome as the Vicar of Christ.

To the Church, Presbyterianism distinguishes between the visible and the invisible Church; the latter consisting of all the professed followers of the reformed religion, deemed from among men to the end of time; the former consisting "of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion," both infants and adults. This one Church, it teaches, has many parts. As the race is separated into numerous nationalities, so the Church is distributed into many families, separated by oceans and continents, and tribal barriers, and divers tongues, as also by peculiarities of faith and order. The necessities of time and place demand, that, in order to the public worship of God, these larger divisions be distributed into smaller, namely, the churches or congregations, not as independent organizations, but as parts of the one great whole.

Presbyterianism, therefore, teaches that any number of Christian people meeting statedly for public worship and the orderly celebration of the Christian sacraments, and covenanting together for these ends, is a particular church. It may be more or less scriptural in form, pure in doctrine, and spiritual in worship; yet it is a church, a distinct organization, dependent on no specific order of men beyond or above it, for leave to be and to do.

But, in the constitution and care of these particular churches, Presbyterianism avails itself of the advantages of a representative form of government. It makes orderly provision for the counsel and co-operation of neighboring ministers and churches, by fixed principles and uniform regulations, instead of leaving everything to the exigencies of time and place, and traditional usage. It provides for periodical instead of only occasional convocations, for a fixed and not a fluctuating constituency of its councils, and so for the common interests of the community.

It recognizes the Church as a great commonwealth, and, by means of well-digested formulas of faith and order, it aims to bring its detached parts into an organic union, the more effectually to give expression to church-fellowship, and to secure to the particular church its rights and privileges; to provide for them a learned and godly ministry, and so preserve them from the inroads of ignorance, immorality, superstition, and intolerance in the pulpit, and conserve the purity of doctrine; to secure a ready and appropriate redress for injuries; to maintain a uniform standard of godliness; and to combine the resources of the whole for the general good.

These salutary ends it seeks to accomplish by a regular series of church judicatories, the session or consistory of a particular church, the presbytery or classis, the synod, and the general synod or assembly. The principle of constitutional representation is maintained throughout; and opportunity is given, by a system of review, complaint, and appeal, for the righting of wrongs and the correction of errors; while, in a well organized and carefully compacted body, provision is made for the most effective aggressive movement against the combined powers of evil. It is a great church with numerous compacted parts, a great Christian republic, of which the Lord Jesus Christ alone is the sovereign.

2. Articles of Faith. — In like manner, Presbyterianism claims that its faith as well as its form is based, not on tradition or custom, not on the inductions of mere human reason, or philosophic thought, but simply and solely on the word of God. It receives and adopts the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being, not simply containing, a revelation of the mind and will of God, as given by inspiration of the Most High,
and as being "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." It rejects as uninspired the apocryphal books and the whole body of papal decrees and canon law.

In general, it receives and adopts Protestantism in its form from Romanism, Trinitarianism in distinction from Arianism and Socinianism, and Calvinism in distinction from Pelagianism and Arminianism. (See these several titles.) It maintains the absolute dependence of every human being, from first to last, on the alone sufficiency of divine grace, for salvation from the guilt and power of sin unto eternal life, together with the free agency of man, and his responsibility for every thought, word, and deed. It exalts the infinite sovereignty of God, and his absolute control of all worlds and creatures. It represents God as overruling all human agency, so as, without violence, to bring about the purposes of his will in the work of redemption.

It maintains the innate depravity and want of original righteousness on the part of all the posterity of Adam, and the amazing grace of God in giving his Son to die for a sinful world, and his Spirit to renew, quicken, and sanctify, thereby making salvation absolutely sure to every believer. It represents the God of the Bible as carrying forward to certain fulfilment, through all time, an eternal purpose and plan of redemption, whereby to glorify his only-begotten Son the Lord Jesus Christ, and make the blood of the atonement irresistibly efficacious in the eternal salvation and glorification of a great multitude whom no man can number.

It claims that this system of faith is revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and is "mighty through God to the pulling-down of strongholds,"—"mighty" in the widest possible diffusion of light and love through the ages, and in the effectual spread of truth and godliness through the habitable world, developing the mind, purifying the heart, and ennobling the soul.

II. HISTORY. — The modern revival of this form of Christianity dates back to the first days of the Protestant Reformation. Unhappily, the Reformers differed essentially in relation to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Those who held with Luther were called "Lutherans" (see this title): those who sided with Zwingli, because of their more thorough abjuration, both in doctrine and discipline, of the errors of the Papacy, obtained the name, distinctively of "The Reformed." At a council held at Zürich, Oct. 28, 1529, the principles of Presbyterianism were formally set forth. The Synod of Dort became the distinctive principles of "the Reformed churches." Under the teachings of Farel, Viret, and Calvin, French Switzerland, in 1538, adopted the same. The Huguenots, some twenty years later (1555), joined them, and established the French Reformed Church, after the model of Calvin. The "Institutio Christiana Religionis," 1551, became the basis of the Presbyterian Church and the German Reformed Church took form about 1560, at which time the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, under the leadership of John Knox, separated herself from the Papacy. Twelve years later (1572), the Presbyterian system was developed, under Cartwright, in England; while the Church of England retained (though doctrinally of the Reformed faith) the system of Presbytery. During the Commonwealth (1640-80) she became Presbyterian. The Presbyterianism of Ireland dates from the same period. The next generation witnessed the rise of Presbyterianism in the British Colonies of America, where it has taken firm root, and has obtained the most vigorous growth. More than thirty thousand churches in all the world are Presbyterian.

Its principal symbols of faith are the Canons of the Synod of Dort, A.D. 1619, and the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, London, A.D. 1648 (see Dort and Westminster); also the Heidelberg Catechism, by Ursinus, A.D. 1563. These symbols, however, have been so modified by the Presbyterian churches of America, in particular, as to exclude the Church and State theory, and to affirm the complete independence of the Church in respect to the State.

In fine, this system claims for itself a large-hearted catholicity. It extends the right hand of fellowship to all communions that profess the faith, and hold to the headship, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and its ethos of Christian charity toward the Christian people of every name in giving the Bible to the world, and in every good work for the purification and elevation of our common humanity.

LIT. — CALVIN: Institutio Christianae Religionis, 1559, 2d ed., 1559; VIRTUS: De vero Verbo Dei, Sacramentorum et Ecclesiae Ministerio, 1553; BEZA: De Diversis Ministeriorum Gradibus, 1594; WILLIAM STOUTHON: An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie, 1804; CALDERWOOD: Altare Damascenum et Ecclesias Anglicana Politia, 1623; BUXTORF: Synagoga Judaica, Basel, 1641; GILLESPIE: Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland, 1641, and Aaron's Rod Blossoming, or the Divine Ordinance of Church Government, 1646; also Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster (February, 1644, to January, 1645); RUTHERFORD: A Peaceable Plea for Paul's Presbytery, 1642, and Due Right of Presbyteries, 1644; BAILIE: A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Times, 1646; BASTWICK: Independence not God's Ordinance, 1645, and The Utter Routing of the Whole Army of all the Independents and Sectaries, 1646; sundry LONDON MINISTERS: Jas Divinum Regnamin Ecclesiasticum, 1646, and Jas Divinum Ministerii Evangelici, 1654; SMECTYMNUUS: An Humble Remonstrance, 1646; DRURY: A Model of Church Government, 1647; LONDON Prov. Assembly: A Vindication of the Presbyterial Government and Ministry, 1650; COLLINOS: Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici, 1651; BYFIELD: Grand Debate between the Presbyterial and Episcopal Church Government, 1652; and The True Church of Christ, 1653; BAXTER: Five Disputations of Church Government and Worship, 1659, and Treatise of Episcopacy, 1681; CHURCH History of the Government of Bishops, 1681; FORRESTER: Confutation of Episcopacy, 1684, and The Hierarchical Bishops' Claim to a Divine Right, 1690; "Eleven Remedies of the Errors of Presbyterian Churches, 1811, and Diocesan Churches not yet discovered in the Primitive Times, 1822, also Primitive Episcopacy, 1868; KING [Sir Peter]: Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, 1891; RULE: Good Old Way Defended, 1807; JAMESON: The Fundamental..."
PRESTON, John, D.D., Puritan divine; b. at Heyford, Northamptonshire, 1657; d. in that shire, July, 1628 (buried in Fawley Church, July 20). He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, 1670; entered holy orders, but never had a charge, or married. On the nomination of the Duke of Buckingham, he was made chaplain to Prince Charles, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and master of Emanuel College (1622). He was the chaplain-in-waiting at King James's death, and "came up, with the young King and the Duke of Buckingham, in a close coach, to London." In his closing years, his stanch Puritanism cost him the duke's patronage. As a preacher, he attracted great attention. He was also a vigorous adherent of Calvinism. His writings were very popular. See list in Darling; also Neal: Hist. Puritans, Harper's ed., vol. i. pp. 275, 276, 281, 296, 297.

PRESLEY, John Taylor, D.D., United Presbyterian; b. in Abbeville District, S.C., March 28, 1795; d. at Allegheny City, Penn., Aug. 13, 1870. He was graduated at Transylvania University, Kentucky, 1815, and ordination, 1815; licenced the latter year by the Second Associate Reformed Presbytery of South Carolina; ordained and installed, July 3, 1816, pastor of the Cedar Spring congregation, the one in which he had been brought up. There he faithfully and successfully ministered until 1820, when he came to Pittsburgh to be professor of theology in the theological seminary of his denomination. The same year the seminary was removed to Allegheny, and Pressly became pastor in that city. He took a leading part in organizing the United Presbyterian Church, which in 1858 was formed out of the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches, and the strength of this denomination in Pittsburgh and its neighborhood is more due to him than to any other one man. As preacher, pastor, and professor, he was unusually successful, and his impress upon his denomination will not soon pass away. See sketch of him by Rev. Dr. Kerr, in MacCracken's Lives of the Leaders of Our Church Universal, pp. 778-783.

PRIDEAUX, Humphrey, D.D., Church of England; b. at Padstow, Cornwall, May 3, 1648; d. at Norwich, Nov. 1, 1724. He was graduated B.A. at Christ Church, Oxford, 1672, and in 1676 published there Marmora Oxoniensia, or a tran-
script of the inscription on the Arundel Marbles (many typographical errors; more correctly presented by Richard Chandler, Oxford, 1780, folio). In consequence of his repudiation of the office of archdeacon, he was made Magister Sacri Palatii sumptuosas Martini Luthericonclusiones de potestate (London, 1503) and Summa Sylvestrina (1515), now entirely considered by the critics as forming, with the Pentateuch, is that of priesthood. God's design for his chosen people was, that they should be a kingness of Eden and the fall of man. God's design for the race was that of unobstructed direct intercourse between God and his people. The people may not themselves approach directly to God to do him homage, or to learn his will; hence arises the idea of a person of more holy character, who stands between God and man as a mediator.

Remark. — It is a matter of debate as to the original meaning of the word “Kōhen.” Some claim that the Arabic indicates that it originally meant soothsayer; others, as Fielischer, affirm that it signifies to stand by a person to help him. It is probable that both meanings may be drawn legitimately from the root. (Compare Curtius's Lexicon Priester, pp. 57, 58.)

Persons Eligible to the Priesthood. — This being the idea which underlies the priesthood, we have to consider what persons were eligible to the office. Modern critics, especially of the German and Dutch schools, in their radical reconstruction of the Old Testament history, utterly reject the Aaronitic priesthood as being the earliest form among the Israelites, and consider it the latest. They hold that the true principle of history is that of development, and that simpler laws and institutions must have preceded those which were more elaborate. They maintain, with reference to the object of worship, that the Israelites were originally polytheists, and that the more spiritual monotheistic conception of God was the noble fruitage of prophecy about the eighth century before Christ. They claim that the mode of worship in sacrifices, festivals, etc., was far simpler at the beginning of Israel's history than in the Priests' Code which mirrors the state of things after the exile. The legal documents in which they trace the gradual developments of the priesthood are the Book of the Covenant with its affiliated Jehovistic history (eighth century B.C.), the Book of Deuteronomy (eighty-two B.C.) with the deuteronomistic elements in Joshua, Ezekiel's Torah ( xl.-xlviii., 573 B.C.), and the Priests' Code (444 B.C.) with related parts of Joshua, which is considered by the critics as forming, with the Pentateuch, a Hexateuch. Their theory involves the complete demolition of the traditional structure of Old-Testament history and the construction of an entirely new edifice. Those who adopt this critical reconstruction of the Old Testament discover the following successive steps in the priesthood:

1. According to the Jehovist, any one may serve as priest. This is illustrated by the history of the Jehovistic period, where Gideon, Manoah, Samuel (who, they say, made a Levite by the chronicler), Saul, David, and others who were not sons of Aaron, or even Levites, offered sacrifices in direct antagonism to the Priests' Code (Num. xiii. 10, xlviii. 7).

2. According to Deuteronomy (x. 8, xxxiii. 8-10; 1 Sam. ii. 28) and contemporaneous writers, there is, for the first time, a priesthood which is confined to the tribe or guild of Levi. Not all Levites are priests; but any Levite who may desire, contrary to the edict of the Priests' Code, may become a priest by virtue of his belonging to the tribe (Deut. xvii. 6, 7).

3. A farther step in the priesthood is exhibited in Ezekiel, who first introduces the distinction between a family, that of Zadok, and the tribe of Levi. The priesthood is limited to the family of Zadok of the tribe of Levi, because they have remained faithful in the service of Jehovah: the
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rest of the Levites, because they have served as idolatrous priests of the high places, are forever deposed from the priesthood (Ezek. xlv. 10–14).

3. The last step is seen in the Priest's Code. Here it is proposed that Aaron and all other Levites are excluded from the priesthood, and the system is crowned through the institution of the high priest. While neither in the prophets, nor in the earlier historical writings, do we find any trace of this highly developed hierarchy, yet in the Books of Chronicles and Ezra [Nehemiah], which were written long after the introduction of the Priest's Code, we find such a hierarchy participating in the affairs of the nation. This representation, however, according to the critics, is not historical. Many of them hold that there was no intention to deceive on the part of the chronicler; but, in rewriting the history, he naturally treated it in the light of his own time, without being at all conscious that the Aaronic priesthood was of comparatively modern origin.

Now, we cannot dispute, that, when we consider these arguments of the critics without regard to other facts, they carry great weight. But, in determining the question of the origin of the Aaronitic priesthood, there are several considerations which seem to render their theory very improbable.

1. According to their hypothesis, we must suppose that the Israelites were originally a horde of barbarians, and that the priesthood, as we find it in the middle books of the Pentateuch, was not developed until after the exile, or at least nine hundred years after the time of Moses. Now, there are two facts on which scholars are well agreed: (1) That Moses is an historical personage, and (2) that the Israelites came out from Egypt. It is well known, however, that, of the four principal castes in Egypt, the priests stood next to the king, occupying relatively the same position which Aaron does with reference to Moses in the Priest's Code, and that Eleazar does with reference to Joshua in the priestly portion of Joshua. While we cannot admit, with Brugsch, that "Moses modelled his teachings on the patterns given by the old Egyptian sages," yet it seems incredible, that, with such a training as he had enjoyed in Egypt, he should have established no priesthood. If, however, he did found such an order, it is easy for us to see points of correspondence between the Aaronitic priesthood, with its high priest, common priests, and Levites, and the different orders of the Egyptian priesthood.

2. It is sometimes further objected, that so elaborate a system could not have been devised at the beginning of the Israelitish nation. But when we remember that Joseph at the very beginning of their history was son-in-law of a priest, and that Moses, as the reputed son of an Egyptian princess, may well have been familiar with the priestly system, and was, besides, the son-in-law of the priest of Midian, and had forty years in which to digest his knowledge, we might certainly expect, that, under God's direction, he would be ready to present as elaborate a system during the forty years of his life as a leader of Israel as we find in the middle books of the Pentateuch. Hence those who hold that God chooses persons and instrumentalities that are adapted to his ends must admit that Moses was more likely to introduce such a system than Ezra, that Egypt and Midian were more suggestive of it than Babylon.

3. The assumption that the representations in regard to the origin of the Aaronitic priesthood are essentially later to the Aaronic priesthood, unless it can be proved that Hebrew literature did not arise until about the eighth century B.C., as the critics claim. But again: if Moses is an historical personage, we have reason to believe that the beginnings of Hebrew literature were contemporary with him. It does not seem possible that he could have been ignorant of the art of writing, at a time when the Egyptians, judging from the memorials that have come down to us, could hardly have been less conversant with it than when Herodotus wrote (ii. 82), "No Egyptian omits taking accurate notes of extraordinary or striking events." But Egypt was not the only nation that had a literature at that time. Chaldea, which was the birthplace of Abraham, had already written down the primitive traditions before he was born; and the Phoenicians, the most cultivated people of antiquity, in whose land Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had undoubtedly come into possession of the art of writing. Now, when we take these facts into account, and remember that the Hebrew was really the Phoenician language, it would be passing strange if the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter (according to the Scriptures), or the priest, who, according to tradition, was the leader of Israel, left no memorials.

4. The critics maintain that the Old-Testament Scriptures belong to two classes of authors, — the priests and the prophets. They find these two classes of writings represented in the Pentateuch and Joshua, and in the historical books. The Jehovistic writings are the prophetic; the Elohist, the priestly. It was once the claim of the critics that the Elohist writings were the oldest, and that the Jehovistic were younger. Since the publication of Graf's work on the historical books of the Old Testament (1866), and especially of Wellhausen's History of Israel (1878), the majority of Old-Testament scholars in Germany have reversed the relation. But here, again, if the Egyptian priesthood had any influence on that of Israel, we must believe, if there are two classes of writings in the Old Testament, that the priestly are not younger than the prophetic; for the Egyptian priesthood were the guardians of the sacred books, which they explained to the king. In the same way, the Israelitish priests are guardians of the written law of Moses (Deut. xvii. 18, xxxi. 9, 24). Hence not only that which we find in the Pentateuch, but what we can gather from the external history of the nation, points to the prominence of the priesthood at the inauguration of the nation under Moses, as well as during the return to first principles under Ezra.

5. The representations of the Old-Testament books, when taken according to the age which has been assigned them by tradition, give a consistent account of the origin of the priesthood, and one which we might expect from the connection of Israel with Egypt; while the notices contained in the different documents discovered by the critics in the Pentateuch are highly fragmentary.

Without raising the question as to the Mosaic
Priest and Priesthood.

The authorship of the entire Pentateuch, there is certainly good reason for believing that Moses is the author of those parts of the Pentateuch which are assigned to him. Some of the modern critics consider him the author of the Ten Commandments and the book of the covenant; but neither contain any directions as to the priesthood. It is most unlikely, however, that he should have composed such a work, and not have prepared any regulations in regard to the priesthood, when the Egyptians had books which remind us strongly of the regulations of the Priests' Code in treating of sacrifices, first-fruits, the land-tax, the priest-tax, etc. And not only this, but the view of the critics would lead us to suppose that he founded no priesthood at all. We cannot believe that Moses would neglect such an institution, when the Egyptian customs and the middle books of the Pentateuch are favorable to the view that he did not.

The Book of Deuteronomy harmonizes well with its supplementary position in connection with the middle books of the Pentateuch; but it is not adapted to give an independent account as to the origin of the Levitical priesthood. The persistent use of the terminology, "priests, Levites" (Deut. xvii. 9, 18, xviii. 1, xxiv. 8, xxvii. 9; Josh. iii. 3, viii. 33), is indeed striking; and the inference that any Levite may become a priest would be legitimate, if we had to do with this book alone. The references to the priesthood, however, are of a very partial and incidental character, and lead to the supposition that Deuteronomy must have contained priestly regulations, and have been a priestly code. Indeed, on many accounts, the so-called Priests' Code is fitted to take the precedence, were it not for the critical objections which are urged. In a passage (Deut. x. 6-9), which, according to some critics, the Deuteronomist has introduced from an older writer (Jehovist,—Kayser), we read, "There Aaron died, and was buried there, and Eleazar his son was priest in his stead." When did Aaron become priest? and what were the circumstances of his induction? Did the Levites belong to the same grade of the priesthood as himself and Eleazar? These are questions to which neither the Jehovist nor the Deuteronomist gives us any response, but which are clearly answered in the Priests' Code. May any Levite become a priest? The natural inference from Deut. xviii. 6, 7, is that he may. But the answer is not unequivocal; for we find in Chronicles that sons of Aaron and their assistants are classed as Levites (2 Chron. xxiii. 18, xxx. 27, xi. 13, 14, etc.). Now, these considerations show the absurdity of making the few references that we have in the book of the covenant a mirror of one stage of the priesthood, or rather of a time when there was no regular priesthood, and that the Deuteronomist has found in Deuteronomy an indication of the first stage in the Levitical priesthood. The attempt would be utterly ridiculous, were it not that the results claimed by the critics in sacrifices, festivals, in language and literature, seem to point in the same direction; but the modern critical theory rides through not a few places in the Old Testament rough-shod.

It is certain that Deuteronomy does not attempt to define the different duties of the priesthood. Even according to it, there must have been a gradation in the most important of all the duties of the priesthood and the giving of a divine decision by Urim and Thummim (Deut. xxxiii. 8). It is certain that all the offices of the tribe, from an Aaron to a common Levite, are grouped together; and this is natural in a farewell address like Deuteronomy.

If we threw away the Priests' Code upon the subsequent history, it explains several things. (1) A high priesthood is implied in the prominent mention of Aaron, Eleazar, and other priests, in Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges, Samuel and Kings, as well as in their use of Urim and Thummim. (2) There is nothing but the theory of the critics in the way of supposing that there were priests and Levites during the Old-Testament history. They are definitely distinguished as priests and Levites in 1 Kings viii. 4. Kuenen tries to escape from this difficulty by quoting the parallel passage in Chronicles (2 Chron. v. 5), without the connective, and assuming that in this place the chronicler exactly followed the original text of Kings. But then, if, as Kuenen assumes, the chronicler was rewriting the history from the stand-point of the Priests' Code, the omission of the connective would not escape him, and he would be likely to insert it, that he might express the difference between the priests and the Levites. It is probable, therefore, that we have here a clerical error, as the versions and a very large number of the best manuscripts insert a connective. Then, too, in Isa. lxvi. 21, the priests and Levites are mentioned according to the authority of the versions and the oldest manuscripts (see Curtiss's Levitical Priests, pp. 205 ff.). (3) The critics say that the Levitical cities existed only on paper; but there are casual references in the history to some of them, which, from their undesigned character, support the view that they really existed. The Levite who is mentioned in Judg. xi. 1 ff. lived on the sides of Mount Ephraim—perhaps in Shechem, which was a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 20, 21). So, too, the father of Samuel, who is mentioned by the chronicler as a Levite descended from the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi. 7-18, E. V. 22-28), is spoken of as being from Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. i. 1). This coincides with the statement that the children of Kohath had Shechem with her surrounding pasturage in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xxi. 21). Another marked, but unintended, coincidence is found in the mention of Beth-shemesh in the first Book of Samuel (1 Sam. vi. 9–15). This city, according to the Book of Joshua, was given to the sons of Aaron (Josh. xxi. 10). If there is any point to the narrative at all, it is that the two new milch cows which have been selected to draw the ark of the Lord, contrary to their natural instincts, under the divine guidance, leave their calves, which had hitherto been the most menial service to the priestly city of Beth-shemesh, where the Levites, among whom were doubtless sons of Aaron, are ready to receive it. But perhaps most important of all is the twofold mention of the priestly city of Anathoth, whither Solomon dismisses Abiathar from the high priesthood (1 Kings ii. 26), and where Jeremiah's father, who was a priest, resided (Jer. i. 1).
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Now, if we read the history of the priesthood according to the Priests' Code, we get the following representation: it is descended from Aaron, through the houses of Eleazar and Ithamar, since Nadab and Abihu were put to death for offering strange fire (Num. iii. 4). In the subsequent history we can trace the work of Eleazar only as far as Phinehas, his son. This is not strange, as it was not the object of the prophetic authors of the Former Prophets (Joshua—Kings) to give a history of the priesthood. In the Book of Samuel we are introduced to Eli, who is supposed to have belonged to the house of Ithamar. Owing to the wickedness of Eli's sons, a curse falls upon this house (1 Sam. ii. 31-34). Both of his sons, Hophni and Phinehas, are slain (1 Sam. iv. 11); a terrible massacre overtakes the priestly city of Nob (1 Sam. xxix. 19); and the prophecy receives its special fulfillment in the deposition of Eli's successor from the priesthood by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 27), and in the putting of Zadok, a descendant of Eleazar, in his place. Under Jeroboam, a great misfortune befalls the priesthood. Since motives of state policy lead him to discourage the people from going to Jerusalem, he establishes the worship of the calves in Dan and Bethel (1 Kings xii. 28-29), and the priests are compelled to leave the land (1 Kings xii. 31; 2 Chron. xi. 13-15). Even in Judah, all the priests (except the sons of Zadok, and hence the sons of Ithamar) serve the people in their idolatrous practices, and hence are deposed from the priesthood, and are compelled to do the work of the ordinary Levites (2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9; Ezek. xlv. 14-14). Whether this regulation extended to the children of the priests, we do not know. During the history of the royal period, as given in the Books of Kings and by the prophets, we meet with priests who occupy positions corresponding to what we might expect from the high priest. Now, while this is the case, it is evident that the chronicler does not attempt to conform the history to the regulations in the Priests' Code; but his traditions are derived from the niiciit Sacerdotii atque Thora Elohistica Origenis, he presents very decided variations from it, both in regard to the priests and the Levites. We do not, therefore, see any sufficient reason for holding that the history of the priesthood had a different origin from that which the Old Testament is commonly understood to teach.

The Duties of the priests were twofold with reference to God and man, although the idea of mediatorialship was contained in them all. The high priest was to offer sweet incense every morning and evening upon the altar of incense (Exod. xxx. 7, 8). The priests were to keep the lamps of the golden candlestick in order, and to light them every evening (Exod. xxvii. 21; Lev. xxvii. 3, 4). They were to clear away the ashes from the altar of burnt offering, and keep the fire burning constantly upon it (Lev. vi. 9-13), to offer the regular morning and evening sacrifices (Exod. xxix. 38-42), and to pronounce the benediction upon the people (Num. vi. 24-28). They were also to set twelve fresh loaves of shewbread every sabbath upon the table before the Lord (Lev. xxv. 3-8). They were to blow the two silver trumpets, either for the calling of the assembly (as an alarm in case of war), or, in their times of gladness, at the beginning of the months, over their burnt offerings and peace offerings, and for the year of jubilee (Num. x. 2-10, xxxi. 6; Lev. xxv. 9). During the sojourn in the wilderness, they were intrusted with the immediate care of the ark of testimony and of the sacred vessels of the sanctuary, which they were to cover before they were borne by the Levites (Num. iv. 4-15).

The main part of the duties of the priests had reference to the needs of the people in the special and individual offerings which they might wish to present, as described in the sacrificial ritual (Lev. i.-vii.). Besides, the priests were to offer the fat of all animals killed for domestic purposes, and sprinkle their blood upon the altar (Lev. xvii. 3-9). They were to determine the valuation of vows (Lev. xxvii.), and to conduct the ceremonies in the consecration of a Nazarite (Num. vi. 1-21).

The Dress and Manner of Life of the priesthood, as well as their physical soundness, indicate their holy, and hence mediatorial character. None who were afflicted with any bodily infirmity might serve as priests (Lev. xxi. 17-23). The dress of the high priest has already been described (see p. 991). During their official service they wore garments of white bysbus, consisting of drawers from their hips to their thighs, and a close-fitting body-coat, without seam, woven throughout, which, according to Jewish tradition, reached to the ankles (Josephus : Antiq., III. 7, 5), and was gathered about the hips with a girdle; while upon the head they seem to have worn a white cap (Exod. xxvii. 40-42). During their service in the tabernacle or temple they were not allowed to drink wine or strong drink (Lev. x. 9; Ezek. xlv. 21). They might not incur defilement on the death of relatives, except for Deuteronomy, a father, a son, a daughter, a brother, or a sister who was a widow (Lev. xxxi. 1-3; Ezek. xlv. 25). The regulations respecting the high priest on the death of relatives were still more strict (see p. 991). They were prohibited from forming any impure marriage connection (Lev. xxi. 7), and could only wed a virgin or a priest's widow (Ezek. xlv. 22); although it was not allowed the high priest to marry a widow (Lev. xxi. 13-14).

The Income and Possessions of the priests depended upon the religiousness of the people. In striking contrast with the revenues of the Egyptian priests, and never at any time excessive, as Ewald has remarked, they must have been entirely inadequate in times of religious declension, and have led to suffering and crime. Instead of owning a third of the land, they were told that they had no inheritance like their brethren; that the Lord was their inheritance. They were assigned thirteen cities by Moses (see p. 1311) as places of residence, the fields that were consecrated to the service of the Lord and not redeemed (Lev. xxvii. 21), a tenth of the tithe which belonged to the Levites (Num. xvii. 26-28), the redemption-money for the first-born of man or beast
PRIESTHOOD IN R. C. CHURCH.

The priestly office of the Levites, as mediators between God and his people, in the presence of the congregation of Israel. After they had been washed, and had put on their priestly garments, they were anointed with a precious oil, which might not be used for any common purpose. This oil was poured on the head of the high priest; while his sons, conforming to the rahi under, had only their foreheads anointed with the finger. After this, the sacrificial rites took place, consisting in a sin offering, in a burnt offering, and a peace offering. In connection with this sacrifice, Moses touched the tip of the right ear, of the right thumb, and of the great toe of the right foot, of Aaron and his sons, with blood; signifying, that as mediators between God and his people, they were to hear his word, do his work, and walk in his ways.

Lit. — See the works quoted in this encyclopedia under Levites, vol. ii. p. 312, and LUND: Die Alten Jüdischen Heilighümer, Hamburg, 1711; RELAND: Antiquitates Sacer Facrum Hebrœorum, Lipsia, 1715, pp. 127-208; LIGHTFOOT: Missi- terium Templi, in Ugolien's Theodorus, Venetiis, 1748, vol. ix. pp. 890-878, and various dissertations in vol. xii., xiii. of the same work, Venetiis, 1751-62; WINER: Biblicis Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1847-48, pp. 369-275; SAALBÜCHT: Das Mosaiche Recl., Berlin, 1853, pp. 89-128, and Archöologie der Hebräer, pt. ii., Königsberg, 1859, pp. 312-369; STADLEN: Versuch einer Geschichte der Verhältnisse des Stammes Levi, Zsch. d. morgenl. Gesell., vol. ix., Leipzig, 1856; HAMBURGER: Real-Encylopädie für Bibel und Talmud, Berlin, 1870, pp. 842-860; SMITH: Dictionary of the Bible, New York, 1870, pp. 2375-2387; GRAY: Priester, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon, vol. iv., Leipzig, 1872, pp. 690-605; S. I. CURTISS: The Levitical Priests, Edinburgh, 1877; SCHULTZ: Alte- testamentliche Theologie, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1878, pp. 300-374; RIEHM: Handwörterbuch des Bi- bischen Altertums, Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1880, pp. 1215-1230; BRENDENKEMP: Gesetz und Propheten, Erlangen, 1881, pp. 172-202; KITTEL: Die Priester und Leviten, in Theologische Studien aus Württem- berg, 1881, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 113-120; DELITZSCH: Der Mosesische Priesterstand, in Zeitschrift für kir- chliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 113-128; OHLER (ORELLI): Prieste- rium im Alten Testament, in Herzog, 2nd ed., vol. xii. pp. 219-229; SAMUEL IVES CURTISS: PRIESTHOOD IN THE ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH. Very early, indeed already towards the close of the first century, a parallel was drawn between the officials of the Christian congregations and the priests of the Old Testament. (See 1 Ep. of Clement, c. 40.) As yet, however, the idea of the priesthood was not so real influence on the idea of the office in the Chris- tian congregation, and could exercise none, be- cause, in the Christian congregation, no offering of sacrifices by its officials was known; the whole congregation considering itself a people of priests. According to Justin (Diot. ii. 11 comp. Apol. 1, 07), the individual members of the congregation, and not its officials, are the acting subjects in the celebration of the Eucharist. Tertullian (De ex- cast., 7; comp. De bapt., 17; De monog., 7) bases the right of every Christian to administer the sac- raments on the universal priesthood of the faith- ful; and the same idea occurs in Augustine (De civit. Dei, 20, 10), and in Leo the Great (Serm., 4, 1). But, alongside of this idea of a universal priesthood of all the faithful, there developed, in course of time, another idea, of directly opposite character. In Africa people first became used, in what manner is not known, to designate bishops and presbyters as sacerdotes. The same custom was current at the time of Tertullian, as may be seen from his polemics against it; and in the third century it also became prevalent in Rome. As soon, however, as a dis- tinction was established between the members and the officers of the congregation, as between priests and laymen, it was impossible to prevent the Old- Testament idea of priesthood from creeping in, and making itself felt. Now, in the Old Testa- ment, the idea of priest and sacrifice are insepar- able; and, by offering up the sacrifice for the people, the priest became the mediator between the people and God. There was also a Christian sacrifice; but, as long as the faithful themselves offered up the sacrifice, the idea was rather in favor of that of universal priesthood. As soon, however, as the idea of sacrifice changed, and the sacrifice was of- fered up, not by the faithful, but for the faithful, that of priest changed too, and the priest became a mediator between God and the faithful. In the time of Cyprian this change was accomplished: see his Epistles, 55, 8; 56, 3; 61, 1, etc. The priest, and not the congregation, had become the acting subject in the celebration of the Eucharist. For the transition in the Greek Church see Apost. Constit., ii. 23, 12, and vi. 5, 1. At the time of Chrysostom the change had taken place.

Thus the priestly character of the higher clergy, derived from the sacramental character of the mass, was transmitted to the medieval church, which accepted all those ideas as axioms. (See Petrus Lombardus: Sent. iv. dist. 24 J.) When Thomas Aquinas incidentally mentions the universal priesthood of all the faithful, he gives to the idea an almost metaphorical signification: the faithful shall, like the priest, offer up spiritual sacrifices to God. The Roman Catholicism also speaks of a twofold priesthood, an internal and an external; but it lays stress on the distinction between the in- ternal, the hierarchy. The foundation of that priesthood is carried back to the Lord himself, who gave to the apostles and their successors the powers of consecration, of baptism, of offering and administering the Body and Blood of Christ, and also of forgiving or retaining sins; and the office itself is spoken of in in- vitant expressions. The priest is not only the emissary and interpreter, but the very repre-
sentative, of God on earth; and above his office none higher can be imagined, either with respect to dignity or to power. Admission to that office can be had only through a solemn consecration. The sacramentum ordinis, which can be given only by a bishop, but which imparts to the ordained an indestructible spiritual character, by virtue of which he can discharge his lofty spiritual functions. The conditions of admission are baptism, male sex, unmarried state, twenty-five years of age, etc.; excluded are slaves, those who were born illegitimately, those who have spilt blood, those who suffer from some conspicuous bodily defect, etc. This view of the priesthood the Roman-Catholic Church retains in spite of the objections of the Protestant churches, and she still retains it almost without the least modification. [See Eng. trans. Catechism of the Council of Trent, Balt., pp. 220 sqq.] HAUCK.

PRIESTLEY, Joseph, LL.D., F.R.S., b. at Fieldhead, Yorkshire, March 18, 1733; d. at Northumberland, Penn., Feb. 6, 1804. He was graduated at the dissenting academy of Daventry, and was successively Independent minister at Needham Market, Suffolk, 1755, and at Nantwich, Cheshire, 1758; professor of belles-lettres at Warrington dissenting academy (1761); minister at Millhill Chapel, Leeds; librarian and companion to the Earl of Shelburne (1773); minister at Birmingham (1780) and at Hackney (1791); sailed for America (April 7, 1794), and lived the rest of his days on his son’s farm. His great reputation rests on his discoveries in chemistry and physics, particularly the discovery of oxygen gas, indeed, of almost all gases. But he is mentioned here because of his advocacy of the “liberal” side in politics, no less than in religion, he made himself so obnoxious at Birmingham, that his house was entered and sacked by a mob on July 14, 1791, while some friends were celebrating the destruction of the Bastille. For this affair he received £2,562 damages. A statue of him was placed in 1860 in the museum of Oxford University; and another was unveiled at Birmingham, Eng., Aug, 1, 1874; while on the same day, the American chemists celebrated at Northumberland, Penn., the centennial of his discovery of oxygen. His bibliography, compiled in 1786, and placed in the Library of Congress, comprises more than three hundred publications of various sizes, and on numerous subjects. The most of his laboratory was in 1883 given over to the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. For his biography, see Memoirs of Dr. Priestley’s Life, written by Himself; with a Continuation to the Time of his Decease, by his Son, London, 1806-07, 2 vols.

PRIMACY, PRIMATE. The hierarchical organization followed the political division of the Roman Empire; but in course of time the titles of the superior ecclesiastics were changed. In the Orient, the patriarch stood at the head of the whole organization, and under him the eparchs in the provinces, and the exarchs in the dioceses. In the Occident, the episcopus primus sedis bore the title of primas, which meant the same as metropolitan. The title of primus, originally given to all metropolitans, was superseded by that of archiepiscopus, and retained only by the vicars of the Pope. Their rights—defined partly by older canons, partly by custom—consisted in confirming the bishops and archbishops elected, convening national synods, and presiding over them, receiving appeals, superintending the districts, and crowning the kings. Gradually, however, their rights were absorbed by the Pope, and their position became in reality only one of honor. The primacy of Spain was Toledo; of France, Bourges and Lyons (for Rheims and Narbonne the primacy was a mere title); of Italy, Pisa; of Hungary, Graz; of Bohemia, Prague; of Poland, Gessen; of Denmark, Lund; of England, Canterbury; of Scotland, St. Andrews; of Ireland, Armagh; of Germany, the three ecclesiastical electorates, and Magdeburg and Salzburg. In Protestant countries the title has been retained in England, where the Archbishop of Canterbury is Primate of all England, and the Archbishop of York, Primate of England; and in Sweden, where the Archbishop of Lund is still styled Primate of Sweden. See J. F. MAIER: Diss. de primatibus, Leipzig, 3d ed., 1741; Damiand Moliert: De primatibus, Göttingen, 1806. H. F. JACOBSEN.

PRIMICERIUS (from primus, “first,” and cera, “wax”), he who has his name inscribed as the first on the waxed tablet; the head of any body of officials, in contradistinction to the secundocerius, tertioceuris, etc. At the papal court, organized, to some extent, on the model of the Byzantine court, there were several officers who bore the title of primicerius. Most frequently, however, it was applied to the head of the lower clergy, the officer ranking immediately after the archpriest and archdeacon, and fulfilling the duties of the praeproctor, or scholasticus, or praeceptor. See Methodism.

PRINCE, Thomas, Congregationalist; b. at Sandwich, Mass., May 15, 1687; d. in Boston, Oct. 22, 1758. He was graduated at Harvard College, 1707; visited Barbadoes and Madeira; preached for several years, written his Memoirs of His Life, and on Oct. 1, 1718 was ordained colleague-
the whole, unrivalled in America. In this respect the village is admitted to approach more nearly than any other the ideal of an English university-town. The cemetery has grown to be one of the most celebrated in the land; for here lie a long line of illustrious citizens, presidents, and professors, including the Bayards and Stocktons of New Jersey, Edwards, Davies, and Witherspoon, of the college, and the Alexanders, Miller, and Hodge, etc., that almost twenty years elapsed after the appearance of the first volume, ere he began the second, and, his death coming soon after, he brought the history down no later than Aug. 5, 1633; and as, during the Revolutionary war, many of his manuscripts were destroyed, a large part of his invaluable collection (made during fifty years) of facts respecting the early history of the country has perished. His History was republished (ed. by Nathan Hale), Boston, 1826, and again (ed. by S. G. Drake), Boston, 1852, and in fifth edition of Morton's New-England Memorial, Boston, 1855. Besides this, he wrote An account of the Earthquakes of New England (1755), New England Psalm book revised and improved (1758), and other works. His library was bequeathed to the Old South Church, and it deposited in the Public Library, Boston, 1896, of which a catalogue has been published. See Sprague: Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. i. 304.

His son Thomas (b. 1722; d. 1748) edited the earliest American periodical, The Christian history, containing accounts of the revival and propagation of religion in Great Britain and America for 1745, Boston, 1745-46, 2 vols. It was published weekly.

PRINCETON, the Village, its Institutions, Theology, and Literature.

I. THE BOROUGH OF PRINCETON is situated almost midway between Philadelphia and New York, on the old Indian path between the fords of the Raritan and the Delaware, near its intersection with the line dividing the provinces of East and West Jersey, two hundred and twenty-one feet above the sea, on the first foot-hills, which, rising above the sandy plains of the south, roll on northward and westward to the Allegheny Mountains. The first settlements were made in 1694, and generally called, after the neighboring rivulet, "Sandy Brook." It was called Princeton in 1724. The battle of Princeton, Jan. 3, 1777, was a turning-point in the Revolution. Two eminent citizens of Princeton, Richard Stockton and John Witherspoon, signed the Declaration of Independence. On the 15th of July, 1776, the first Legislature of New Jersey, under the Constitution, met in Princeton, and organized the new State government; and Princeton continued the capital until the latter part of 1778. During four months, from June 20 to Nov. 4, 1778, the American Congress held its sessions in the college; and Washington, for some time in attendance, issued his farewell orders to the Revolutionary armies from the house of Judge Berrien on Rocky Hill. The village itself, numbering three thousand inhabitants, is distinguished only by its market, trees, and elevated situation; but in recent times the beautiful and spacious buildings erected by munificent patrons for the uses of the college and the theological seminary are, upon
of the special type represented by the Westminster Standards. This was true equally of the founders of the seminary, — Ashbel Green, James Richards, and others. It postulates one of the most rare and extensive paleontological museums in the country, and its united libraries amount to about 75,000.

(2) Princeton Theological Seminary. — After the first settlement of the various Christian denominations in the United States, their candidates for the ministry received their theological education from the more learned pastors. The president, or other theological professor in Princeton College, taught theological classes from the first, until the commencement of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the same place. The presidents of Yale College began to hold theological classes in 1754: its theological seminary as a distinct department was added in 1822. The Associate Synod founded the first American Protestant theological school in Beaver County, Penn., in 1784, under the Rev. John Anderson, D.D. The Associate Reformed Seminary, under Dr. John M. Mason, in the city of New York, was commenced in 1804; Andover, in 1808; the Dutch Reformed, in New Brunswick, N.J., by Dr. John H. Livingston, in 1810. Princeton Theological Seminary was founded by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, under Dr. Archibald Alexander, in 1812. He continued in office until his death, in 1831. Its principal founders were Rev. Drs. Green, Woodhull, Romety, Miller, Archibald Alexander, James Richards, Amzi Armstrong, etc. Dr. Samuel Miller of New-York City was elected second professor in 1813 (d. 1850). The Rev. Charles Hodge was made professor in 1822 (d. 1878). Joseph Addison Alexander, D.D., was made instructor in 1833, and professor in 1835 (d. 1860). Rev. John Breckinridge, D.D., became professor in 1836, resigned in 1838. Rev. James Waddel Alexander, D.D., became professor in 1846, and resigned in 1851. The present faculty consists of — Dr. Charles Hodge, editor-in-chief (became professor in 1851), Rev. A. T. McGill, D.D., in 1854, and retired Emeritus in 1888, Rev. C. W. Hodge, D.D., in 1860, Rev. James C. Moffatt, D.D., in 1861, Rev. Charles A. Aiken, D.D., in 1871, Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., in 1877, Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., in 1883, Rev. William M. Paxton, D.D., in 1888. The whole number of students, from the beginning to the spring of 1882, has been 3,464. These have graduated from 150 different colleges: 204 have been foreign missionaries. The chief benefactors of the seminary have been Robert and James Lenox, Robert L. and Alexander Stuart, John C. Green, George Brown, and Levi P. Stone, etc. These have endowed this eldest of Presbyterian seminaries with admirable grounds, dormitories, chapel, library, buildings and library, lecture-rooms, professors' houses, scholarship and other funds. The library contains about 40,000 volumes.

School, of the special type represented by the Westminster Standards. This was true equally of the founders of the seminary, — Ashbel Green, James Richards, and others. It postulates one of the most rare and extensive paleontological museums in the country, and its united libraries amount to about 75,000.

The term “Princeton Theology” originated in New England about 1831 or 1832, and was applied to the general characteristics of that system advocated by the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review in its controversies with the disciples of Drs. Hopkins, Emmons, Finney, and Taylor, the leaders of various phases of the “New-England School.” Of this “Princeton Theology” the characteristic was close and persistent adherence to the type of Calvinism taught in the Westminster Standards as these are interpreted in the light of the classical literature of the Swiss and Dutch and English Puritan theologians, who wrote after the date of the synod of Dort, especially Francis Turretin of Geneva, and John Owen of England. The phrases “Princeton Party” and “The Princeton Gentlemen” were applied to the party represented by the Biblical Repertory during the controversies which terminated in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1836. This “party” was in perfect doctrinal agreement with the Old-School party in that struggle, but hesitated to follow its leaders in some of their more extreme and disputable methods of reform, such as the “Act and Testimony” of 1834, etc.

IV. Lit. — The sources of information on the subjects embraced in this article are The History of the College of New Jersey, from its Origin in 1746 to Commencement of 1864, by John Maclean, tenth president of the college, Phila., 1877, 2 vols.; J. B. Lippincott & Co.; The History of Princeton and its Institutions, by John Hageman, Phila., 1879, 2 vols.; J. B. Lippincott & Co.; Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century, by Rev. Samuel D. Alexander, D.D., 1872; The Princeton Book, a Series of Sketches pertaining to the History, etc., of the College and Theological Seminary, illus. with views and portraits, Boston, 1878, 4to, Houghton, Osgood, & Co.; A Brief History of the Theological Seminary, pamphlet, by Dr. Samuel Miller, Princeton, 1888; The General Catalogue of the College of New Jersey, by Professor H. C. Cameron, D.D., Princeton, 1882; The General Catalogue of the Princeton Theological Seminary, by the Rev. William E. Schenck, D.D., Princeton, 1882, 8vo, 330 pp.; the Lives of Drs. Archibald and Joseph Addison Alexander, of Drs. Samuel Miller, Ashbel Green, and Charles Hodge. The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, from 1825 to 1872, Dr. Charles Hodge editor-in-chief, represents the "Princeton school" by discussions on all topics, biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical. Dr. Samuel Miller contributed between 1880 and 1842 twenty-five articles; Dr. Archibald Alexander, in all, seventy-seven articles; Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander, ninety-three; Dr. James W. Alexander, one hundred; Dr. Lyman B. Atwater, sixty-six; and Dr. Charles Hodge, a hundred and forty. Mr. Hageman, in his History of Princeton, etc., has enumerated seventy authors, citizens of Princeton, principally officers of the college and seminary. This work has been edited by previous authors of these articles. The Princeton school is remarkably prolific of printed essays, sermons, orations, not yet collected. Not counting the works of Jonathan Edwards, the principal permanent works which

**PRIOR.**

**PRIOR and PRIORESS are, as titles of monastic officials, of comparatively late date,—from the time of Pope Celestine V. to the end of the thirteenth century.** With respect to priors, a distinction must be noticed between a prior claustri and a prior consecutral. The former was simply a subordinate officer of the abbot, appointed by him, and in certain cases acting as his substitute; while the latter was himself the head of a monastery, and exercising the same authority as an abbot.

**PRISCILLIANISTS**, so called from their founder, Priscillian, were a religious sect which flourished in Spain and Gaul from the fourth to the sixth century, but was declared heretical, and finally put down, by the Catholic Church. Among its peculiar tenets the following were the most conspicuous. There is only one God, and the Trinity is only a triple form of revelation; but from God emanate spirits, which, however, gradually deviate more and more from the divine perfection. The world was created by such a spirit, but by no means by a perfect one; and the condition of the world soon became so much the worse as it fell under the influence of the Devil. The Devil is not a fallen angel, not even a creature of God. He developed spontaneously from chaos and darkness, and is the principle and substance of evil. From him come plagues, diseases, sufferings, etc. The human body is his handiwork. The human spirit is either a privation from God; and, to save it from the Devil, Christ appeared on earth. But Christ was not a real man, and not actually born by Mary. He only assumed human flesh, without also assuming a human soul; and he was altogether exempted from the human process of growth and development. From these doctrinal tenets the Priscillianists derived a very austere asceticism. They abstained altogether from flesh; they took great care not to put any children into the world, etc. Externally they maintained connection with the church, and professed to be good Catholics, only that they fasted on Saturdays and on Christmas Day, and avoided swallowing the elements in the Lord's Supper. But secretly they celebrated divine service in their own manner, allowing women to officiate, and opening the doors both for magic and licentiousness. They also kept their doctrines secret, and for that purpose they considered both lying and perjury admissible. They had a literature. Besides Priscillian, their founder, Latronianus, Tiberianus, and Dictinnius are mentioned among them as authors. But that literature has altogether perished.

The sect was first discovered in Spain in 379. Priscillian, a rich and gifted man, of a distinguished family, devoted himself from early youth to philosophical and theological studies, disdaining all vain and frivolous enjoyments. Like many other gifted men of his time, he fell into the hands of the Manichaeans, and his ambition did not allow him to become a mere adept of another sect. He aspired to form a sect himself. Mixing up various elements of Gnosticism and Manichaeism with Christianity, he developed a system of his own, and succeeded in having it adopted, not only by a number of women, but even by two bishops, Justianus and Salvianus. The miserable condition of Catholic Christianity, and the degeneration, spiritual and moral, of the hierarchy, contributed much to his success, not to speak of the general longing after the hidden truth, which the Manichean propaganda had awakened far and wide in the congregations. Bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to take notice of the spreading heresy. But he was a man of Christian feeling and of discrimination; he wished to convert the heretics. Quite otherwise with Bishop Idaci of Emerida, and Bishop Ibacus of Sosserba: they wanted to suppress the heresy. As the condemnation and excommunication launched against the Priscillianists by the synod of Saragossa (380) proved of no avail, the two bishops appealed to the emperor, Gratian; and he actually issued an edict threatening the heretics with banishment from the country. Meanwhile, Priscillian, who had become Bishop of Avila, repaired to Italy, and exerted himself to win Ambrose of Milan, and Damasus of Rome, for his cause. In that he failed, but by bribery he succeeded in having the imperial edict cancelled. Shortly after, however, Gratianus was assassinated; and a new appeal was made by the Catholic bishops to his successor, Maximus. In spite of the protest of Bishop Martin of Tours, who declared it a crime for the secular power to interfere in matters purely religious, Maximus condemned Priscillian to death, as a heretic; and he was decapitated at Treves in 385. It was the first time that a Christian was punished with death on account of heresy, and all Christendom felt the shock.

The death of the leader, however, was not the end of the movement. The military force which Maximus sent against the Priscillianists was recalled at the instance of Bishop Martin of Tours; and, in spite of the condemnation of the synod of Toledo (in 400), the sect spread freely. The confusion became still worse when the Arian Visigoths broke into the country. They hated the Catholics, and they were too rude to really understand the heretics. At that time Orosius wrote against the Priscillianists, also Augustine and Leo the Great. But every thing proved in vain until King Theodemir abandoned Arianism, and joined the Catholic Church; then the synod of Braga (568) succeeded in employing really effective measures against the heretics, and the sect soon disappeared. See also the writings of Orosius, Augustine, Jerome, Leo the Great, and Sulpicius Severus, also S. van Fries: *Diss. de Prisc.,* Utrecht, 1745, and Lübeck: *De haer. Prisc.,* Copenhagen, 1840.

**A. A. HODGE.**
PROBATION, Future, the doctrine taught by some modern German divines, that the offers of the gospel will be made to men in the next life who never had a probation in the present life. It must be distinguished from purgatory, where souls are supposed to undergo purification through penal suffering; from the doctrine, that, in the intermediate state, the process of sanctification, incomplete at death, is carried on to perfection; and from Universalism in all its forms. How long the gospel was preached to men while they were alive is argued, and the high authority of Augustine is quoted in support of the exegesis, that the non-forgiveness of sins against the Holy Ghost in the next world implies the possible forgiveness of all other sins: so Lange, Olshausen, and others. But there is no reason to believe that these words meant more than that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost can never be forgiven, as, indeed, is taught in so many words in Mark iii. 29. In regard to the second passage, there is the difficulty, referred to above, of knowing whether the text means to teach that the gospel was preached to men while they were in the state of the dead, or whether, having been
preached unto, those here spoken of have since then been dead.

It must be evident there is very slight, if there is any, probability of the hypothesis of a probation in the future state. The argument in favor of it rests mainly upon a priori and speculative grounds, founded, partly in sentiment, and partly also in wrong conceptions regarding the covenant of grace. For, in reply to those who advocate the theory, it may be urged:—

1. While it may be properly said that no one under moral government can be justly condemned who has not had a fair opportunity, this cannot be urged in supporting a future probation. If the government of God were conducted upon the principle of individualism, something might be said in favor of a future probation for the heathen. But the Bible emphasizes the race-unity of mankind. It teaches the representative responsibility of Adam, and accordingly that the race had its probation in him. Condemnation, therefore, does not follow rejection of the gospel, though that rejection may enhance it. The gospel finds men in a state of condemnation; and, though acceptance of Christ may be necessary to salvation, rejection of him is not the condition of condemnation.

2. There is no adequate explanation of the apostle's Epistle to the Romans, if the heathen can be justly condemned only after they have rejected Christ. Paul's argument is unequivocally to the effect that the light of conscience is sufficient to condemn them.

3. The Scriptures not only distinctly say, "After death, the judgment," but they teach that we are to "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body." The references to the future life contained in the New Testament imply that this life is in antithesis to the life to come, as to working, and receiving reward, as to sowing and reaping, as to running, and reaching the goal. The sins that bar entrance into heaven are sins that presuppose the present conditions of our earthly life. Sodom and Gomorrah are represented as suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Christ says, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with his holy angels." These considerations should be enough to show how perilous it is to neglect salvation in this world in the hope of having opportunities of repentance in the world to come, and how mistakenly the Church would be acting if the hope (for which the Bible gives no warrant) that the heathen are to have a probation after death should lead her to relax her effort to evangelize the world.

**Procession.**

**Proclus.** See Neo-Platonism.

**Procopius.** See Neo-Platonism.

**Procopius of Cesarea.** At Cesarea in Palestina; studied law at Berytus, and accompanied Belisarius as legal adviser on his campaign in Persia in 526; visited Africa, 533-536, and Italy, 536-539; and settled in 542 in Constantinople, where he was made prefect in 562. The date of his death is not known. He wrote a work on the wars of Justinian, another on his public buildings, and a third, which was not published until after his death, and forms a kind of supplement to the first. They have considerable interest to the church historian. The best edition of them is that by Dindorf, Bonn, 1838-38, 3 vols.

**Procopius of Gaza.** Lived in Constantinople during the reign of Justin I. (518-527), and compiled from the works of the Fathers commentaries on the Octateuch (ed. C. Clauser, Zurich, 1555), on Isaiah (ed. J. Curterius, Paris, 1580), and on Kings and Chronicles (ed. I. Meursius, Lyons, 1620), thus opening the long series of catena-writers.

**Procopius.** Surmounted The Great, to distinguish him from contemporaries of the same name) was a Bohemian priest, who on the death of Ziska, in 1424, succeeded him as leader of the Hussite army. Procopius was sprung from the lower nobility, and had been a follower of Hus. As a priest he never bore arms; but he learned warfare under Ziska, and conducted campaigns with consummate skill. He was more of a statesman than Ziska, and his policy was to terrify Europe into peace, not by force, but by an honorable and enduring peace. In 1426 he invaded Saxony, and defeated the Germans at Aussig. In 1427 he turned to ignominious flight, at Tachau, a vast host of Crusaders. In 1441 he still more ignominiously routed the forces of Germany at Hus. These victories of Procopius rendered inevitable the assembling of the Council of Basel, which was the only hope of
Europe for the settlement of the Bohemian question, which could not be settled by the sword. With the council, Procopius was willing to negotiate for an honorable peace. In January, 1433, Procopius and fourteen other Bohemian leaders came to Basel to confer with the council. The discussion of which ensued is the most complete statement of the Hussite views. Procopius respected Cardinal Cesarini, the president of the council; and the conference was conducted with moderation and good feeling on both sides. When the conference was over, envoyes were sent by the council to a diet in Prague to gauge the feeling of Bohemia. Bohemia, anxious to present a united front to the council, strove to reduce the town of Pilsen, which still held by Catholicism. The siege did not succeed, and a mutiny against Procopius arose in the army. The proud spirit of Procopius was broken; and he retired to France. In the meantime the Bohemian Diet accepted the Compacts as a basis of negotiation with the council. When once the idea of peace prevailed in Bohemia, it spread rapidly; and a party in favor of the restoration of Sigismund as king of Bohemia began to form. The barons of Bohemia and Moravia formed a royal league, and Procopius roused himself to oppose them. In May, 1434, the barons’ army met the Taborites, under Procopius, at Lipan. After a desperate fight, Procopius was defeated and killed. With him fell the power of the Taborites, and the moderate party was thenceforth predominant in the management of Bohemian affairs.

LIT. — The authorities for this period are numerous. The chief may be found in Hüfeler: Geschichtsschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung, Vienna, 1856-86, 3 vols.; Palacky: Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges, von 1419 bis 1436, Prag, 1872-73, 2 vols. The conferences with the Council of Basel are given by various writers in Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Seculi XV., vol. i., Vienna, 1857. For a careful history of the period, Palacky: Gesch. von Böhmen, vol. iii., Prag, 1866.

PROFESSIO FIDEI TRIDENTINAE. See Tridentine Profession of Faith.

PROLOCUTOR, chairman of a convocation.

PRONIER, César Louis, b. at Geneva, Switzerland, Oct. 19, 1831; d. at sea, Nov. 22, 1873. He was in early life in business in the United States, but, returning, studied theology at Geneva and Berlin. In 1863 he was called to the chair of systematic theology in the Free Church theological seminary, Geneva, as successor to Dr. Gauzen (see latter management of affairs at the time of his death. He was a delegate to the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in New-York City, October, 1873; was upon the "Ville du Havre" when she collided with the "Loch Earn," and went down with the ship. This disaster created great sympathy in the United States; and a large sum was at once raised for the families of the three delegates to the Alliance Conference. — Pronier, Carrasco, and Cook. See memorial sketch in Evangelical Alliance, New York, 1874, pp. 763-765.

PROPAGANDA. The missionary operations of the Roman-Catholic Church were conducted, from the thirteenth century on, by the different religious orders. The Jesuits were specially active in missionary enterprises; and Ignatius Loyola started the idea of establishing colleges for the training of missionaries from the lands where missionary operations were to be carried on. On June 21, 1622, Gregory XV., the first pupil of the Jesuits who reached the papal dignity, founded the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (the Society for the Propagation of the Faith). This society, as well as the training institute in its affairs, and the whole missionary system of the Catholic Church, is called the Propaganda. The congregation of the Propaganda includes all the cardinals, and has the entire missionary work of the church under its supervision. When it undertakes a missionary enterprise, it confines the new field to the care of some religious order, and sends out missionaries under the charge of an apostolical prefect (prefectus apostolicus). As the work advances, the Pope, by reason of his authority as universal bishop, substitutes for the prefect an episcopus in partibus (provincial bishop), who is also called apostolic vicar, and finally, if the success warrants it, establishes a bishopric. On account of the heresy of Protestant lands, they are included, with heathen lands, under the head of missionary territory. Pius IX. even went so far as to establish a congregation of the Propaganda for the Greek Church (per gli affari di Rito orientale). Protestants, being in the eyes of the Catholic Church heretics, are to be brought into subjection to its discipline. The bishoprics in Germany, North America, England, and Holland, are missionary bishoprics in the sense that their bishops have oversight over the heretical Protestants. The Bishop of Paderborn, in 1894, did not hesitate to call himself "the lawful overshepherd of the Protestants living in his see." The bishops in these lands are in constant communication with the Propaganda at Rome. The doctrine promulgated by Benedict XIV., and re-affirmed by Pius VI. in 1791, is held in the Catholic Church, that the heathen are not to be forced into obedience to the Church, but that Protestants who have received baptism are so to be forced (sunt cogendi). The Church calls to its help the civil power to secure this end, and, if it should ever gain the supremacy in Germany or any other Protestant country, will fully carry out this policy. See MEIER: D. Propaganda, ihre Provinzen u. ihr Recht, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland, Göttingen, 1852 sq.; Bullarium Cong. de Propaganda Fide, Rome, 1839 sqq. MEIER.

II. MISSIONARY OPERATIONS AMONG THE HEATHEN. Western Africa. — Roman-Catholic missions in Western Africa in the Middle Ages. The Portuguese discoverers who took these regions in the latter half of the fifteenth century planted the Christian Church through the Dominicans and Franciscans who accompanied them. In the kingdom of Congo the favor of
the king (who became a convert) and the compul-
sion of the Inquisition secured for the Christian
doctrines a pretty wide diffusion. The principal
city of the king is the name to a bishopric, part
of the sixteenth century, and gloried in a number
of churches and convents. The Jesuits entered in
1547, and for a time revived the mission, which
had begun to show signs of decay. But the
gradual departure of the Portuguese was accom-
pounded with the decline of Christianity; and when
in the eighteenth century, all commerce of Euro-
peans with Congo ceased, the land reverted to its
heathen condition. Since the recent expedition of
Stanley, the Catholics have again, under the
protection of the Portuguese flag, entered the old
field.

An apostolic prefecture was established in the
French possessions of Senegambia in 1765.
The work has been prosecuted with some vigor
since 1848, when the congregation of the Most
Holy Heart of Mary, established for the conversion
of the negroes, took up the work. In the first
ten years, 42 out of 75 missionaries became victims
to the climate. This prefecture has been divided,
and the following four apostolic vicariates estab-
ished: 1. Senegambia, with stations at St. Louis,
Gorée, Dacar, near Cape St. Verde, etc., and in-
cluding, in 1878, 10,000 Catholics; 2. Sierra Leone,
with 1,000 Catholics, who were not, from the
heathen population, but from Protestant congre-
gations; 3. Dahomey, including the so-called Ben-
inese; 4. The two Guines, with Gaboon for its
centre, where the zealous and consecrated Father
(later Bishop) Bessieux established several insti-
tutions, which are said to be the most flourishing
on the western coast of Africa. This mission,
which he founded in 1849, had 2,000 adherents
at his death, in 1876. There is also an apostolic
prefecture of Corisco and an apostolic vicariate
Liberia, which, however, for a number of years,
had existed only on paper.

Southern Africa. — This has been unfruitful
for Catholic missions till lately. The
Dutch government and population were very in-
imical to them. The apostolic vicariate of the
Cape Colony was established in 1847, and was
divided nine years later. In 1874 the apostolic
prefecture of Central Cape Colony was founded,
and in 1892 the vicariate of Natal. More effort
has been put forth to gather together the Catholics
among the European emigrants than to convert
the heathen. A seminary has been founded in
Grahamstown for the training of native helpers.
From Natal, work is pushed among the Basutos;
but it does not appear how many of the 700 con-
verts of 1880 had before been rescued from a state
of heathenism by the Protestant society of Paris.
The diocese of Central Cape Colony numbered,
in 1878, 890 adherents. The year previous a sta-
tion was established in Namaqueland, where the
Rhenish missionary society has been laboring for
many years. The most advanced mission-field is the
region on the Upper Zambesi. They began their labors in 1879.

Eastern Africa. — Through the discoveries of
the Portuguese, Christianity was also planted in
this region in Mozambique, Inhambane, etc. In
the kingdom of Momotapa it prevailed for half a
century. With the conquest of Angola, these
missions likewise declined. Since 1863, sta-
tions under the protection of the Sultan of Zanzí-
bar have been maintained on the island and at
Bagamoyo, where the congregations of the Holy
Spirit and of the Holy Heart of Mary have built
up successful educational institutions. Zanzíbar
constitutes an apostolic prefecture. Catholic mis-
sions got a foothold in Abyssinia in the seven-
teenth century, but were subsequently suppressed.
Abyssinia was made an apostolic vicariate in 1858.
Of the results of the mission there are no
accessible reports.

Central Africa constitutes an apostolic vicari-
ate. The Jesuits attempted to push forward into
this region in 1848, and occupied Khartoum and
Gondokoro. The missions were abandoned on
account of the murderous climate, but resumed in
1861 by the Franciscans. This second effort has
also failed; and in 1895 only two missionaries were
left at Khartoum, forty (most of them Germans)
having succumbed to the climate. The idea of
converting Africa by Africans was taken up, and
in 1897 an institution was founded near Cairo to
train Africans. Another institution, at Verona,
trains Europeans for the work. The station at
Khartoum was re-enforced in 1872. The Catho-
lics, under the direction of the Archbishop of Al-
giers, have pressed on to the kingdom of Mtesa on
the Victoria Nyanza, where they are seeking to
push up the Church Missionary Society, and to
Lake Tanganyika.

North Africa.— The Franciscans have attempted
to win the Copts in Egypt for the Papal chair. The
Jesuits also undertook the work, and by the close
of the last century 15,000 had been won. In 1887
the apostolic vicariate of Egypt was established.
The archbishopric of Algiers includes the sees of
Oran and Constantine-Hippo. There has been
some missionary activity; and different societies
have been at work among the natives, but with
what results we cannot discover.

African Islands. — Madagascar, the most impor-
tant for Catholic missions, became the scene of
Franciscan labors in 1842. In 1874 the Portu-
guese colony of Port Dauphin was destroyed.
In 1892, stimulated by the achievements of the Lon-
don Missionary Society, the apostolic prefect of
Bourbon made a new attempt. In 1844 the Jes-
uits undertook the work, and since that time, or,
more definitely, since 1866, when French influence
began to be felt, have had yearly additions of
1,600 adults and 800 baptized children. These
figures seem to be inexact. Tananarivo is the
headquarters of the mission. Several societies
are laboring in Bourbon, Mauritius, and the Sey-
chelles.

Turning to Asia, we pass over the labors of
Catholic missionaries in Syria, Asia Minor, and
Persia, where the efforts are directed to make con-
verts from the Protestant churches. Of the work
among the Mohammedans there is no report.

British India. — Early in the sixteenth century
we find Franciscans and Dominicans at work at
Goa, which in 1534 gave the name to a bishopric.
With Francis Xavier, who, accompanied by two
other Jesuits, entered Goa in 1542, began a new
period, a period of earnest and fruitful effort
amongst the natives. He displayed a rare devo-
tion, labored also in Timnevelly, and is said to
have baptized if the Portuguese work. The station
Zealous as Xavier was, he succeeded only in build-
ing up a nominal Christianity. He left after a
few years of effort, and was followed by other Jesuits, who in 1565 counted in the Portuguese possessions in India 300,000 Christians. Goa was elevated to an archbishopric in 1557. In 1566, in the hope of removing his objections, the Jesuit Roberto de Nobili published a holy Veda, in which he accommodated Christianity to the Brahmins. It succeeded, so it is said, the conversion of 30,000 natives; but the principle carried out in the book was condemned by the Pope. The Indian missions subsequently dwindled with the decay of the Portuguese power. In the present century new life has been infused into them. There are a number of apostolical vicariates; and the different dioceses are distributed among the Benedictines, Jesuits, and other orders. Missionaries from the Mill-Hill Seminary, near London, have been carrying on work since 1879 in the vicariate of Afghanistan and Beloochistan. The following table gives the statistics of 1879, according to the vicariates:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vicariate</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>108,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffna</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quilon</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varkopoli</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madura</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay-Puna</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiderabad</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verapoly</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to determine the value of these figures, as all the European Catholics in India, and all the old and nominal Christians, are included in the statistics. The Catholic schools of India had only 31,436 pupils in 1888, while the Protestant schools a few years later had 115,735.

Panther India. — Malacca was made a bishopric in 1537, after Xavier had labored there for two years. The early missions in Burma accomplished little. In 1722 it was made an apostolic vicariate. Since 1856 it has been under the control of the Paris Missionary Seminary. It is now divided into three vicariates, with 15,000 Catholics. The mission was in a flourishing condition in the last century. After a period of lapse, it was revived in 1840. Siam now includes two vicariates, with 16,000 Catholics. Among the heroic Jesuits, Alexander of Stignon in 1858. In 1880 the vicariates were credited with the following number of adherents:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vicariate</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Coch-China</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Coch-China</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Rossellin</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catholic missions followed the Portuguese to the Philippine Islands in the sixteenth century. Manila gave the name to an archbishopric, and several bishoprics were established. 5,502,000 Catholics are reported for these islands. The total population is 7,451,000. The old missions on Java (1590) were abolished by the Dutch. In the present century Batavia (1841) has been made a vicariate, and is credited with 23,000 Catholics.

Central Oceanica constitutes an apostolic vicar-
riate. Bataillon started a mission on the Island of Ua in 1836. The whole population of 4,000 is Catholic. The same is true of the population (15,000 souls) of Futuna. The French flag compelled many of the islands to receive the mission. This was the case with the Tuamotu Islands in 1858. But the natives remained true to the Protestant Church. For example, in the northern group there are 6,000 Protestants and only 200 Catholics. On the Samos Islands, where a mission was started in 1845, there are "about 5,000 converts." The violent occupation of Tahiti by the Catholics at the time stirred the blood of the Protestant world. In 1836 two priests were expelled from the land; but the French compelled the Protestant queen to re-admit them to her dominions, and to pay a heavy indemnity, and forced her in 1842 to accept a French protectorate. The people rose in revolt against this for foreign injustice, and could only be put down after two years of resistance. The Protestant missionaries, robbed of their influence, left. The whole population was forced to contribute to the cathedral of Papeiti; but, notwithstanding these measures, only 500 converts have been made. The results of many to a semi-heathenish life is due to the violent measures of the Catholics, by which the congregations were robbed of their pastors. A small vessel, "The Vatican," plies between Tahiti and the adjoining islands. The Marquesas Islands form a vicariate by themselves. Catholic missionaries in 1888 planted themselves at the very station which had been the scene of the hard struggles of a Protestant mission. Under the protectorate of the French flag (1842) earnest efforts have been made to win the islanders, but with little success.

The Hawaiian Islands.—The Catholics succeeded in getting a foothold on this territory of the American Board in 1840. The entire population had at that time renounced heathenism. The mission has been successful, and in 1874 there were 24,000 Catholics on the islands. The fact and reports forbid it. The defects of the reports seems, in many cases, to be intentional. The successes are frequently exaggerated, and the failures suppressed; while the achievements on the fields cultivated by Protestant societies are magnified and gloried in. Under these circumstances it is not possible to get a fair conception of the success of Catholic missions. It is a fact, however, that their revival in the middle of this century followed the hard and heroic pioneer work of Protestant missionaries. So far as we can judge, the results of Roman-Catholic missions in this period have been, upon the whole, very small, and dispropor tioned to the amount of labor spent. The number of converts made in this century would be very small if the multitudes converted at an earlier period were not counted in.

LIT.—The most important works on the subject are Annales de la Propagation de la Foi, Lyons (eine 1822); D. katol. Missionen, Illustirte Zeitschrift, Freiburg-i.-Breisgau; HAHN: Geschichte der katholischen Missionen, Köln, 1857-63, 5 vols.; KALKAR: Den katholische Missions-Historie, Copenhagen, 1862; Dictionnaire des Missions Catholiques, par Djnnkovscy, Paris, 1864 (to be used with caution).

PROPHETIC OFFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. The object and signification of the Old Testament prophecy is seen from Deut. xviii. 9-22. Before his death Moses appointed a successor, in the person of Joshua, for the theocracy, and laid down rules for the monarchy, thus indicating, that, with his death, the revelation of the divine will was not to be final, but new organs of revelation were to be expected. The theocratical people was not to be left without a guide, thus being led to take refuge in heathenish divination. And, as the people was unable to bear the terrors of the appearance of God, Jehovah intended to communicate his will to the people through men, by raising from among the people, who occupy an island by themselves, deserves mention.

America.—In America we are brought in contact with the missions among the Indians and negroes. For the United States, see arts. Indians and Roman-Catholic Church in the United States. In the diocese of Quebec, Canada, the Jesuits have been laboring among the Indians since the beginning of the eighteenth century. Perhaps 18,000 Catholic Indians are connected with the Catholic Church. The centre of missionary operations in the diocese of Toronto is the station of St. Boniface on the Red River, established in 1820. The centre in the western diocese of St. Albert is at St. Anna, established in 1813. The apostolic vicariate of Athabasca began with a station in 1849.

In Mexico the cross was planted by the bloody hand of Cortez. The first missionaries were Franciscans, and in the first six years 200,000 heathen were converted. There are now 6,000-000 Christian Indians in Mexico; but their Christianity is for the most part a nominal profession. The case is similar in Central America, where there are 1,200,000 Catholic Indians. In the West Indies the natives died out, and the negroes were baptized without much preparation. In South America the Jesuits carried on extensive missionary operations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and trained the Indians in the arts of civilized life. With the abolition of the order, the Indians were neglected, and returned to a semi-heathen condition.

We regret to be obliged to renounce the plan of giving a statistical table of Catholic missions. The facts and reports forbid it. The defectiveness of the reports seems, in many cases, to be intentional. The successes are frequently exaggerated, and the failures suppressed; while the achievements on the fields cultivated by Protestant societies are magnified and gloried in. Under these circumstances it is not possible to get a fair conception of the success of Catholic missions. It is a fact, however, that their revival in the middle of this century followed the hard and heroic pioneer work of Protestant missionaries. So far as we can judge, the results of Roman-Catholic missions in this period have been, upon the whole, very small, and disproportioned to the amount of labor spent. The number of converts made in this century would be very small if the multitudes converted at an earlier period were not counted in.
together, and formed the so-called schools of the spiritual overseers and theocratic historiographers. Foundation may have been laid for that great sacrificial cult. After the election of David in the monarchy, Samuel had resigned his judicial office, from the fact that not only was Samuel a Levite, theocratic historiography, commenced with Samuel (cf. 1 Chron. xxv. 1, 5; 2 Chron. xxi. 19). It seems, however, that they were on good terms with Gad and Nathan, although the sacred song emanating from the heart moved by the Divine Spirit may be called prophesying. Under Solomon the prophetic office for a time stood in the background, until towards the end of his reign, when his heart was inclined to apostasy, the warning voice of the prophet, perhaps of Ahijah the Shilonite, was heard (1 Kings xi. 11–13). The great influence which the prophetic office still exercised among the people may be seen from what we read of the prophet Shemaiah (1 Kings xii. 21 sq.; 2 Chron. xi. 2). In the following centuries the activity of the prophetic office was mainly in the kingdom of the ten tribes, the history of which was mainly the conflict between the prophets and the apostatized kings. This religio-political conflict, which had already been inaugurated under Jeroboam, was continued under his successors; and Jehu, Elijah, Eliah, Jonah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Oded, and Nahum are mentioned as the men of God who pleaded the cause of Jehovah. Different, however, was the character of the prophetic office in the kingdom of Judah, where the mediatorial position between God and the people now rested in the person of the divinely inspired prophets.

The relation of the prophetic office to the monarchy is shown in the behavior of Samuel towards Saul (cf. 1 Sam. xv. 11, xvi. 1; and Samuel's word (1 Sam. xv. 22) is, so to say, the programme for the position of the prophetic office to the sacrificial cult. After the election of David in the place of Saul, Samuel retired to Ramah for the rest of his life, in the latter part of Joash's reign lived Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, the first martyr of the prophets of Judah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 19 sq.). Under Joash's successor, Amaziah, two prophets (2 Chron. xxvii. 19 sq.), under Asa, Azariah, the son of Oded (2 Chron. xxvi. 5 sq.); under Asa, Azariah, the son of Oded (2 Chron. xvi. 1), and Hanani (xvi. 7). Under Jehoshaphat we find Jehu, the son of Hanani (xix. 2), and Eliezer (xx. 37). During Jehoshaphat's reign the work of the priests seems to have been of more influence than that of the prophets, as may be seen from 2 Chron. xvii. 7 sq., where, among those who were sent about to teach the people, no prophets or priests acted harmoniously, we see from Joel, who belonged to the earlier period of the reign of Joash. When a plague visited the country, he brought it about that both priests and people held a fast-day. In the latter part of Joash's reign lived Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, the first martyr of the prophets of Judah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 19 sq.). Under Joash's successor, Amaziah, two prophets (2 Chron. xxvii. 19 sq.) are mentioned. Taken all in all, the work of the prophets in Judah, with the exception of Isaiah, was of less effect than that of the prophets in the kingdom of the ten tribes. With Joel, or perhaps with Obadiah, i.e., in the first decades of the ninth century B.C., the beginning was already made with the writings of prophetic books. The older prophets also had uttered prophecies, which were written down in the prophetic books of history. The basis of the prophetic books of history was already made with the writings of the older testimonies of revelation; but, whilst the former prophets had more regard for the present of the kingdom of God, the prophetic word now views the future. Despised and misjudged by the contemporaries, the prophetic word in its historic fulfillment was to legitimize to future generations God's righteous and faithful service, and was intended as a guide to the pious. For...
this reason, the word of the prophets had to be transmitted faithfully, which could only be done in writing. This writing down is therefore often referred to by the prophets as effected at divine command (Isa. viii. 1; Hab. ii. 2 sq.; Jer. xxxvi. 2), and, by expressly emphasizing the object of the writing, to show to coming generations the truth of the prophecy (Isa. xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2 sq.; 30. 5; xxxiv. 10). In this way follows the oral utterance in order to confirm the latter, and where sometimes (Isa. viii. 1 sq.; perhaps Isa. xxx. 8 belongs here also) it was sufficient to note down before witnesses the more salient points. In general, however, the literary activity is independent from the oral preaching; and prophets (like Amos, Hosea, Micah) probably did not write down their prophetic utterances till towards the close of their life, thus transmitting to the world in a formulated order a totality of their prophetic office. That some literary productions have been lost, we may infer from the reference often made to older sources, as Isa. ii. 2-4; Mic. iv. 1-4; Isa. xv. sq. But on the other hand, we perceive herein an important peculiarity of prophetic literature; viz., the connection which exists between the prophetic books, in so far as the younger prophets in a great many instances looked up the utterances of the older prophets, made them their own, enlarged and developed the same. Thus, e.g., Amos 3 follows Joel iii. 16; the younger Micah takes up the close of the discourse of the older (1 Kings xxii. 28). Almost throughout all prophets, especially in Zephaniah and Jeremiah, we find allusions and references to former prophetic works; but herein we perceive the unity of the spirit in which the prophets stand, who, in spite of the changes of times, followed up this one unity of the word of God which they proclaimed; thus also proving the lasting validity of the not yet fulfilled prophecies.

As has already been indicated, the work of Isaiah was of the greatest effect in the kingdom of Judah. At the beginning of his ministry, Judah was in the zenith of her power, brought about under the powerful reign of Uzziah and Jotham. And although these kings in general preserved the theocratic order, yet the moral and religious condition of the people was less pleasing; since corruption, idolatry, and other vices had taken a hold upon the people, especially upon the higher classes. In connection with this we find a degenerated priesthood (Mic. iii. 11; Isa. xxviii. 7), which, together with a number of false prophets and flattering demagogues, strengthened the people in their sins (Isa. ix. 14 sq.; xxviii. 7; Mic. iii. 11, iii. 5). After Isaiah had already announced under Jotham the coming of the great day of Jehovah (Isa. ii.—vi.), his public activity, as far as we can see from his own book (vii.), commences under Ahaz, in that critical moment when the two great powers, Athens and Rome, met in the East. Athens conquered Judah, and it reaches its height under Hezekiah. For while the prophet continues the word of the former prophets, yet in him prophecy for the first time takes a universal stand-point, from which all destinies of the kingdoms of the world, and of the heathenish nations at large, are to become a part of the divine ways of judgment, the end of which is the eternal kingdom of God triumphing over all power and greatness of heathendom. Contempo-

rarily with Isaiah was Micah the prophet, "full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might is therefore often referred to by the prophets as effected at divine command (Isa. viii. 1; Hab. ii. 2 sq.; Jer. xxxvi. 2), and, by expressly emphasizing the object of the writing, to show to coming generations the truth of the prophecy (Isa. xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2 sq.; 30. 5; xxxiv. 10). In this way follows the oral utterance in order to confirm the latter, and where sometimes (Isa. viii. 1 sq.; perhaps Isa. xxx. 8 belongs here also) it was sufficient to note down before witnesses the more salient points. In general, however, the literary activity is independent from the oral preaching; and prophets (like Amos, Hosea, Micah) probably did not write down their prophetic utterances till towards the close of their life, thus transmitting to the world in a formulated order a totality of their prophetic office. That some literary productions have been lost, we may infer from the reference often made to older sources, as Isa. ii. 2-4; Mic. iv. 1-4; Isa. xv. sq. But on the other hand, we perceive herein an important peculiarity of prophetic literature; viz., the connection which exists between the prophetic books, in so far as the younger prophets in a great many instances looked up the utterances of the older prophets, made them their own, enlarged and developed the same. Thus, e.g., Amos 3 follows Joel iii. 16; the younger Micah takes up the close of the discourse of the older (1 Kings xxii. 28). Almost throughout all prophets, especially in Zephaniah and Jeremiah, we find allusions and references to former prophetic works; but herein we perceive the unity of the spirit in which the prophets stand, who, in spite of the changes of times, followed up this one unity of the word of God which they proclaimed; thus also proving the lasting validity of the not yet fulfilled prophecies.

As has already been indicated, the work of Isaiah was of the greatest effect in the kingdom of Judah. At the beginning of his ministry, Judah was in the zenith of her power, brought about under the powerful reign of Uzziah and Jotham. And although these kings in general preserved the theocratic order, yet the moral and religious condition of the people was less pleasing; since corruption, idolatry, and other vices had taken a hold upon the people, especially upon the higher classes. In connection with this we find a degenerated priesthood (Mic. iii. 11; Isa. xxviii. 7), which, together with a number of false prophets and flattering demagogues, strengthened the people in their sins (Isa. ix. 14 sq.; xxviii. 7; Mic. iii. 11, iii. 5). After Isaiah had already announced under Jotham the coming of the great day of Jehovah (Isa. ii.—vi.), his public activity, as far as we can see from his own book (vii.), commences under Ahaz, in that critical moment when the two great powers, Athens and Rome, met in the East. Athens conquered Judah, and it reaches its height under Hezekiah. For while the prophet continues the word of the former prophets, yet in him prophecy for the first time takes a universal stand-point, from which all destinies of the kingdoms of the world, and of the heathenish nations at large, are to become a part of the divine ways of judgment, the end of which is the eternal kingdom of God triumphing over all power and greatness of heathendom. Contempo-

rarily with Isaiah was Micah the prophet, "full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might is therefore often referred to by the prophets as effected at divine command (Isa. viii. 1; Hab. ii. 2 sq.; Jer. xxxvi. 2), and, by expressly emphasizing the object of the writing, to show to coming generations the truth of the prophecy (Isa. xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2 sq.; 30. 5; xxxiv. 10). In this way follows the oral utterance in order to confirm the latter, and where sometimes (Isa. viii. 1 sq.; perhaps Isa. xxx. 8 belongs here also) it was sufficient to note down before witnesses the more salient points. In general, however, the literary activity is independent from the oral preaching; and prophets (like Amos, Hosea, Micah) probably did not write down their prophetic utterances till towards the close of their life, thus transmitting to the world in a formulated order a totality of their prophetic office. That some literary productions have been lost, we may infer from the reference often made to older sources, as Isa. ii. 2-4; Mic. iv. 1-4; Isa. xv. sq. But on the other hand, we perceive herein an important peculiarity of prophetic literature; viz., the connection which exists between the prophetic books, in so far as the younger prophets in a great many instances looked up the utterances of the older prophets, made them their own, enlarged and developed the same. Thus, e.g., Amos 3 follows Joel iii. 16; the younger Micah takes up the close of the discourse of the older (1 Kings xxii. 28). Almost throughout all prophets, especially in Zephaniah and Jeremiah, we find allusions and references to former prophetic works; but herein we perceive the unity of the spirit in which the prophets stand, who, in spite of the changes of times, followed up this one unity of the word of God which they proclaimed; thus also proving the lasting validity of the not yet fulfilled prophecies.

As has already been indicated, the work of Isaiah was of the greatest effect in the kingdom of Judah. At the beginning of his ministry, Judah was in the zenith of her power, brought about under the powerful reign of Uzziah and Jotham. And although these kings in general preserved the theocratic order, yet the moral and religious condition of the people was less pleasing; since corruption, idolatry, and other vices had taken a hold upon the people, especially upon the higher classes. In connection with this we find a degenerated priesthood (Mic. iii. 11; Isa. xxviii. 7), which, together with a number of false prophets and flattering demagogues, strengthened the people in their sins (Isa. ix. 14 sq.; xxviii. 7; Mic. iii. 11, iii. 5). After Isaiah had already announced under Jotham the coming of the great day of Jehovah (Isa. ii.—vi.), his public activity, as far as we can see from his own book (vii.), commences under Ahaz, in that critical moment when the two great powers, Athens and Rome, met in the East. Athens conquered Judah, and it reaches its height under Hezekiah. For while the prophet continues the word of the former prophets, yet in him prophecy for the first time takes a universal stand-point, from which all destinies of the kingdoms of the world, and of the heathenish nations at large, are to become a part of the divine ways of judgment, the end of which is the eternal kingdom of God triumphing over all power and greatness of heathendom. Contempo-
exiles is to be compared with that of the prophets among the ten tribes. Without a temple and sacrifice, he is to the people the nucleus for preaching the Divine Word, and giving them prophetic advice outside the temple. As during all this time the people are left without the ark of the covenant and the Urim and Thummim, so also without the prophetic spirit. Not by the law of Moses alone, but also by the light of the Divine Word given unto them, and their magicians and astrologers had an opportunity to bring their arts face to face with the revelation of the living God. The battle which Jehovah had to fight at the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage with Egypt's gods was ratified in the building of the temple. When despondency took hold on the people, and the better ones doubted whether Israel could still hope for forgiveness of sins, and fulfillment of the divine promises, Haggai and Zechariah were called (Ez. xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxi. 1-6; xxiv. 1-19). Side by side with the prophetic word, which continually had Israel's future mission in view, those laws, especially the sabbath, were observed, which could be kept even in heathen lands. These observances were, so to say, a fence for the people, scattered among the nations, against heathenish customs. This must be especially held in view in order to understand Ezekiel and his junior contemporary Daniel. It is true, that the former often speaks of usages and customs (cf. iv. 14, xx. 13); but he does not regard the sanctification of the people in such formalities, as may be seen from the manner in which he exercises his prophetical office, and from his prophecies, according to which the restitution of Israel was mainly conditioned through the outpouring of that spirit which creates a new heart (xii. 30), and which was to follow, by a new outward form of the theocracy, as the effect of the new life. Ezekiel may have nourished, to some degree, that Levitical spirit which was prominent among the Jews in captivity; but its degeneration was not his fault. As for Daniel, in whose book many thought to have found a support for a righteousness through works, it must not be overlooked, that, in all these instances (as in i. 8 sq., iv. 24, vi. 11), Daniel's adherence to the faith of the laws of his fathers is expressed; and that he did not intend to teach the religion of the Gentiles enjoy peace, and Judah is bowed down (i. 8-18); but soon the powers of the world will devour each other (Hag. ii. 21; cf. Zech. i. 18-21), and the kingdom of God will triumph, and receive the best of the Gentiles and their treasures (Hag. ii. 7 sq.; Zech. vii. 20-23), while the people themselves shall be sifted anew (Zech. v.). From this time on, till Nehemiah, prophets are no more mentioned; and the first notice which we have only shows how the prophetic office was by becoming a tool for political intrigues. Nehemiah is accused by Sanballat, that he had appointed prophets for the sake of being proclaimed king by them. Nehemiah, on the other hand, accuses Sanballat of having bribed the prophet Shemaiah in order to intimidate him. In connection with this, other prophets also, and a prophetess, Noadiah, are mentioned as opponents of Nehemiah (Neh. vi. 14-15). To Nehemiah's time, probably, belongs the prophet Malachi, who closes the prophetic prophecy. The tendency which completed itself afterwards in Pharisaism has now taken a deep root in the people. Malachi opposes the religion of dead works (i. 6—ii. 9, iii. 7-12). With the announcement of the divine messenger (iii. 1) prophecy ceases, till, four hundred years later, prophecy once more is revived in that same messenger, who, pointing to the sun of salvation which had already appeared, closes the time of the old covenant by proclaiming, "He must increase; but I must decrease" (John iii. 30). During that long intervening time, it is Israel's calling to preserve in itself the root of the future congregation of salvation, whilst the root itself was to preserve the oracles of God (Rom. iii. 2). To do the latter was the main object of the scribes, who took the place of inspired prophets. As during all this time the people are left without the ark of the covenant and the Urim and Thummim, so also without the prophetic spirit. Not even the Maccabean period can produce a prophet (1 Mace. iv. 49, ix. 27, xiv. 41). As soon, however, as the time of the messianic salvation appears, the power of the prophetic spirit is again felt (Luke ii. 25, 26). It is also remarkable, that as before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, false prophets were in their height, thus leading the people to destruction, so, likewise, before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, a number of pseudo-prophets became the leaders of the people (Joseph. : Jewish War, VI. 5, 2 sq.), while the words of the true prophets were not heeded (VI. 6, 3).
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PROPITIATION.


PROPHETS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

From Matt. xxiii. 34 (cf. Luke xi. 49) we learn, that, after the ascension of Christ, prophets were to come who would proclaim, especially to the Jewish people, the truth of the salvation as it is in Christ, and thus bring about the decision either for or against. The testimony of the first Christian church is entirely of a prophetic character. The first effect of the Pentecostal spirit is the prophesying of the believers who were so suddenly and miraculously filled with his power (Acts ii. 4): their word is followed by signs and wonders (iii. 6, iv. 12, 15, 10, ix. 34, 40). The judicial prophecy of their prophecy reveals itself in the history of Ananias and Sapphira (v. 1-11). The Church as such, in her appearance and condition, as well as in her activity, stands like a prophet in the midst of the people; and in the consciousness of this her office she abandons every worldly avocation. She has a charge committed to her by the Lord; through her, God will give “repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins” (v. 31); she is the Zion that bringeth good tidings, “Behold thy King cometh” (xxxvi. 8). From this church proceed the different prophets, such as Stephen, who experienced what the Lord prophesied (Matt. xxiii. 34). At his death the Pentecostal Church for the first time comes in conflict with the carnal-minded Israel; her testimony is mingled with his blood. Those who were scattered abroad (Acts viii. 4) founded the diaspora, to which St. James addresses his Epistle: they are the prophets (Jas. v. 10) who went about in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and preached the word of God to the Jews. In transferring the prophetic method to her members, we thus get the wide range in which the idea of the New-Testament prophecy is to be taken. It corresponds entirely with Deut. xviii. 18 sq.; and thus a prophet is such a one, who is called by the spirit of God, here by the spirit of Jesus Christ, to become the organ of communicating the truth in such a manner that his testimony, with convincing power of the truth, proves itself to the hearers as the word of God (2 Cor. ii. 14–17). The prophetic illumination comprises the contents and form of the speech (Matt. x. 19, 20). It does not exclude the subjective activity of the prophets, but includes it (1 Cor. xiv. 22), and lifts it up beyond the natural degree of knowledge and faculty, and renders it serviceable to the higher purposes of the Holy Spirit. The object of prophecy is the edification of the congregation (1 Cor. xiv. 4), and this also must be taken in the widest sense.

In the Acts of the Apostles, mention is made of the following, as men of prophetic calling: Agabus (xi. 28), Barnabas, Simeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen, and Saul (xiii. 1), from among whom Barnabas and Saul were separated for the work whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. Judas and Silas, who were sent with Barnabas and Paul to Antioch (xv. 23–29), were also prophets; and prophetic faculties were also given to the four virgin daughters of Philip (xxi. 9).

The charisma of prophecy was not limited to these individuals. It was found in the congregations of the apostolic times everywhere. Everywhere Paul speaks of the gifts, offices, faculties, of the Church (Rom. xii. 6–8; 1 Cor. xii.–xiv.; Ephes. iv. 11; 1 Thess. v. 20), he also mentions the prophets immediately after the apostles (1 Cor. xii. 28; Ephes. iv. 11). He distinguishes between prophets and evangelists, pastors, teachers. As to their activity in the congregations, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 8, 6, 19, 29–38. Excluded from public speaking, as well as from prophesying, were women (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35).

To the contents of the prophetic speech, we have no particulars; but, in order to find out the pureness and divine origin of such communications, the Church had the gift of discerning of spirits (1 Cor. xii. 10) which accompanied prophecy (xiv. 29), and for which a canon was laid down (1 John iv. 1–5). Although the apostolic rule of discerning of spirits already shows that the warning words of Jesus (Matt. xii. 15, 29, xxiv. 4 sq., 28 sq.) were already fulfilled at a very early time (Acts xx. 30; Rev. ii. 20), the Apocalypse of St. John was certainly intended to be the keystone of New-Testament prophecy; since, after the death of the apostles, prophecy makes room for the use of the writings of the New Testament, which ever since have become the rule of faith for the believers. To the believer the more sure word of prophecy (2 Pet. i. 19) must be sufficient, which shineth as a light in this dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise. K. BURGER.

PROPITIATION. A sacrifice offered to God to render him propitious. Such an effectual sacrifice was Jesus Christ: he is therefore our propitiation. For the doctrinal statements, see ATONEMENT.
PROSELYTES OF THE JEWS. At all times there were non-Israelites, who, by conversion to the God of Israel, were incorporated into the people of Israel. They must be distinguished from the so-called strangers, who, either for a time or permanently, resided among Israel, and the number of whom amounted, in the time of David and Solomon, to 135,000 (2 Chron. ii. 17). Many of these strangers became adherents of Jehovah, and by circumcision became members of the household of Israel. Slaves who were circumcised, and partook of the Paschal lamb (Exod. xii. 44), may also be called proselytes. The children of a heathenish slave born in the house were circumcised; but, according to rabbinic interpretation, they were not yet like a free-born. According to Jebamoth (fol. 48, col. 2), the master, in case he held of Israel. Slaves who were circumcised, Judaizing with permanent slavery. It then heathen, was to make it known in the act of baptism. By baptism the proselyte became a member of the house of Israel. They must be distinguished from proselytes of righteousness and proselytes of the gate. The proselytes of righteousness receive circumcision, and with it (Gal. v. 3) the whole Mosaic ceremonial law: they thereby become "sons of Israel," and "Israelites in every respect," and are called also "complete Israelites." When a proselyte asked for admission, he was first catechised as to his motives. If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised—only when he was a male—in the presence of three teachers. In the case of a convert already circumcised, it was still necessary to draw a few drops of "the blood of the covenant." A special prayer accompanied the act of circumcision. The proselyte then takes a new name, opening the Hebrew Bible, and accepting the first that came. But the convert was still a "stranger;" and, unless he had been baptized, his children are counted as bastards, i.e., aliens. To complete his admission, baptism was required. When the wound caused by circumcision was healed, he was stripped of all his clothes in the presence of the three witnesses who had acted as his teachers, and who now acted as his sponsors, the "fathers" of the proselyte, and led into the pool or tank. As he stood there, up to his neck in water, they repeated the great commandments of the law. These he promised and vowed to keep; and then, with an accompanying benediction, he plunged under the water. A female proselyte was conducted to the tank by three women, while the three teachers stood outside at the door, reading to her aloud the law. A new name was given to her after baptism. By baptism the proselyte became a new creature. All natural relationships were cancelled. As long as the temple stood, baptism was followed by the offering of a sacrifice consisting of two turtledoves or pigeons. After the destruction of the temple, a vow to offer it as soon as the temple should be rebuilt was substituted.

As to the proselytes of the gate, also known as the "sojourners" (Lev. xxv. 47), they were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code, but obliged themselves to observe the so-called seven precepts of Noah; viz., (1) against idolatry, (2) against blasphemy, (3) against bloodshed, (4) against uncleanness, (5) against theft, (6) of obedience, with (7) the prohibition of flesh with the blood thereof. Whoever wished to become a proselyte of the gate had to declare it solemnly last three times.

As to the antiquity of the baptism of proselytes, and its relation to the baptism of John, cf. Schneckenburger: Ueber das Alter der judischen
PROSPER OF AQUITANIA. 1942

PROSPER OF AQUITANIA, the ardent literary champion of Augustine. Of his personal life very little is known. He was born in Aquitania, and probably in the last decade of the fourth century. He died in Rome, but the date of his death is not known. He received the ordinary education of his time. It is very little known how long he was a pupil of Augustine, and whether he ever made personal acquaintance of his master. He clung more especially to Marseilles. There he became acquainted with a set of views very different from those he had adopted from Augustine; and, though he never made any public assertion of his change of views, he was accused of being a Semi-Pelagian. But, in spite of his zeal and industry, Prosper did not succeed in converting the Massiliotes to the Augustinian views. Two Genoese priests addressed a number of questions to him concerning difficult passages in the works of Augustine, and he answered them by his Responsiones ad exspectta Gennensium. A work of similar character is his Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianorum; the author, probably, being Vincentius of Lorius, who was a Semi-Pelagian. But, in spite of his zeal and industry, Prosper did not succeed in converting the Massiliotes to the Augustinian views. In 432 he visited Rome, to induce Pope Celestine I. to interfere; in the next year he published his last instalment in the controversy, De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio; and in 434 he moved to Rome. There he finished his Chronicle, one of his principal works. The first part (to 378) is only an extract from Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine; the second part (to 455) is original, and written, as the book itself shows, partly in Gaul, and partly in Rome. He also wrote a book of epigrams, and a Liber Sententiarum, or "Collection of Gems," from Augustine. The best edition of his works is that by Le Brun and Mangeant, Paris, 1711.

HAUCK.

PROTESTANTEN-VEREIN (Protestant Union), a voluntary organization of rationalistic ministers and professors in Germany. It was formed in 1863, and fairly started June 7 and 8, 1865, at Eisenach. Since 1867 it has had yearly meetings. But it has come into such strong opposition to the orthodox and conservative tendencies of the German Church authorities, that it has had to fight for its life. See HOLTZMANN u. ZÖPFEL: Lexikon für Theologie u. Kirchengesch., Leipzig, 1871.

PROTESTANTISM. See REFORMATION.

PROTEVANGELIUM. See APOCRYPHA.

PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS. According to later accounts, Bishop Clement of Rome first appointed a notary (notarius regionarius) in each of the seven wards of the city, for the purpose of drawing up an official record of the deeds and sufferings of the martyrs. These notaries belonged to the clergy of the city. They were appointed by the Pope; and, when it proved necessary to increase their number, the seven original notaries were distinguished by the title Protontarii Apostolici. In course of time they obtained other distinctions and great revenues. They even claimed to take precedence of the bishops, which, however, Pius II. denied them by the breve of June 1, 1459. They formed a college of their own, and their number was by Sixtus V. increased to twelve. In the papal chapel they sat on the second tier; but in the consistories, where four of them must be present, they sat beside the Pope; and their signature is necessary to the validity of any document which concerns the whole Roman-Catholic Church. See BANGEN: Die romische Curie, Münster, 1854.

PROTESTANTISM. See Reformation.

PROTEVANGELIUM. See Apocrypha.

PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS. According to later accounts, Bishop Clement of Rome first appointed a notary (notarius regionarius) in each of the seven wards of the city, for the purpose of drawing up an official record of the deeds and
the first professor of theology in that branch of the church; and most ably and satisfactorily did he discharge the duties of that office till his decease. On the occurrence of that sad event, the church felt deeply the sore bereavement; and the members of the congregation seemed to estimate they entertained of his eminent talents, his varied erudition, and manifold services. Mr. Proudfoot was a man of commanding presence, of great personal power, and force of character. In debate his spirit was candid, his argument cogent, his language incisive, his inductive sometimes sarcastic and scattering. As a theologian, he was scholarly and profound; as a scholar, erudite and accurate; as a preacher, instructive and impressive; as a teacher, clear, logical, and inspiring. It is a matter of painful regret that the treasures which he left in neatly written manuscripts have never been published; but it is not yet too late to hope that his memoir, and some of his discourses and sermons, may enrich the theological literature of the Dominion.

WILLIAM ORMISTON.

PROVERBS OF SOLOMON. I. The External Plan of the Book of Proverbs, and its own Testimony as to its Origin. — The new superscription of the book, which recommends it, after the manner of later Oriental books, on account of its importance, and the general utility of its contents, extends from verse 1 to 6; with verse 7 the book itself begins. The book is described as “the proverbs of Solomon,” and then there is annexed the statement of its object, which, as summarily set forth in verse 2, is practical, and that in a twofold way,—partly moral (3–5), and partly intellectual (6). The former presents moral edification, moral sentiments for acceptance, not merely to help the unwise to attain to wisdom, but also to assist the wise. The latter seeks by its content to strengthen and discipline the mind to the understanding of thoughtful discourses generally: in other words, it seeks to gain the moral ends which proverbial poetry aims at, and at the same time to make it familiar; so that the reader, in these proverbs of Solomon, or by means of them as of a key, learns to understand much like a proverbial in general. Thus understood, the title of the book does not say that the book contains proverbs of other wise men besides those of Solomon: if it did, it would contradict itself. It is possible that the book contains also non-Solomonic proverbs, possible that the author of the title of the book added such to it himself; but the title presents to view only the proverbs of Solomon. If i. 7 begins the book, then, after reading the title, we cannot think otherwise than that here begin the Solomonic proverbs. If we read farther, the content of the book, the nature of the proverbs, which follow, do not contradict this opinion; for both are worthy of Solomon. So much the more are we astonished when we meet at x. 1 with a new superscription, which is followed to xxii. 16 by a long succession of proverbs of quite a different tone and form,—short maxims (mashals proper); while in the preceding parts of the book, we find the second, or rather proverbs are more than monitory discourses. What, now, must be our opinion when we look back from this second superscription to the part (i. 7–ix.) which immediately follows the title of the book? Are i. 7–ix., in the sense of the book, not the proverbs of Solomon? From the title of the book, which declares them to be so, we must judge that they are. Or are they proverbs of Solomon? In this case the new superscription (x. 1) appears altogether incomprehensible. And yet only one of the two is possible. On the one side, therefore, there must be a false appearance of the highest, which a closer investigation disappears. But on which side is it? If it is supposed that the tenor of the title (i. 1–6) does not accord with that of section x. 1–xxii. 16, but that it accords well with that of i. 7–ix., then Ewald’s view is probable, that i. 7–ix. was originally one whole, intended to serve as an introduction to the larger Solomonic Book of Proverbs, beginning at x. 1. But it is also possible that the author of the title has adopted the style of section i. 7–ix. The introductory section (i. 7–ix.) and the larger section (x.–xxii. 16) are followed by a third section (xxii. 17–xxiv. 29), which again is followed by a short fourth section (xxiv. 29–34), a kind of an appendix to the third, bearing the superscription, “These things also belong to the wise.” The proverbs of Solomon begin again at xxv. 1, extending to xxx. This fifth portion of the book has a superscription similar to the first, but, commencing, “Also [D2] these are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, collected.” The Hebrew word translated “collected” denotes “to remove from their place,” and means that the men of Hezekiah removed from the place where they found them the following proverbs, and put them together in a separate collection. The words have thus been understood by the Greek translator. The Hezekiah gleanings of Solomonic proverbs are followed by two appendices, the authors of which are given: the first (xxx.) is by “Agur the son of Jakeh,” the second (xxxi. 1–9), by a “King Lemuel.” In so far the superscriptions are clear. The names of the authors, elsewhere unknown, point to a foreign country; and to this corresponds the peculiar complexion of these series of proverbs. As a third appendix to the Hezekiah collection (xxxi. 10 sq.), follows a complete alphabetical proverbial poem in praise of a virtuous woman.

By reviewing the whole argument, we see that the Book of Proverbs divides itself into the following parts: 1. The title of the book (i. 1–6), by which the question is raised, how far the book extends to which it originally belongs; 2. The introductory discourses (i. 7–ix.), in which it is a question whether the Solomonic proverbs begin with these, or whether they are only the introduction thereeto, composed by a different author, perhaps the author of the title of the book; 3. The first great collection of Solomonic proverbs (x.xxii. 16); 4. The second collection, “the words of the wise” (xxii. 17–xxiv. 22); 5. The second appendix, supplement of the words of some wise men (xxiv. 23 sq.); 6. The second great collection of Solomonic proverbs, which the “men of Hezekiah” collected (xxv.–xxx.); 7. The first appendix to this second collection, the words of Agur (xxx.); 8. The proverb appendices of King Lemuel (xxxi. 1–9); 9. Third appendix, the acrostic ode (xxxi. 10 sq.). These nine parts may be comprehended under three groups: the introductory hortatory discourses with the general title at their head, and the two great collections of Solomonic proverbs, with their two appendices.
PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

In prosecuting our farther investigations, we shall consider the several parts of the book, first from the point of view of the manifold forms of their proverbs, then of their style, and, thirdly, of their type of doctrine.

11. The Several Parts of the Book of Proverbs with Respect to the Manifold Forms of the Proverbs.

That the Book of Proverbs is not a collection of popular sayings, we see from the fact that it does not contain proverbs of one line each. It is, indeed, probable that popular proverbs are partly wrought into these proverbs, and many of their forms of expression are moulded after the popular proverb; but, as they thus lie before us, they are, as a whole, the production of the technical mashal poetry. The simplest form is, according to the fundamental peculiarity of the Hebrew verse, the distich. The relation of the two lines to each other is very manifold. The second line may repeat the thought of the first, only in a somewhat altered form, in order to express this thought as clearly and exhaustively as possible. Such proverbs we call antithetic distichs; as, e.g., xi. 25: —

"A soul of blessing is made fat;
And be that watereth others is himself watered."

Or the second line contains the other side of the contrast to the statement of the first: the truth spoken in the first is explained in the second by means of the presentation of its contrary. Such proverbs we call antithetic distichs; as, e.g., x. 1: —

"A wise son maketh his father glad;
And a foolish son is his mother’s grief."

Sometimes it is two different truths that are expressed in the two lines; and the authorization of their union lies only in a certain relationship, and the ground of this union, in the circumstance that two lines are the minimum of the technical proverb — synthetic distichs; e.g., x. 18: —

"A cloak of hatred are lying lips;
And he that spreadeth slander is a fool."

Sometimes one line does not suffice to bring out the thought intended, the begun expression of the poet himself expressly compares the two subjects: e.g., xi. 31 (cf. I Pet. iv. 18): —

"The righteousshallbe recompensed on the earth:
And a contentiouswoman, are alike."

How much more the ungodly and the sinner1"

The usual form of expression, neither unpoetic nor properly poetic, is the introduction of the comparison by kēn ("as"), and of the similitude in the second clause by ḫēn ("so"); as x. 20: —

"As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes,
So is the sluggard to them who give him a commission."

This complete verbal state of the relation of similarity may also be abbreviated by the omission of the kēn, as xxv. 13, xxvi. 11: —

"As a dog returning to his vomit,
A fool returning to his folly."

We call the parabolic proverbs of these forms comparisons. The last, the abbreviated form of the comparative proverb, forms the transition to another kind of parabolic proverb, which we call, in contradistinction to the comparative, the emblematic, in which the contrast and its emblem are loosely placed together, without any nearer expression of the similitude. This takes place either by means of the copulative ws, as xxv. 25: —

"Cold water to a thirsty soul,
And good news from a far country,"

or without the ws; in which case the second line is as the subscription under the figure or double figure painted in the first; e.g., xi. 22: —

"A gold ring in a swine’s snout,
A fair woman, and without understanding."

These ground forms of two lines can, however, expand into forms of several lines. Since the distich is the peculiar and most appropriate form of the technical proverb, so, when two lines are not sufficient for expressing the thought intended, the multiplication to four, six, or eight lines, is most natural. In the tetrastich, the relation of the last two to the first two is as manifold as is the relation of the second line to the first in the distich. There is, however, no suitable example of four-lined stanzas in antithetic relation: but we meet with synonymous tetrastichs, e.g., xxii. 15 sq. xxiv. 3 sq., xxv. 8 sq.; integral, xxx. 17 sq.; comparative, xxvi. 18 sq.; and emblematical, xxx. 4 sq. Proportionally the most frequently occurring are tetrastichs, the second half of which forms a proof clause commencing with kēn or ḫēn. Among the less frequent are the six-lined, presenting (xxiii. 1-8, xxiv. 11 sq.) one and the same thought in manifold aspects, with proofs interpersed. Among all the rest which are found in the collection (xxiii. 12-14, 19-21, 26-28, xxx. 15 sq., xxx. 29-31), the first two lines form a prologue introductory to the substance of the proverbs; as, e.g., xxiii. 12-14: —

"Oh, let instruction enter into thine heart,
And apply thine ears to the words of knowledge.
Withhold not correction from the child;
For, if thou beatest him with the rod, he dies not.
Thou shalt beat him with the rod,
And deliver his soul from hell."

Similarly formed, but more expanded, is the eight-lined stanza (xxiii. 22-28), the only one which is found from the tenth chapter on.

Here the mashal proverb already inclines to the maschal ode; for this octastich may be regarded as a short maschal song, like the alphabetical maschal psalm (Ps. xxxvii.), which consists of almost pure tetrastichs. We have now seen how the distich form multiplies itself into forms consisting of four, six, and eight lines; but it also unfolds itself into forms of three, five, and seven;
lines. Tristichs arise when the thought of the first line is repeated (xxvii. 22) in the second, according to the synonymous scheme; or when the thought expressed in one or two lines (xxv. 8, xxvii. 10), there is added its proof. The parabolic scheme is here represented when the object described is unfolded in two lines, as in the comparison xxvii. 13, or when its nature is portrayed by two figures in two lines, as in the emblematic proverb xxv. 20:

"To take off clothing in cold weather,
Vinegar upon nitre,
And he that singeth songs to a heavy heart."

In the few instances of pentastichs which are found, the last three lines usually unfold the reason of the thought of the first two (xxii. 4 sq., xxv. 6 sq., xxx viii. 4 sq.): to this, xxiv. 13 forms an exception, where the ken before the last three lines introduces the expansion of the figure in the first two. As an instance we quote xxv. 6 sq.:

"Seek not to display thyself in the presence of the king,
And stand not in the place of the great;
For better that it be said unto thee, Come up hither
Than that they humble thee in the presence of the prince,
While thine eyes have raised themselves."

Of heptastichs there is only one example in the collection; viz., xxiii. 8-8:

"Eat not the bread of the jealous,
And lust not after his dainties;
For he is like one who calculates with himself:
Eat and drink, saith he to thee,
And his heart is not with thee.
Thy morsel which thou hast eaten must thou vomit up,
And thou hast wasted thy pleasant words."

From this heptastich, which one will scarcely take for a brief mashal ode, according to the compound strophe scheme, we see that the proverb of two lines can expand itself to the dimensions of Ps. xxv., xxxiv., and especially xxxvii. To this long course of distichs, which professes to be the words of the wise, the rhetorical form here outweighs the purely poetical. This first part of the Proverbs consists of the following fifteen mashal-strains: (1) i. 7-9, (2) 8 sq., (3) ii. 1-18, (4) iii. 1-10, 15-26, (5) 16 sq., (6) 17-27 sq., (7) iv. 1-6, (8) 7 sq., (9) vi. 1-5, (10) 6-11, (11) 12-19, (12) 20 sq., (13) vii. (14) viii. (15) ix. in i.ii. and in iii. there are found some mashal odes of two lines and of four lines, which may adapt themselves to the schemes employed. The octastich (vi. 16-19) makes the proportionally greatest impression of an independent inwoven mashal. It is the only proverb in which symbolical numbers are used, which occurs in the collection from i. to xxxix.:

"There are six kings which Jahve hateth,
And seven are an abhorrence to his soul
Haughty eyes . . . brethren."

Such numerical proverbs, to which the name middah has been given by later Jewish writers, are found in xxx. We may also mention the mashal chain; i.e., the ranging together, in a series, of proverbs of a similar character, such as the chain of proverbs regarding the fool (xxvi. 1-12), the sluggard (xxvi. 13-16), the talebearer (xxvi. 20-22), the malicious (xxvi. 23-28): but this form belongs more to the technics of the mashal collection than to that of the mashal poetry.

On examining the separate parts of the book, we find, that, in the introductory pedagogic part (i. 7-ix.), there is exceedingly little of the technical form of the mashal, as well as generally of technical form at all. It consists, not of proper mashals, but of fifteen mashal odes, or rather, perhaps, mashal discourses, didactic poems of the mashal kind. The second part (x.-xxii. 16), containing three hundred and seventy-five proverbs, consists, for the most part, of distichs. An apparent distinction seems to be the tristich xix. 7; but this, too, is a distich with the disfigured remains of a distich that has been lost. The Septuagint has here two distichs which are wanting in our text: the second is that which is found in our text, but only in a mutilated form:

"He that does much harm perfects mischief,
And he that uses provoking words shall not escape,"

probably the false rendering of—

"The friend of every one is rewarded with evil:
He who pursues after rumors does not escape."

These distichs are, for the most part, antithetic; although we also find the synonymous (xi. 7, 25, xii. 14, 28, xiv. 19, etc.), the integral (xiv. 7, xv. 3 sq.), especially in proverbs with the comparative mind (xii. 9, xv. 16, 17, xvi. 8, 19, xvii. 10, xxii. 19, xxiii. 1) and with the ascending quotation "much inore" (xxi. 31, xiii. 11, xvii. 7, xix. 10, xxii. 27), the synthetic (x. 18, xx. 29, xiv. 17, xix. 13), and the parabolic, only in a very few instances (xx. 26, xx. 22).

To this long course of distichs, which professes to be the proverbs of Solomon, there follows (xxii. 17-xxiv. 22) a course of "the words of the wise," prefaced by xxii. 17-21, which comprehends all the forms of the mashal, from those of two lines in xxii. 28, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, to the mashal song, xxiii. 29-35. Between these limits are the tetraetachs, which are the most popular form (xxii. 22 sq., 24 sq., 26 sq., xxiii. 14 sq., 15 sq., 16 sq., xxiv. 1 sq., 3 sq., 5 sq., 15 sq., 17 sq., 19 sq., 21 sq.), pentastichs (xxiii. 4 sq., xxiv. 13 sq.), and hexastichs (xxii. 13, 12-14, 19-21, 26-28, xxiv. 11 sq.): of tristichs, heptastichs, and octastichs, at least one specimen is found (xxii. 29, xxiii. 6-8, 22-25).

To the first appendix to the Proverbs of Solomon, there follows a second (xxv. 23 sq.), with the heading. "These things also to the wise."
which contains a hexastich (xxiv. 23-25), a distich (26), a tristich (27), a tetristich (28 sq.), and a maschal ode (30 sq.) on the sluggard; the last in the form of an experience of the poet, like Ps. xxiv. 3 sq. The material from this recorded observation is expressed in two verses such as we have already found at vi. 10 sq. These two appendices are, as is evident from their commencement as well as from their conclusion, in closest relation to the introduction (i. 7-ix).

There now follows, in xxv.-xxix., the second great collection of "proverbs of Solomon." "arranged," as the heading says, by the direction of King Hezekiah. It divides itself into two parts; for as xxiv. 30 sq., a maschal hymn, stands at the end of the two appendices, so the maschal hymn xxvi. 23 sq. must be regarded as forming the division between the two halves of this collection. It is very sharply distinguished from the collection beginning with chap. x. In the first collection the proverbs are exclusively in the form of distichs: here we have also some tristichs (xxv. 18, 20, xxvii. 10, 29), tetristichs (xxvi. 4 sq., 9 sq., 21 sq., xxvii. 15 sq.), and pentastichs (xxv. 6 sq.), besides the maschal hymn already referred to. The kind of arrangement is not essentially different from that in the first collection: it is equally devoid of plan, yet there are here some chains or strings of related proverbs (xxvi. 1-12, 13-18, 20-22). A second essential distinction between the two collections is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb forms the prevailing element, here it is the paraboly, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii. the proverbs are almost without exception of this character.

The second collection of Solomon's proverbs has also several appendices, the first of which (xxx.), according to the inscription, is by an otherwise unknown author, Agur the son of Jakeh, and presents in a thoughtful way the unsearchableness of God. This is followed by two other pieces, such as a tetristich regarding the purity of God's word (xxx. 5 sq.), a prayer for a moderate position between riches and poverty (7-9), a distich against slander (10), a priamel without the acrostic (xxx.i.10 sq.). A second essential distinction between the two collections is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb forms the prevailing element, here it is the parabolic, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii. the proverbs are almost without exception of this character.

The second collection of Solomon's proverbs has also several appendices, the first of which (xxx.), according to the inscription, is by an otherwise unknown author, Agur the son of Jakeh, and presents in a thoughtful way the unsearchableness of God. This is followed by two other pieces, such as a tetristich regarding the purity of God's word (xxx. 5 sq.), a prayer for a moderate position between riches and poverty (7-9), a distich against slander (10), a priamel without the acrostic (xxx.i.10 sq.). A second essential distinction between the two collections is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb forms the prevailing element, here it is the parabolic, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii. the proverbs are almost without exception of this character.

The second collection of Solomon's proverbs has also several appendices, the first of which (xxx.), according to the inscription, is by an otherwise unknown author, Agur the son of Jakeh, and presents in a thoughtful way the unsearchableness of God. This is followed by two other pieces, such as a tetristich regarding the purity of God's word (xxx. 5 sq.), a prayer for a moderate position between riches and poverty (7-9), a distich against slander (10), a priamel without the acrostic (xxx.i.10 sq.). A second essential distinction between the two collections is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb forms the prevailing element, here it is the parabolic, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii. the proverbs are almost without exception of this character.

The second collection of Solomon's proverbs has also several appendices, the first of which (xxx.), according to the inscription, is by an otherwise unknown author, Agur the son of Jakeh, and presents in a thoughtful way the unsearchableness of God. This is followed by two other pieces, such as a tetristich regarding the purity of God's word (xxx. 5 sq.), a prayer for a moderate position between riches and poverty (7-9), a distich against slander (10), a priamel without the acrostic (xxx.i.10 sq.). A second essential distinction between the two collections is this, that while, in the first, the antithetic proverb forms the prevailing element, here it is the parabolic, and especially the emblematic: in xxv.-xxvii. the proverbs are almost without exception of this character.
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kiah, enlarged the work by the addition of the Hezekiah portion, and by a short supplement of "the words of the wise," which he introduces, according to the law of analogy, after xxii. 17-xxiv. 22. The harmony of the superscriptions (xxiv. 23, xxv. 1) favors at least the supposition that xxiv. 23 and xxv. 1 are by the same hand. The circumstance that "the words of the wise" (xxii. 17-xxiv. 22) in two of their maxims refer to the older collection of Solomonic proverbs, while, on the contrary, "the words of the wise" (xxiv. 23 sq.) refer in xxiv. 23 to the Hezekiah collection, and in xxiv. 33 sq. to the introduction (i. 7-ix.), strengthens the supposition, that, with xxiv. 23, a second half of the book, added by another hand, begins. There is no reason for not attributing the appendix (xxx.-xxxii.) to this second collector: perhaps he seeks to render, by means of it, the conclusion of the extended Book of Proverbs uniform with that of the older book. Like the older collection of "proverbs of Solomon," so, also, now the Hezekiah collection has "proverbs of the wise" on the right and on the left, and the king of proverbial poetry stands in the midst of a worthy retinue. The second collector distinguishes himself from the first by this, that he never professes himself to be a proverbial poet. It is possible that the proverbial poem of the virtuous woman (xxxi. 10 sq.) may be his work; but there is nothing to substantiate this opinion.

IV. The Book of the Proverbs on the Side of its Manifoldness of Style and Form of Instruction. —

Beginning our inquiry with the relation in which x.-xxii. 16 and xxv.-xxx. stand to each other with reference to their forms of language, we come to the conclusion that there exists a linguistic unity between the two collections. And as to the linguistic unity of i. 1-ix. with both of these, maintained by Keil, our conclusion is, that, notwithstanding the numerous points of resemblance, i. 1-ix. demands an altogether different author from Solomon, and one who is more recent. If we hold by this view, then these points of resemblance, taken as a whole, are proof of the necessity of distinguishing the two "collections. And as to their primary stock, truly Solomonic, but belong to the editor of the older Book of Proverbs, which reaches down to xxiv. 22, so that thus the present book of the poetry of Solomon is uniform in the form of the collection made by the older editor, and, besides, of other poets, partly unknown Israelites, and partly two foreigners, particularly named, Agur and Lemuel, — we now turn our attention to the doctrinal contents of the work, and ask whether a manifoldness in the type of instruction is noticeable in it, and whether there is perceptible in this manifoldness a progressive development. It may be possible, that as the "proverbs of Solomon," the "words of the wise," and the proverbial poetry of the editor, they represent three eras, so, also, they represent three different stages in the progressive development of proverbial poetry. However, "the words of the wise" (xxii. 17-xxiv.) are so internally related to the "proverbs of Solomon," that even the sharpest eye will discover in them not more than the evening twilight of the vanishing Solomonic mashal. There thus remain, on the one side, only the "proverbs of Solomon," with their echo in "the words of the wise," on the other, the proverbial poems of the editor; and these present themselves as monuments of two sharply defined epochs in the progressive development of the mashal.

The common fundamental character of the book in all its parts is rightly defined when we call it a "book of wisdom." Indeed, among the Church Fathers our book bears this title. We need not hesitate to call the Book of Proverbs a "philosophical" treatise, without, therefore, denying, with Theodore of Mopsuestia, its divine inspiration; although the effect of the Spirit upon the "wise" is different from that upon the "prophet:", we deny it just as little as did Christian Bened. Michaelis, who, passing from the exposition of the Psalms to that of the Proverbs, says, "From David's closet, consecrated to prayer, we now pass into Solomon's school of wisdom, to admire the greatest of philosophers in the son of the greatest of theologians." What was the character of this chokma (or wisdom)? To what was it directed? To denote its condition and aim in one word, it was universalistic or humanistic. Emanating from the fear and reverence of Jahve (x. 29), but seeking to comprehend the spirit in the letter, the essence in the form of the national life, its effort was directed towards the general truth affecting mankind as such. While prophecy, which is recognized by the chokma as a spiritual power indispensable to a happy and salutary life (xxix. 18), is of service to the historical process into which divine truth enters to work out its results in Israel, and from thence outward among mankind, the chokma seeks to look into the very essence of this truth through the robe of its historical and national manifestation, and then to comprehend those general ideas in which could already be discovered the fitness of the religion of Jahve for becoming the world-religion. From this aim towards the ideal in the historical, towards the everlasting name amid changes, the human (I intentionally use this word) in the Israelitish, the universal religion in the Jahve religion (Jahvism), and the universal morality in the law, all the peculiarities of the Book of Proverbs are explained, as well as of the long, broad stream of the literature of the chokma, beginning with Solomon, which, when the Palestinian Judaism assumed the rugged, exclusive, proud national character of Pharisaism, developed itself in Alexandrinism.

When James (iii. 17) says that the "wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypoc-
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risy,“ his words most excellently designate the nature and the contents of the discourse of wisdom in the Solomonic proverbs; and one is almost inclined to think that the apostolic brother of the Lord, when he delineates wisdom, had before his eyes the proverbs of Solomon. For the relationship to purity by the most impressive admonitions. Next to its admonitions to purity, are those especially to peacefulness, to gentle resignation (xiv. 29), quietness of mind (xiv. 32), and humility (xi. 2, xv. 33, xvi. 5, 18), to mercy, even toward beasts (xii. 10), to firmness and sincerity of conviction, to the furtherance of one's neighbor by means of wise discourse and kind help.

Bruch, in his Weisheitstheorie der Hebräter, 1851, was the first to call special attention to the chokma, or humanism, as a peculiar intellectual tendency in Israel; but he is mistaken in placing it in an indifferent and even hostile relation to the national law and the national cultus, which he compares to the relation of Christian philosophy to orthodox theology. Of highest interest for the history of the Book of Proverbs is the relation of the Septuagint to the Hebrew text. One half of the proverbs of Agur (xxx. of the Hebrew text) are placed in it after xxv. 22, and the other half after xxvi. 34; and the proverbs of King Lemuel (xxx. 1-9 of the Hebrew text) are placed after the proverbs of Agur; while the aoristic proverbial poem of the virtuous woman is in its place at the end of the book. Besides, there are many proverbs in the Septuagint which are wanting in the Hebrew, but which are translations from the Hebrew, and may easily be re-translated into the Hebrew (comp. iv. 27, ix. 12, xii. 18). On this subject, compare Bertheau's Introduction to his Commentary, 1847; Hitzig, to his, 1858; Ewald: Jahrbuch, 1861; J. G. Jaeger: Observationes in Prorberbiorum Salomonis Versionem Alexandrinam, 1789; De Lagarde's Anmerkungen zur griechischen Ubersetzung der Proverbien, 1863; Heidenheim: Zur Textkritik der Proverbien, in Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche und englische Theologie, No. viii. 1865, ix. xi. 1866; compare also the Gracius Venetus in the edition of Gebhardt, Leipzig, 1875, and a description of this version by Pick, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, s.v., Veneta Versio].


PROVIDENCE. The doctrine of providence, representing God not only as the sustainer, but also as the ruler, of the world, forms, on the one hand, the complement to the doctrine of creation, while on the other it includes the doctrine of predestination as a special subdivision. Belief in providence forms one of the principal roots of all living religion, and is inseparable from belief in a personal God. Lactantius was quite right when he denounced the Hebrew text (institz., i. 2), and Clement of Alexandria uses similar language. Even in its lowest form, as Feticism, religion is based on faith in providence; and when that faith disappears, as in the most extreme forms of Epicureanism and Stoicism, religion itself disappears. As the revelation of the living, personal God, Scripture is, in a special sense of the words, the book of providence, unfolding its nature and working in the relation between human and divine counsels (Prov. xvi. 1-9), in the restriction and destruction of evil (Ps. lxv. 8, and Isa. viii. 10) and its turning into good (Gen. I. 20), in the complete change of all anti-Christian schemes in favor of the kingdom of God (Acts iv. 27, 28), in the ruling of the whole world (Acts xvii. 26), and in the guidance and preservation of the faithful (Ps. xxxvii. 5; Rom. viii. 28; Matt. x. 28-31). The Book of Job is throughout a book on providence; and the same may be said, in a still higher sense of the words, about the Gospels. The word providentia (προνοούσα) we owe to the apocryphic stage of the Old Testament theology (Wisdom xiv. 3, xvii. 2).

On account of this its central position in the sphere of religion, the doctrine of providence is, like that of God, characterized by a certain stability which excludes all sudden and striking changes. It has, nevertheless, been treated by all great theologians, from Lactantius to Thomas Aquinas, and again from the Reformation down to our days, sometimes in connection with the doctrine of God (1530); sometimes in connection with the doctrines of the creation, the fall and the scheme of salvation, and sometimes, especially of late, in connection with the doctrines of predestination and evil. But it is evident, from its very character as a general article of faith, that it has its place in the Creed rather than in the Synnergism. When in the Small Catechism, of Luther it is treated in the explanation of the first article of the Apostles' Creed, but only cursorily, and it has received no more elaborate treatment in the Large Catechism, or in the Lecí of Melanchthon; but in the Heidelberg Catechism (Qu. 27, 28) it forms one of the most elaborate
points of the whole development, and in the Confessio Helvetica it is also defined with great care. The Catechismus Romanus too (p. i. c. ii. qu. 15–20) treats it at length. In the later Protestant theology, from Chemnitz to Nietzsche, the subject has received its complete systematical development: though at first the christological principle was not a profound one; the doctrine of God and of man were kept too abstractly monotheistic, without being brought into sufficiently close connection with the doctrine of Christ, which, of course, had its influence on the doctrine of providence; while the dissolution of the idea of providence into the elements of maintenance and government, and the division into providentia generalis, specialis, and specialissima, were very early adopted. See Hase: Hutterus prooidentia generalis, speciatis, and specialissima, Leipzig, 1827.

As a full and living faith in the providence of God depends upon a sound and true conception of his nature, all the various abstractions of the latter idea have given rise to similar aberrations of the former. From infidelity and scepticism sprung materialism, mechanism, sensualism, and casuism; from superstition and credulity, fatalism, determinism, particularism, and occasionalism. When the causa secunda in external nature are recognized as the sole ruling power, infidelity will produce materialism or mechanism, according as it emphasizes matter or form: in human life a similar manner of proceeding will produce sensualism or casuism, though, indeed, casuism, when consistently developed, is neither more nor less than a complete denial of all casuality. In paganism, superstition gives its idol, the inexorable destiny, either a transcendental form (fatalism) or an immanent form (determinism); while particularism and occasionalism are superstitious forms developed within monotheism. Generally speaking, the relation between providence and human life forms one of the principal problems of the whole subject, and admits of a double solution besides the orthodox one, according to which the causa secunda, though acting in strict conformity with their own nature, act only on the basis of the causa prima: — namely, one deistic,— God maintains not the world, but only the laws and powers active in the world; and one pantheistic,— God works all in all, but without passing beyond the limits of natural law. Closely connected with this problem, though of much less importance, are those of the relation between providence and chance (casualism dissolving all life into a mass of blind chances), and between providence and small things; the popular consciousness being very apt to doubt the existence of a particular providence. Of the greatest significance is the problem whether the Evangelical providence and human freedom, or providence and evil; but they are more properly treated under the doctrine of predestination.

LIT. — The older literature from Zwingli may be found in Walch: Bibl. Theol. 1. pp. 81, 173, 248. Of modern treatments of the subject, see Buseck: System Der Freih. Pred. in der Förschung, Berlin, 1820; and Paulus: Förschung, Stuttgart, 1840.

PROVINCIAL (Præsidentis Superior). Those monasteries of the same order which were situated in a certain district formed a unity under the head of a custos: and all the custodes of a country formed a still higher unity under the name of a province. At the head of the province stood the provincial.

PROVOST (Propositus) was the name of a monastic official immediately subordinate to the abbot, and co-ordered with the diaconus, according to the rules of St. Benedict. When Chrodegang organized the cathedral chapters on the monastic model, he retained the office of the propositus, which, however, in some cases, was united with that of the archi-diaconus. The principal duties of the provost were, distribution of the common income, superintendence of discipline, etc.

PRUDENTIUS, Aurelius Clemens, the most original and the most fertile of the elder Christian poets of the West; was born in Spain, 348, and belonged to a distinguished family. He entered upon a political career, held offices of importance, and have led a gay life, until a spiritual change took place, and he became a poet, as much from devotion as from aesthetic enthusiasm. When he was fifty-seven years old, he collected his poems. The year of his death is not known. His principal works are: Liber Cathemerinon, twelve hymns (of which the first six are adapted for the regular hours of prayer), written on the model of Ambrose, though with greater prominence given to the allegorical and descriptive elements, and in a variety of metres, so that they have been used in the church service only in parts; Peristephanon, fourteen hymns on martyrs, very much in the character of ballads, and more original than the Liber; three polenical poems in hexameters, — Apotheosis, a defence of the divinity of Christ against the Patripassians, Sabellius, and others; the Hanartigenia, against the Gnostic dualism of Marcion; and Contra Sapientiam (2 books), against the heathen state religion. Of less interest are his Psychomachia (the first instance in the West of a purely allegorical poem) and Dittochton, explanations of Bible pictures. The best editions of his works are those by Arevalo, Rome, 1788, and Dresel, Leipzig, 1860. See Clemens Bockhaus: Prudentius delticus, 1873.

PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES, a native of Spain, whose true name was Galindo; came early to France, and was in 847 appointed bishop of Troyes. He died April 6, 861, and was reverenced as a saint by his diocese. In the predestination controversy he sided with Gottschalk, and wrote an epistle, Ad Hinkmarum and De praed. contra Jo. Scotum. He also continued the Annales Bertiniani from 835 to 861.

PRUSSIA contains, according to the census of 1880, a population of 27,279,111, of which 17,618,580 belong to the Evangelical State Church, 9,205,196 to the Roman-Catholic Church, 96,855 (14,961 Old Lutherans and Separate Lutherans, 13,072 Mennonites, etc.), to minor Christian denominations, and 363,970 are Jews. The Evangelicals are chiefly settled in the provinces of Brandenburg, Pommerania, Saxony, Hanover, and Schleswig-Holstein, and the Roman Catholics in the provinces of East Prussia, Silesia, Westphalia, and Rhenish Prussia.

The relation between the State and the Roman-Catholic Church has for the last ten years been
the subject of very energetic and comprehensive legislation; but the unflinching resistance of the clergy, steadily inflamed by the Pope and the curia, and to a certain extent, also, supported by the Roman-Catholic priestswere principally educated in the German universities or in the German seminaries, were excluded from holding office in the Roman-Catholic Church in Prussia; the power of the bishop over the lower clergy and the clergy over the laity was limited, so that no punishment touching a person's body or property, his social position or civil honor, could be administered by an ecclesiastical court; a civil court of ecclesiastical affairs, which enabled the government to deal with refractory bishops, was established; and the clergy was summoned to take an oath of obedience to the laws of the State. Other laws followed, dissolving the monasteries, and expelling the monastic orders (July 4, 1872, and May 31, 1875), and re-organizing the administration of the property of the Church (May 20, 1874, and April 22, 1875): but it became more and more difficult to enforce these laws; and, after the death of Pius IX., negotiations between the Prussian Government and the Roman curia, which have led to various modifications by the laws of July 14, 1880, and May 31, 1882. The Roman-Catholic Church has theological faculties at the universities of Breslau and Bonn, and at the academy of Münster and the Lyceum Hosianum at Braunsberg. Formerly the Roman-Catholic priests were principally educated in the seminaries maintained at the episcopal residence, but since the issue of the May Laws those institutions are no longer recognized by the State.

The first Council of Braga (353 A.D.) expressly stated in imposing upon the learned; for he not only compiled and invented a description of the Island of Formosa (London, 1704, 2d ed., 1765), but actually a language for the country, into which he translated the Church Catechism, by request of Bishop Compton, whose protegé he was. His fraud was, however, discovered at Oxford, and for the rest of his life he supported himself by writing for booksellers. As the pretended Formosan, he played the part of a heathen; but from his thirteenth year he was in all his actions a genuine Christian, and won the highest respect of his contemporaries. See his Memoirs, London, 1764.

PSALMODY IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH. As psalm-singing was the practice of the synagogue, it was an integral part of Christian worship from the beginning. Justin Martyr speaks of the Christians singing "hymns;" but by these he probably meant sacred lyrics in general, including the Psalms. The first Council of Braga (385 A.D.) expressly
PSALMS.

1. Their Position in the Old-Testament Canon. — The Psalter always forms a part of the so-called Kethubim, or Hagiographa; but its position among these varies. That it opened the Kethubim in the earliest period of the Christian era is evident from Luke xxiv. 44. The order of the books in the Hebrew manuscripts of the German class, which is followed by our manual editions, is: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the Chronicles from Ezra, Nehemiah, in order to let Chronicles follow after the prophetic character, which has the collective title of nebim (prophets). The whole of the preceding psalms are here comprehended under the name of Tephilloth (prayers), which is striking, since, with the exception of Ps. xlvii. (and, farther on, Ps. lxxvii., cxxvii., cxxxii., cxxxvii.), they are all inscribed otherwise, and because, in part, as, e.g., Ps. lxvi. and lii., they contain no supplicatory address to God, and have, therefore, not the form of prayers. Still, the collective name of Tephilloth is suitable to all psalms. The essence of prayer is a direct and undiverted looking towards God and the absorption of the mind in the thought of him. All psalms share in this, even the didactic and hymnic, without any supplicatory address, as Hannah’s song of praise (1 Sam. ii. 1). The title inscribed on the Psalter is (Sepher) Tehillim, for which Thillim and Thi lli are also used. This name, as well as Tehillith, occurring in later Jewish writings, is strange, since the Psalms, for the most part, are hardly hymns in the proper sense: most of them are taken from the Psalter before the night office. Cf. the elaborate art. by Rev. H. J. Hotham on “Psalmody,” in Smith and Cheetham’s Dict. Christ. Antiq., vol. ii. pp. 1742–1753.

2. Name. — At the close of the seventy-second Psalm (ver. 20) we find the subscription, “the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.” The whole of the preceding psalms are here comprehended under the name of Tehillith (prayers), which is striking, since, with the exception of Ps. xvii. (and, farther on, Ps. lxxvii., cxxvii., cxxxii., cxxxvii.), they are all inscribed otherwise, and because, in part, as, e.g., Ps. lxvi. and lii., they contain no supplicatory address to God, and have, therefore, not the form of prayers. Still, the collective name of Tephilloth is suitable to all psalms. The essence of prayer is a direct and undiverted looking towards God and the absorption of the mind in the thought of him. All psalms share in this, even the didactic and hymnic, without any supplicatory address, as Hannah’s song of praise (1 Sam. ii. 1). The title inscribed on the Psalter is (Sepher) Tehillim, for which Thillim and Thi lli are also used. This name, as well as Tehillith, occurring in later Jewish writings, is strange, since the Psalms, for the most part, are hardly hymns in the proper sense: most of them are taken from the Psalter before the night office. Cf. the elaborate art. by Rev. H. J. Hotham on “Psalmody,” in Smith and Cheetham’s Dict. Christ. Antiq., vol. ii. pp. 1742–1753.

3. Historical Suppositions of the Psalm Composition. — The lyric is the earliest kind of poetry, and Hebrew poetry is therefore essentially lyric; neither the epic nor the drama, but only the mahal, has branched off from it, and even that has not only one (Ps. cxlv.) is directly inscribed Tehillah. But even the name Tehillim is admissible; for all psalms partake of the nature of the hymn, and all speak of the magnalia Dei. In the Koran, the Psalter is called zabir: in the Hellenistic Greek, the corresponding word psalmoi is the more common. The Psalm collection is called biblos psalmon (Luke xx. 42; Acts i. 20), or psaltérion.

4. Revision of the Psalm Text. — The Hebrew Psalter or psalms are preparatory to the Greek versions, and therefore naturally have been revised by them. The best Vulgate rendering is in Gen. xix. 26; Acts iv. 25, etc. The Psalter was probably first revised by the Rabbis in the time of Nehemiah, and afterwards by the Chaldeans in the time of Ezra, when the Psalter was inserted into the Mosaic code. The numbers of the books, “as in the Septuagint, are: “Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.” — The Psalter was first revised by the Rabbis in the time of Nehemiah, and afterwards by the Chaldeans in the time of Ezra, when the Psalter was inserted into the Mosaic code. The numbers of the books, “as in the Septuagint, are: “Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.”
Jacob represent the poetry of the birthplace of Israel from which proceeded, not only Israel's future prophecy has sanctified it. The Mosaic time still wanting in the strophic symmetry which poetry but also Israel's spirit of its nation's wealth. From Egypt, the Israelites brought instruments, which accompanied their first song (Exod. xv), the oldest hymn which re-echoes in the oldest psalms (Ps. xxi. 8, lxviii. 13, 54, lxxix. 7 sq.). If we add to these Moses' testamentary song (Deut. xxxii. and Ps. xc.), which is ascribed to Moses, and may be his, we then have in these three documents, which from the Mosaic period, the prototypes of all psalms,—the hymnic, elegiac, and prophetico-didactic. All three are still wanting in the strophic symmetry which characterizes the later art. It has been thought strange that the very beginnings of Israel's poetry are so perfect; but Israel's history, also that of her literature, comes under a different law from that of a constant development from a lower to a higher grade. In David the sacred lyric attained its highest development. Many things combined to make the time of David its golden age. Samuel had laid the foundation of this, both by his energetic reforms in general, and by founding the schools of the prophets in particular, in which, under his guidance (1 Sam. xix. 19 sq.), in conjunction with the awakening and fostering of the prophetic gift, song and music were cultivated. In these schools, David's poetic talent was cultivated. He was a musician and poet by birth. Even as a Bethlehemite shepherd he played upon the harp, and with his natural gift he combined a heart deeply imbued with religious feeling. But the Psalter contains as few traces of David's Psalms before his anointing as the New Testament does of the writings of the apostles before the Pentecost. It was only from the time when the spirit of Jehovah came upon him at his anointing as Israel's king, and raised him to the dignity of his calling in connection with the covenant of redemption, that he sang psalms which have become an integral part of the canon. They are the fruit, not only of his high gifts and the inspiration of the spirit of God (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), but also of his own experience and of the experience of his people interwoven with his own. David's way, from his anointing onwards, led through affliction to glory. Song, however, as a Hindu proverb says, is the offspring of suffering: the soul is revealed through the eyes of the heart. Song marked by vicissitudes which at one time prompted it to elegiac strain; at another, to praise and thanksgiving. At the same time he was the founder of the Kingship of promise, a prophecy of the future Christ; and his life, thus typically modified, should not escape, if recorded in typical, and even consciously prophetic language. Raised to the throne, he did not forget the harp, his companion and solace, but rewarded it with all honor. He appointed the Levites as singers and musicians at the service, and placed over them the Levite family of the sons of Korah (xlii.—xlii., xliii., lixiv., lixvii., lixviii., including lixiii.). Both the psalms of the Ezrahites (xlixiii., by Heman, and lixiv., by Ethan) began to decline; and only twice, and this for a short period (under Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah), it rose to any height. With the exception of these two periods of revival, the latter part of the regal period, produced scarcely any psalm-writers, but is all the more rich in prophets, who now raised their trumpet voice in order to revive the religious life of the nation, which had previously expressed itself in psalms. It is true that in the writings of the prophets, as in Jonah (i.), Isaiah (xlii.), Habakkuk (iii.), we also find psalms; but these are more imitations of the ancient congregational hymns than original compositions. It was not until after the exile that a time of new productions set in. As the Reformation gave birth to German hymnology, and the Thirty Years' War revived it again, so the Davidic age gave birth to psalm-poetry, and the exile revived what had almost become dead. The divine chastisement did not fail to have its effect; and it is certain beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Psalter contains psalms belonging to the exile period, as, e.g., Ps. cxii. After the return, many more new psalms were composed. The harps which in Babylon hung upon the willows were tuned afresh, and a rich new flood of song was the fruit of this reawakened first love. But this did not continue long. Pharisaism, traditionalism, and the service of the letter, now prevailed. Nevertheless, in the era of the Seleucidae, the national feeling revived under the Maccabees in its old life and vigor. Prophecy had then long been silent, as may be seen from many passages in the First Book of the Maccabees. That psalm-poetry flourished again at that time cannot be maintained. Hitzig has endeavored to prove, that, from Ps. lxxiii., every thing belongs to the Maccabean period (Commentary of 1835—36). He also maintains this position in his Commentary of 1863—65, and assigns to Ps. xiii., xliii., xliv., lx., a Maccabean origin. Lengerke and Olshausen, it is true, have reduced the number; but they still hold a Maccabean origin of many psalms. On the other hand, both the existence and possibility of Maccabean psalms have been denied by Hengstenberg, Havéncurn, Keil, Gesenius, Hassler, Ewald, Thunius, Illmann, and more recently by Ehrth; but the reasons are not cogent, and Maccabcean psalms are therefore not an absolute impossibility. And, if Maccabean psalms do not exist, they at any rate only be few; because the redaction of the Psalter is the work, not of the Seleucide, but of the Persian period.
4. Origin of the Collection.—The Psalter, as we now have it, consists of five books; and in this it is a copy of the Thora, Elohistic and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohistic psalms (xiii.-lxxviii.) is surrounded on both sides by groups of Jehovistic (l.-xii., lxxv.-cl.). The five books are as follows: l.-xii., lxxv.-cl. (as lxvi., lxvii., lxxvi., cii.-cvi.). Each of the first four books closes with a doxology, which is part of the preceding psalm (xii. 14, lxxii. 18 sq., lxxix. 53, cii. 48); the place of the fifth doxology is occupied by Ps. cl. as a full-toned finale to the whole. These doxologies very much resemble the language of the liturgical beracha of the second temple. The [78] [79] coupled with 1 is exclusively peculiar to them in Old-Testament writings. Even in the time of the chronicler-writer, the Psalter was a whole, divided into five parts, which were indicated by these landmarks, as we infer from 1 Chron. xvi. 38. The chronicler is a free manner, which characterizes ancient historiography, there reproduces David’s festal hymn that resounded in Israel after the bringing home of the ark; and he does it in such a way, that, after he has once fallen into the track of Ps. cii., he also puts into the mouth of David the beracha (benediction) which follows that psalm. From this we see that the Psalter was then already divided into books: the closing doxologies had already become part of the psalms. The chronicler, however, wrote towards the end of the Persian supremacy, although a considerable time yet before the beginning of the Grecian.

Next to this application of the beracha of the fourth book by the chronicler (Ps. lxxii. 20) is a significant mark for determining the history of the origin of the Psalter. The closing words are, without doubt, the subscription to the oldest psalm collection, which preceded the present psalm-paragraph. The chronicler certainly has removed this subscription from its original place close after lxxii. 17, by the interpolation of the beracha (lxxii. 18 sq.), but left it at the same time untouched. But unfortunately that subscription, which has been so faithfully preserved, furnishes us less help than we could wish. We only gather from it that the present collection was preceded by a primary collection of very much more limited compass, which formed its basis, and that this closed with the Solomonic psalm lxxiii.; for the redactor would certainly not have placed the subscription, referring only to the prayers of David, after this psalm, if he had not found it there already. And it leads to the supposition that Solomon himself, prompted, perhaps, by the liturgical requirements of the new temple, compiled this primary collection, and, by the addition of Ps. lxxii., may have caused it to be understood that he was the Thora, which he also resembles in this particular, that as, in the Thora, Elohistic and Jehovistic sections alternate, so here a group of Elohistic psalms (xiii.-lxxxviii.) is surrounded on both sides by groups of Jehovistic (l.-xii., lxxxv.-cl.). The closing words are, without doubt, the subscription to the oldest psalm collection, which preceded the present.

5. Arrangement of the Collection of Psalms.—This bears the impress of one ordering mind; for (a) its opening is formed by a didactic pro-
PHETIC COUPLET OF PSALMS (i., ii.), introductory to the whole Psalter, and therefore, in the earliest times, regarded as one psalm, which opens and closes with אֱלֹהִים (shemre); and its close is formed by four psalms (cxlvi.-cxlix.), which begin and end with ויִתְרוּ עֲמָנוּ (Hallelujah). We do not include Ps. cii., for this psalm takes the place of the beracha of the fifth book. The opening of the Psalter celebrates the blessedness of those who walk according to the will of God in redemption, which has been revealed in the law and in history. The close of the Psalter calls upon all creatures to praise this God of redemption, as it were on the ground of the completion of this great work. (b) There are in the Psalter seventy-three psalms bearing the inscription ויִתְרוּ עֲמָנוּ (le-David); viz., thirty-seven in book i., eighteen in book ii., one in book iii., two in book iv., fifteen in book v. The redaction had designed the placing effect of closing the collection with an imposing group of Davidic psalms, just as it begins with the bulk of the Davidic psalms. The hallelujahs, commencing with Ps. cxcvi. (after the fifteen Davidic psalms), are already preludes of the closing doxology. (c) The two Korahitic (xliii., xliv.-xlvi., xxxiv., xxxv., li., lii.) psalms are found exclusively in the second and third books. Korahitic psalms, followed by an Asaphic, open the second book: Asaphic psalms, followed by four Korahitic, open the third book. (d) The manner in which Davidic psalms are interspersed clearly sets before us the principle by which the arrangement according to the matter, which the collector has chosen, is governed. It is the principle of homogeneity. The Asaphic psalm (i.) is followed by the Davidic psalm (ii.), because both similarly disbarge the material animal sacrifice, as compared with that which is personal and spiritual. So also lxxv. and lxxvi., with lxxvii. between, lv. and lii., xxxiv. and xxxv., ix. and x., come together. (e) Closely connected with this principle is the circumstance of the Elohimic psalms—i.e., those which exclusively call God אֱלֹהִים, and besides this make use of such compound names of God as אֱלֹהִים יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהִים יְהֹוָה (Jehovah Zebaoth, Jehovah Elohim Zebaoth) are placed together without any intermixture of Jehovistic psalms. In Ps. i.-xii. the divine name אֱלֹהִים predominate: it occurs two hundred and seventy-two times, and only fifteen times, and only where אֱלֹהִים was not admissible. With Ps. xliii. the Elohimic style begins: the last psalm of this class is the Korahitic psalm lxxvii., which for this very reason is placed after the Elohimic psalm of Asaph. In Ps. lxxvi.-cxvi. אֱלֹהִים again becomes so exclusively prominent, that, in the psalms of the fourth and fifth books, it occurs three hundred and thirty-nine times, and only one (cxlix. 9) where it denotes the true God. Among the Psalms of David, eighteen are Elohimic; among the Korahitic, nine; and the Asaphic are all Elohimic. Including one psalm of Solomon and four anonymous psalms, there are forty-four in all (taking Ps. xlii. and xliii. as two). They form the middle portion of the Psalter, having on their right forty-one, and on their left sixty-five Jehovah psalms. (f) Community in species of composition also belongs to the manifold grounds on which the order according to the subject-matter is determined. Thus the פֶּלֶג (xlii., xliii., xlv., lii.-lv.) and the פֶּלֶג (vi.-ix.) stand together among the Elohim psalms. In like manner we have in the last two books the פֶּלֶג (xxv.-xxxiv.), and, divided into groups, those beginning with פֶּלֶג (cv.-cvii.) and those beginning and ending with פֶּלֶג (cxi.-cxvii., cxvii.-cl.).

6. Inscriptions of the Psalms. — These are older than the final redaction of the Psalter, and are of three kinds: (a) giving the name of the author, sometimes, especially to Davidic psalms, adding also the historical occasion, thus, vii., lx., li., lii., liii., lixiv., lix., lx., lxv., xxxv., lii., liii., lixiv., lix., lixii., xxx., lxxi., lxii., (b) giving the poetico-musical character of the Psalms, i.e., cxi., cxxi., cxxv., etc.— (c) pointing out the liturgical use of the Psalms. If we understood the inscriptions of the Psalms better, we would have more to say about—

7. The Poetical and Musical Character of the Psalms. — The early Hebrew poetry has neither rhyme nor metre, both of which (first rhyme, then metre) were first adopted by Jewish poetry in the seventh century after Christ. True, attempts at rhyme are not wanting in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament, but, except the epithelia style (Ps. cxi. 4-7; cf. Jer. iii. 21-25), where the earnestness of the prayer naturally causes the heaping up of similar flexional ends; but this assonance, in the transition stage towards rhyme proper, had not taken an established form. Yet it is not mere fancy, when Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, have detected in the Old Testament songs, especially in the Psalms, something resembling the Greek and Latin metres. Old Hebrew poetry, indeed, had a certain syllabic measure, since, apart from the audible שֶׁבֶד and נְשֶׁי, both of which represent the primitive shortening, all syllables have a full vowel and are intermediate, and in ascending become long, in descending, short. Hence the manifold rhythms arise, e.g., the anapestic, וַעֲדֵהֶלֹהִים תְּהַלְלוּ יְהוָה (ii. 3), or the dactylic, אֲדַבְּרֵי יְהוָה בֵּצַיְתָּם (ii. 6), and thus obtains the appearance of a lively mixture of the Greek and Latin metres. But this is the very beauty of this kind of poetry, that the rhythms always vary according to the thoughts and feelings; as, e.g., the evening song (Ps. iv.), towards the end, rises to the anapestic measure, אֲדַבְּרֵי יְהוָה בֵּצַיְתָּם (ii. 6), in order then quietly to subside in the iambic, לַבְּקָהָה לֵבָנָה. With this alternation of rise and fall, long and short syllables, harmonizing in lively passages with the subject, there is combined, in Hebrew poetry, an expressiveness of accent which is hardly to be found anywhere else to such an extent.

Under the point of view of rhythm, the so-called parallelismus membrorum has also been rightly placed since the time of Lowth. The relation of the two parallel members is like the two halves on either side of the iamb, with the accent and pentameter, and this is particularly manifest in the double long line of the casual schema; e.g. (Ps. xlviii. 5, 6), "They beheld,
straightway they marveled, | bewildered they took to flight. Trembling took hold upon them there, | anguish, as a woman in travail. | Here the one thought is expanded as in the same verse in two parallel members. But from the fact of the rhythmical organization being carried out without reference to the logical requirements of the sentence, as in the same psalm, vers. 3, 7 ("Elohim in her palaces | was known as a refuge.") the same verse in two parallel members. But from the fact of the rhythmical organization being carried out without reference to the logical requirements of the sentence, as in the same psalm, vers. 3, 7 ("Elohim in her palaces | was known as a refuge.") we see that the rhythm is not called into existence as a necessity of such expansion of the thought, but, vice versa, this mode of expanding the thought results from the requirements of the rhythm. Here is no logical parallelism, but merely that which De Wette calls rhythmical, the rhythmical rise and fall, the dissotole and systole. The ascending and descending rhythm does not usually exist within the compass of one line; but it is distributed over two lines, which bear the relation to one another of rhythmical antecedent and consequent, and form a distich. This distich is the simplest ground-form of the strophe, which is visible in the earliest song passage, and even extends the network of the rhythmical period, by combining the two instruments and the instruments generally are to be referred to the female) was represented by the citherns, an octave lower (1 Chron. xv. 17-20). In a psalm in which Selah (H^D) is appended, the stringed instruments and the instruments generally are to join in such a way as to give intensity to that which is being sung. To these instruments, besides those mentioned in Ps. cl., 2 Sam. vi. 5, belonged also the flute and the trumpets. In the second temple it was otherwise. The sounding of the trumpets by the priests, and the Levitical song with its accompanying music, alternated; they were not simultaneous. The congregation did not sing with the choir, but only uttered their Amen. In the time of the second temple, the singing of the strophe appointed for each day commenced, at a sign given with the cymbal, at the time when the ministering priest offered the drink-offering. The Levites standing upon the platform, who were both players and singers, were at least twelve in number. Of what kind this song and music were, we can hardly now have an idea; and it is nothing but a mere fiction of Anton and L. Haupt to assert that the present accentuation of the vowels is the result of a pure and unmixed tradition, if the eight tones are to be traced back to the eight church-tones, in the same manner as the two modes of using the accents in chanting, which are attested in the ancient
PSALMS.

service-books, recall the distinction between the festival and the simpler sacerdotal manner in the Gregorian style of church-music.

The history of Psalmody, especially of the practical use of the Psalter, is a glorious history of blessing and victory. No other book of the Old Testament has gone so much from the heart and mouth of the church into the heart and mouth of the church as this Old Testament hymn-book. But, with all this praise, neither the true value of this hymn-book of Israel, nor the wonderful effect which it exercised upon the church, is sufficiently acknowledged. To do this we consider —

6. The Soi gion of the Psalter.

When men had corrupted themselves by sin, God did not leave them to that doom of wrath which they had chosen for themselves, but visited them on the evening of that most decisive of all days, in order to make that doom the disciplinary medium of his love. This visitation of Jehovah-Elolim was the first step, in the history of redemption, towards the goal of the incarnation and the so-called evangelium was the first laying of the foundation towards this goal of incarnation and the recovery of man. The man of this salvation, making its way in history and in the consciousness of men, runs all through Israel; and the Psalms show us how this seed-corn of words and deeds of divine love has expanded with a vital energy in the believing hearts of Israel. They bear the impress of the period during which the preparation of the way of salvation was centered in Israel, and the hope of redemption was a national hope. At that period the promise of the future Mediator was in its third stage. The hope of overcoming the tendency in mankind to be led astray into evil was attached to the seed of the woman, and the hope of a blessing for all nations, to the seed of Abraham; but at this period, when David became the creator of psalm-poetry for the sanctuary service, the promise had assumed a messianic character, and pointed the hope of the believing ones towards the king of Israel, and, in fact, to David and his seed. When Solomon ascended the throne, the messianic desires and hopes of Israel were directed towards him, as Ps. Ixiii. shows: they belonged only to the one final Christ of God, but they clung for a time inquiringly, on the ground of 2 Sam. viii., to the son of David. But it was soon found out that neither in Solomon, nor in that son of David referred to in Ps. xiv., the full reality of the messianic idea had yet appeared; and when, in the later time of the kings, the Davidic line became more and more inconsistent with its theocratic calling, the messianic hope broke entirely with the present, which became merely the dark background from which the image of the Messiah, as purely future, stood forth in relief. The son of David, in whom the prophecy of the later time of the kings centres, and in whose individual hopes of salvation the direct reign of Jehovah, the author of salvation, is appointed for atonement (י"ע) : in one word, the prophecy and the hope of the messianic age, as such, which is complete inwardly and outwardly in its own representation of itself, — of the advent of a human king, but of Jehovah himself, with the kingdom of God manifest in its glory. For the announcement of salvation in the Old Testament runs on in two parallel lines: the one has as its termination the Anointed of Jehovah, who rules all nations out of Zion; the other, Jehovah, sitting above the cherubim, to whom all the earth does homage. These two lines do not meet in the Old Testament: it is only the fulfilment that makes it plain that the advent of the Anointed and that of Jehovah is one and the same. And of these two lines the divine preponderates in the Psalter: the hope is directed, after the cessation of the kingdom in Israel, beyond the human mediation, directly towards Jehovah, the author of salvation. The Messiah is not yet recognized as the God-man. Jesus is in Jehovah. Jehovah is the Saviour. The Saviour, when he shall appear, is nothing but the visible manifestation of the י"ע (salvation) of Jehovah (Isa. xlix. 6).

As to the relation of the Psalms to sacrifices, it is true we find passages in which the legal sacrifice is acknowledged as an act of worship on the part of the individual and of the congregation (Ps. lxvi. 15, li. 19); but there are many more passages in which it appears as something not at all desired by God (xi. 7 sq., 1, li. 18 sq.); but in this respect the Psalms show the progress of the history of salvation. It is a continuation of the words of Samuel (1 Sam. xxv. 22).), who already something of the spirit of the New Testament. In place of sacrifices is required contribution of heart, prayer, thanksgiving, yielding one's self to God in the doing of his will, as Prov. xxi. 3, to do right, Hose. vi. 6, kindness, Mic. vi. 6-8, acting justly, love, and humility, Jer. vii. 21-23, obedience. This is what surprises one. The disparaged sacrifice is regarded only as a symbol, not as a type: it is only considered in its ethical character, not in its relation to the history of redemption. Its nature is unfolded only so far as it is a gift to God (י"ע), not so far as the offering is appointed for atonement (י"ע). In this word, the mystery of the blood remains undisclosed. And why? Because the bloody sacrifice, as such, in the Old Testament, remains a question, to which only Isa. lii. 13 sq. gives the only distinct answer. The prophetic representation of the passion and sacrifice of Christ is only given in direct prophetic language thus late on, and it is a literal history of the fulfilment that shows how exactly the spirit which spoke by David has moulded that which he says concerning himself, the type,
into correspondence with the antitype. The confidence of faith under the Old Testament, as it is found in the Psalms, rested upon Jehovah, as concerning the atonement, so concerning the redemption; and Jehovah is not only Saviour, but also the Atoner (נים), from whom expiation is earnestly sought and hoped for (Ps. lxxix. 9, lxiv. 4, lxviii. 33, lxxxv. 2, etc.). Jehovah, at the end of his course of the redemptive history, is the God-man; and the blood given by him as the medium of atonement, is, in the antitype, his own blood.

As to the moral self-confidence bordering on self-righteousness, and the imprecations found so often in the Psalms, which makes it difficult to amalgamate the prayers of the Psalms with the Christian consciousness, it must be observed that the self-righteousness here is a mere appearance, since the righteousness to which the psalmists appeal is not a sum of good works which are reckoned up before God as claiming a reward, but a godly direction of the will, and a godly form of life, which has its root in the surrender of one's whole being and all his works to God, and regarded in the operation and work of justifying, sanctifying, preserving, and ruling grace (lxiii. 25 sq., xxv. 5-7, xix. 14, and other passages). There is not wanting an acknowledgment of the innate sinfulness of our nature (li. 7), of the condemnation of man before God apart from his grace (xviii. 2), of the many, and, for the most part, unpardoned sins, even of the converted (xix. 13), of the forgiveness of sins as a fundamental condition of salvation (xxxii. 1 sq.), of the necessity of regeneration (li. 12), in short, of the way of salvation, which consists of penitential contrition, pardon, and newness of life. As for the so-called imprecatory psalms, the Christian and the Church wish the conversion of the enemies of Christ; but, suppose that they reject all means (vii. 13, ix. 21), the transition from a feeling of love to that of wrath is also warranted in the New Testament (e.g., Gal. v. 12), and, assuming their absolute sinfulness, the Christian also may pray for their final overthrow. Where, however, as in Ps. lxix. and cix., the imprecations go into particulars, and extend to the descendants of the unfortunate, and even on to eternity, they have emanated from a prophetic spirit; and, for the Christian, they admit of no other acceptance, except as, reiterating them, he gives the glory to the justice of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to his favor.

As for the relation of the Psalms to the last things, the hope of eternal life after death is nowhere definitely expressed, but there are, nevertheless, passages in which the hope of not falling a prey to death is expressed so broadly, that the thought of a final destiny of all men being inevitable is completely swallowed up by the living one's confidence of living in the strength of God (Ps. lvi. 13, and especially xvi. 9-11); passages in which the covenant relation with Jehovah is contrasted with this present life extending beyond the present time is implied (xxvii. 14 sq., lxxiii. 4); passages in which the end of the ungodly is compared with the end of the righteous, as death and life, defeat and triumph (xlix. 15); so that the inference rests upon this, that the former dies, although they seem to live forever, and the latter live forever, though they die; passages in which the Psalmist, though only by way of allusion, looks forward to a being borne away to God, like Enoch and Elijah (xxv. 4, lxxxi. 24).—Nothing, however, where there is an expressed hope; but we see how the belief in a future life struggles to be free, at first only as an individual conclusion of the believing mind from premises which experience has established; and, far from the grave being penetrated by a glimpse of heaven, it has, on the contrary, to the ecstasy of the life derived from God, as it were, altogether vanished; for life in opposition to death only appears as the lengthening of the line of the present ad infinitum. On the other hand, death and life in the mind of the psalmists are such deep-rooted notions (i.e., taken hold of at the very roots, which are grounded in the principles of divine wrath and divine love), that it is easy for the New-Testament faith, to which they have become clear, even to their background of hell and heaven, to adjust and deepen the meaning of all utterances in the Psalms that refer to them. It is by no means contrary to the meaning of the Psalms that, as in passages like vi. 5, Gehenna is substituted for Hades to adapt it to the New-Testament saint; because, since the descent of Jesus Christ into Hades, there is no longer any limbus patrum. The way of all who die in the Lord is not earthwards, but upwards: Hades exists only as the vestibule of hell. Nor is it contrary to the idea of the poets to think of the future vision of God's face in all its glory, in Ps. xvii. 15, and of the resurrection morn, in Ps. xlix. 14; for the hopes expressed there, though to the Old-Testament consciousness they referred to this side the grave, are future according to their New-Testament fulfilment, which is the only truly satisfying one. The innermost essence of both Testaments is one. The Old-Testament barrier contains already the germinating New-Testament life, which at a future time shall burst it. The eschatology of the Old Testament leaves a dark background, whereas the New-Testament is filled by the New-Testament revelation into light and darkness, and is to be illumined into a wide perspective, extending into the eternity beyond time. Everywhere, where it begins to dawn in this eschatological darkness of the Old Testament, it is the first morning rays of the New-Testament sunrise which is already announcing itself. The Church, as well as the Christian, here cannot refrain from leaping the barrier of the psalmists, and understanding the Psalms according to the mind of the Spirit, whose purpose, in the midst of the development of salvation and of the perception of it, is directed towards its goal and consummation. But the scientific exposition must carefully distinguish between the times of the history of salvation, and the degrees in the perception of that salvation.

How late this object of scientific exposition has been perceived will be seen by reviewing it. 

B. The History of the Exposition of the Psalms. We begin (a) with The Apostolic Exposition. The Old Testament is, according to its essence, Christocentric: therefore the innermost truth of the Old Testament has become known with the revelation of Jesus Christ, but not at once. His passion, resurrection, ascension are the third step of this progressive opening of the Old Testa-
especially of the Psalms. Before and after his resurrection he unfolded the meaning of the Psalms from his own life and vicissitudes; he showed how what was written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets and in the Psalms, was fulfilled in him; he revealed to his disciples the meaning of psalmody with which the psalm of Moses says 'Sing unto the Lord all the earth' (Psalm 47:8). Jesus Christ's exposition of the Psalms is the beginning and goal of Christian psalm-interpretation. It began, as that of the Church, and first of all as the apostolic, with the Pentecost; and how strongly the disciples were drawn to the Psalms, we see from the fact, that, with the exception of the Book of Isaiah, no other book of the Old Testament has been cited so often as the Book of Psalms. It is quoted about seventy times in the New Testament. (b) The Post-Apostolic, Apostolic Exposition. With the exception of Origen and Jerome, the interpreters of the early Church had no knowledge of the Hebrew, and even those two not sufficient to free themselves from a dependence upon the LXX. Of Origen's Commentary and Homilies on the Psalms, we have fragments in the translation of Rufinus. From Jerome, we have an excellent translation of the Psalter (Psalterium juxta Hebraeos, published in the Hebrew-Latin Psalter), and from the Latin into German by Tischendorf, Baer, Delitzsch, Leipzig, 1874, and by De Lagarde, after his own recension, Leipzig, 1874). This Psalterium is the most important work of the prismatic period. Athanasius wrote on the contents of the Psalms in his epistle σφον ἐρασεῖς τὸν οἶκον, translated into Latin by Reuchlin, and from the Latin into German by Jörg Spalatin (1516). About the time of Athanasius, Hilarius Pictaviensis wrote his Tractatus super Psalmos, with an extensive prologue. We still have his exposition of Ps. i., ii., ix., xii., xiv., lxv., lii., liii.-lxxv., xcv., cxxviii.-cl. (according to the numbering of the Septuagint), which is more useful for the dogmatic theologian than for the exegete. Of somewhat later date are Ambrose's Enarrations in Ps. i., xxxv.-xl, xliii., xlv., xlvii., xlviii., lxviii., lxix., lxxviii. (some li. of the Benedictine edition). The most comprehensive work of the early Church on the Psalter is that of Chrysostom, of which only the third part is still extant. It is composed in the form of homilies: the style is brilliant, the contents more ethical than dogmatic. The only representative of the school of Antioch is Theodoret; but his work is a mere beginning, and therefore defective throughout. The Western counterpart to Chrysostom's Commentary are Augustine's Enarrations in Psalms (in tome iv. of the Benedictine edition), the chief mine of all later exposition in the Western Church. Cassiodorus, in his Expositiones in omnes Psalms (tome ii. of the Benedictine edition), draws largely from Augustine, though not devoid of independence. What the Greek Church has done for the exposition of the Psalms has been garnered up many times since Photius, in the so-called Catena: one, extending to Ps. 1., was published at Venice, 1669; another, more complete, was edited, in 3 vols., by the Jesuit Corderius, Antwerp, 1643. From the Catena of Nicetas Heracleota, Folckmann published extracts in 1601. But, in spite of all defects which we find in these works, it must be said that the Church has never found such rapturous delight in the Psalms, which it was never weary of singing day and night, never used them richer results, even to martyrdom, than the period. Instead of profane popular songs as one passed through the country one might hear psalms resounding over the fields and vineyards. And how many martyrs have endured every form of martyrdom with the psalm of David saying: 'My soul waiteth all the night upon the Lord' (Psalm 62:6). That which the Church in those days failed to furnish in writing towards the exposition of the Psalms, it more than compensated for by preserving the vitality of the Psalms with its blood. (c) The Medieval Synagogue Exposition is wanting in the recognition of Christ, and consequently in the fundamental condition required for a spiritual understanding of the Psalms. The midrash on the Psalms, entitled מיקם מושך במערה, and the midrashic Catena entitled משלי, of which at present only בְּקָלַת (by Simeon Kara ha-Darahan), and not the כְּפָלָה (by Machir ben abba Mari), is known, are of little use. With the study and cultivation of the grammar, about the year 900 A.D., exposition and exegesis also commenced among the Jews. At the head of this period of Jewish exposition we find Saba Isaac (d. 941, 942), author of an Arabic translation of and exposition on the Psalms. The next great expositor who wrote on the whole of the Old Testament (with the exception of Chronicles) and on almost the whole of the Talmud is Rashi (d. 1105). Nicolaus de Lyra (d. 1340), author of Postilla perpetua, made use of the works by Jewish expositors. Lyra and Paul de Santa Maria, Archbishop of Burgos (d. 1435), the author of Addiciones ad Lyram, were both Jewish Christians. Less dependent upon tradition are Aben-Ezra (d. 1167) and David Kimchi (d. about 1250); the Karaites, from whose Commentary on the Psalms De Bargas published some fragments (1846), was Aben-Ezra's teacher. Compared with other books, the Psalms were less commented upon by the Jews. In later commentaries, as in that of Moses Alshech (Venice, 1601) and Joel Shooe (Salonichi, 1669), the simplicity and elegance of the older exegetes, as in that of Moses Alshech (Venice, 1601) and Joel Shooe (Salonichi, 1669), the simplicity and elegance of the older exegetes, were lost, and in their place we find a repulsive scholasticism. The simple though mystical commentary of Obadiah Sorno (d. at Bologna, 1550), the teacher of Reuchlin, makes an exception. (d) The Reformation Exposition. With the Reformation the rose-garden of the Psalter began to breathe forth its perfumes as with renewed freshness of a May day; for, converted into imperishable hymns (by Luther, Albinus, Franck, Gerhard, Jonas, Musculus, Ringwaldt, and others), it was transferred into the psalmody of the German Lutheran Church. In the French Reformed Church, Clement Marot translated into verse fifty psalms; two were added by Calvin, and the rest by Beza; while Goudimel, the martyr of St. Bartholomew's night, and teacher of Palestrina, composed the melodies and chorals. The English Church adopted the Psalms as part of its Liturgy: the Congregational followed the example of the Continental brethren. And how did the Psalter mould into Latin verse! But the exegetical functions of psalm-exposition have been more clearly apprehended and more happily discharged than ever before. Luther's interpretation of the Psalms, in spite of its deficiencies,
explained the Psalms in the spirit of the Church, (1853), but with this difference, that, while Lenzen's consciousness of the Church, (g) Modern Exposition of taste is the merit of Herder; and the merit of these works, Ewald's Commentary (1839, 1840) is a perpetual mine of wealth. M. Butzer's Commentary (1520) is distinguished by sagacity and delicacy of judgment. Calvin's exposition has many excellencies; but his deficiency consists in denying the Mosaic origin, even in those passages in which the modern rationalistic exegete must even acknowledge. Calvin's strict historical method of interpretation becomes a caricature in Esrom Düringer, the Moravian. (f) The Post-Reformation Exposition is best represented by Martin Geier, more dogmatist, however, than exegete. In the Reformed Church we find Coccejus (d. 1669). Johann Heinrich Michaelis represents, in his Adnotationes ubiores in Hagiographa, the exposition of the Psalms from 1600 to 1750: every thing is accumulated here; the glossarial annotations groan beneath the burden of numberless unsifted examples and parallel passages. After 1750 Burk published his Gnomon to the Psalms (1740), and Christian A. Crusius, his Hypomnemata (1784): both follow Bengel's principles. To have freed the psalm-exposition from want of taste is the merit of Herder; and the merit of Hengstenberg consists in having brought it back, out of this want of spirituality, to the believing consciousness of the Church. (g) Modern Exposition is marked by De Wette's Commentary, which was first published in 1811 (ed. by G. Baur, 1856), and forms an epoch in exegesis. The negative criticism of De Wette was supplemented by the positive results of Hitzig (1835, 1836), who was followed by Lengerke (1847) and J. Olshausen (1853), but with this difference, that, while Lengerke surpasses Hitzig by asserting that not a single psalm can be ascribed with certainty to David, Olshausen finds Maccabean influences wherever the opposition of the just and unjust is mentioned. But, though excellent in linguistic respect, yet Olshausen's Commentary is surpassed by that of Hupfeld (1855, 1858 sq.). Beside all these works, Ewald's Commentary (1838, 1840) has a special charm. The merit of having perceived fully the object of the expositor, and having expressed it in a style which unites logical order with forceful expression, belongs to the much abused psalms which the modern rationalistic exegesis has forced out of this want of spirituality, to the believing consciousness of the Church. (h) The English literature on the Psalms embraces translations of the Commentaries by Hengstenberg (Edinb., 1845-48, 3 vols.), THOLUCK (by J. I. Momert, Lond., 1856, N. Y., 1856), DELITZSCH (Edinb., 1871, 3 vols.), MOLL (in Lange Series, N. Y. and Edinb., 1872); original works by HORNE (Lond., 1776, 2 vols., many eds., e.g., N. Y., 1865), HORSLEY (Lond., 1816, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1845), J. A. ALEXANDER (N. Y., 1860, 3 vols.), PEROWNE (Lond., 1864-65, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1878-79), PLUMER (N. Y., 1897), BARNES (N. Y., 1869, 8 vols.), SPURGEON (Treasury of David, homiletical, Lond., and N. Y., 1870-84, 7 vols.), W. KAY (Lond., 1871), J. G. MURPHY (Edinb., 1876), FAUSET (Lond., 1877), D. THOMAS (Lond., 1882 sqq.). Works upon Individual Psalms of Groups of Psalms. — Sir RICHARD BAKER: Meditations and Disquisitions on the First and Seven Penitential Psalms, Lond., 1840, rep. 1882; JOHN BROWN: The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah (Ps. xviii.), Edinb., 1859; JAMES Moir of the Church of Scotland: The Psalms, and thus in truly spiritual rapport with the spirit of the psalmists, belongs to the much abused name of Hengstenberg (1842-47, 2d ed., 1849-52). The kindred spirited works of Umbreit (Christ- liche Erbauung aus dem Psalter, 1855) and Stier (Siebenzig Psalmen, 1854, 1898) comprise only a part of the Psalms. The Commentary of Tholuck (1843) is adapted to gain friends for the Psalms from among the educated classes. The same may be said also of Vaihinger's Commentary (1843). A second edition of Hupfeld's Commentary was published by Riehm in 1867-71: a third is to be prepared by Eb. Nestle. For Lange's Bibelwort, Moll wrote the theologico-homiletical exposition of the Psalter, 1869-71 [Eng. trans. New York, 1872]. The German predecessors to Moll have been made use of in the excellent Commentary on the Psalms by J. J. Stewart Passive (1844, 1848). In Holland, the General Synod of the Reformed Church adopted in 1855 the resolution of preparing a commentary on the Old Testament. The Psalms were given to John Dyserinck, and his work was published in 1877. In 1878 he also published Kritische Scholien bij de Vertaling van het boek der Psalmen, containing emendations on 250 passages. Degenerated beyond measure is the critico-conjectural tendency in Graetz's (the Jewish historian) critical Commentary on the Psalms (1882, 1888, 2 vols.). To exegesis and textual criticism this scholar has evidently no call. A more precious and intelligent work is the fifteenth part of the Biblical Commentary by the veteran Ed. Reuss, who treats of the Psalms and Lamentations under the main title of Poesie Lyrique (2d ed., 1879). He refuses to assign any date to almost all the Psalms (Geschichte des Alten Testaments, 1881, § 157), and doubts that "we have Davidic psalms at all." Stade also (Zeitschrift, 1882, p. 169) declares the Psalter to be the product of post-exilic Judaism, and asserts that each and every psalm must be regarded as post-exilic, unless the contrary is proved. The critical stand-point of an Ewald and Hitzig, who, like Herm. Schultz in his O. T. Theol. (2d ed., 1878, pp. 84 sq.), acknowledges a group of real psalms of David, is thus surpassed; and freer scope is now left to the modern reconstruction of the religious history of Israel according to the Darwinistic pattern. FRANZ DELITZSCH. (B. PICK.) The English literature on the Psalms embraces translations of the Commentaries by Hengstenberg (Edinb., 1845-48, 3 vols.), THOLUCK (by J. I. Momert, Lond., 1856, N. Y., 1856), DELITZSCH (Edinb., 1871, 3 vols.), MOLL (in Lange Series, N. Y. and Edinb., 1872); original works by HORNE (Lond., 1776, 2 vols., many eds., e.g., N. Y., 1865), HORSLEY (Lond., 1816, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1845), J. A. ALEXANDER (N. Y., 1860, 3 vols.), PEROWNE (Lond., 1864-65, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1878-79), PLUMER (N. Y., 1897), BARNES (N. Y., 1869, 8 vols.), SPURGEON (Treasury of David, homiletical, Lond., and N. Y., 1870-84, 7 vols.), W. KAY (Lond., 1871), J. G. MURPHY (Edinb., 1876), FAUSET (Lond., 1877), D. THOMAS (Lond., 1882 sqq.). Works upon Individual Psalms of Groups of Psalms. — Sir RICHARD BAKER: Meditations and Disquisitions on the First and Seven Penitential Psalms, Lond., 1840, rep. 1882; JOHN BROWN: The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah (Ps. xviii.), Edinb., 1859; JAMES Moir of the Church of Scotland: The Psalms, and thus in truly spiritual rapport with the spirit of the psalmists, belongs to the much abused name of Hengstenberg (1842-47, 2d ed., 1849-52). The kindred spirited works of Umbreit (Christ- liche Erbauung aus dem Psalter, 1855) and Stier (Siebenzig Psalmen, 1854, 1898) comprise only a part of the Psalms. The Commentary of Tholuck (1843) is adapted to gain friends for the Psalms from among the educated classes. The same may be said also of Vaihinger's Commentary (1843). A second edition of Hupfeld's Commentary was published by Riehm in 1867-71: a third is to be prepared by Eb. Nestle. For Lange's Bibelwort, Moll wrote the theologico-homiletical exposition of the Psalter, 1869-71 [Eng. trans. New York, 1872]. The German predecessors to Moll have been made use of in the excellent Commentary on the Psalms by J. J. Stewart Passive (1844, 1848). In Holland, the General Synod of the Reformed Church adopted in 1855 the resolution of preparing a commentary on the Old Testament. The Psalms were given to John Dyserinck, and his work was published in 1877. In 1878 he also published Kritische Scholien bij de Vertaling van het boek der Psalmen, containing...
and, we believe, the General Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of Holland. In the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the only authorized manual of praise is the Book of Psalms; although, in many congregations of that church, "paraphrases" of other parts of Scripture, and a few uninspired songs, which the advocates of Scripture restriction to the Psalms are here subjoined. In all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, Canada, the United States, and Australia, there is a considerable number of persons who favor the view that only the Psalms should be used in the service of praise.

Among those who advocate the exclusive use of inspired songs in praising God, some (a small minority, it is believed) hold, that, besides the Psalter, other parts of Scripture may be employed in that exercise. It is, moreover, to be observed that the advocates of Scripture Psalmody do not object absolutely to the use of uninspired hymns as a means of exciting and expressing pious feeling; their objection being to be observed that the advocates of Scripture Psalmody do not object absolutely to the use of uninspired hymns as a means of exciting and expressing pious feeling; their objection being to the use of such compositions in the direct and proper worship of God.

Some of the considerations urged in favor of restriction to the Psalms are here subjoined.

1. To worship God otherwise than he has appointed is "will-worship," more or less gross. The law regulative of worship is not that we may use both what is commanded and what is not expressly forbidden, but that we must be limited to the use of what is either expressly or implicitly appointed by God (Deut. xii. 32; Matt. xv. 9, xvi. 20).

2. To the Old-Testament Church God gave inspired songs, and prescribed the use of them in worship.

3. There is no evidence that God ever authorized his ancient people to employ in the stated service of song any other hymns than those finally collected into one book, that of Psalms.

4. This book continues to be the only divinely authorized hymn-book of the church. It is more suited to the present dispensation than it was even to the past. It is full of Christ, as the early Christian writers asserted vigorously. From the most devout Christians of the last eighteen centuries the highest eulogies of the Psalms have proceeded. Of the right and obligation to use the Psalms in praise, there has been no repeal. No substitute, no supplement, has been furnished or authorized by God. At the institution of the Supper, Christ and his disciples "hymned." It is generally admitted that the hymns used on the occasion were the Psalms, extending from Ps. cxiii. to Ps. cxviii. inclusive. Our Lord thus wedded together the Supper and the Psalms, and authoritatively transferred the Psalms to the worship of the Church.

By apostolic authority the use of the Psalms in praising God is clearly enjoined in Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16. It is urged, indeed, that, in these texts, the use of "hymns" and "spiritual songs" is also enjoined, and therefore that uninspired odes may warrantably be employed in formal praise.

The reply made to this, is that it assumes without proof that the "hymns" and "songs" meant are uninspired compositions; that the argument, if valid, would prove that it is sinful not to use uninspired hymns. The direction given is not to prepare hymns, but only to sing the Psalms; that the epithet "spiritual," applied to the songs, marks them as emphatically the product of the Spirit, that is, as inspired, and not merely devotional (1 Cor. ii. 18, xiv. 1); that it is difficult to believe that the apostle placed inspired and uninspired compositions on the same level; that, if psalms differ materially from hymns and songs, these latter must differ from each other, whereas, no distinction is made between them practically by hymn-singers; that the advocates of an uninspired hymnology seem to admit that psalms may fitly be called hymns; or psalms may be found in many popular collections styled Hymnals or Hymn-books; and that in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the version used by the Christians of Ephesus and Colosse, the three terms which the apostle uses are employed to designate the Psalms, while, moreover, Josephus, a contemporary of Paul, frequently styles the Psalms "hymns," and expressly says that David wrote "εὐως εἰς θεόν καὶ ἔσωρος," that is, "songs and hymns to God" (Ant., 7, 12, 3).

5. If other hymns than those of the Psalter were used in the Apostolic Church, some of them would surely have survived. But not even one has certainly come down from the first two centuries. The earliest Christian hymn extant is believed to be that to the Logos, attributed to Clemens Alexandrinus, who died about 220 A.D.; but there is no evidence that it was ever used in the express worship of God. It needs to be noted that the mere existence of a hymn, or the fact that it was sung devotionally, is no proof that it was used in formal worship. During, at least, the first four centuries, the Psalms were pre-eminently used in worship; and the earliest departures from them, so far as the Orthodox were concerned, consisted in the chanting of fragments culled from the other parts of Scripture, as if, in the heart of the church, the feeling existed, that, in praising God, inspired compositions only should be employed.

6. The fact that God gave to the church a psalm-book, but not a prayer-book, seems to teach that between prayer and praise there is such a difference, that the right to make our own prayers does not warrant the conclusion that we have the right to worship God with hymns uninspired.

7. The aid of the Spirit is promised in reference to prayer, but no such aid in reference to hymn-making, a much more difficult operation.

8. The inspired Psalter is the true Union Hymn-book. Prepared, as it was, by the Spirit, it meets the wants of all Christians, while, moreover, it forms a golden link between the church of the past dispensation and that of the present.

### PSALMS

**True Psalmody**, Philadelphia, 1860; **William Binnik**: The Psalms, their History, Teachings, and Use, London, 1870; Bishop **Alexander**: Witness of the Psalms to Christ, 1877; **James Harper**.

**Instrumental Music in Worship**. Those churches which reject uninspired hymns, though not they only, have hitherto been noted for a repugnance to the use of instrumental music in worship; hence a brief statement of the anti-instrumental line of argument may not unfitly be appended to the sketch given of the arguments against uninspired hymns.

Anti-instrumentalists commonly reason thus:—

1. In the matter of worship, our great inquiry should be, "What has God appointed?" Any form of worship not appointed is forbidden.

2. That which is necessary to the suitable observance of a prescribed form of worship can be regarded as a circumstance needing no explicit appointment. If so, instrumental music is not a circumstance of worship.

3. Though divinely prescribed in the Old Dispensation, instrumental music was not intended to form an element of New-Testament worship.

(1) It is in keeping with the sensuousness which distinguished the Old Dispensation from the New.

(2) It pertained to the transient ceremonial system of the Israelites. The temple was the seat, and Levites the performers, of the instrumental service. Even if practised elsewhere and by others, it could still be deemed ceremonial; for the rites of the ceremonial system were not limited to the precints of the tabernacle, or the temple.

The Psalms, indeed, which by divine authority are still sung, enjoin the use of instruments, but so do they the use of sacrifices; while, besides, an injunction is more than a permission, which is all for which most instrumentalists contend.

(3) The New Testament is unfavorable to the view that instrumental music is among the appointments of New-Testament worship.

At the institution of the Supper, Christ and his disciples "hymned," but used no instruments. If, in the most sacred of our observances, instrumental music may be wisely dispensed with, why not in all?

Sanction of instrumental music in worship is supposed by many to be found in Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16, where occurs the word ψαλλω, which, it is alleged, means to sing with the accompaniment of a harp. But this argument would prove that it is as much a duty to play as to sing in worship. It is questionable whether, as used in the New Testament, ψαλλω means more than to sing. But, even admitting that it retains an instrumental allusion, we may hold, with Meyer and others, that it does so only figuratively; the heart being the seat or the instrument of the action indicated. The absence of instrumental music from the New Testament was so firm that the church was rather against the apostles, and the sentiment regarding it which pervades the writings of the Fathers, is unaccountable, if in the apostolic church such music was used.


**PSALTER**, technically the Book of Psalms arranged for use in worship. So in the Roman-Catholic Church the Psalter presents the Psalms distributed to fit different services. In the Prayer-Book, the Psalms are divided into sections for reading in daily morning or evening service. The translation is that of the Great Bible (Cramer's, 1889).

**PSELLUS**, b. in Constantinople about 1020; studied in Athens; held for many years the first chair in philosophy in his native city, and was appointed tutor to the imperial princes, but lost the favor of the court after the death of Michael Ducas, and retired in 1078 to a monastery, where he died after 1105. He was a very prolific writer, and wrote on metaphysics, logic, mathematics, physics, jurisprudence, medicine, etc. His principal works are, De omnifaria doctrina, a metaphysical exposition of the fundamental ideas of all science; De daemonum operatione, a dialogue edited by Boissoneade (Paris, 1838); and, of special interest for the study of the sect of the Euchites, a comparison between the ancient Christian and Pagan orators, etc. Many of his works are found in **Migne**: Patr. Graecos, vol. 123; S. T. S. M.: **Michael Psellus**, Paris, 1874–5, 2 vols. Many are unprinted. Cf. **Leo Allatius**: Diatriba de Psalmis in Migne. **GAB**.

**PSEUDEPGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT**. After a careful examination of the scope of the biblical canon, the ancient church divided the mass of biblical literature, in the widest sense of the word, into three classes; viz., (1) The canonical and inspired; (2) The non-canonical, but, on account of their long use, worthy of being read in the churches (τα καθολικα και αγγλειον τα, έκκλησιαστικα); and (3) The other books of a biblical character in circulation (biblical name in the title, a biblical form, biblical contents, but differing greatly in spirit and truth from the canonical books), called secret, and such that should be kept secret (αντικεραυνως).

Virtually the same books which the ancient church called Apocrypha are embraced under the name Pseudepigrapha by the Protestant Church. Since, after the example of Jerome, the non-canonical books of the Old Testament received the name Apocrypha, it became necessary to find a name to denote the third class of writings. The name Pseudepigrapha is indeed taken only from a single and outward mark; namely, the spurious character of the author's name which they bear. It is neither sufficiently comprehensive, nor does it distinguish sufficiently this class of writings from the apocrypha; nor is it applicable to all the writings of the third class. For many of these books, it is probably the best term that could be found.
The pseudepigrapha are divided into those of the Old, and those of the New Testament; the former embracing all those that claim to have been written by an Old-Testament personage, whether the contents be of a Jewish or of a Christian character; the latter embracing those pretending to be gospels, epistles, revelations, etc., of New-Testament characters. The latter class could probably better be called Apocrypha of the New Testament (in the old sense of the word).

In the following will be found a bird's-eye view of the Old-Testament pseudepigrapha, both of those that are still preserved, and of those whose name alone we know. We preface a few general remarks on the origin and development of this whole class of literature. The rapid growth and spread of pseudepigraphic literature among the Jews and Christians in the last century before, and the early centuries after, Christ, is a peculiar phenomenon, for which other nations (e.g., the Indian) have only distant analogies; which is all the more remarkable, because such writings are in direct contradiction to the duty of strict truth, as demanded by both Mosaicism and Christianity. That these books were used only in sectarian circles cannot be proved. It is true that heretics in the early days of the church frequently adopted this method of promulgating their errors; but this was already the period of the decay of this literature: and we must remember, on the other hand, that, in the course of the centuries during which it flourished, it generally was employed for honorable and usually noble purposes, and by members of the orthodox church at that. There is no doubt that their origin is not to be explained as an imitation of the secret books in possession of the priests of the Gentile temples, but that they are the outgrowth of the peculiarity and life of the Jewish congregation, and were then transferred to the Christian Church. Above all, we must remember that it was the custom of Jewish writers not to prefix their names to their productions, as these were written for the service of the congregation, and not for fame, except in the case of prophets, where the person of the prophet was guaranty for the truth of the revelation. Thus the names of the authors of nearly all other books, even of such having the literary finish of a Job, have been hidden from posterity. This custom of omitting the author's name explains, to some extent, the origin of writings under a strange name. The other weighty reason lies in the inner rupture in the spiritual life of the Jews, which began already before the captivity, but showed itself in great potency in the first centuries of the New Jerusalem. With the ruin of the old political and religious organization, and the sufferings under heathen supremacy, the freedom of the spirit was also broken, the Holy Spirit of revelation withdrew, the state of affairs among the fathers and the doctrines of former days became the decisive rule for the new; and as all this led to syncretism and amalgamation, the exactions after the exile, thus it also increased the reverence for the old history, the old persons and writings, so much, that these ruled and decided the whole spiritual life of the people. The examination, study, and application of the sacred writings, were the fundamental objects of these times. Although, through association with other nations and educational forces (Persians, Greeks, Romans), and through a more systematic and a deeper investigation of the old books, new knowledge and aims were born, and although, in extraordinary and dangerous times, prominent men would feel themselves called upon to speak to the congregation, yet the lack of personal influence always induced such authors to put their thoughts and words into the mouth of some pious hero of antiquity, and conform the shape and style of their writings to those of the Old Testament. A thorough acquaintance with these latter facilitated the application of their contents to later circumstances. Such revivification of ancient persons, and making them the bearers of later thoughts, are common to all literatures; and it was but one step farther to ascribe a whole book to them. In many respects it can be compared with the dramatic works of other nations. But to call such writings simply fraudulent cannot be justified; as they were not necessarily written with such intent, and the knowledge of their late origin was constantly present to the minds of the readers. The danger of leaving a false impression existed for the contemporary readers — indeed it was small, but constantly growing with time, especially when Christianity brought these later spiritual productions of the Jews to nations who did not understand them. The opposition of the early Christian Church against such books can thus be easily understood. But theological science must investigate, and make all possible use of them.

The pseudepigraphical form was chiefly adopted for the purpose of exhortation, instruction, and consolation in the great trials and troubles of post-exilic days. These writings seek to be for the present what the prophets were for the past, and accordingly they mostly have a prophetic character. Some, however, appear as apocalypses, in imitation of the Book of Daniel.

In addition to this class of literature, there was one of a similar kind; namely, that of the haggadic Midrash, of which there are many representatives. These embrace a vast number of explanations, stories, narratives, and the like, concerning biblical persons, events, etc., which arose in the course of time by help of the imagination or extraneous play and tricks. The production of fables and stories began early among the Israelites, and continued down to the middle ages. The Targumim, Midrash, and Talmudic writings bear ample testimony to this fact; and our pseudepigrapha contain much of such materials.

With the rise of Christianity, a new element was introduced into this literature, and contributed to its growth and development. The Essenes were not, as is frequently stated, the mediums which transferred this class of writings into the Christian territory. There is no historical evidence for this, not even in Josephus. But Jewish-Christian pseudepigrapha flourished most abundantly among the Judaizing sects and the Gnostics in the first centuries after the exile, and became the decisive rule for the new; and as all this led to syncretism and amalgamation, the exactions after the exile, thus it also increased the reverence for the old history, the old persons and writings, so much, that these ruled and decided the whole spiritual life of the people. The examination, study, and application of the sacred writings, were the fundamental objects of these times. Although, through association with other
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51 Ethiop.), seventy apocryphal books are distinguished from the twenty-four canonical, which, however, is probably a round number, but became authoritative for later times. The chief contents of these preserved are the best of their class. Of many we have only the titles, or short extracts in the Church Fathers. The last decades have discovered some that were thought lost, and the future may still furnish us more. They are more than mere curiosities of literature: they nearly all have historical value, and were the popular literature of their day.


I. LYRICAL POETRY.—1. The Psalter of Solomon (Greek), published first from an Augsburg manuscript (since lost) in 1626, by a Jesuit, J. L. de la Cerda; later by Fabr., i. 914 sqq., with a collation of a Vienna manuscript of the tenth century; by Hilgenfeld, in Ztschr.f. wetts. Theol., xi. 134 sqq., and in Mess. Jud., pp. 3 sqq.; by E. Geiger, Der Psalter Salomos mit Übers. u. Erklär. (Augsburg, 1871); and by Fritzche, i. c. pp. 569 sqq. A German translation (revised from Geiger's) is furnished by Hilgenfeld, in his Ztschr., xiv. 383 sqq. and one by Wellhausen, Die Pharisaer und Sadd. (Griesfsw., 1874), pp. 138 sqq., together with a good discussion, pp. 112-120, 131-138; [an English translation by H. Pick, in Presbyterian Review, October, 1883]. It is a collection of songs for the congregation, in the manner of the biblical psalms (esp. in ii. 1 sqq., viii. 15-24, xvi. 13-20 (especially viii. 16, xvi. 14), harmonize with his doings, but also the manner of his death, in ii. 30 sqq., as all the best investigators acknowledge (Movers, Delitzsch, Lange, Keim, Hitzig, Nildeke, Wittichen, Hilgenfeld, Geiger, etc.). They accordingly originated between the years 63 and 45 B.C. The utterances seem to be the expression of the pious under the catastrophe of 68, and uttered soon after. The most remarkable feature is that, this the psalmists see in the Ammonians unholy usurpers, who have been justly huddled from the throne (xvii. 7 sqq., viii. 12 sqq., ii. 3, iv. 1-25, viii. 8 sqq., xii. 1-4, xvii. 6-8, 17-22); and they thus sympathize with the Pharisees. In the place of these godless rulers, the singers pray for the speedy coming of the Anointed One, the Messiah, the Son of David, and the advent of the kingdom of God (ii. 36, 39, xvii. 1-38, vi. 9, xi. 1 sqq., xviii. 28 sqq., xviii. 6 sqq.). In so far as these psalms are an important index to the relation of the parties in those days. They are also full of messianic hopes, faith in the resurrection and eternal retribution (iii. 16, xiii. 9, xiv. 2, 7, liii. 16, xiv. 6, xv. 11). They are sometimes found in manuscripts of the Greek Bible, and sometimes were counted among the antilegomena of the Old Testament. Cf. Hilgenfeld: Mess. Jud., p. xi. sq. On the five Σαι of Solomon, found in the Gnostic Pistis Sophia, cf. Hilgenfeld, p. xiv.

2. A Pseudepigraphon of Ἀρτάκ is mentioned in the Constit. Apost., vi. 16. Whether this is Ps. cii. of the Greek Bible, or a larger, independent work, can now no longer be decided.

II. PROPHETIC WRITINGS. (a) The So-called Apocalypses, Revelations, (b) Testaments (see below).

(a) This is the name assigned to those books of fictitious prophecy, which, after the spirit of prophecy had departed from Israel, were written, in the manner of the genuine prophetic books, to solve the problems suggested by the fate and sufferings of the people. Such is the historical origin of each one of them. They seek a solution of the intricacies of the present in predictions of the glory of the future. Accordingly they do not imitate the old prophets in their chief peculiarity, namely, to counsel and warn the people on account of their sin, but make a subordinate office, that of foreseeing and of foretelling the future, their chief object, but nevertheless endeavor to erect their prophetic building on the foundation of the inspired seers. The chief contents of these revelations are the messianic times in their relation to the present time and circumstances. Not that the messianic times would come, but when and how, was the question for the waiting congregation. The books that seek to answer these questions are called Apocalypses. Their contents are most varied and peculiar, their explanation manifold and strange; the topics discussed all referring directly or indirectly to the kingdom of God, and the future of the chosen people; the style enigmatical and highly figurative. Cf. on the whole matter Lücke: Einleitung in die Off. des Joh., 1848; Hilgenfeld: Die jud. Apokalypse, 1857; Langen: Das Judenlum in Palästina, 1868; Schürer: Lehrbuch d. N. T. Zeitshr., 1874; [Dean Stanley's History of the Jewish Church, 3d series, lect. xvi.].

3. The Enoch and Noach Writings, combined in the Book of Enoch. This book, cited in Jude
14 sq., much used by the Christian writers of the first five centuries, and then lost to the Greek Church also, with the exception of the remnants preserved in the Chronology of George Syncellus, and a few fragments (56, 42-49) discovered by Mai and Gilmontem, was in 1773 found entirely in the Bible of Ethiopia by Bruce, who brought three manuscripts to Europe. It has since been published in the Ethiopic by Laurence in 1838, and in much improved form by Dillmann in 1851. Laurence also rendered it into English (1821), and Dillmann into German (1853). The literature on this subject is remarkably rich. [See the original art. It is mentioned and utilized in SCHODDE: The Book of Enoch, translated, with Introduction and Notes, Andover, 1882, besides which the following works in English may be consulted, — DRUMMOND: The Jewish Messiah, London, 1877, pp. 17 sq.; BISSELL: The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, N.Y., 1880, pp. 665 sq.; LAURENCE: Book of Enoch the Prophet, translated, with text corrected by his latest notes, with an Introduction by the author of “Evolution of Christianity,” London, 1883; Dean STANLEY: i.e., lect. xlix. The articles in PSEUDOTRIPHENA, PSEUDOPHILON, and in POOLE’S Index, p. 419.]

The book, aside from the introduction (i.-v.), embraces five parts: (1) vi.-xxxvi., narrative of the fall of the angels, and of a tour of Enoch, in company with an angel, through heaven and earth, and the mysteries seen by him; (2) xxxvii.-lxxi., parables concerning the kingdom of God, the Messiah, and the messianic future; (3) lxxii.-lxxxiii., astronomical and physical matter; (4) lxxxiii.-cxi., two dream-visions, giving a symbolic representation of the history of the world to the messianic completion; (5) cxxi.-xxvi., exhortations of Enoch to Methusaleh and his descendants. Then follows an appendix, cxxvi. Enoch’s revelations embrace both Jews and Gentiles, treat extensively of the messianic kingdom and the Messiah, explain the mysteries of the visible and the invisible world, and might be called a system of biblical gnosis, derived from a study of the sacred writings, together with haggadic matter on antediluvian affairs. They are pervaded by a deep moral tone, and in tenor and style the Old Testament is well imitated. In its present shape the book consists of three parts: (1) The groundwork, i.-xxxvi. and lxxii.-cxi.; was written in the days of Hyrcanus (Dillmann, Ewald, Kistlin, Schürer), not of Alexander Janannas (Hilgenfeld), nor in the time of Bar-cocheba (Volkmar), nor in the days of Judas Maccabaeus (Lücke, Langen, and Schodde, [see pp. 41 sqq.]); (2) The parables, xxxvii.-lxxi. (with the exception of the Noachic fragments), the best part in contents and style, treating of the Messiah and his kingdom, angelology and demonology, and dividing themselves into three distinct parables — its opposition to the sinful “kings and rulers,” as well as lvi. 6 sqq., points to the time of Herod as the probable date of writing. (3) The Noachic fragments, liv.-lv. 2, lx., lxv.-lxxix. 25, cxi.-cxi., containing revelations to Noah of uncertain but later date. All these parts were originally written in Palestine, in Hebrew or Aramaic. Nothing in any way shows any Christian influence: it is entirely of and for the Jews. This whole matter is treated in extenso, in Dillmann’s Einleitung to his German translation, [and later by Schodde, in his General and Special Introductions, pp. 1-60].

4. The ‘Apokalypsis Messivi (Assumptio Moisii, or Ascensio Moisii). This writing had hitherto been known only from four disjoined passages in the princi. 6, 21, 17, where mention is made that Judas II. was based upon it, and from the references of other Church Fathers, e.g., Clemens Alexanderinus, Didymus, and others (Fabr. i. 839 sqq.). Lately the first part was found in an old Latin translation in Milan, by Ceriani, and since then issued by several editors, — by Hilgenfeld (Nov. Testament. extra Can. I., 1866, with a translation back into the Greek, in his Ztschrift., 1868, vol. xi., and in Mess. Jud., pp. 485 sqq., and in Clemen. Rom. Epistul., 1876), Volkmar (Mose, Prophetie und Himmelsfahr., Lips., 1867, M. Schmidt and Merz in MERZ: Archiv., 1868, i. 111 sqq.), and Fritzsche (pp. 700 sqq.). It is discussed by Ewald (Gesck. Isr., v. 73 sqq.), Langen (p. 102), and in Reusch (Theol. Lit. Bl., 1871, No. 3), F. Philippi (Das Buch Henoch, pp. 166 sqq.), Wieseler (Jahrb. d. d. Th., 1868, pp. 622 sqq.), A. Geiger (Jud. Ztschrift., 1868, pp. 41 sqq.), Heidenheim (Zeitschrift. f. theol. Forsch., 4, 1880), Colson (in Revue de Théol., 1888, 2 livr.), Rösch (Ztschrift. f. wiss. Theol., 1868, 1869, 1871), Schürer, i.e. pp. 586 sqq.). The book claims, in its hundred and twentieth year, and the twenty-five hundredth of the creation, handed it, together with the Pentateuch, to Josue, and in it professed the course of Israel’s history, to the establishment of the messianic kingdom. The conclusion of the book is wanting. The book clearly speaks of John Hyrcanus, Herod in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, the invasion of Varus (c. 7), and was evidently written soon after this last event (4 A.D.). In the parts preserved, no mention is made of a Messiah; though the author is a member of the party of the Zealots, an enemy of the Ammonites, Herodians, Sadducees, and even of the Pharisees (c. 7). Although originally a Hebrew work, the Latin has been translated from a Greek version.

5. The Fourth Book of Ezra, according to the method of numbering the Ezra books in the Latin Church, originally "Esdra 6 Propheticus" (Hilgenfeld: Mess. Jud., pp. xviii. sqq.). The original Greek text, with the exception of very few small fragments, has been lost; but in its room we have a Latin and four Oriental versions. The Latin text in the Vulgate, a very corrupt one, has been much improved by Volkmar (Handb. der Einleitung. d. Apokr., vol. ii.; Das 4 Buch Ezra, Tubingen, 1883), by Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche, i.e. The large lacuna, which, owing to a loss of a leaf in the Cod. Sangermanensis, had existed between vii. 35 and 36, has been filled by the discovery of an old manuscript in Amiens, by R. Bensly (The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the IV. Book of Ezra, Cambridge, 1875). The Syriac version, together with a Latin translation, has been published by Ceriani, 1866; the Ethiopic, by H. Langen, 1826, from a manuscript in Amiens, with a poor English and Latin translation. In addition to these three versions from the Greek, we have the inaccurate Armenian translation into Latin by Petermann, in Hilgenfeld, pp. 378 sqq., and two somewhat free Arabic versions, one of which, on the basis of a manuscript in the Bodleian
Library, was published in an English translation of S. Ockley, by W. Whiston (Prætiosa Christiana, London, 1711, t. 4), and in Arabic by Ewald (Abh. d. G. G., vol. xi., 1869); and the other was published complete by Gildemeister (Estre, liber iv., Arabice, Bonn, 1877, 4to), in Arabic and Latin. With the aid of the Oriental versions, we can restore the original book, which proves to be the production of a Jew in the last quarter of the first Christian century. The destruction of Jerusalem by the Jews is both the historical background, as also the occasion, of the book, which seeks, from a Jewish stand-point, to explain the cause and bearing of this terrible calamity, as far as Israel is concerned. The speedy dissolution of the Roman supremacy, and the establishment of a messianic sway, is the burden of the visions so vividly and dramatically portrayed. It is written in Hebraizing Greek and in the spirit of Palestinian Judaism. Internal indices point to the existence and influence of Christianity. The famous eagle-vision, in which plumes and wings must be taken, in bring the pair of the Messianic future, is that the Roman emperors, decides the date of the book.

6. The present Jewish Ezra revelation found an entrance into the church, but usually with some modifications. In the editions of the Vulgate it has, beside these, long additions in front and at the close. These in the manuscripts are written as separate Ezra books, one of which, at least (i. sq.), is of Christian origin, to impress the importance of Christianity upon the stubborn Jews; the other, probably a portion of an independent Jewish work. Both are translations from the Greek.

7. The λόγος καὶ ἀπόκαλψις τοῦ ἀγίου προφήτου Ἰσραήλ, published by Tischendorf, in Apocal. apoc. (Lips., 1866), from a Paris manuscript, has little or no merit. On other Ezra literature, cf. LÜCKE, p. 150; TISCHENDORF: Studien u. Kritiken, 1851, Heft. 2.

8. Closely related to the Ezra prophecy is the Apocalypse of Baruch, published in a Latin translation from a Syriac original in the Ambrosiana at Milan, by Ceriani (Monumen. Sacr., i, 2, pp. 73 sq.), 1866, and by Fritzsche (pp. 654–699), and in Syriac, by the former, in 1871. Cf. Ewald: Göt. Gel. d., 1867, pp. 1708 sqq.; The Greek, vii. 83 sqq.; LANGEN: De Apoc. Baruch comment., Frib., 1897, 4to; HILDENFELD: Mess. Jud., pp. ixiii. sq.; FRITZSCH, p. xxx. sq.; SCHÜLER, 542 sqq.; KNEKERS, in Journ. des Savants, 1877, pp. 222 sqq.; KNECKER: Das B. Baruch, Lips., 1878, 190 sqq. It is a revelation to Baruch concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the following captivity, and the second destruction, to which are added visions of the messianic future. It is allied in content and style to 4 Ezra, and called forth by the same historical events, but is a little later. The original language is Greek.

9. The Pseudepigraphon Baruch, mentioned in the Synopsis Psalmi Athanassi, is the same as above, is uncertain. We still, however, possess a Christian Baruch Book, published (in Ethiopic) by Dillmann, in Chrest. Ethiop., pp. 1-15 (Greek), in the Menarum Grecorum, Venet., 1869, and by Ceriani (Mon. Sacr., i. pp. 8 sqq., 1865; translated into English by W. Whiston, 1711, t. 4, and into English by Schodde, in Lutheran Quarterly, Getzburg, Penn., July, 1878), with the title in both Greek and Ethiopic, τα μυστήρια του προφήτου, only that the latter substitutes Baruch for Jeremiah. It, too, treats of the captivity, and shows strong Christian influence.

10. Α΄ η ἔπαφανος is mentioned in Psalm Athanassi and in Nicæphorus, and a Λίτον σταλαντιον και μυστήριον is known for a long time. (Fabr. ii, i. pp. 1086 sqq.). In 1819 Laurence published an Ethiopic text (Ascensio Isaiae), with poor Latin translations. Dillmann published a splendid text in his Apoc. Isaiae, Ethipice et Latine, cum proteg. et annot. (Lips., 1877) [from which Schodde made an English translation in the October number of the Lutheran Quarterly, 1878]; soon after which the Greek Prototypia, ἐπιστολής καὶ μαγίας Ἰσαίαν was discovered in Paris by Gebhardt, and printed in HILDENFELD: Zuschriften, xxii., 380 sqq. It is virtually an extract from the Ethiopic. The book is composed of Jewish and Christian documents, combined by a Christian hand, not later than the second half of the second century.

11. An Apocalypse, or Prophecy of Zephaniah, in imitation of the Ascensio Isaiae, is not only mentioned in the four catalogues of Apocrypha, but a fragment is also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Deo, 5, 11, § 76.

12. An Apocryphon of Jeremiah, in Hebrew, used by the Nazarenes, is mentioned by Jerome (Fabr. ii, i. 1102 sqq.) as the source of the quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9; but this is improbable. Concerning the Apocalypses of (14) Habakkuk, (15) Ezekiel, (16) Daniel, and (17) Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, we have no further information.

13. An Apocryphon of Moses, distinct from the Book of Jubilees (cf. No. 31) and the Assumptio Mosis, is mentioned in the Catalogue of Apocrypha, but a fragment is also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Deo, 5, 11, § 76.

14. An Apocalypse of Moses, distinct from the Book of Jubilees (cf. No. 31) and the Assumptio Mosis, is mentioned in the Catalogue of Apocrypha, but a fragment is also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Deo, 5, 11, § 76.

15. A Lachme Book is mentioned in the Catalogue of Apocrypha, and—


(b) Testaments.

21. A διαδραματικός καὶ πρωτοκλατόριος, according to Fabr. ii. 83, contained the mention that Adam was taken into Paradise when forty days old. It is probably a portion of the Vita Adami (No. 35).

22. Αἱ διαδραματικοὶ τῶν δώδεκα Πατριαρχῶν (Testamenta XII., Patriarchorum), mentioned first by Tertullian and Origen. The original Greek text has often been issued; cf. in The Presbyterian Review, January, 1880.) The book is a Jewish-Christian work, in the garb of addresses made by the twelve sons of Jacob at their death, of a practical and ethical character, in the spirit of the Epistle of James. The work was probably written about the close of the first century.

23. An Apocryphon, τῶν τρεῖς Πατριαρχῶν, is mentioned in the Const. Apor., vi. 16; and (24) an
Apocryphal Testament of Jacob, in the Decretum Gulianii (Fabr.2, i. 457, 799).
25. A novel, based on Gen. xli. 45, is frequently mentioned, and is also counted among those read (napp'Ephoros) by Origen and others. (Cf. Fabr.2, i. 765, 768.) It seems to have been strongly cabalistic.
26. A δωτρευμένος is found in the four catalogues and in the Catena of Nicephorus, i. col. 175.
28. The Testament of Adam and Noah are portions of the Vita Adami. Cf. No. 35.
(a) Other Books of and concerning the Prophets.
29. In the acts of the Nicene synod (Fabr.2, i. 848) mention is made of a Μητροθείον μαντείου Μωυσείου. What book is meant is uncertain. The later Jews had a work (Petirat Mosche) on the death of Moses.
30. Liber Eldad et Medad is mentioned in Pastor Hermæ, i. vis. 2, 3; and later authorities mention it as an apocryphon of the Old Testament.
31. The Book of the Jubilees, or the Little Genesis (הגדת שמות, חֶבְשָׁנָת), the treatise De primitiva ecclesia et synodo Nicaena, of which the Greek and Latin fragments are found in Fabr.2, i. 849 sqq., ii. 120 sq. An Ethiopic translation was recently found, and translated by Dillmann (in Ewald's Jahrb. der beth. Wis., ii. 250 sqq., iii. 1 sqq.), who also published the Ethiopic text, Liber Jubilarum Ethiopicise, Kil., 1859. Ceriani later discovered and published fragments of an old Latin translation (Mon. Sacra., i. 1, pp. 15 sq.). Rönch treats the book extensively in Das Buch der Jubiläen, Leipzig, 1874. A translation back into Hebrew was attempted by Rabin, Vienna, 1870. The Book of Jubilees is a little larger than Genesis, and is a kind of a commentary on it, treating the minutiae, הָעַמְדוּת. It receives its name from its chronology, which is divided according to jubilee years. The author is strictly Jewish and narrow. He makes use of Enoch, does not yet know of the destruction of Jerusalem, and is used by the Textus. Patr. The book is thus a production of the first century, and probably early in it. The original language was Hebrew or Aramaic.
32. Jamnæus and Mambros treat of the contest between Moses and the Egyptian sorcerers (Exod. vii. 11). Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 3. The story of these two sorcerers is already very old, and was early used. Cf. Hebræ: Palest. Expl. Fund., October, 1881, pp. 311 sqq.
33. Manasseh's conversion (2 Chron. xxix. 11) early gave rise to an Apocryphon of M., used both by Christian writers and by the Targum to Chronicles (Judas., i. 9, 10) in a subsequent stage. The Greek text is found in Fabr.2, i. 775 sqq., and some Greek fragments, ii. 85 sqq. It is Christian in character.
34. A novel, based on Gen. xli. 45, we have in Aœnath, formerly much read. The Latin text is found in Fabr.2, i. 775 sqq., and some Greek fragments, ii. 85 sqq. It is Christian in character.
35. Books pretending to give the life and deeds of the other Fathers existed in abundance among the Jews and early Christians. For their titles, etc., compare the original of this article.

The most important one is the Vita Adami, translated from the Ethiopic by Dillmann, in Ewald's Jahrbuch, v. 1853, and, with the assistance of the Arabic, by Tarnpe, in Acad. der Wiss., Berlin, 1880, and English, by Malan: The Book of Adam and Eve, London, 1882. There is also a Latin Vita Adam et Eva, edited by W. Meyer, München, 1879.
36. A Gnostic writing called Noria, after the wife of Noah, is mentioned by Ephiphanus (Her., 20 and 87), and an Ebonitic book, ἀνάμμελητα ινασίς, written by G. de Bov (Gen. xxviii.), by the same (Fabr., i. 437). On the Jewish Midrashim cf. Zunz: Gottesd. Vort. der Juden, pp. 126 sqq., and Jellinek: Betata-midrash, i–vi.
IV.—Later, this class of literature was used for worldly and evil purposes, and stood in the service of quackery, witchcraft, and sorcery. The name of Solomon was, above all others, connected with this kind of works; sometimes, also, that of Joseph, Abraham, and other fathers in Israel.

A. DILLMANN.

PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS is the common designation of a large collection of spurious letters ascribed to the popes of the first three centuries, which was brought into circulation in the ninth century, generally in connection with the so-called Spanish collection of canons and decretales, though sometimes also alone. It opens with a preface, also spurious, by Isidorus Mercator; and thence it came to pass, that, already in the ninth century, it was considered to be the work of Isidore of Seville. Down to the fifteenth century no doubt ever arose as to its genuine-ness; but later on the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries, the Reformed preacher Blondel, the brothers Ballerini, and others, proved beyond question, that it is spurious. Very different opinions prevail, however, with respect to the place, date, author, and chief purpose of the fraud. The oldest, and for centuries the only, printed edition of the collection was that by Merlin, in his Coll. Concil., vol. i. (Paris, 1558, and often afterwards); but it was poor and unreliable. In 1853 a new edition by Denzinger, in Würzburg, appeared in Migne (Patrolog. Latin., vol. 130); but it was in reality only a reprint of Merlin. An excellent edition, based on a comprehensive critical research of the existing manuscripts, was published by Hinschius, Leipzig, 1863.

The arrangement of the contents of the complete collection is as follows: first the preface; then a letter from Aurelius to Damasus, and the answer of the latter, both spurious; the Ordo de celebrando concilio, borrowed from the fourth Council of Toledo; a list of councils; two spurious letters from Jerome to Damasus and from Damasus to Jerome, after which the collection proper begins. It consists of three parts: the first part contains the fifty apostolical canons, fifty-nine spurious letters chronologically arranged, and ascribed to the popes between Clement I. and Melchiades, the treatise De primitiva ecclesia et synodo Nicaena, and the spurious Donato Constantini.

The second opens with a quotation from the genuine Spanish collection, and another from the collection of Faustus Queenell, and contains the Greek, African, and Spanish councils, generally agreeing with the Hispana.
and then gives the papal decretals from Sylvester to Gregory IV. (d. 731), or at thirty-five years of age even to the Bishop of Rome, he tries to exclude all secular courts as incompetent in episcopal cases. Alexander (Ep. 1, c. 5-8), who tried to exclude all secular courts as incompetent in episcopal cases, concludes: 'Si unusquisque episcopus sit in judgment upon a bishop, without the consent of the metropolitans and the provincial synods, he is not to be regarded as a competent accuser; and, in any way he seemed to be munitus, offensus, irritus, suspectus, etc. Furthermore: the accuser should be accompanied by seventy-two witnesses, each of whom should be qualified to be an accuser himself; and, finally, the bishop had the right to break off the proceedings at any stage of their development, and appeal directly to the Pope; that is, it was next to impossible to have a criminal bishop punished, unless the Pope himself consented and interfered.

The principal sources from which Pseudo-Isidore drew his materials were the works of Cassiodorus and Rufinus, the Liber pontificalis and the Vulgate, the writings of the Fathers, and the theological literature generally down to the ninth century, the correspondence of Archbishop Boniface shows that the archives of Mayence were at the disposal of the compiler; and the indication is strongly corroborated by the circumstance that the language swarms with Gallicisms; the style, with phrases and expressions from the juridical terminology of the Frankish Empire; and the contents, with references to the actual state of the Frankish Church at that time. At all events, those who have fixed the birthplace of the collection at Rome—Febronius, Theiner, Eichhorn, and others—have not succeeded in adducing equally strong reasons for their supposition. The frequent use made of the correspondence of Boniface proves that the manuscripts of Mayence were at the disposal of the compiler; and Mayence was, down to very recent times, generally considered as the place of fabrication. This seems true, however, only so far as regards the older and minor collection; while the later and larger series have been made at Rheims. Only of the former are the oldest manuscripts (those of St. Gall and Cologne) of German origin; while of the latter, not only the oldest, but also by far the most numerous, manuscripts are French. In Germany the collection did not come into general use until the eleventh century. With respect to the time of the authorship, the period within which it must have taken place is determined by the two facts that Pseudo-Isidore used the canons of the Council of Tours (567), while his own collection was used by the synod of Chieray (857). Since the researches of the Ballerinii and Bongardus (Pseudo-Isidore, et Turrium caput), the collection was made in the fourth or fifth decade of the ninth century. But attempts have been made to arrive at a closer determination of the
There is, indeed, a direct connection between the false decretals and the ecclesiastical conflicts arising out of the civil wars between Lewis the Pious and his sons; and it is more than probable that the decretals were manufactured by the party of Lothair — more especially by Autgar of Mayence, and Ebbo of Rheims — in order to prevent the metropolitans and the provincial synods of the party of Lewis from inflicting any punishment on the bishops of the defeated party. Autgar was an outspoken adherent of Lothair, and Ebbo was his intimate friend. Now many tracks lead from the false decretals to Mayence. One has already been mentioned, here is another: the decretals speak much of 

primates and vicarii pontifici, who should form an intermediate link between the Pope and the metropolitan archbishops, and under whose authority all causa majores and episcoporum negotia should be settled. Boniface had held such a position as Archbishop of Mayence. It was one of the greatest desires of the party of Lothair — more especially by Autgar to have this authority restored to his see. The decretals also contain references to the deposition of Ebbo by the synod of Didenhofen (885), his restoration (840), and his transference to Halberstadt (814). Now, since Ebbo on those occasions made no appeal to the decretals, it is fair to infer that they did not yet exist; but there is a trace of them at the synod of Soissons (857), in the so-called narratio, by the clergy ordained by Ebbo.

The history of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals presents the curious phenomenon, that, instead of achieving the purpose for which they were originally made, they finally came to serve the almost opposite interest. They were intended to protect the bishops against the metropolitan archbishops; but they became the means by which the Pope crushed not only the metropolitan archbishops, but also the bishops. The Frankish clergy saw the danger, and made from time to time considerable opposition. The first pope who directly appealed to them was Nicholas I. In a brief of 863, addressed to Hincmar as the proper authority, without making any reference to them: but shortly after he must have become acquainted with them, for his decision on the dispute with Rothad; for, in the controversy between the latter and Hincmar, he makes copious use of them. Hincmar protested; but, from many of his utterances, it is apparent that he considered them spurious, though he did not hesitate to use them himself when they answered his purpose. See Weizäcker: Hincmar und Pseudo-Isidor, in Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie, 1856, p. 327. Indeed, it was the demoralization of the bishops, their religious indifferentism, and their political ambition, which finally made the Pseudo-Isidorian fraud triumph, and delivered up the church, with all her revenues of war, self-defence, into the hands of the Pope. From the end of the ninth century numerous extracts were made from the false decretals, the most remarkable of which was the so-called Capitula Remedi Curiensis. Nothing, however, contributed more to spread them about, and secure their incorporation with the great systematical collections of canons made at that time; as, for instance, with the Collectio Anselmi dedicata, the decree of Burghard, the two works of Ivo, the collection of Anselm of Luessa, the Collectio trium partium, etc.; and, as those collections were the sources from which Gratian drew his materials, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals thus became part and parcel of the Corpus juris canonicus.

Down to the fifteenth century the genuineness of the decretals was, as above mentioned, never in question; open and candid disapprobation and denial of its authenticity were, however, contributed more to spread them about, and secure their incorporation with the great systematical collections of canons made at that time; as, for instance, with the Collectio Anselmi dedicata, the decree of Burghard, the two works of Ivo, the collection of Anselm of Luessa, the Collectio trium partium, etc.; and, as those collections were the sources from which Gratian drew his materials, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals thus became part and parcel of the Corpus juris canonicus.
deeds. — (5) Ptolemy V., Epiphanes ("illustrious"), B.C. 205-181; alluded to in Dan. xi. 13-17; reigned when only five years old. During his minority Antiochus the Great conquered Cæsarea, Phœnicia, and Judea, out of which the Jews who were loyal fled to Egypt. The Romans compelled him to surrender these provinces. Antiochus apparently did this when he married his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy V. (B.C. 193), although they really remained under his authority. He was, however, foiled in his further designs by Cleopatra's unexpected advocacy of her husband's interests. Ptolemy was poisoned as he was on the eve of an attempt to recover the provinces from Seleucus, Antiochus' successor. (6) Ptolemy VI., Philometer ("mother-loving"), B.C. 181-146; alluded to in Dan. xi. 25-30. So long as his mother lived (i.e., until 173), peace was preserved with Syria; but three years later Egypt had been overrun by Antiochus Epiphanes, and Ptolemy taken prisoner. The Romans again interfered, and compelled Antiochus to leave the country (168). Ptolemy then turned his attention to his brother, Euergetes II., whose sedition efforts he suppressed, and to Syrian intrigues, by which he accomplished the ruin of Alexander Balaes (see art.). It was under Ptolemy that the Jewish temple at Leontopolis was built. He marks the transition of the kingdom of Egypt into a Roman province. Cf. art. Ptolemaeus, in Smith's Dictionary of Biography and Dictionary of the Bible.

**GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE PTOLEMIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ptolemy I., Soter</th>
<th>Arsinoe = Ptolemy II., Philadelphia = Arsinoe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy III., Euergetes I.</td>
<td>Berenice = Antiochus II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IV., Philopator</td>
<td>Aralnoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy V., Epiphanes = Cleopatra (d. of Antiochus M.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VI., Philometor = Cleopatra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy VII., Cleopatra</td>
<td>Cleopatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra.</td>
<td>Ptolemy VIII., Cleopatra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Balaes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demetrius II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICAN, an under collector of the Roman tribute (Matt. xviii. 17). It was an office which no patriotic Jew could hold, because it implied in the most offensive way the recognition of Roman supremacy. Publicans, being thus despised, generally revenged their insults by exorbitant demands under color of law. It is remarkable, that, out of this despicable class, our Lord chose one of his apostles (Levi, or Matthew), who became a brilliant figure (Luke x. 20) and of his chief converts, Zacchæus of Jericho (Luke xix. 2). Our Lord's association with publicans was one of the commonest taunts he received (Luke vii. 34). The system of farming the revenue then practised led directly and naturally to fraud and cruelty, from which the Jews were free. — **PUBLICANI** (a corruption of *Pauliciani*) was the name given by the French and English crusaders of the middle of the twelfth century to the Cathari of the West, because, like the Paulicians of the East, they were dualists. Several French writers of that time call the Paulicians simply *Popicans*.

**PUFENDORF, Samuel**, b. at Chemnitz in Saxony, 1632; d. at Berlin, 1694; lectured on jurisprudence at Heidelberg and Lund in Sweden, and finally settled at Berlin, as historiographer to the elector of Brandenburg. His principal work is De natura et jure naturae et gentium (Lund, 1684; Amsterdam, 1715, etc.), translated into German, English, and French. Though essentially only an elaboration and systematization of the ideas of Grotius, it forms the foundation of the modern conception of the doctrine of natural and international rights. Previously that doctrine had been based on the Decalogue, and developed in accordance with the idea of the justice of God. Grotius was the first who completely severed it from theology, based it on the instinct of sociability inherent in human nature, and derived it directly from human reason. In the systematic exposition which it received from Pufendorf, it attracted great attention, but also met with great opposition: indeed, Buddeus and Wolff were the first who fully recognized it. Among Pufendorf's other works, his *De habitu religionis Christianae ad viunm civilem* (Bremen, 1687) has also theological interest as a defence of the collegial system. After his death appeared his *Jus faciale divinum*, a demonstration of the impossibility of bringing about a union between the Lutheran and Reformed creed, as long as the latter retains the doctrine of predestination. — **PUL.** See Tiglath-Pileser.

**PULCHERIA**, a daughter of Arcadius, and older sister of Theodosius II.; was in 414, though only sixteen years old, intrusted by the Senate with the title of Augusta and the guardianship of her weak-minded brother. For ten years she governed the empire with great authority, though in a narrow, monastic spirit: she actually transformed the palace into a monastery. She then married her brother to Eudoxia-Athenais, a daughter of an Athenian philosopher; but bitter jealousy soon sprang up between the two sisters-in-law. In the Nestorian controversy Eudoxia sided with Nestorius, while Pulcheria took the part of Cyril of Alexandria. Pulcheria was banished from the court; and, by the support of Eudoxia, Eutyches and Dioscorus triumphed at the synod of Ephesus. Pulcheria, however, returned before her brother's death, and regained her influence. Eudoxia was banished to Jerusalem; and orthodoxy was restored by the Council of Chalcedon, at whose sixth session (Oct. 25, 451) Pulcheria herself was present. After her return she married the general Marcianus, but died shortly after, Sept. 11, 453. She is revered by the Greek Church as a saint. — See Act. Synct., Sept. 3, and Gregorovius: *Athena*, Leipzig, 1861, p. 451.

**PULLEYN, Robert,** an English scholastic and Roman cardinal; b. in England towards the close of the eleventh century, but the exact date and place are unknown; d. in Rome between 1147 and 1154. He studied in Paris, where the dialectical treatment of place was current. He stood in its first bloom (William of Champeaux, Abelard, Gilbert de la Porre). In 1130 he returned to England, was made archdeacon of Rch-
PULPIT. 1970

PUNISHMENT.  

PULPIT. (From the Latin pulpitum), the foremost point of the Roman stage, where the actor stood while reciting his part, denotes, in the Christian Church, an enclosed desk from which the sermon is delivered. In the oldest times the deacon preached from the ambo, and the bishop from his throne. Later on, however, movable pulpits, of which a specimen has been preserved at Hereford, were among his pupils. An attempt of his bishop to compel him to return to England, by withholding the revenues of his benefice, brought him to Rome, where he was received with great honor, made a cardinal, and chancellor of the apostolic see. Many of his writings are still unprinted, as a Commentary on the Revelation, a Commentary on the Psalms, a treatise De contemtu mundi, etc.; but his principal work, Sententiarum Libri VIII., was edited by Hugo Mathoud of St. Maur, Paris, 1555, and reprinted in Migne, Patrol. Lat., vol. 188. It combines the dialectics of Abelard with the dogmatism of Bernard. It originated under the influence of Abelard's Sic et non, and it became the principal source from which the Lombard drew his Sentences. The dialectical method is employed solely for the purpose of demonstrating and proving the traditional faith of the church; and, in cases in which occurring contradictions cannot be logically solved, all doubt is crushed by the authority of the Bible and the Fathers. See Hau-réau: Histoire de la philosophie scolastique, Paris, 1872, vol. i.

WAGENMANN.

PUNISHMENT. Among the Hebrews, as well as among other nations, originally and naturally based on the principle of retaliation. This is clearly expressed on several occasions, as Exod. xxi. 29 sq. and Lev. xii. 29 sq. In the native country, probably on account of the internal disturbances which broke out after the death of Henry I. He settled in Paris, and taught theology with great success. Bernard of Clairveaux recommended him on account of his orthodoxy. John of Salisbury and William of St. Thierry were among his pupils. An attempt of his bishop to compel him to return to England, by withholding the revenues of his benefice, brought him to Rome, where he was received with great honor, made a cardinal, and chancellor of the apostolic see. Many of his writings are still unprinted, as a Commentary on the Revelation, a Commentary on the Psalms, a treatise De contemtu mundi, etc.; but his principal work, Sententiarum Libri VIII., was edited by Hugo Mathoud of St. Maur, Paris, 1555, and reprinted in Migne, Patrol. Lat., vol. 188. It combines the dialectics of Abelard with the dogmatism of Bernard. It originated under the influence of Abelard's Sic et non, and it became the principal source from which the Lombard drew his Sentences. The dialectical method is employed solely for the purpose of demonstrating and proving the traditional faith of the church; and, in cases in which occurring contradictions cannot be logically solved, all doubt is crushed by the authority of the Bible and the Fathers. See Hau-réau: Histoire de la philosophie scolastique, Paris, 1872, vol. i.
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(1 Kings ii. 29), in case of murder by the nearest relatives as the avengers of blood (Num. xxxv. 19, 21, 27; Deut. xix. 12).

Capital punishment could only be inflicted after a careful trial, and at the mouth of two or three witnesses (Deut. xix. 15). The killing of capital punishment could be made more ignominious by hanging up the bodies against the sun, — which, however, was not to last over night (Num. xxxv. 4; Deut. xxi. 22 sq.; Josh. x. 26; 2 Sam. xxi. 6, 9), — or by mutilating (2 Sam. iv. 12), or by burning the same (Lev. xx. 14, xxii. 9; Josh. vii. 15, 25), or by heaping up stones over the body (Josh. vii. 25 sq., viii. 29). Comp. J. H. Otto: Lexicon rabbinico-philologicum, Geneva, 1675, pp. 618 sq.; Roskoff, in Schenkel’s Bibellexicon, v. 420 sq.; Saalschütz: Monarchie Recht (1858), pp. 448 sq.

PUNISHMENT, Future. Belief in a future state of retribution implies belief in the personality of God, a moral government, the ill-desert of sin, and the continuation of life beyond the grave. There may be great differences of view in regard to each of these points; but, where any one of them is denied, the doctrine of a future retribution is not likely to be entertained. The fact of future retribution cannot reasonably be denied by any except those who hold a pantheistic or a materialistic theory of the universe. Differences of opinion upon this subject among those who profess to believe in God, and particularly to believe in Christianity, have pertained to the mode and duration of future retribution, and not to the fact. Natural religion, as has been suggested, will suffice to create the expectation and belief in a retribution of some kind in the next life; but, for any definite belief, we are, of course, dependent upon revelation. The authority of the Bible is therefore the postulate of the Christian dogma of retribution. There has not been an absolute agreement among the students of Scripture in regard to what its teaching is. What the differences are, and what we regard as the true view, can be best exhibited, perhaps, if we deal with the subject by considering, (1) its history, (2) the church doctrine, (3) the departures from the church doctrine.

I. HISTORY. — So widespread has been the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments, that Warburton founded his great apologetic, The Divine Legation of Moses, on the absence of any appeal in the Mosaic legislation to the sanctions of reward and punishment in the next life. The absence of such appeals has been taken by some to imply ignorance, on the part of the Jews, of a future state. This is a great mistake, for the doctrine of future retribution is unmistakably present in the Old Testament. Before Christ and in the time of the Maccabees, belief in eternal punishment was entertained. At the time of our Lord, belief in everlasting punishment was held (perhaps not universally) by the Pharisees, as we know from Josephus. Philo, however, of the same period, is cited as an annihilationist. The Fathers of the first six centuries believed, for the most part, in the eternity of hell-torment. The early Fathers universally held this belief; though Justin Martyr and Irenæus have been claimed, but on insufficient grounds, as annihilationists. Clement and Origen were restorationists. So were Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen, together with Theodore of Mopsuestia. Augustine defended the generally received doctrine of endless punishment. This Father held, however, that Christians not perfect at death undergo purification in the intermediate state. In this way he contributed to the development of the idea, and which Gregory the Great was the first to make an article of faith. The scholastics held that all heretics, infidels, and those who die in mortal sin, go immediately to hell; that those who die in the peace of the church, but imperfect, experience the purifying pains of purgatory; and, finally, that the souls of all unbaptized infants go to the limbus infantum, a place distinct from the limbus patrum, which was the abode of the Old-Testament saints.

Protestants and Roman Catholics agree respecting the doctrine of hell. The points of difference between them, so far as eschatology is concerned, grow out of an attempt to answer the question, What was subsequently known as the doctrine of purgatory, — a doctrine which Cyprian (according to Neander) first promulgated as to its germinal idea, and which Gregory the Great was the first to make an article of faith. The scholastics held that all heretics, infidels, and those who die in mortal sin, go immediately to hell; that those who die in the peace of the church, but imperfect, experience the purifying pains of purgatory; and, finally, that the souls of all unbaptized infants go to the limbus infantum, a place distinct from the limbus patrum, which was the abode of the Old-Testament saints.

Reformers denied the doctrine of purgatory, and affirmed that all men at death go either to heaven or hell. They differed respecting the salvation of infants. The Anglesburg Confession makes baptism essential to salvation. This Calvinists denied. They held to the guilt of original sin, to the ill-desert of infants, to the doctrine that the area of the saved is defined by that of sovereign election, and that regeneration is not conditioned by ordinances. Elect infants dying in infancy were saved, whether they were baptized or not. Calvinistic theologians did not say that there were no non-elect infants who died in infancy: indeed, they commonly believed that there were. Whether this common belief shall govern the construction of the Westminster Confession, or whether the cautious words in which the subject of elect infants is expressed shall lead us to believe that the Assembly declined to say dogmatically that there were non-elect infants, is a question that cannot be discussed here. See INFANT SALVATION.

Those who now subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith do not believe that any infants dying in infancy are lost. Some dislike the phraseology employed regarding the subject; while others see in it no necessary implications regarding non-elect infants. The Confession says that the saved are the elect. It tells how the elect are saved. Those elect who are capable of being outwardly called are required to repent, and exercise faith. Elect infants dying in infancy, and other elect persons incapable of being outwardly called, are regarded as the sovereign exercise of the power of the Holy Ghost, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth. The antithesis is not between elect and non-elect infants, but between elect persons who can, and who can not, exercise faith. Infants dying in infancy fall into the latter category. That all such infants
were elect, the writers of the Confession did not know, whatever they might hope and believe; but neither did they say that some such infants were non-elect.

It is not strange that a doctrine which puts such a strain upon our sympathies as that of everlasting punishment should meet with opposition. In modern, as in ancient times, therefore, we find representative men who are at variance with the orthodox belief. Locke taught the doctrine of conditional immortality, which has been favored by Watts, Whately, and Isaac Taylor. Rothe also held this view, though restorationism is more in favor with the German theologians who diverge from confessional orthodoxy. Nietzsche and Müller show their strong leanings toward restorationism by affirming the possibility of eternal damnation as the result of persistent obduracy in the future state. Tillotson hoped for an ultimate restoration of all men, and John Fosten confidently believed in it. Organized opposition to the doctrine of eternal punishment, at the beginning of this century, consisted, for the most part (in this country), of a denial of all post mortem punishment for sin. This extreme type of Universalism (that of Ballou), however, has few representatives at the present day. It has succumbed to the merciless criticism to which it was subjected. But it is to be feared that belief in restorationism and annihilationism is increasing within orthodox communions. This is evident in the increase of the literature advocating one or the other view, and in the fact that either view is being freely tolerated in some denominations. That subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles does not bind Anglicans to hold the doctrine of eternal punishment was decided by the Privy Council (1863-64), in the case of Fendall vs. Wilson.

A less serious departure from the Protestant position regarding retribution is found in the disposition of some leading divines, like Dorner and Martensen, to hold that the period between death and the resurrection may be a probationary period for those who did not embrace the gospel in this life or thenext, from those who believe in Christ; (3) that the punishment of hell is everlasting.

The punishments of hell are set forth in Scripture under the strong imagery of fire and brimstone. It is not necessary to interpret these passages literally, yet care must be taken not to empty them of their terrible meaning. Whatever the nature of hell-torture may be, it is something so terrible that only the strong language of the Saviour's description will represent it. The punishments of hell must not be regarded as merely the natural consequences of wrong-doing; though these are serious enough, and they constitute a strong argument in support of the doctrine of eternal punishment. We see the natural segregations of men in this world according to character, the hardening effect of sin, and the suffering that always associates itself with persistent wrong-doing. It is therefore fair to suppose that the sinner's separation from God and the suffering consequent therefrom will be eternal.

These considerations, together with the view of some, that sin is an infinite evil and demands a punishment of infinite duration, and the view of others, that eternal suffering is the result of eternal sinning, constitute what may be called the rational argument for eternal retribution. The great reason why some who believe the doctrine, however, is the fact that it is taught with such terrible plainness in Scripture.

II. CHURCH DOCTRINE. — There is a general agreement among the confessions of Christendom, that after the judgment all men go either to heaven or hell, and that the punishments of hell are endless. Confessional differences concern the condition of the dead during the period between death and the resurrection. Roman Catholics teach that the atonement of Christ only delivers men from eternal punishment, and that temporal punishments, especially the pains of purgatory in the next world, remain to be endured as satisfaction for sin. Protestants reject the doctrine of purgatory, because it is not taught in Scripture. It is true that nothing that defileth can enter heaven: it is also true that men are not perfectly sanctified in this life. But this, though it is the ground of the inference, does not justify the inference, that there must be a period of purgation in this life or thenext life. The doctrine of purgatory is rejected also, because it rests upon the false assumption that Christ has not made a complete satisfaction for sin. It contradicts, moreover, the distinct statement of Scripture, that there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.

Some Protestants teach what is known as the doctrine of the intermediate state. This is a harmless doctrine, however, and consists mainly in the emphasis given to what all Christians believe; namely, that the state of the blessed dead, though one of complete happiness during the period after death, is yet inferior to that upon which they are to enter after the resurrection. The advocates of this view will not say that the righteous go to heaven when they die: they go to paradise. The Westminster divines rejected purgatory, and refused to assign a locality and a name to the intermediate state. The Protestant doctrine is, (1) that there is no probation after death; (2) that no personal satisfaction for sins is demanded, either in this life or the next, from those who believe in Christ; (3) that the punishment of hell is everlasting.

The great reason for believing the doctrine, however, is the fact that it is taught with such terrible plainness in Scripture.

III. DEPARTURES FROM CHURCH DOCTRINE. — Those who deny the orthodox doctrine as to the eternity of hell-torture agree in the use of the following general arguments:

1. Eternal punishment is said to be unjust. To this it is answered, that the justice of God can only mean conformity to the nature of God, and this can be determined by an exegetical study of what the Scriptures teach. Objections on the score of justice must affirm, (a) that men deserve lenient treatment because of their disadvantages, which would be an argument against any if against eternal punishment; or (b) that sins do not deserve eternal punishment, which is assuming that we can measure the turpitude of sin.

2. Eternal punishment is said to conflict with God's infinite goodness. To which we reply: God may be infinitely benevolent, yet discriminating in the exercise of his benevolence; and the area of benevolence must always be limited by the demands of justice.

3. Eternal punishment is said to conflict with God's design in governing the world. We deny
that the end of God's government is the promotion of happiness; but, if we were, we do not know that in such a world the conditions necessary to the promotion of the greatest happiness do not make the eternal misery of some antecedently possible.

(4) Eternal punishment is said to militate against the end of punishment. But this is based on the belief that all punishment is intended to be reformatory, whereas every true philosophy of punishment must recognize the deterrent, and especially the vindicator element, as well as the reformatory element, in the infliction of penal suffering.

(6) And it is finally said that the eternal dualism of good and evil which the orthodox doctrine implies is contrary to the use of the universal terms of Scripture respecting the putting away of evil, the reconciliation of all things in Christ, the subjugation of everything in heaven and earth, and under the earth, to him. But again, it is urged in reply, that the general must be defined by the specific, the vague by the more distinct, and that while these passages might have the meaning put upon them by those who deny the orthodox doctrine, if they stood alone, they cannot bear it when interpreted in the light of the specific statements regarding the fate of the wicked.

The specific arguments against the orthodox doctrine differ according to the different forms which the divergence from the symbolic statement of the doctrine has assumed.

1. Universalism Proper. — The old form of Universalism in this country (that of Ballou) taught that there is no punishment in the next life. The general principle contended for was, that this life is not one of probation, but of retribution; and that sin receives its full punishment in this world. The proof of this was supposed to rest upon the following grounds: (a) the rational character of this view, (b) the absence of all reference to future punishment in the Mosaic code, and (c) the claim that the passages supposed to teach future punishment do not have this meaning. This form of Universalism was proved, (1) to be immoral in its tendency (this has been admitted by leading Universalists; see Brooke's New Departure); (2) to be inconsistent with the specific infliction of the death-penalty in the Old Testament; and (3) to be contrary to the unmistakable teaching of three classes of passages: to wit, (a) those which speak of a place of punishment, (b) those which mark an antithesis between the present life and the life to come in respect to punishment, and (c) those which associate punishment with the final judgment.

2. Restorationism. — It is affirmed by some that the punishment of the impenitent is limited, and that eventually all will be saved. In addition to the rational arguments already referred to, reliance is also placed upon certain considerations based on the promulgation of the gospel to all men. These considerations may be grouped under the following heads:

(1) It is said that there are promises teaching directly or by implication the ultimate salvation of all men. These embrace the following points: (a) that the statement that God will reconcile all things to himself, (c) the prophecy regarding the universal reign of Christ, (d) the apokatastasis, (e) the casting of death and Hades "into the lake of fire."

In no one of these passages, however, is there any warrant for the belief that all men, in the sense of "every man," will be saved, or any thing to contradict the plain teaching of Matt. xxv.

(2) It is said that the passages relied upon to prove eternal punishment do not teach it. Thus it is said that the word αἰώνιος ("a-praying") points in the direction of ultimate restoration, and that αἰών means "age-long," if it is not better to regard it as having a non-temporal significance, and as indicative of the quality of the punishment, αἰώνian punishment. But whatever these words, when put together, may be made to mean under the stress of a theory, the plain meaning which they carry upon their face is that which the church has always put upon them. This is what Meyer, not to mention other exegetes, thinks they teach, and what harmonizes with the strong passage in the Apocalypse (xx. 10), σωτηρίαν και τιμήν τῆς αἰωνίας.

(3) The third mode of defending restorationism consists in the endeavor to reconcile the passages that teach eternal punishment with those that are alleged to teach universal restoration. This assumes several forms; one of the principal being the allegation that the doctrine of eternal punishment is only regulative, and that God has not made plain his purpose to save all men ultimately, because he wishes men to feel the legitimate influence of the doctrine of eternal punishment. This raises the question, which it ought not to be hard to answer, whether a belief can be regulatively true, but really false. But, if this be the true view of the matter, it is certainly presumptuous to undertake to deliver men from the influence of this salutary belief, by holding out the hope of an unrevealed salvation.

Aside, however, from the special exegetical difficulties of restorationism, it is contrary to the whole analogy of faith, if it be taught on any other basis than that the offers of salvation conditioned only by faith and repentance are made to those who have not embraced the gospel in this life. The objections to the doctrine of a second probation rest upon other grounds. But every doctrine of restorationism which teaches that believers must suffer for sin in the next life, before being admitted to heaven, or that any punishment of finite duration will pay the penalty of sin, is irreconcilably opposed to the teaching of Scripture regarding the satisfaction of Christ, the exemption of all believers from the condemnation of the law, and the necessity of an atonement.

3. Annihilationism, or, as some prefer to call it, Conditional Immortality. — It is said by yet another class that eternal life is the lot of Christians only, and that eternal punishment means a punishment consisting of, or at least ending in, extinction of being. Some have held that there is no suffering after death, but this view is too glaringly in conflict with Scripture to find many supporters.

More plausible is Constable's position, which was substantially Rohde's, that the wicked suffer after death, but that the sufferings finally wear out the suffering, and extinction of being is the result. The arguments in support of it are:
(1) Rational. It is said (a) that this view accounts for the statement, "narrow is the gate that leadeth unto life," and that there is no difficulty in believing that only a few are saved, if the wicked are blotted out; (b) that it harmonizes with the analogy of God's providence generally; (c) that it removes the difficulty presented by the idea of universal predestination; (d) that it harmonizes with the idea that God's glory in the salvation of an elect people is the end of his moral government among men, without necessitating the conception of a suffering and surviving race of reprobates.

(2) Scriptural. It is said that life and death in Scripture stand respectively for existence and non-existence under conscious conditions. But this is not death. Life is used, and so is death, in many cases where the ideas of conscious and unconscious existence are not involved. It is said that the word "destroy" and its cognates imply the idea of termination, of actual non-existence. It is also said that Paul hoped for the resurrection of the dead, and that this implies that resurrection was a boon that only a limited number would enjoy. To these arguments it is common to oppose the instinctive impulse to believe in immortality, and the indubitable teaching of the New Testament, that the wicked, sharing the fate of the fallen angels, suffer pain, being tormented, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων.

It must be admitted that the most plausible form of opposition to the orthodox doctrine is that presented by Rothe, above referred to. The strength of the position is, that it does least violence to the plain meaning of Scripture in the attempt to get rid of the eternal dualism of good and evil. But the plain meaning of Scripture, after all, is the old doctrine of the ecclesiastical symbols. It was our Lord himself who said, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." These words cannot be explained away by speculation, or deprived of their obvious meaning by exegesis.
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Purcell, John Baptist, D.D., Roman-Catholic prelate; b. at Mallow, County Cork, Ireland, Feb. 26, 1800; d. at St. Martins, Crown County, O., July 4, 1883. He emigrated to America in 1818; studied theology in America and France; in 1826, at Paris, was ordained priest; returned to America, and was a professor, and afterwards president, of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md. In 1833 he was consecrated bishop, and in 1850 archbishop, of Cincinnati. When he came to his see, there were only 16 Roman-Catholic churches in all Ohio, and many of these were mere sheds. In 1876 there were 460 churches, 100 chapels, 8 theological seminaries, 8 colleges, 6 hospitals, and 22 orphan-asylums. For many years Archbishop Purcell consented to receive the savings of his parishioners, spent them upon ecclesiastical buildings of various kinds, and in 1876 failed for $4,000,000, whereupon he retired permanently to a monastery. He was the author of Lectures and Pastoral Letters, a series of school-books, a Life of X. D. McLeod (New York, 1866), and held public debates (afterwards published) with Alexander Campbell (1888), Thomas Vickers (1888), and others. In the Vatican Council he spoke and voted against the infallibility dogma, though he accepted it. See Gilmour: Funeral Oration on Archbishop J. B. Purcell, New York, 1888.

Purgatory. The doctrine of purgatory, which the Roman-Catholic Church has fully elaborated, strikes its roots in the early Christian centuries. It is connected with the doctrine of an intermediate state, where the imperfect are made fit for paradise by a system of punitive and refining sufferings. This process of refining was not always ascribed to fire. The later rabbins held to a purification by water (Eisenmenger: Entdecklees Judentum, ii.337). The general view, however, was, that paradise was encompassed by a sea of fire, in which the blemishes of souls were consumed before their admission to heaven. The Mohammedans held that a wall (Koran, sura vii.) is built between heaven and hell, to the top of which all are assigned whose good works and evil works are equal, and from which they can look both heaven and hell. The doctrine of purgatorial fire was developed from texts of Scripture and the church's teaching concerning penance. Fire is frequently referred to in the Bible as a symbol of purification (Mal. iii. 2; Matt. iii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7, etc.), as well as a symbol of punishment and damnation (Matt. xxv. 4; Mark ix. 44, 49, etc.). There is no allusion to any process of purification in the period intervening between the death of the individual and the general resurrection. The doctrine of purgatorial purification first began to be broached in the third century. Clement of Alexandria (Ped. 3, Strom. 7) speaks of a fire in the world; and Origen held that it continues beyond the grave (Hom. in Num. xxxv.), and says that even Paul and Peter must pass through it in order to be purified from all sin (Hom. in Ps. xxxvi.). Augustine, relying on Matt. xii. 32, regarded the doctrine of purgatorial fire as the cleansing away of the remainder of sin as not incredible; and Gregory the Great established the doctrine. Its further history is associated with the doctrine of masses for the dead, and penance in this life. Thomas Aquinas (qu. 70, 3), Bonaventura (Comp. theol. verit., 7, 2), Jerson (Serm. 2. De Defunctis), and other great men of the middle ages, held that the fires of purgatory were material. The Greek Church, refusing to go as far as the Latin, laid down the doctrine of purgatorial fire as one of the irreconcilable differences between them at the Council of Florence, 1566. Wiclif opposed this doctrine. The Reformers raised their voices against the whole theory of purgatory. The Council of Trent, on the other hand, pronounced an anathema against those who reject the dogma. Bellarmi elaborated the doctrine in his extensive work on purgatory (De Purgatorio), proves it from the Old Testament (1 Kings xxxi. 13; 2 Kings i, iii., etc.), the Apocrypha (2 Macc. xii. 40 sq.; Tob. iv. 18), the New Testament (Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 11 sq., etc.), the Fathers, the councils, and reason, and comes to the conclusion that the fire of purgatory Letterarius ex aeterno (see aeternum). The doctrine of purgatory in the Greek-Catholic Church is thus stated in the Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church:—

"Q. 376.—What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance? This, that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in their behalf for their memory. Q. 377. On what is this doctrine grounded? On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church, the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabaeus offered sacrifices for his men that had fallen (2 Macc. xii. 43). Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the apostle James. Jerusalem says, 'Very great will be the benefit to those souls for which prayer is offered at the moment when the holy and tremendous sacrifice is lying in view' (Lect. Mys., v. 9). St. Basil the Great, in his Prayers for Pentecost, says that 'the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers, and causes the prayers of those that are kept in Hades, and allows us the hope of obtaining for them peace, relief, and freedom.'"


The Roman-Catholic doctrine of purgatory is stated in the eighth article of the Profession of the Tridentine Faith (see art. TRIDENTINE), and also thus in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent:—

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils, and very recently in this ecclesiastical Synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar: the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory ... be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ."

—Bosio xxv. of Schaff: Creeds.

"Catholics hold that there is a purgatory, i.e., a place or state where souls departing this life with remission of their sins as to the guilt or offense, but yet liable to some temporary punishment still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects which we call venial sins, are purged..."
PURIFICATIONS.

I. What defiles, according to the Old Testament? how, whom, how much, and how long, does it defile?

A. Certain animals, when eaten by men, defile. B. The woman, after childbirth. The defiling element in her is not the giving birth to a child, or the fact that she gave birth, but her condition, which is like the "uncleanliness of her being unwel!" (Lev. xii. 2); i.e., the impurity of her monthly illness.

C. Leprosy. It defiles not only the person suffering from it, and his dress, but also every other person with whom he comes in contact during the time of the disease (Lev. xiii. 46). Each one who enters a house which the priest has pronounced leprous becomes unclean for one day (Lev. xiv. 46).

D. Certain secretions of the human body (Lev. xv.).

(a) In a man. (a) Gonorrhcea renders unclean not only the patient himself, but every couch, seat, or object on which he lies or sits; and all persons he spits upon, or touches with his body, are unclean till the evening (1-12). (b) Nocturnal emissions of a man render him unclean till the evening, and so all stained garments, and his wife, in case she lies at his side. It is important to know, that, according to the context in verse 18, the nocturnal accident is the primary object of discussion in the section: whereas the fact that he lies by a woman is secondary, just as accidental as the garment or skin which happens to be near the man having the discharge. It must also be noticed, that concerning the garment or skin, it is said, "whereon is the discharge of seed" (17); whereas of the woman (18), nothing is said in connection with the discharge of seed; whereas a human being becomes unclean, if he only comes in immediate contact with the man having the discharge. The possibility that a man may have a nocturnal emission without having any sexual intercourse with the wife lying at his side, must be regarded as known to the lawgiver. And the possibility becomes a reality, when we consider that the same phrase, "to lie with" (אָדִּישׁ), is also used in verse 24, where a man lies by the side of his wife being in her monthly impurity, and where it cannot have the meaning of sexual intercourse, since the intercourse with such a woman did not render the man unclean for seven days, but was a crime punished with death (Lev. xv. 18). We thus see that from Lev. xv. 18 it cannot be inferred that conjugal intercourse rendered unclean, and that our passage treats only of involuntary emission of semen has already been indicated by the Massoretes.

(b) In a woman. (a) Her courses, which render her unclean seven days, and so all things which she touches, and which, on the part of others, defile any object, belongs to them as long as they remain. Thus object causes uncleanness till the evening, and so does any personal contact with the woman. The man who lies with her is unclean for seven days (Lev. xv. 19-24). (b) Prolonged issue of blood, which defiles as much as menstruation (Lev. xv. 25-27).

E. A dead body defiles. (a) Touching the carcasses of unclean beasts renders unclean for one day (Lev. xi. 8, 24, 25, 28; Num. xix. 22).

The carcasses of such clean beasts as had not been regularly slaughtered, or had died of themselves, when eaten, or even touched, made unclean for one day (Lev. xi. 30 sq., xxii. 8). (b) A human corpse when touched makes unclean for seven days (Num. xix. 11); and it imparts its uncleanness to the tent, and this again to all persons entering the same, and to every uncovered vessel (14 sq.).

To touch one that is slain with a sword in the open field, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, makes one unclean for seven days (16).

2. What is the nature of the object of the unclean phenomena enumerated above? Is it a physico-aesthetic, or a religio-ethical, or both? And what is the source of perception that such impurity exists?

A. In defining the character of the impurities treated above, we have to consider, (a) the etymology of the Hebrew word tameh ("unclean"), which, whatever significance we attach to the word, denotes from the very beginning an external, ethico-aesthetic impurity; (b) the usage of tameh — this denotes, on the one hand, physico-aesthetic impurity (Ezek. iv. 12-14; Deut. xxiii. 12-14), on the other hand, an ethical impurity (Lev. xxii. 4; Isa. vi. 5; Ezek. xxii. 5; Zech. xiii. 2); and even if we take the word in its wider sense, as denoting "abomination" or "inmorality" (in the highest sense), we have not yet the character of all impurity; (c) The synonyms of tameh, but these do not help us in deciding the character of the impurity in question; (d) In opposition to the usage of the test on the person, we are not yet able to decide if the same, and to every uncovered vessel (14 sq.).

The result is, that the phenomena enumerated under I.1 have not been pronounced as impure because of physical or esthetic impurity, but on account of another quality, because to them was attached an abnormality of a higher, non-perceptible nature; that is, because in those "impure" phenomena a disturbance of the normal psychological relation to God, of the true religio-moral connection with the divine, is supposed. Thus the impurity in question has in the first place a religio-ethical character, and an external impurity is the secondary factor of the abnormality which is supposed in the "impure" phenomena, a religio-ethical-aesthetic impurity is attached to them, which is not in opposition to Heb. ix. 13 sq., rightly understood.

B. What is the source of perception, that to die in a unholy place impurities? the things mentioned (I. 1) belongs an ethico-aesthetic impurity?

(a) The direct source of this perception. We have no direct indication, and we can only arrive at a result by examining indirectly what the Old Testament understands by an "ethico-aesthetic impurity." The following possibilities have been
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urged. (1) The impurity in question is a common physical one, intended to prevent persons afflicted with it from visiting the temple (Maimonides: More nebulim, iii. 47; Hess: Geschichte Mosis, iv. 4, 5; v. xix). Or (2) A foreign origin of the idea in question could be supposed on the ground that a nation being in a more distant or nearer relation to Israel could show parallel to I. 1: food baked with dung that cometh out of man is unclean (iv. 14 sq.); the menstruating woman with her pollution is mentioned (xxii. 19); the defiled land is compared to her uncleanness (xxxvi. 17); that which dieth of itself; or is torn in pieces, is unclean (xx. 33); the sanctuary and Jerusalem are defiled by the presence of idols (v. 11, xiv. 11, xx. 7, 18, 30 sq., 45, xxiii. 3 sq., 15, xxxii. 7, 30, 35, xxxvi. 17 sq., xiii. 7); ancient Jerusalem is defiled by blood (xv. 9, 11); uncleanness and apostasy together (xxxix. 24); to defile the neighbor's wife by adultery (xxii. 22); a dead body defiles according to the dictum of the priests (li. 18). Since in the non-disputed oldest literary monuments of Israel we have essentially the same laws of uncleanness as contained in Lev. xi.-xv., Num. xix., it can be no question that Israel's views concerning purifications are, for the most part, very old. When, nevertheless, Israel is said to have taken those ideas from another source, this can only be supposed to be found in the perceptions of those nations with whom Israel at a very early period is said to have come in contact, or, in fact, has been in contact.—Aryans, ancient Babylonians, Egyptians; but...

(a) Show since when the conception of an ethico-aesthetic impurity existed in Israel. From those prophetical writings the date of which is given with certainty, we learn the following, putting, however, those passages where unclean (i.e., abominable) is taken in a mere religio-ethical sense, and as not immediately belonging here, in brackets. [Amos: unclean is the land outside of Palestine (vii. 13). Micah: unclean is the land outside of Assyria (ix. 3 sq.); [Israel is defiled on account of irreligiousness and moral uncleanness (xvii. 15 sq.). Micah: uncleanness (i.e., abomination) causes destruction (i. 13). Isaiah: the Israel of the time of salvation will defile his former idols (xxx. 25). Jeremiah: the defiled land is compared to the place of Tophet (xix. 13). This defilement was probably brought about by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 10), since he defiled the high places in the cities of Judah in general (8), not by physical defilement (as 2 Kings x. 27), but as in the case of the altar at Bethel (2 Kings xxiii. 9 sq.), because by bones the defilement (of the sepulchres [Israel has polluted himself by idolatry (Jer. ii. 23), and his land (iv. 7, vii. 30, xxxii. 34). Lamentations: polluted with blood (iv. 14 sq.). In Ezekiel we have parallels to I. 1: food baked with dung that cometh out of man is unclean (iv. 14 sq.); the menstruating woman with her pollution is mentioned (xxii. 19); the defiled land is compared to her uncleanness (xxxvi. 17); that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces, is unclean (iv. 14); Jahve's house is defiled by bones out of the sepulchres (ix. 7, xliii. 7); priests can only defile themselves for five dead persons (xlv. 25); [the sanctuary and Jerusalem are defiled by the presence of idols (v. 11, xiv. 11, xx. 7, 18, 30 sq., 45, xxiii. 3 sq., 15, xxxii. 7, 30, 35, xxxvi. 17 sq., xiii. 7); ancient Jerusalem is defiled by blood (xiv. 9, 11); uncleanness and apostasy together (xxxix. 24); to defile the neighbor's wife by adultery (xviii. 28); the new-born child as unclean. These arguments are (a) Show since when the conception of an ethico-

(b) No indirect source of the Israelitish conception of the ethico-aesthetic impurity outside of the Old Testament. To make this assertion good, we must...

(1) The impurity in question is a common physical one, intended to prevent persons afflicted with it from visiting the temple (Maimonides: More nebulim, iii. 47; Hess: Geschichte Mosis, iv. 4, 5; v. xix). Or (2) A foreign origin of the idea in question could be supposed on the ground that a nation being in a more distant or nearer relation to Israel could show parallel to I. 1: food baked with dung that cometh out of man is unclean (iv. 14 sq.); the menstruating woman with her pollution is mentioned (xxii. 19); the defiled land is compared to her uncleanness (xxxvi. 17); that which dieth of itself; or is torn in pieces, is unclean (xx. 33); the sanctuary and Jerusalem are defiled by the presence of idols (v. 11, xiv. 11, xx. 7, 18, 30 sq., 45, xxiii. 3 sq., 15, xxxii. 7, 30, 35, xxxvi. 17 sq., xiii. 7); ancient Jerusalem is defiled by blood (xiv. 9, 11); uncleanness and apostasy together (xxxix. 24); to defile the neighbor's wife by adultery (xxii. 22); a dead body defiles according to the dictum of the priests (li. 18). Since in the non-disputed oldest literary monuments of Israel we have essentially the same laws of uncleanness as contained in Lev. xi.-xv., Num. xix., it can be no question that Israel's views concerning purifications are, for the most part, very old. When, nevertheless, Israel is said to have taken those ideas from another source, this can only be supposed to be found in the perceptions of those nations with whom Israel at a very early period is said to have come in contact, or, in fact, has been in contact.—Aryans, ancient Babylonians, Egyptians; but...

(1) The impurity in question is a common physical one, intended to prevent persons afflicted with it from visiting the temple (Maimonides: More nebulim, iii. 47; Hess: Geschichte Mosis, iv. 4, 5; v. xix). Or (2) A foreign origin of the idea in question could be supposed on the ground that a nation being in a more distant or nearer relation to Israel could show parallel to I. 1: food baked with dung that cometh out of man is unclean (iv. 14 sq.); the menstruating woman with her pollution is mentioned (xxii. 19); the defiled land is compared to her uncleanness (xxxvi. 17); that which dieth of itself; or is torn in pieces, is unclean (xx. 33); the sanctuary and Jerusalem are defiled by the presence of idols (v. 11, xiv. 11, xx. 7, 18, 30 sq., 45, xxiii. 3 sq., 15, xxxii. 7, 30, 35, xxxvi. 17 sq., xiii. 7); ancient Jerusalem is defiled by blood (xiv. 9, 11); uncleanness and apostasy together (xxxix. 24); to defile the neighbor's wife by adultery (xviii. 28); the new-born child as unclean. These arguments are...
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sacrifices, has also brought the ideas of uncleanness, as being connected with sin and death, in the foreground of the thinking of the Israelitish congregation in general, and also especially of that of Ezekiel, whom God had taken from among the priests to be a prophet. Comp. Koenig: Offenbarung des Gottes i. pp. 13 sq.; Lorenz: Herkunft der urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer (Berichte der Akademie zu Berlin, 1882), p. 3.

II. 1. What Purifications were enjoined for removing the enumerated impurities? — For A is no purification. For B — For seven or fourteen days respectively (i.e., after the birth of a boy or a girl) the woman is as thoroughly unclean as in the time of her menstruation; and, after washing herself and her clothes, she is clean from her positive impurity, but not from her negative impurity (i.e., her keeping aloof from holy things and from the sanctuary), which can only be removed by presenting a lamb one year old as a burnt offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove as a sin offering (Lev. xii. 6 sq.); but, if she be poor, a pigeon or a turtle-dove suffices for the burnt offering also (8). For C — He who has shown a doubtful symptom of leprosy on his body has only to wash his garments (Lev. xiii. 6, 34); garments affected with leprosy, or garments or stuffs which only showed doubtful signs of leprosy are to be washed (54, 58). At the purification of the leper, one of the two clean live birds is to killed over a vessel containing spring water: the other is to be dipped in the mixed blood and water, together with cedar-wood, hyssop, and a crimson thread or band. The fluid is then sprinkled upon the convalescent seven times, and the living bird is allowed to fly away over the fields (Lev. xiv. 4-7). The convalescent then washes his garments, shaves off all his hair, bathes in water, as he is to do again on the seventh day (8 sq.). Of the blood of the lamb killed as trespass-offering, the priest sprinkles upon the top of his right ear, upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; then some of the oil is sprinkled seven times towards the holy place of the sanctuary (14 sq.). Next the offering of a sin-offering, and the second he-lamb as a holocaust, accompanied by the usual bloodless oblation of the flour (19 sq.). In case of poverty, for the sin-offering and holocaust two turtle-doves or two young pigeons are accepted (21 sq.). A leprous house is to be broken down (45), and he who did sleep or eat in it must wash his garments (47). But, if the house is declared clean, its purification is effectuated as described above (4-7, 48-53). For D, (a), (e) — When the discharge of semen has ceased, he must wash his garments, and bathe in running water; he presents two turtle-doves or two young pigeons as a sin offering, and another for a holocaust (Lev. xv. 13-15). Persons defiled directly or indirectly by such a person have only to wash their garments, and bathe their bodies (5-11). Earthen vessels touched by the patient must be broken; wooden ones, rinsed with water (15). For D, (d), (e) — The purificatory laws for the menstruating woman (D, b, β) is only regarded as temporary, different from the regular issue, having the same defiling qualifications (25 sq.), we may take it for granted that the lawgiver intended the same purificatory laws for the one afflicted with an irregular issue of blood (29 sq.). For E, (a) — Whoever carries the carcass of unclean animals must wash his garments (Lev. xi. 21, 28); the objects upon which a carcass accidentally falls, such as utensils of wood, garments, or skins, require cleansing by being left in water till the evening (32); earthen vessels, ovens, and stoves must be broken (33, 35). For E, (b) — Carrying the carcass of a clean animal requires washing of garments (40). For E, (c) — Dehlement at a dead person requires a red heifer without spot, and upon which never came yoke, etc. (Num. xix. 1-7). The ashes of the burnt heifer are put into running water (17), which becomes the water of abomination, i.e., the water appointed for the purification of uncleanness: in this sense the word מְנִדָּה (may niddah) is to be taken. With this water, those who have become defiled directly or indirectly for a dead person, as well as the house of the dead and its vessels, are to be sprinkled, by means of hyssop, on the third and seventh day after the defilement; and on the seventh day the person shall purify himself, and wash his clothes (15 sq., 17-19). The latter must also be done by him who prepares, keeps, and uses the ashes (7 sq., 10, 21). The officiating priest, as well as the man who burnt the red heifer, have, besides, to bathe their flesh in water (7 sq.). As for the Nazarite who defiled himself by a sudden death, see Num. vi. 9-12. Of the booty taken from heathenish nations, every thing that may abide the fire is to go through it, and must be purified with the water of separation: all that abideth not the fire is to go through the water; and a person touching such must wash his clothes on the seventh day.

2. Upon what perceptions is the purifying power of the objects used, and actions performed, at the purifications, is present, and how the ethico-aesthetic impurity is a matter of course; and it is possible that “living” water, even where it is not expressly stated, is meant. (d) The sin and burnt sacrifices required of the woman after childbirth, the leper, the man having a running issue, and the woman having an issue of blood, have their usual signification. (e) The purification of the person and his garments shows the great step which the person to be purified took from the awful nearness of death to the gladsome communion of untroubled life. (f) In removing the impurity caused by the touch of a dead person, the red color of the cow, as symbol of the source of life, being burnt, the person must be broken; wooden vessels, rinsed with water. The sick person is considered as a yoke which had never come upon her, she was the emblem of virgin energy. Cedar-wood, crimson thread, and hyssop, which were also used, represent emblems of incorruptibility, medicine against impurity, and symbol of life.
III. Post-canonical Development, and Time of Validity, of the Old-Testament ideas of impurity and purificatory ceremonies. — 1. Later Development. When, in the time of Ezra, Israel took upon himself to observe even the laws concerning clean and unclean according to the Pentateuch, the scribes took it upon themselves to clearly define, not only the laws laid down in the canon, but also those inferences which were deduced from them. These rules and regulations are found in the treatises, Chullin, Kidnah, Tebul jom, Oholah, Aboda zarah (ii. 6), Mikvaot, Yadaim (comp. the art. TALMUD). But not all Israelites took part in these rigorous purificatory efforts. Religious indifference led on the one hand to laxness (Job i. 10 sq.); while over-scrupulosity on the other hand led to the formation of special societies, the most rigorous of which was that of the Chasidim (q.v.). 2. Time of Validity. That the Old-Testament purificatory laws and purifications existed before and after the time of Christ, we see from 1 Macc. i. 62 sq.; 2 Macc. vi. 18, vii. 1 sq., xi. 31; Tacitus: Hist., v. 4, 5. The sixth part, or seder, of the Mishna (compiled about 180 A.D.), shows a development of the Old-Testament ideas of impurities and purification, 180 sq.; finally the articles of Winer, in his Realwörterbuch (3d ed., 1847), of Schenkell, in his Bibellexikon (1875, 5 vols.); of Camphausen, in Riehm's Handworterbuch (14th part, 1880), and by Riehm (Ibid.) art. "Strafrecht," Nos. 3, 4 (1882), of Hamburger, in his Real-encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, 1870-83, 2 vols. FR. ED. KÖNIG. (B. PICK.)

PURIM (for the meaning of the name, see Esth. ix. 24-26; cf. iii. 7). The Book of Esther gives us our information respecting the origin of this Jewish festival. It encountered opposition on its introduction according to the Jerusalem Talmud; for eighty-five elders, including thirty prophets, ridiculed the idea (cf. Lightfoot on John x. 21). But by Josephus' time (cf. Ant. XI, 6, 18), it was universally observed. It is observed on the 14th and 15th Adar, i.e., exactly a month before passover, preceded by the "fast of Esther" on the 13th, which was the actual day of the delivery. It was not a temple, but a synagogue festival, and observed in public by the reading of the entire Book of Esther — called Megillah ("the roll") par excellence — on the appearance of starlight the 14th of Adar, during which, at every mention of Haman's name, the "Esther fast" shall rot. On the next morning (still the 14th of Adar) another synagogue service is held, and the Megillah read; but the rest of the day and the next are given up to merriment and gift-making. In leap-year, Purim is celebrated in the intercalary month (Veadar); but formerly it was twice celebrated, — both in Adar and Veadar. If the 14th of Adar falls on a Sunday, then, since there can be no fasting on sabbath, the "Esther fast" falls on Thursday. Ewald conjectured, that originally Purim could be celebrated on the 13th of any month; but, by connecting it with the delivery from Egyptian bondage, it was put before the passover, as a sort of preparatory festival. OHLEH.
The first Puritans were men who could not accept the work as complete, nor rest satisfied with it in its imperfection. They wished to make the church as perfect an instrument as possible with it in its imperfection. They submitted to those regulations which they approved; but, whether consistently or inconsistently we do not now inquire, they resisted those which appeared to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests of Protestant truth.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to accept the work as complete, nor rest satisfied with it in its imperfection. They wished to make the church as perfect an instrument as possible with it in its imperfection. They submitted to those regulations which they approved; but, whether consistently or inconsistently we do not now inquire, they resisted those which appeared to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests of Protestant truth.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to accept the work as complete, nor rest satisfied with it in its imperfection. They wished to make the church as perfect an instrument as possible with it in its imperfection. They submitted to those regulations which they approved; but, whether consistently or inconsistently we do not now inquire, they resisted those which appeared to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests of Protestant truth.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to accept the work as complete, nor rest satisfied with it in its imperfection. They wished to make the church as perfect an instrument as possible with it in its imperfection. They submitted to those regulations which they approved; but, whether consistently or inconsistently we do not now inquire, they resisted those which appeared to them inexpedient, or contrary to the interests of Protestant truth.
with its oath ex officio, was the means of inducing extreme suffering on the Puritans.

In order to assure uniformity, "advertisements" were issued by the bishops in 1554, by which it was ordained that "all licences for preaching, graven out the works of men which it permitted the first day of March, 1564, to be void and of none effect." Thus all preachers were silenced. And further, to complete the work, it was ordained that only "such as shall be thought meet for the office" should receive fresh licenses. Thus only conformable ministers were restored. But, whilst some of the best and most conscientious of the clergy were cast out of their office, thousands of parishes were destitute, and had no ministers to preach to them the word of life: this, however, in the estimation of the queen and her ecclesiastical advisers, was a less evil than a ministry without the Roman-Catholic vestments.

Archbishop Parker seconded the queen in all her severities; the consequence of which was, that in 1567 some of the laity resolved to meet privately and to worship God, as the Protestants did in Queen Mary's days. About a hundred of them met in Plumbers Hall in London. But they were surprised, some of them apprehended, and imprisoned for more than a year. These rigorous measures tended rather to the increase of Puritanism than to its destruction. The people continued to meet privately; and the clergy began to look beyond the vestments, and to question the constitution of the church itself. Their leader was Thomas Cartwright, who, as Margaret Professor of divinity at Cambridge, unfolded his views of ecclesiastical order, which were in harmony with those of the Presbyterian churches on the Continent and in Scotland. A severe controversy hereupon arose. Cartwright was deprived of his professorship and fellowship, and was forbidden to teach or to preach. He retired to Geneva, where he was chosen professor of divinity; but he afterwards returned to England. In 1572 John Field and Thomas Wilcox (two ministers of the Puritan party) presented it themselves, and asked the queen whether they should be brought to trial; but he escaped to Heidelberg. During Cartwright's exile, Hooker afterwards maintained, and said that no form of church order is laid down in the New Testament, and that the government in the apostles' days cannot now be exercised. Mr. Cartwright, who had published A Second Admonition, was chosen to reply to Whitgift. Both his books gave such offence to the queen and archbishop, that it was resolved he should be brought to trial; but he escaped to Heidelberg. During Cartwright's exile, Whitgift published his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition; and Cartwright then published his Second Reply. This exile continued eleven years; after which he returned home, to experience yet further molestation and suffering.

It has been frequently said, that in 1572 a Presbyterian church was formed at Wandsworth; Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, being the first minister, and Travers and Wilcox among the founders. The facts are, that the first distinct practical movement to secure a Presbyterian or organization began with a secret meeting at that place. Wilcox and Field convened a few of their ministerial brethren and others to sketch an outline of the ecclesiastical polity they wished to see in operation. Some of their papers fell into the hands of Bancroft; from which it appears that the only presbytery erected was on paper, and was immediately demolished by Bancroft. Field and Wilcox were thrown into prison. The leaders of the party succumbed, and their meetings were discontinued (Waddington's Surrey Congregational History, p. 5).

In 1574 Archbishop Parker died, and was succeeded by Grindal. He found the country morally and religiously in a deplorable condition, in consequence of the ignorance and incapacity of so many of its clergy. This state of things did not distress the queen, for she thought one or two preachers in a diocese was enough; but the Puritans thought otherwise. In the year 1571 these clergy, in some districts, with the permission of the bishop, engaged in religious exercises called "prophesyings," which were meetings at which short sermons were preached on subjects previously fixed. These were good exercises for the clergy, and cultivated the art of preaching. But, whilst the laity were admitted, and derived instruction and benefit from them. In 1574 Parker told the queen that they were only auxiliaries to Puritanism and Nonconformity, whereupon she gave him private orders to suppress them. When Grindal became Archbishop of Canterbury, he not only inherited the office, but also the task of suppressing the prophesyings; but, approving of them, he set himself rather to repress any irregularities, and to guard them against abuse. The queen, on the other hand, disliked them, and determined that they should be suppressed. On Dec. 20, 1576, Grindal wrote a very respectful but very faithful letter to the queen, in which he said, "I am forced with all humility, and yet plainly, to profess that I cannot with safe conscience, and without the offence of the majesty of God, give my assent to the suppressing of the said exercises: forasmuch as much less can I see the famous Admonition to Parliament for the Reformation of Church Discipline. They presented it themselves, and for doing so were committed to prison. Whitgift replied to the admonition, and took the Erastian ground, which Hooker afterwards maintained, and said that no form of church order is laid down in the New Testament, and that the government in the apostles' days cannot now be exercised. Mr. Cartwright, who had published A Second Admonition, was chosen to reply to Whitgift. Both his books gave such offence to the queen and archbishop, that it was resolved he should be brought to trial; but he escaped to Heidelberg. During Cartwright's exile, Whitgift published his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition; and Cartwright then published his Second Reply. This exile continued eleven years; after which he returned home, to experience yet further molestation and suffering.

It has been frequently said, that in 1572 a Presbyterian church was formed at Wandsworth; Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, being the first minister, and Travers and Wilcox among the founders. The facts are, that the first distinct practical movement to secure a Presbyterian or
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word of God, but may be lawfully used; and that he himself will use the same, and none other, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments. (c) That he alloweth the Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation held in London in 1552, and afterwards by her Majesty's authority; and he believe all the articles therein contained to be agreeable to the word of God."

Wielding almost absolute power with a despotic severity, we are not surprised to find that he suspended many hundreds of the clergy from their ministry. Petitions and remonstrances were in vain: Whitgift could not yield. And for twenty years this man guided the affairs of the Established Church. Only the records of the High Commission Court can tell the havoc he made, and the misery he inflicted on some of the holiest of the clergy and the people of their charge. A new commission was issued at Whitgift's instigation; its jurisdiction was almost universal, embracing heretical opinions, seditious books, false rumors, slanderous words, abstaining from divine service, etc. A jury might be dispensed with, and the court might convict by witnesses alone: if they were wanting, "by all other means and ways they could devise," — by the rack and ex-officio oath, etc.; and, if the oath was declined, the court might inflict "fine or imprisonment, in three months without the queen's license, they shall abjure the realm, and go into perpetual banishment; and that if they do not depart within the time appointed, or if they ever return without the queen's license, they shall suffer death without benefit of clergy." Under the provisions of this cruel act, Barrow, Greenwood, Peir, and others suffered death, and many of the Brownists left the kingdom.

It is not pretended that all the Puritans were always wise, or always moderate in the expression of their sentiments. The oppression to which they were subjected was severe enough to goad them on to the use of strong language, which some of them sometimes employed. But in 1588 a series of tracts was issued from a secret press, by an unknown writer who called himself Martin Marprelate. (Dr. Dexter, in his Congregationalism, has devoted a lecture to the controversy connected with these tracts, to which the reader is referred.) They were bitter and caustic enough, and unquestionably excited the wrath of the bishops, and brought down further afflictions upon the heads of the Puritans; though it is probable that the Puritans properly so called had nothing to do with them. The oppression of this cruel act, Barrow, Greenwood, Peir, and others suffered death, and many of the Brownists left the kingdom.

Elizabeth died in 1602, and James VI. of Scotland succeeded her. The Puritans hoped that from him they would receive a milder treatment than they had experienced from his predecessor. He had praised the Scottish Kirk, and disparaged the Church of England, saying that "its service was but an evil-said mass in English, wanting nothing but the Ibis. But Whitgift sent agents to Scotland to assure the king of the devotion of the English ecclesiastics to his interests; and he, in return, gave them entirely his patronage. The Puritans presented a petition to
him, when on his way to London, signed about a thousand clergymen, and therefore called the "Millenary Petition." In it they set forth in moderate language their desires. And now a fair opportunity presented itself. The conference was resolved upon, which assembled at Hampton Court, Jan. 14, 1603-04, professedly to give due consideration to these matters. On the first day the king and the episcopal party alone went over the ground, and settled what was to be done. The next day four Puritan ministers—Dr. Rainolds, Dr. Sparke, Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Knewstubs—were called into the privy council chamber, where they expressed their desires, and explained and enforced the Puritan objections. On the third day the king and the bishops had the conference, at first to themselves; and, after they had settled matters, the four Puritans were again called in, and told what had been decided. The king said that he expected of them obedience and humility, and "if this be all your party have to say, I will make them conform, or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." And so the opportunity for conciliation was lost, and then severities were resumed.

In 1604 the constitutions and canons of the church were settled in convocation, and, without receiving the assent of Parliament, were issued on the strength alone of the royal supremacy. They were conceived in a rigorous spirit, and dealt freely in excommunication, which at that time was not a mere brulum fulmen. Bancroft, bishop of London, presided at this convocation, and after they had settled matters, the four Puritans were again called in, and told what had been decided. "But, the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew." And now the Book of Sports became the shibboleth of religion. The controversy on the observance of the sabbath began in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. Dr. Nicholas Bound, who had not separated from the Established church were settled in convocation, and, without the consent of Parliament, were issued and during the next seven years multitudes of them, ministers and laymen, were driven to Holland and America. The Book of Sports was re-published, with like consequences as at the first publication. Pryme, Burton, and Bastwick suffered their horrible punishments. Ruinous fines were imposed, superstitious rites and ceremonies were practised and enjoined, and the whole church appeared to be going headlong to Rome. In 1640 the Convocation adopted new constitutions and canons, extremely superstitious and tyrannical, which the Long Parliament condemned as being "contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm and to the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing things tending to sedition and dangerous consequence." The nation could bear the unmitigated political and ecclesiastical tyranny no longer. Those who had suffered from the king's arbitrary rule joined with those who were groaning under the despotism of the bishops, and with one vast effort overthrew absolute monarchy and Anglican Popery together. A new era now commenced. [Puritanism properly so called had a leader of the Lollard party. He then preached the doctrines of the Reformers and of their successors, Conformists and Puritans alike, had been hitherto Calvinists; Whigfield was a High Calvinist; the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy, and many began to set forth Arminianism. The Puritans held fast to the old faith, and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time, and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practice, was obnoxious to those in power.

James died in 1625, and was succeeded by Charles I. Under this monarch "the unjust and inhuman proceedings of the Council Table, the Star Chamber, and the High Commission, are unparalleled." Nonconformists were exceedingly harassed and persecuted in every corner of the land. These severities were instigated by Laud, soon after made bishop of London, and prime-minister to the king. Lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism and the Popish ceremonies were suspended; the Puritans were driven from one diocese to another, and many were obliged to leave the kingdom. In 1633 Laud succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury, on the death of Abbot, when the Puritans felt the whole force of his fiery zeal; and during the next seven years multitudes of them, ministers and laymen, were driven to Holland and America. The Book of Sports was re-published, with like consequences as at the first publication. Pryme, Burton, and Bastwick suffered their horrible punishments. Ruinous fines were imposed, superstitious rites and ceremonies were practised and enjoined, and the whole church appeared to be going headlong to Rome. In 1640 the Convocation adopted new constitutions and canons, extremely superstitious and tyrannical, which the Long Parliament condemned as being "contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm and to the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing things tending to sedition and dangerous consequence." The nation could bear the unmitigated political and ecclesiastical tyranny no longer. Those who had suffered from the king's arbitrary rule joined with those who were groaning under the despotism of the bishops, and with one vast effort overthrew absolute monarchy and Anglican Popery together. A new era now commenced. [Puritanism properly so called had a leader of the Lollard party. He then preached the doctrines of the Reformers and of their successors, Conformists and Puritans alike, had been hitherto Calvinists; Whigfield was a High Calvinist; the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy, and many began to set forth Arminianism. The Puritans held fast to the old faith, and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time, and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practice, was obnoxious to those in power.

James died in 1625, and was succeeded by Charles I. Under this monarch "the unjust and inhuman proceedings of the Council Table, the Star Chamber, and the High Commission, are unparalleled." Nonconformists were exceedingly harassed and persecuted in every corner of the land. These severities were instigated by Laud, soon after made bishop of London, and prime-minister to the king. Lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism and the Popish ceremonies were suspended; the Puritans were driven from one diocese to another, and many were obliged to leave the kingdom. In 1633 Laud succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury, on the death of Abbot, when the Puritans felt the whole force of his fiery zeal; and during the next seven years multitudes of them, ministers and laymen, were driven to Holland and America. The Book of Sports was re-published, with like consequences as at the first publication. Pryme, Burton, and Bastwick suffered their horrible punishments. Ruinous fines were imposed, superstitious rites and ceremonies were practised and enjoined, and the whole church appeared to be going headlong to Rome. In 1640 the Convocation adopted new constitutions and canons, extremely superstitious and tyrannical, which the Long Parliament condemned as being "contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm and to the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing things tending to sedition and dangerous consequence." The nation could bear the unmitigated political and ecclesiastical tyranny no longer. Those who had suffered from the king's arbitrary rule joined with those who were groaning under the despotism of the bishops, and with one vast effort overthrew absolute monarchy and Anglican Popery together. A new era now commenced. [Puritanism properly so called had a leader of the Lollard party. He then preached the doctrines of the Reformers and of their successors, Conformists and Puritans alike, had been hitherto Calvinists; Whigfield was a High Calvinist; the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy, and many began to set forth Arminianism. The Puritans held fast to the old faith, and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time, and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practice, was obnoxious to those in power.
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the Bishop of Worcester. In 1390 he was in prison, and while there compiled from Wiclif's writings a Lollardy tract, entitled *Liber Albus*. In 1391 he was released, and moved to Canterbury, where he resided Oct. 8, 1403, and was again in prison in 1421. He is chiefly remembered for his share in Wiclif's version of the Scriptures, and for his revision of the same (1414). On this revision he wrote a Prologue of great length and interest. See Forshall and Madden's edition of Wiclif's Bible, Oxford, 1850, 4 vols., vol. i.; Mombert: *The English Versions*, chap. iii.; and art. Wiclif.

Pusey, Edward Bouverie, D.D., Church of England; b. 1800; d. at Ascot Priory, Oxford, Sept. 16, 1882. He was graduated 1822, with high honors in classics, in 1828 elected fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; during 1826 and 1827 he studied languages and theology in Germany, under the direction of Dr. Tholuck in Halle, and his first book was on German rationalism. In 1838 he was appointed Regius-professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church. In 1833 the *Tracts for the Times* were started. Pusey sympathized with this Anglo-Catholic movement, and wrote the eighteenth tract, entitled *Thoughts on the Benefits of the System of Fasting enjoined by our Church*, the fortieth, *Baptism*; and the sixty-seventh, *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*. In 1843 he delivered a sermon on Matt. xxvi. 28, entitled *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, which caused his suspension by the vice-chancellor from preaching in the University pulpit for three years. In 1846 Newman joined the Roman Church; but Pusey remained, and for the rest of his days was the recognized head of the High-Church party. He resided almost constantly at Oxford. Those who held his views were styled "Puseyites," an epithet he earnestly repudiated, insisting that he and they merely followed the Primal Church, and it was wrong, therefore, to attach his name to doctrines which had been taught in the church centuries before. He was a voluminous author. Among his works may be mentioned: *An Historical Inquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany*, London, 1828-30, 2 parts; *A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects*, Oxford, 1845; *Parochial Sermons*, London, 1848-69, 3 vols.; *The Doctrines of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers of the Church*, (see Patristics), for which he edited the opening volume, *St. Augustine's Confessions*, 1840, 4th ed. 1854; and in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.* See B. W. Savile: *Dr. Pusey, an Historic Sketch, with Some Account of the Oxford Movement during the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1883 (a sharp criticism, from an evangelical stand-point, of Dr. Pusey's doctrines on the Lord's Supper, baptism, justification by faith, and general); J. Rigg: *The Character and Life-Work of Dr. Pusey, a Sketch and Study*, 1883 (94 pp.); his Life, by Canon H. P. Liddon, in preparation; also arts. Ritualism, Tractarianism.

Dr. Pusey was personally a pure, humble, and devout man. His piety was of the ascetic or monastic type, and corresponded to his theology, which was essentially Catholic, although opposed to Romanism on the subject of Mariolatry and the authority of the Pope. He was the moral, as J. H. Newman was the intellectual, and Keble the poetic, leader of the Anglo-Catholic movement which has succeeded the Church of England and all her branches for the last fifty years, and exerted as much influence as the Wesleyan movement, which sprang from the same university a hundred years before, although in the opposite direction. Methodism strengthened the cause of Protestantism, and revived practical religion among the lower classes of the people. Oxford Tractarianism undermined Protestantism, and developed a Romanizing tendency among the clergy and higher classes. Newman followed the logical consequences of the system, and submitted his powerful intellect, weary of freedom, and anxious for rest, to the infallible authority of the Pope, and drew several hundred of the clergy and nobility after him. Pusey and Keble died in the Church of England, and kept a larger number of their followers from secession. Apparently the Oxford theology is a reaction and a backward movement; but it has received a vast churchly activity in every direction, and there is now more life and energy in the Church of England than ever before. The future must decide the providential aim and true value of that revival of Anglo-Catholicism with which the name of Dr. Pusey is so prominently connected.

PYM, John, the great leader of the Parliament party at the commencement of the civil wars; b. of a Somersetshire family in 1584; d. in London, Dec. 8, 1643. During the latter part of the reign of James I. he vigorously opposed the measures of the court, and, after the accession of Charles I., came further into public notice through the prominent part he took in impeaching the Duke of Buckingham. At the opening of the Long Parliament, by common consent he assumed the leadership of the popular party; and his attack on the Earl of Strafford, once his friend, can never be forgotten. It was a mighty duel, in which one of the antagonists was sure to fall; and, if PYM had not conquered him whom he denounced as "the great promoter of tyranny," the "promoter of tyranny" would have crushed him, and arrested the movement of the age. The impeachment of Strafford has been pronounced "the masterstroke of policy," as it deprived the king of his right hand, and opened the door to a successful resistance of encroaching prerogatives.
The biography of Pym includes the history of the Long Parliament down to the end of 1643. He was ever at his post in the House of Commons, swaying the members in the main particulars of his policy. He was not a republican: he preferred a limited monarchy, and was moderate in many of his counsels. He was the Mirabeau of the great English Revolution which led to the execution of Charles; but, if he had lived, perhaps the issue would have been different. But he died in the midst of his days, and was buried, with something like royal pomp, in the Abbey of Westminster.

JOHN STOUGHTON.

PYNCHON, William, b. in Essex, Eng., about 1590; d. at Wraisbury, Buckinghamshire, opposite Magna Charta Island in the Thames, near Windsor, Oct. 22, 1662. He was one of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company; came to America, 1630; settled at Roxbury, Mass.; founded Springfield on the Connecticut River, 1636, naming it for his English home. In 1650, at London, he published "The meritorious price of our redemption, justification, etc., clearing (sic) it of some common errors" (4to, pp. xii. 152, 2d ed., 1855). Scarcely were copies of it brought to Boston, in October, 1650, than heresies it contained attracted attention; and the General Court then assembled quickly took action upon such a flagrant violation of the law passed in Massachusetts (1646), which forbade such erroneous teaching, and banished perpetually such teachers. The "heresies" were, (1) That Christ did not suffer for us the torments of hell; (2) That Christ did not bear our sins by God's imputation, and therefore did not bear the curse of the law for them; (3) That Christ hath not redeemed us from the curse of the law by suffering that curse for us. The third heresy had been expressly forbidden. The court directed that Mr. John Norton should answer the book, and that it should be burned by the executioner in the market-place in Boston. In May, 1651, Pynchon appeared before the court with a partial recantation, which, however, was not satisfactory, and he was cited to appear the next session, in October. Not coming, he was, under penalty of a hundred pounds, enjoined to appear before it the following May, but, to the relief of all, went back to England ere the set day came. Mr. John Norton's answer was entitled "A discussion of that great point in divinity, the sufferings of Christ; and the questions about his righteousness, active, passive, and the imputation thereof," London, 1653, 8vo, pp. xxiv. 270. In 1655, in London, Pynchon published his answer to Norton, "A further discussion of that great point in divinity, the sufferings of Christ, and the questions about his righteousness, 4to, pp. iii. 439. Besides these volumes, Pynchon wrote, "The Jews' synagogue," 1652, and (1) The time when the first sabbath was ordained; (2) the manner how the first sabbath was ordained, pt. ii., "A treatise of holy time," 4to, pp. xvi. 148, xvii. 120. See J. G. Palfrey: Hist. N. E., vol. ii. pp. 385, 396; Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., viii. 2d series; Dexter: Congregationalism, Appendix, Nos. 1552, 1638, 1642, 1705.

PYX (from νιξον "a box") denotes, in the terminology of the Roman-Catholic Church, the box or vessel, of various but often very elaborate form, in which the consecrated elements of the Eucharist are preserved. Its use was prescribed by Innocent III. in 1215. See Augusti: Christ. Arch., iii. 522, and Smith and Cheetham, ii. 1765.
QUADRAGESIMA. See LENT.

QUADRATUS. In the second century of our era there were three persons of the name Quadratus. One was the apologist. He presented his work to the Emperor Hadrian in 125, and it seems to have been in existence in the seventh century (Porphyr. Cod., 102); but it afterwards perished. Eusebius gives a fragment of it (Hist. Eccl., IV. 3), in which Quadratus appeals to the miraculous healings of Christ, and mentions that persons healed by him were still living. — Another Quadratus is mentioned, in the Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to the Athenians, as the successor of Bishop Publius, as a man of great merits with respect to the re-organization of his congregation, and as having suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius. An extract from the epistle is found in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV. 29). Jerome (De script. eccl. 19, and Ep. ad. Magn.) identifies him with the apologist, but without sufficient reason. — A third Quadratus is mentioned in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 17), as a prophet beside Agabus, Judas, Silas, and others. He, too, has been identified with the apologist. See A. Harnack: Die Ueberlieferung d. christl. Apologeten, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 100 sqq.

QUAKERS. See FRIENDS.

QUARLES, Francis, b. at Stewards, Essex, 1592; d. in London, Sept. 8, 1644; ranks next to Herbert (Photius : Cod., 102); but it afterwards perished. Eusebius gives a fragment of it (Hist. Eccl., IV. 3), in which Quadratus appeals to the miraculous healings of Christ, and mentions that persons healed by him were still living. — Another Quadratus is mentioned, in the Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to the Athenians, as the successor of Bishop Publius, as a man of great merits with respect to the re-organization of his congregation, and as having suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius. An extract from the epistle is found in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV. 29). Jerome (De script. eccl. 19, and Ep. ad. Magn.) identifies him with the apologist, but without sufficient reason. — A third Quadratus is mentioned in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 17), as a prophet beside Agabus, Judas, Silas, and others. He, too, has been identified with the apologist. See A. Harnack: Die Ueberlieferung d. christl. Apologeten, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 100 sqq.

QUESNEL, Pasquier (Paschasius), b. in Paris, July 14, 1634; d. in Amsterdam, Dec. 2, 1719. He studied theology at the Sorbonne; entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1657; was ordained a priest in 1659; and appointed director of the seminary of the Congregation in Paris, 1662. Shortly after, he began the publication of his celebrated work, Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament, and in 1675 appeared his edition of the works of Leo the Great. As the former proved him to be a Jansenist, and the latter a Gallicanist, a conflict with the Jesuits was unavoidable. He left Paris, and settled at Orleans; but, when he refused to sign the famous anti-Jansenist formula in 1685, he was compelled to flee for his life, and went to Brussels. There he continued the publication of his Réflexions, of which the first collected edition appeared in 1657; the second, much augmented, in 1655-99; later edition, Amsterdam, 1798, 8 vols.; [Eng. trans., The New Testament, with moral reflections upon every verse, London, 1719-25, 4 vols. There is another translation of a part of this work under the title, The four gospels, with a commentary and reflections, both spiritual and moral; translated, and the Popish errors expunged, by a Presbyter of the Church of England, Bath, 1790, 2 vols.; new ed., revised by Rev. H. A. Boardman, D.D., N.Y., 1867, 2 vols.]. In 1703, however, he was arrested, and put into the dungeon of the archiepiscopal palace; but he escaped, and fled to Holland, out of the reach of the Jesuits. Among his other works are, Traditio de l'Eglise romaine, 1687; La discipline de l'Eglise, 1688; La vie de M. Arnauld, 1695, etc. His letters were edited by Le Courayer, Paris, 1721-23, 3 vols.

QUETIF, Jacques, b. in Paris, Aug. 8, 1618; d. there March 2, 1698. He entered the Dominican order; succeeded at Bordeaux; was ordained a priest in 1642, and in 1652 appointed librarian in the Jacobin convent in Paris. He published Con-

times as greatly as Shakspeare," said Thoreau. His purity and sincerity were beyond question. His life, or rather character, was ably, but far too briefly, sketched by his widow. — His son, John Quarles (b. in Essex, 1624; d. of the plague in London, 1665), wrote Fons Lachrymarum, 1649, Divine Meditations, and other poems, a brilliant fragment from one of which has sometimes been used as a hymn.

QUARTERLY MEETING. See FRIENDS.

QUARTODECIMANI. See PASchal CONTROVERSY.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY. See TAXES.

QUEENSTEDT, Andreas, b. at Quedlinburg, 1617; d. at Wittenberg, 1688. He studied at Helmstadt under Calixtus; went then to Wittenberg, became a pupil of Calovius, and was in 1649 appointed professor of theology there. His principal work is his Theologia didactica polemica, which appeared in 1685, and is the last comprehensive, systematic exposition of Lutheran orthodoxy, appearing just as the process of dissolution began to take effect.
QUIETISM. QUIRINIUS.

1987

cilii Trid. Canones, Paris, 1666; Vita Savonarola (by Picus de Mirandola, with valuable additions), Paris, 1674, 3 vols.; Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum, Paris, 1718, unfinished, but nevertheless his chief work.

QUIETISM. See Molinos; Guyon.

QUINSEXTUM CONCILIUM, held in Constantinople, 692, is thus called because it forms a kind of supplement to the fifth (quintum) and sixth oecumenical councils of 555 and 680. It is also called the Trullan Council, on account of its being held in the imperial palace called Trullus. See Trullan Councils.

QUIRINIUS (Κύρινιος), the governor of Syria at the time of Christ's birth (according to Luke ii. 2, "this was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria"). His full name was Publius Sulpicius Quirinius. He is the second of that name mentioned in Roman history. He was made consul 12 B.C., and was probably twice governor of Syria and Cilicia, from 4 to 1 B.C., and from 6 to 11 A.D. Tacitus (Annals, iii. 48) supplies us with most of our knowledge of the man.

"About this time he (Tiberius) asked of the Senate that the death [21 A.D.] of Sulpicius Quirinius might be celebrated with public obsequies. Quirinius was in no way related to the old and patrician family of the Sulpicii, but was born at Lanuvium, a municipal town. In recognition of his military and administrative ability, Augustus made him a consul [with M. Valerius Messala 742 A.U.C., 12 B.C.]. Soon afterwards he obtained the honor of a triumph for having taken the stronghold of the Homonadenses in Cilicia. While attending Gaius Caesar rector, when the former was campaigning in Armenia, he secretly cultivated Tiberius, who was then at Rhodes. Tiberius mentioned the fact in this letter, praised him for his good offices, and found fault with Marcus Lollinus for sowing dissensions between himself and Gaius Caesar. But to other people the memory of Quirinius was by no means dear, because of his persistence in the trial of Lepida [his wife, whom he had convicted of adultery, attempted murder, and other crimes, but who yet succeeded in gaining the people to her side; cf. Annada, iii. 23], and also of his sordid avarice in his old age, although very powerful."

He is mentioned also in Dion Cassius (liv. 28), Strabo (xii.), Suetonius (Tiberius, 49), and Josephus (xviii. 1, 1 sqq.). Putting all these statements together, the relations of Quirinius to Palestine and Syria may be thus determined. Quirinius headed an army in Africa, perhaps as proconsul of that province, in 7 B.C., and was in the East between 2 B.C. and 2 A.D., because Gaius Caesar went thither late in 2 B.C. or early in 1 B.C., and Tiberius returned to Rome 2 A.D. His position as head of an army in Cilicia proves that he must have been a governor of a province, or a legate of the emperor's legate. But Cilicia was probably under the jurisdiction of the legate of Syria. There is a break in our list of governors of Syria from P. Quintilius Varus (B.C. 6–4) to C. Sentius Saturninus (4 A.D.). Quirinius may therefore, chronologically speaking, have been governor in 4 B.C., the year of our Lord's birth. If so, he was governor again 6–11 A.D. Much support of the supposition of a double governorship has been derived from the mutilated inscription, first published in 1765, to the effect that some one (name missing) was governor of Syria twice. But, even if Quirinius be assumed to be the one intended, he was not governor until autumn 4 B.C., or after Christ's birth. Luke probably mentions Quirinius in connection with the census, because it was completed by him, and therefore bore his name. The problem in the passage in question is not yet solved; but by the hypothesis of a double governorship its solution is measurably approached. The census, first conducted by Quirinius, was accompanied with a registration of property, for the object was taxation. A census of the Roman Empire has been reasonably inferred from the known fact that Augustus prepared a list of all the resources of his empire, which was read in the Senate after his death. Herod could not resist the execution of the emperor's order, because he was a tributary king; besides, if the census was made by Jewish officers, it would not greatly differ from a similar registration made by Herod, and need not have alarmed the Jews if proper care was taken. Because of Quirinius' experience in such matters, he was sent into Syria 6 A.D., to superintend an assessment; and it was then the rising under Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37) took place. His vigorous efforts brought it to an end. Cf., besides the commentaries upon Luke ii. 2, the art. "Cyrenius," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible; by Schürer, in Riehm's Handb. d. bib. Alt.; and especially A. W. Zumpt: Das Geburtsjahr Christi, Leipzig, 1899; and Schaff: Hist. Christ. Ch., vol. i., rev. ed., 1892, pp. 151–125.
Rabanus Maurus. b. at Mayence about 778; d. there Feb. 4, 856. He was educated in the cloister-school of Fulda, and afterwards in the school of Tours, under the tutelage of Alcuin, who gave him the surname Maurus, after the friend of St. Benedict. Recalled from Tours, he was put at the head of the school in Fulda, which he soon brought to a very flourishing condition, and in 822 he was elected abbot of the monastery. Political circumstances, it would seem, induced him to resign his position as abbot in 842, and to retire to the neighboring Paderborn; but in 847 he was made archbishop of Mayence, and thus once more called to take active part in public life. An excellent administrator. Under his government, his monastery and his diocese flourished. His fame, however, he owes chiefly to his literary activity. He wrote Commentaries on the Old Testament, on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, and on the Pauline Epistles; devotional books; two collections of homilies; hymns (De eulogendo Deo, De modo penitentia, etc.); text-books for his school (De clericorum institutio, De computo, De universo, etc.); polemics (De oblat. puerorum) against the synod of Mayence, which permitted Gotzeschalk to leave his order (Ep. ad Equi de eucharistia) in the controversy caused by Radbertus Paschasius, etc. There is a collected edition of his works by Colvenerius, Cologne, 1827, reprinted by Migne, vols. 107-112; but it is not complete. See his life by the monk Rudolf; Kunstmann: Hrabanus M., Mayence, 1841; Spiegel: Rob. M., Ratisbon, 1856. Hauck.

Rabaut, Paul, b. at Bédarieux, in the department of the Hérault, Jan. 9, 1718; d. at Nimes, Sept. 25, 1794; one of the most celebrated preachers of the Church of the Desert. He went in 1740 to study theology in the seminary of Lavaux, and was in 1744, by the General Synod, made pastor of Nimes. The Protestant Church in France, after the fearful calamities which had overtaken her by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the wars of the Camisards, and the horrid edicts of March 8, 1715, and May 14, 1724, was again rallying. Persecutions continued. The decrees of Feb. 1 and 16, 1745, punished participation in the assemblies with the galleys, and imposed heavy fines on the congregations in which a minister was found. In 1752 a price of a thousand livres was set on the head of Rabaut; and as he always escaped, often in a miraculous manner, his wife and children were for some time imprisoned, and otherwise annoyed. Nevertheless, lulls of peace and quiet occurred. When the Prince of Conti, in 1755, retired from the court to his estates in Provence, Rabaut presented to him a memorial setting forth the demands of the Protestants; namely, the release of those sent to the galleys, restoration of the children sent to the monasteries, legal recognition of their baptism and marriage, etc. When, in 1761, the Governor of Guienne proposed to compel by force the Protestant children to have their children baptized, and their marriages consecrated by a Roman-Catholic priest, and Rabaut published his Lettre pastorale, in which he advised his flock to emigrate rather than submit to such tyranny, the government, remembering the financial difficulties caused by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, dropped the matter. Meanwhile the execution of Rochette, of the three brothers Grenier, of Jean Calas, La colomnie confondue of Rabaut, and, more than anything else, the denunciations of Voltaire, drew the attention and the sympathy of the public to the condition of the Protestants; and with the accession of Louis XVI. in 1774 a milder practice became prevalent, though the Edict of Toleration was not issued until 1787. The last part of his life Rabaut spent in peace, at Nimes. Two of his sons, St. Etienne (b. at Nimes, in April, 1745; executed in Paris during the reign of terror, Dec. 5, 1793) and Pommier (b. at Nimes, Oct. 24, 1744; d. in Paris, March 16, 1820), were also ministers of the Reformed Church. See Borrel: Biographie de Paul Rabaut et de ses trois fils, 1854, and Histoire de l'église reformée de Nimes, 1856; [Maccracken: Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal, 1879, pp. 486-492]. Th. Schott.
tion were brought for adjudication. It is probable that at first the teachers were priests; but, as there was no necessity for combining those two functions, the teaching of the law, and its judicial application, the law came into the hands of the laity, and, as one of the principal duties of those teachers was to copy the sacred books, they received the name of Sopherim (פָּיפה, "scribes").

In the time of Simeon the Just, who lived under Alexander the Great, or a little later, the institution attained its perfection and final establishment. With Simeon the Just, however, begins the second stage in the development of rabbinism. It was quite natural, that, in the interpretation of the law, a tradition should be formed, comprising the opinions of the oldest and wisest interpreters, the Chachamim; and soon this tradition was dated back beyond the Babylonian captivity, even up to Moses. But where there is tradition, there will come schools. Antigonus, a pupil of Simeon the Just, formed the first school, and from that branched off afterwards the school of the Saducees; for the Sadducees were a sect before they became a sect. About the same time a circle of men gathered from among the mass of the people, and pledged themselves to the strictest observance, even of the most minute precepts of the law; and from this circle of men, the Chassidim, afterwards developed the sect of the Pharisees. Of still greater importance than the formation of schools was the transformation of the whole class of law-teachers into a corporation, which also took place in this period, owing to the introduction of the semichah, or ordination by the laying-on of hands. Though the semichah was not legally established until about eighty years before Christ, it, too, was dated back to Moses. Its final form it received from Hillel I.: it could be given only within the boundaries of Palestine, and only with the consent of the president of the sanhedrin, and any one who had professed Judaism was eligible to that assembly.

The principal event of the third period was the editing of the Mishnah. It was begun by Hillel at the opening of the period, and finished by Jehuda at its close. Previously the Mosaic law had been treated by the rabbis under six hundred and thirteen different heads,—two hundred and forty-eight commandments and three hundred and sixty-five prohibitions, two symbolical numbers; the former referring to the parts of the human body, the latter, to the days of the year. Hillel reduced the heads to eighteen, and Jehuda to six; namely, on seeds, women, festivals, property, sanctuaries, and clean and unclean. Hillel also established certain rules for the interpretation of the law: for these, his great services, he was by the Talmud styled “the restorer of the law after Ezra.” When the Jewish state was dissolved, and the priesthood abolished, after the destruction of the temple, rabbinism was introduced. So tightly bound which still held the Jewish nation together. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the sanhedrin moved to Jamnia, and afterwards, in the middle of the second century, to Tiberias, where for several centuries it continued to exercise its double function of a court and a school. Under Jehuda a great number of students gathered there, and returned, when their studies were finished, to their native places with their written certificates as the teachers and judges of their people. Meanwhile a sharp rivalry sprang up between the school of Tiberias and the Babylonian. In the third century, rabbinical academies had been founded at Nahardea near Nisibis, at Sura on the Euphrates, and at Pumbeditha on the left bank of the Lower Euphrates; and so richly were those academies donated, that Sura could support and instruct eight hundred pupils at a time. Gradually the Babylonian academies assumed the same rights and the same authority as the school of Tiberias, and, during the latter part of the fourth century, Rabbi Ashe actually stood as the centre of the whole rabbinical world. His greatest service was the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud,—a work which occupied fully sixty years of his life. Thirty years he spent in collecting the materials; thirty others, in sifting and arranging them. For the first purpose he used his pupils. Not only had great differences developed in the exposition of the Mishnah, especially in the different schools, but variations had crept into the very text. All these were carefully collected; each pupil bringing along from his native place what was found there of interpretation of the text, of recollections from the past, and expectations with respect to the future, of rules, maxims, parables, etc. The material thus collected was then critically sifted and revised by Ashe, and arranged into sixty-one treatises. The story that the work, when completed, was accepted and sanctioned by a synod, is probably a fable; but the circumstance that the rabbinical schools were closed shortly after throughout the Persian realm gave to the Babylonian Talmud the character of being something final and perfect, which it would be sacrilegious to meddle with.

The second epoch of the history of rabbinism, from the fifth century of our era to the present times, has less interest to Christian theology than the first, and is partially treated under other heads,—Carda, Midrash, Abnabacel, Aben Ezra, Maimonides, etc. In the fifth century the rabbinical schools were closed, not only in Persia, but also in the Byzantine Empire, and yet no schools had been founded in the West. It was the suppression of the Visigoth rule, and the establishment of the Arab dominion in Europe, which first called forth the literary and scientific activity of the Jews in Europe. They studied Arabic with great eagerness, and, having mastered the language, they were not slow in taking possession of the great literary and scientific treasures to which it opened the way. They studied Arabic medicine, natural science, mathematics, and astronomy, and began to translate, not only from Arabic into Hebrew and Latin, but also from Hebrew into Arabic. Meanwhile the Babylonian Talmud was brought to Europe, and its study was taken up with great zeal, and it was translated into Arabic. But under the influence of the Arab civilization, there developed a liberal form of rabbinism in Spain, in the schools of Cordova, Granada, and Lucena, a strictly orthodox form was developed in Gaul and Italy. In the schools of Narbonne, Toulouse, Bari, Otranto, and Mayence, philosophy was loudly up as something dangerous, and the study of the Talmud was pursued
with an indescribable pedantry. It was the great problem of Maimonides to reconcile these two tendencies; and he succeeded, though it became a matter of national policy to require that Jewish children were allowed to study philosophy until he had filled his twenty-fifth year. In the thirteenth century the persecutions of the Inquisition began to tell on the character of rabbinism. The schools were closed, and only the study of the Cabala flourished. No doubt the roots of the Cabala were as old as rabbinism itself; but, while the Cabala had hitherto existed as a branch only, it now became the principal stem. To some it was a Christian garment, beneath which they concealed the genuinely Jewish ideas; to others, it became the bridge which led them into the Mohammedan mosque or into the Christian Church; others, again, used it as a means of magic and fraud. An influence of an opposite character was derived from the invention of the printing-press, which once more brought rabbinism into living contact with the general stream of civilization. The Talmud was printed in Venice, 1520; the works of Rabbi Jacob ben Chajim of Tunis, in Venice, 1538; and schools were opened in Venice, Amsterdam, Brody, Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Furth, and Frankfurt. In these schools the two different tendencies, the liberal and the orthodox, could still be observed, and were known under the names of the Portuguese-Italian and the Polish-German. But there was no direct contest between them; and in many places, as, for instance, in Amsterdam, they existed peaceably beside each other, until in the eighteenth and particularly in connection with a military officer sent to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. According to the Hebrew form, the title would mean "chief eunuch;" but, as it is a transliteration of the Assyrian title rub-sak; it means "chief cup-bearer;" but Schrader questions whether saris, which in Hebrew means "eunuch," has this sense in Assyrian, and thinks that, if the name in the Hebrew Bible were a translation, it would be in the plural (rabšākhīn). See Kühn's Wiörterbuch in loco.

RA'B SHAKEH, the title of an Assyrian officer who was sent by Sennacherib to Hezekiah to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. According to the Hebrew form, the title would mean "chief cup-bearer;" but, as it is a transliteration of the Assyrian title rab-sak, it means "chief officer." In the inscriptions the title rab-sak is used particularly in connection with a military officer sent by Tiglat-pileser 11 to Tyre. See SCHRADER: Die Keltinschriften und das Alte Testament, 2d ed., 1882.

RA'BULAS, more correctly Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, the predecessor of Isai; d. Aug. 8, 435. He governed his diocese with great authority, and successfully kept down the various heretical sects until the Nestorian controversy began. Some of his letters, some rules for monks, some hymns, and a sermon delivered in Constantinople, are still extant. See J. J. OVERBECK: Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Edesseni, aiiorumque Opera Selecta, Oxford, 1865. His prose works were translated into German by Bickell for the Kempten Bibliothek of church fathers, 1874. E. NESTLE.

RA'CIA (Matt. v. 22), a term of contempt frequent among the Jews in Christ's time and since. It is the Aramaic rēka ("empty"), and expresses, therefore, folly, but is not so opprobrious a term as "fool," which brands one as wicked and blasphemous.

RACOVIAN CATECHISM. See SOCINIANISM.

RA'CHEL. See JACOB.

RABBERTUS, Paschasius, Abbot of Corbie in Picardy, and one of the most prominent ecclesiastical writers of the Carolingian age. Of his personal life, only very little is known; and that little is gleaned exclusively from scattered notices in his own works, and from the paraphrases of Engelmodus, bishop of Soissons, printed in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. 120. The vita found in Mabillon (Act. Sanct., IV. 2) dates from the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century, and has no independent value. He was born towards the close of the eighth century, in Soissons or near by, and, as his mother died soon after his birth, he was brought up by the Benedictine nuns of the place. In 814 he entered the monastery of Corbie, and became one of the most intimate pupils of the abbot Adalhard, a relative of Charlemagne. In due time he advanced to the teachership (among his pupils were the younger Adalhard, Ansarius, Hildemann, Odo, Warinus, and others); and in 844, after the death of Abbot Isaac, he was himself elected abbot. As such he was present at the synod of Paris (846) and of that of Chiersey (848); but the gradual collapse of discipline which had begun immediately after the death of Adalhard, and his own inability to restore order, led him to resign his position in 851. He lived long enough after that time to write several important works; but, with the exception of this one fact, nothing is known of his life in retirement.

Ten works by him have come down to us; namely, Expositio in Matthewum, of which the first four books were written before he became abbot, while the rest, like the Expositio in Psalmum XLIV. and Expositio in lamentationes Jeremiae, date from after his abdication. De Fide, Spe, et Charitati belongs to the earlier part of his life. De vita Adalhardi was written in 826; De corpore et sanguine Christi, in 831; Epistula ad Arsenu, in 839; De partu virginis, on the contrary, he wrote as an old man. De passione S. Rufini et Valerii, was written while abbot; and Epistola ad Prudegarum, after his retirement. A complete and critical edition of his collected works does not exist. The best is that by Sirmond, Paris, 1618, which has been reprinted in Bibl. Patr. Max., vol. xiv., Lyons, and in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. 120, in a revised and augmented form.

The most important of the writings of Rabbertus is his De corpore et sanguine Domini, the first comprehensive treatise produced in the Christian Church on the Lord's Supper, and also the first to call forth a controversy concerning that doctrine. Previously two almost diametrically opposite or at all events contradictory views had run peaceably beside each other; but considering the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper as mere symbols, or tokens of the body and blood of
RAGGED SCHOOLS, the term for those schools in which vagrant children are taught, and thus, in many cases, kept from a criminal career. The earliest such school is said to have been started in Rome, towards the close of the last century, by an illiterate mason, Giovanni Borgia. In 1819 John Pounds, an uneducated cobbler of Ports- mouth, began a similar work, and kept it up until his death, in 1839. His was the first Ragged School in England. In 1838 a Ragged Sunday School was started in London. In 1864 the Ragged-School Union of London reported 201 day schools with 17,983 scholars, 180 Sunday schools with 206 night schools with 8,325 scholars. The great name connected with the formation of such schools is Thomas Guthrie (see art.). He issued his first pamphlet on the subject (A Plea for Ragged Schools) in 1847, and devoted himself henceforward to the work. His school on the Castle Hill, Edinburgh, became the parent of many elsewhere.

RAIFES, Robert, founder of Sunday schools; b. at Gloucester, Sept. 14, 1735; d. there April 5, 1811. His father was a printer, and also publisher of the Gloucester Journal, "scarcely larger than a sheet of foolscap." Robert, as a youth, manifested a benevolent disposition, and used to visit the jail of the city, not only from pity to the prisoners, but from a desire for prison reform,—a department of usefulness in which John Howard became so conspicuous. But to prepare for the establishment of Sunday schools in England and America was the great work to which he was destined by Divine Providence. When this kind of agency became popular, curiosity was excited respecting one, who, if not the only, was certainly the chief, author of modern Sunday schools. He was asked about the manner in which he commenced his enterprise; and anecdotes respecting it, derived from his contemporaries, were carefully treasured up. He wrote a letter relating how he was struck with the miserable state of children in his native city; and that, hearing of a clergyman who had sent some outcasts to school, he employed "four decent, well-disposed women" to gather round them boys and girls, that they might teach them to read, and repeat the Catechism; for which each of the instructors was to receive a shilling a week. This was something very different from our present Sunday-school system, as elaborate as it is voluntary; but it was the seed out of which sprung the goodly tree which now spreads its branches over the world. This simple, unostentatious act has made Raikes, with the words of St. Paul: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek." He was converted, entered the Dominican order, and became one of the most zealous adversaries of his former co-religionists. The Pope made him inquisitor of Lombardy. In 1259 he wrote a Summa de Catharibus et Leonisatis, not polemical, but probably intended for the clergy. It is a valuable historical and statistical notices of great interest. Copies were made of it in Italy, France, Ger-
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many, and England, and in each country pertinent
amenities were made. The original text was
edited by John Pickering (Cambridge, 1833) ; and, the third time, he and seven Indians
who had undertaken to defend him were killed.

RAMADAN (from ramida, "to glow with heat"),
the ninth month of the Mohammedan (lunar)
year, observed as a fast. In the Koran Surah
ii. (The Cow), §180, it is written :—

"As to the month Ramadan, in which the Koran
was sent down to be man's guidance, and an expla-
nation of that guidance, and an illumination, as soon
as any of you observeth the moon, let him set ali
out fasting a likenumber of days, and that you glorifyGod
for his guidance; and haply you will be thankful.
You are allowed on the night of the fast to . . . eat
and drink until ye can discern a white thread from a
black thread by the daybreak : afterwards fast strictly
during the fast into seasons of feasting, revelry,
and dissipation, and the days into sleeping times.
The fast celebrates the giving of the Koran.
According to Arabic tradition, Abraham, Moses,
and Jesus also received their revelations during
this month. The month is followed by three
days of fasting, called the Little Eiram. Thus
Mohammed imitated the Christian Lent and
Easter.

RALEIGH is the name of several German the-
ologians more or less noticeable.— August Jakob
Rambach, b. at Quedlinburg, May 28, 1777; d.
at Giessen, Feb. 24, 1802. He was appointed pastor
in Hamburg in 1802. He distinguished himself as a hymnologist, and pub-
lished Martin Luthers Verdienst um den Kirchen-
gesang, Hamburg, 1813 ; and Anthologie christlicher
Gesänge, Leipzig, 1817-33, 6 vols. — Johann Jakob
Rambach, b. at Quedlinburg, May 28, 1793 ; d. at Giessen,
April 19, 1835 ; studied at Halle ; was appointed
professor at Giessen in 1871 ; and exercised a

e.g., by Edward Edwards, London, 1885. His
Poems were collected by Sir Edenton Bridges,
1814 ; and his Complete Works, in 3 vols., at
Oxford, 1829. F. M. REID.

RA' MAH (high place), the name of several Pal-
estinian towns. (1) In Benjamin, near Gibeah
(Josh. xviii. 25 ; Judg. xix. 18), taken by Saul
(1 Sam. xxii. 8). Captives of Nebuchadnezzar,
among them Jeremiah, were placed there (Jer.
xxvi. 15, xxxix. 8-12, xl. 1) ; re-occupied after the
captivity (Ez. ii. 26 ; Neh. vii. 30). It is identified
with er-Ram, five miles north of Jerusalem. (2) In
Asher (Josh. xix. 29), identified by Robinson
with Rameh, thirteen miles south-east of Tyre.
(3) In Naphtali (Josh. xix. 30), identified with
Rameh, ten miles north-west of the Sea of Galilee.
(4) A name for Ramoth-gilead (2 Kings viii. 29 ;
2 Chron. xxxii. 6) ; a city of the Amorites (Deut.
iv. 43), then of Gad, and a city of refuge (Josh.
xx. 8), commonly identified with Es-Salt. (5) A
place inhabited by Benjaminites after the captivity
(Neh. xi. 59). (6) The place of birth, home, death,
and burial of the Prophet Samuel (1 Sam. i. 1,
ii. 11, vii. 17, viii. 4, xx. 34, xvi. 13, xix. 18, xxv.
1, xxvii. 3). In full the name was Ramathaim-
zophim (double height of the watchers). Its loca-
tion has been pronounced "the most complicated
and disputed problem of sacred topography."
What is known about it is that it was on a height
south of Gibeah, and in the undefined district
called "Mount Ephraim." No certain identifi-
cation can yet be given.

RAMEH, ten miles north-west of the Sea of Galilee.

When Ramadan comes in midsummer, the long
fast is severe. It is usual to turn the nights
during the fast into seasons of feasting, revelry,
and dissipation, and the days into sleeping times.
The fast celebrates the giving of the Koran.
According to Arabic tradition, Abraham, Moses,
and Jesus also received their revelations during
this month. The month is followed by three
days of fasting, called the Little Beiram. Thus
Mohammed imitated the Christian Lent and
Easter.

When Ramadan comes in midsummer, the long
fast is severe. It is usual to turn the nights
during the fast into seasons of feasting, revelry,
and dissipation, and the days into sleeping times.
The fast celebrates the giving of the Koran.
According to Arabic tradition, Abraham, Moses,
and Jesus also received their revelations during
this month. The month is followed by three
days of fasting, called the Little Beiram. Thus
Mohammed imitated the Christian Lent and
Easter.

When Ramadan comes in midsummer, the long
fast is severe. It is usual to turn the nights
during the fast into seasons of feasting, revelry,
and dissipation, and the days into sleeping times.
The fast celebrates the giving of the Koran.
According to Arabic tradition, Abraham, Moses,
and Jesus also received their revelations during
this month. The month is followed by three
days of fasting, called the Little Beiram. Thus
Mohammed imitated the Christian Lent and
Easter.

RAMBACH isthe name of several German the

CARL BERTHEAU.

RAMSES. See EXODUS.

RAMMOHUN ROY, Rajah Hindu religious reformer; b. in the district of Burdwan, province of Bengal, 1772; d. at Stapleton Park, near Bristol, Eng., Sept. 27, 1833. He was a Brahman, strictly educated; but, under the influence of the Koran, he early renounced polytheism. He translated the *Veidanta*, or the Resolution of all the Vedas, the theology of the Vedas, from Sanscrit into Bengalee and Hindostanee, prepared also an abridgment of it, and in 1816 published an English translation of it, the *Cena Upanishad* (1816), and the *Ishopanishad*. In 1820 he published, at Calcutta and London, selections from the New Testament, *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*, in English, Sanscrit, and the Veds, the theology of the Veda, from Sanscrit, Bengalee, and English, *Apology for the Pursuit of Final Beatitude, Independently of Brahmanical Observances*, Calcutta, 1820; *Exposition of the Judicial and Revenue Systems of India*, 1832. He believed in the divine mission of Jesus, but considered that a combination of Christianity and Brahmanism was possible. He maintained that the correct interpretation of the *Upanishads* was monotheistic. On Jan. 23, 1830, he founded the *Brahmo Samaj* (which see). He strenuously advocated through the Bengal Herald, of which he was part proprietor, the abolition of slavery and the abolition of suttee. In 1830 he appeared before the British court in London, as the accredited representative of the sovereign of Delhi, for the purpose of obtaining from the East-India Company an increase of their annual stipend to him, and successfully performed his mission. While in England he worshipped with the Unitarians. The fiftieth anniversary of his death was celebrated at Bristol, Eng., Sept. 27, 1888. The address was delivered by Prof. Max Müller. See Carpenter: *Last Days of Raja Ram Mohun Roy in England*, with a Biographical Sketch, London, 1866.

RAMUS, Petrus (Pierre de la Ramée), b. at Cuth, a village in Vermandois, 1515; d. in Paris, Aug. 26, 1572. When he was twelve years old, he came, walking on his bare feet, to Paris to study; and he began his career at the university as errand-boy to an older and richer student. He was in the two following years at the university, and, when he attained the degree as Master of Arts; and, when he shortly after began to teach, he immediately became the subject of the most intense interest. He was a declared adversary of the Aristotelian logic; but when, in 1548, he published his *Animadversiones Dialecticas*, (a criticism of Aristotle's logic and his *Institutiones Dialecticae* (an exposition of his own logical system), he stirred up such a wrath among the philosophers that he was arraigned before a royal court as an impudent seducer of youth, and condemned to perpetual silence on the subject, under pain of "confusion and bodily punishment." After the accession of Henry II., however, in 1547, he once more obtained freedom to speak and write through the good offices of the Cardinal of Lorraine; but he was soon again entangled in embroilments of various kinds. He was a man of reforms; and his reformatory zeal went far beyond the field of logic, dialectics, and grammar. After the colloquy of Poissy, 1562, he openly embraced Protestantism; and, though he retained his chair at the Sorbonne as professor of philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of great benefit to mankind; though it found many illustrious adepts,—Milton, Arminius, Chytræus, Sturm, and others,—and formed, if not a school, at least a party, the Ramists. But his persistent and passionate coherence of Saaristis, and the Wolffian philosophy, he had to flee for his life, whenever the two religious parties took to arms. He finally fell as a victim of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The logical system which he proposed to substitute for that of Aristotle has not proved of...
RAINTERS, an Antinomian sect of the Commonwealth period, which Fuller, in his Church History, associates with the Familists. Ross, in his Havacsia (p. 287, ed., 1655), describes them as making an open profession of lewdness, practising a community of women, etc. In An Account of the Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan (London, 1692, p. 22) they are described as believing themselves incapable of sinning, and fancying themselves in Adam's state, as he was in paradise before the fall, of stripping themselves naked (like the Turbulines, etc.) at their public meetings.

The name was also at one time applied to the Primitive Methodists, who separated themselves from the main body of Methodists, and were distinguished by their violent bodily manifestations.

RAPHAEL (the divine healer), in Jewish angelology "one of the seven holy angels who present the prayers of the saints, and who go in and out before the glory of the Holy One" (Tob. xii. 15); also said to be one of the four archangels (Michael, Uriel, Gabriel, and Raphael) who stand round the throne of God. In Tobit he plays the part of guide to Tobias, for whom he works miracles. In Progress to Economy, seventeen miles north-west of Pittsburgh, on the right bank of the Ohio.

RASHI, the celebrated Jewish commentator; b. at Troyes in Champagne, France, 1040; d. there July 13, 1105. (See De Rossi: Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, Parma, 1802.) He is often spoken of simply as Yarchi; and how that misunderstanding arose is not known. But he did not belong to that circle of rabbins who assumed the surname of Yarchi from their native place, Lunel in Perpignan ("luna," כלכנ). He spent seven years in travelling through Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, and was well versed in philology, philosophy, medicine, astronomy, law, etc. Besides commentaries on twenty-three treatises of the Talmud, commentaries on the Midrash Rabbah, a book on medicine, etc., he wrote commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, giving both the literal sense and the allegorical explanations of the older rabbins. These commentaries, written in Hebrew mixed up with Latin, Greek, and Old-French words, and in a condensed, obscure style, attracted, nevertheless, much attention, both among Jews and Christians. The first book printed in Hebrew was his commentary on the Pentateuch, Reggio, 1475. The later editions are quite numerous; and there is a complete Latin translation by Breithaupt, — Prophets, Psalms, and Job (1713), the historical books (1714), the Pentateuch (1740). See J. Chr. Wolf: Biblioth. Hebraea, 1715-33, 4 vols. quarto; I. M. Jost: Geschichte des Judenraums, 1807; Bloch: Lebensgeschichte d. Salomo Jecchaki, 1840.

The name Rashi is the combination of the initial letters, ר"ש, of the full name and title, רashi, יוחנן, i.e., Rabbi Shelomoh ben Yitz'haki. De Rossi's Dizionario, referred to above, has been translated into German by Dr. Hamberger, Leipzig, 1839. Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch was translated into German by Lucas, Prague, 1838-39. WILHELM PRESSL.

RASKOLNIKS. See Russian Sects.

RATHERIUS. b. at Liege about 890; d. at Namur, April 23, 974. He was a monk in the monastery of Lobach (German) or Lobbes (French), in the Hainaut, and became possessed of what was still left, from the Carolingian age, of education and scholarship. Through his incidental connections with King Hugo of Provence he became bishop of Verona in 964, but was deposed and imprisoned on account of
RATHMANN. Hermann, b. in Lübeck, 1585; d. at Dantzic, June 30, 1628. He studied theology at Leipzig, Rostock, and Cologne, and was in 1612 appointed pastor at Dantzic. In 1621 he published Jesu Christi Gnadenreich, in which he asserted that God's word has no inherent power to instruct man, and make him better, but must be supported and supplemented by the activity of the Holy Spirit. The book was vehemently denounced by Johann Corvinus; and a controversy broke out which lasted to the death of Rathmann, and in which many of the first theologians of the time took part. See Möller: Cimbria literata, iii. p. 503.

RATIONALISM and SUPRANATURALISM, two terms of great prominence in modern theology, are aptly defined by Fr. V. Reinhard, in his Geschichte, Sulzbach, 1810. He says,—

"In rationalism, reason is the sole arbiter. What reason cannot comprehend and accept can never form part of the rationalist's conviction. His consciousness is homogeneous, and his intellect consists of a single bond, to which Scripture is like any other book. He accepts it, only when it agrees with his opinions, and then only as an illustration and affirmation, not as an authority. The supranaturalist, on the other hand, is no less in harmony with his fundamental maxim. In matters of religion, Scripture is to him what reason is to the rationalist. Though he, too, employs reason, he employs it only to search and judge those claims to a divine origin which Scripture puts forth; and as soon as that point has been decided, and he is convinced that Scripture contains the direct teachings of God, it becomes his highest, sole authority. The only office of reason is to search and explain the true meaning of Scripture; but the doctrines themselves, even though they may seem strange and hard, must be recognized, and accepted unconditionally."

Of the two terms, rationalism is the older. It was first used by Amos Comenius, in his Theologia naturalis, 1661, where it was applied to the theologians of the Socinian school, to naturalists and deists. It is probable, however, that Comenius was not the inventor of the name "rationalist," as the form "rationists" occurs before his time, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when it was applied to the Aristotelian humanists of the school of Helmholtz. At its first appearance the opposite of rationalism was not designated as supranaturalism, but simply as protestantism (see Gabler: Neuestes theolog. Journal, Nuremberg, 1801). As the champions, however, of a new religion, that is, of a religion based upon Scripture as the divine revelation, generally designated their adversaries, not as rationalists, but as naturalists, it naturally came to pass that their own views were designated as supranaturalism, and not as supranaturalism, or irrationalism, though the latter designation occurs. When the term "supranaturalism" was brought into use is not known; but it is found in Gabler.

About the middle of the eighteenth century the two opponents stood fully developed, confronting each other, and the contest began. The finisheing strokes, both naturalism and supranaturalism, came from the triumphant science of Wolff; but long preparations preceded the commutation, and it is interesting to notice the different characteristics which the incipient movement exhibits under the different national conditions. In England the rapidly increasing deism called forth a long series of apologetical writings, though without thereby producing any sharp and decisive contrast. Herbert of Cherbury (d. 1648) taught that the innate ideas of reason and the general contents of revelation were identical, but that the latter was, nevertheless, necessary in order to restore the original but almost ruined natural religion. Around this idea of a natural religion, deism gathered its champions; and the prevailing latitudinarianism, emphasizing that which is common to all confessions, and willing to sacrifice that which is specifically Christian for that which is common to all religions, almost succeeded in the same standard. Hobbes (d. 1679) disgusted people by representing the absolute authority of the king as the sole foundation of positive Christianity, while Locke (d. 1704) charmed them by his demonstration of the reasonableness of Christianity; but both contributed, each in his way, to strengthen the domination of that common sense in accordance with which Toland (d. 1722) could proclaim that Christianity contains no mystery, and Tindal (d. 1733), that the Gospels are simply a republication of the religion of nature. But the curious fact is, that this relation between Christianity and natural religion was recognized by the apologists: yes, Butler (d. 1751) even accepted Tindal's proposition concerning the republication of the religion of nature. Indeed, by accommodating themselves to the views of their adversaries, and confining their defence of the authority of Scripture to a strictly scientific demonstration, the English apologists came to point nearly in the same way as their antagonists; and the representatives of the type of supranaturalism must be sought for among the dissenters. In the Netherlands two currents may be observed; one issuing from a purely philosophical, and the other from a pietistic, religious principle, but both setting directly and with vigor against orthodox Calvinism. From the first proposition of Descartes (d. 1650), De omnibus dubitantium est ("every thing must be doubted"), even the confession of the Established Church could not hope to vindicate itself as an exception; and his second proposition, cogito ergo sum ("I think, consequently I am"), gave to all speculation a merely subjective basis, from which the objectivity of a denominational creed could never be reached, except by a leap, or surreptitiously. Still worse, in his Tractatus theologico-politicus Spinoza openly attacked the authority of Scripture, and demanded the whole question of the true religion to be referred to a historical court. No wonder, therefore, that, towards the close of the seventeenth century, the Netherlands swarmed with atheists, and critical questions rose to the surface even within theological circles, especially since the other current, the
Dutch Pietism, rapidly developing from a cautious emphasis on life as against doctrine (Cocceius, d. 1669), into an open tendency of separation from the Established Church (Labadie, d. 1674), ran in an almost parallel direction. Pietism generally took its rise in life, but in science, the result of which is that it often allows science to shrivel into a mere formal demonstration. On account of this indifference to the extension of truth for truth's own sake, Pietism may come to consider Scripture simply a practical means to a practical end, and not keep the source of all truth ever flowing, and ever renewing and refreshing life; the practical end of Pietist life so often shrinks into a narrow brotherhood of the faithful, with no interest for, but perhaps even antipathy against, the church universal. Thus Pietism is never well fitted to take up arms in defence of Supranaturalism; on the contrary, in its further development it generally shows a tendency towards Rationalism. But in France, in the middle of the eighteenth century, even this semblance of an opposition to rationalism disappeared, and the whole movement was directed by the encyclopedists. Pascal's influence had died out; and the adversaries of the encyclopedists were either petrified in mere externals, or lost in indifferentism. But the finest fruits, in a religious aspect, which the encyclopedists produced, were the very affected enthusiasm of Rousseau for Christ and the Gospels, and Voltaire's very natural passion for toleration.

What has been said of Pietism in the Netherlands is true also of Pietism in Germany. Though it was only the eccentricities and excesses of some enthusiasts which actually led into apostasy and free-thinking, even in its noblest form Pietism could not help acting on orthodoxy as a solvent. It was adverse to the scholastic form in which the orthodox system was presented; it was lukewarm to the idea of pure doctrine for purity's own sake; it was well disposed to those who labored for a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches; and it was firmly determined to exterminate, first and foremost, a practical issue: that is to say, Pietism was indifferent where orthodox passion, and passionately where orthodoxy was indifferent. At the same time, orthodoxy underwent certain changes which actually weakened it. It is true that Georg Calixtus (d. 1656) occupied a somewhat insulated position. It is also true that Musseus (d. 1681), so famous for his attack upon Herbert of Cherbury and Spinoza, was compelled to abjure all synthetism. But the Carpzovs and the Calvists, nevertheless, soon ceased to sound the keynote. Distinctions were adopted between against and above reason (non contra, sed supra rationem), between regenerated and unregenerated reason (ratio renata and ratio irregenita), between a mechanical and a normal use of reason (usus organisicus and usus normatus); and, though these distinctions did not actually shake the authority of Scripture, they certainly much detracted from the gravity on which that authority rested. The old professors fought valiantly against the approaching danger; but they saw with regret and anxiety how the young students dropped off, and fell into Pietism, or disbelief of various kinds. Such was the state of German theology when the period of enlightenment (Aufklärung) dawned upon it. It was double-faced; at once popular and philosophical. The popular light was at first introduced from England, France, and the Netherlands; but it soon found in Friedrich II. of Prussia its social guaranty, in Lessing its theological exponent, and in Gellert and a swarm of co-workers its literary propagators, who, in a light, genteel, half-satirical manner, swept away all pedantry, scholasticism, and other forms of old-logicism. Wolff was the bringer of the philosophical light. He established a sharp distinction between theologia naturalis and theologia revelata. In the former, nothing is admitted but that which can be logically demonstrated and scientifically proved: in the latter any thing is accepted which is taught in Scripture. And the relation between these two dominions is this: that all that is valid in theologia naturalis must be found in theologia revelata, but not all that is found in theologia revelata is valid in theologia naturalis. To this distinction corresponds that between rationalism and supranaturalism; and the contest between the two latter is, so to speak, symbolized by Wolff's own life. In 1723 he was driven away from Halle with threats of the gibbet: in 1740 he was brought back in a triumphal chariot.

In the group of supranaturalists which formed under the direct influence of the philosophy of Wolff, S. J. Baumgarten (d. 1757) occupies the most prominent place, and by his side J. D. Michaelis (d. 1781). In Germany as in England the relation in which supranaturalism placed itself to the advancing rationalism was apologetical; and it cannot be denied that the Wolffian school, with its elaborate method of demonstration, its many new cosmological and anthropological ideas, and its bright, ethical optimism, furnished the apologists with much excellent material; though, on the other hand, it is evident, that, by its perpetual harping on the principium ratio sufficientin, it often drew the whole subject down into a lower sphere by teaching people to content themselves with the probable and the useful, instead of demanding truth and goodness. (See Zorn: Petinothologie, 1742.) More independent of Wolff are Mosheim (d. 1755) and the Württemberg school of theology, Matthäus Pfaff (d. 1760), Öttinger (d. 1782), and others. The Württemberg school is thoroughly biblical in its character, and its work was principally exegetical. Pfaff concedes that natural religion is held in high esteem by Scripture; but he adds that it is utterly insufficient to salvation, because it knows nothing of Christ: it has only a usus pedagogicus. Exegesis, he asserts, is the only foundation on which true theology can be built up; and he laments, when seeing how people's hearts have been turned away from Scripture "since theology put on the cloak of philosophy." Öttinger brought into the school a mystico-theosophical element; and he, too, complained of the meagre reasonableness of the Wolffian demonstrations. Entirely without any connection with the Wolffian school, and not belonging to, the supranaturalist group, stand the two great apologists of the period, — Bonnet (d. 1793) and Haller (d. 1777). Between supranaturalism and rationalism, Lessing (d. 1781) forms the transition. His fundamental idea, that God educates the human race by revelations, every supranaturalist will accept.
But when he adds that the contents of the divine revelations are essentially identical with the contents of human reason, and would easily be recognized as such, but for the peculiar form which had been given to it by the theologians, one says that reason to religion, a feeling of disgust begins. And when he goes on, and declares that none of the historically given religions is or can be the absolute religion, because its dogmas, though they may contain eternal truth, must be set forth in expressions belonging to a certain time and place, and consequently transitory, he has arrived at the thresholds of rationalism. By the decisive distinction he makes between that which is eternal in a religion and that which is historical, he is connected directly with J. S. Semler (d. 1791), the father of modern biblical criticism, and the representative of rationalism in its first stage. In his critical exhibitions of the transient features of the Christian revelation, Semler entirely lost sight of the eternal kernel, which he replaced with a somewhat vague idea of a sublime teaching, conducive, if not indispensable, to the social and moral development of mankind. Personally, however, he was without piety, and in all practical relations he was quite conservative. He attacked Basesow, the Wolfenbiittel Fragments, and Bahrdt, though, perhaps, not without a feeling that he fought against disagreeable consequences drawn from his own premises; and he held that the State had a right to decide what should be taught in the school and in the pulpit, and what not. It was only in the theoretical questions of theology that he was liberal in the application of the principle of “accommodation,” his own invention, according to which any idea set forth in Scripture could be put quietly out of the way as a mere accommodation, from the side of the author or of Christ, to reigning circumstances. There was a long distance between him and the Wolfenbiittel Fragments, whose publication began in 1774, and, again, between the Wolfenbiittel Fragments and Bahrdt (d. 1792). Semler's was the moral character of Jesus and the apostles. It was the Wolfenbiittel Fragments which led the way in that field, representing Christ as simply a reformer of Judaism, as a mere enthusiast, as a visionary, whose schemes of establishing a kingdom of Palestine were miserably wrecked. But Bahrdt followed up the track; and, to the intense disgust of the rationalists themselves, he represented Christ as a coarse naturalist, who, from mere regards of prudence, concealed his real plan, that of destroying all positive religion, and only communicated his wisdom to a select few, whom he formed into a kind of secret society. Its headquarters rationalism had in Berlin; its popular organ, in Nicolai’s Algemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, which began to be published in 1765. As a representative example of its scientific productivity may be mentioned Teller’s Wörterbuch des N. T., 1772. In Nicolai’s periodical, which it was his business to edit, one of the great instruments of German civilization, everything which in English or French philosophy smacked of passionate research or audacious aspirations was carefully cut off, and that which was served was cautiously toned down to a most insipid palaver. In Teller’s Wörterbuch all the specifically biblical ideas were left out, and the commonplace trivialities of general morals, which naturally led the author to the idea of the perfection of Christianity. Generally speaking, the course of rationalism, from its origin to the appearance of Kant, may be described as a movement from Christianity to rationalism, from religion in general to merely moral, and finally, from morality to eudemonism, the doctrine of happiness.

As the philosophy of Wolff had proved decisive for the final development of both supranaturalism and rationalism, it was to be expected that the philosophy of Kant would also exercise its influence. And so it did. When Kant, on the one side, theoretically, completely excluded the supranatural as something to which reason could enter into no relation whatever, and yet, on the other side, practically re-introduced it into reason as a necessary postulate, he seemed simply to open the way for the idea of a divine revelation. And, indeed, there were quite a number of theologians—Stäudlin (d. 1828), K. L. Nitzsch (d. 1831), Ammon (d. 1849), and others—who attempted to infuse new life into supranaturalism by deducting the necessity of it from Kantian premises. Stäudlin never grew tired of asserting that the true conception of Christianity could be built up only on the basis of a union between rationalism and supranaturalism, whence the school received the name of rational supranaturalism, or supranatural rationalism. But it soon became apparent that the hybrid had not strength enough to live. The philosophical substructure could not bear the theological building reared upon it. One concession had to be made to rationalism after the other; and the school gradually disappeared, while those who took its place—Haumann, Claudius, Harns, and others—built on another foundation, pursued other aspirations, and soon dropped the whole question of rationalism and supranaturalism.

Still more affinity rationalism showed to the Kantian philosophy; and all the more serious rationalists among the theologians accepted the Kantian deduction of morality as a true liberation from the vulgar eudemonism, in which they felt half suffocated. But rationalism had at this time spent all its power of production. It could do nothing but repeat its old proposition,—that reason is the highest arbiter, even in matters of religion; that Christianity is perfectible, etc. Thus Röhr, in his Briefe über den Rationalismus, 1813, explains, that “that which the supranaturalists call Christology forms no part of his system, which is simply the exposition of a religion taught by Jesus, but not of a religion of which Jesus is the subject.” The fundamental principle of rationalism he finds in the non-exclusion of intermediate causes. “No experience,” he claims, “has ever found evidence of a direct, immediate interference of God: nay, the very notion of the supranatural causes a feeling of disgust. The religion of Jesus is considered one of the principles of a universal religion, only so far as it is the religion of pure reason; and only those of its propositions can be accepted as universal truth which have been recognized by the collected reason of the human race. Not so very different from this is Weisgeberscher Institutionen theor. dogm., 1816. But though, in the second decade of the 19th century, the rationalists were still in possession both of the
church and the school, they not only produced nothing new, but they actually began to pine away, from inanition; and the new theological schools which arose beside them (those of Schleiermacher and Hegel) were as indifferent to the question of rationalism and supranaturalism as were the successors of their supranaturalist adversaries Cornelius a lapide and Montesquieu.

Lit. — Hain: De rationalismo inbole, 1827; Stäudlin: Geschichte des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus, 1826; Tholuck: Vorgeschichte d. R., 1853, and Geschichte d. R., 1885; Hündes hagen: Der deutsche Protestantismus, 1850, 3d ed.; F. de Rougemont: Les deux cités, 1874; [histories of rationalism by Lecky (Lond., 1865, 2 v.), and Hurst (N.Y., 1865); Cairns: Unbelief in the 18th Century, Edinb., 1881; and Tholuck: art. in Herzog, I. xii. 537-554].

ROBERT KÜBEL.

RATIBSON, The Conference of (April 27-May 25, 1541), may be considered as a continuation of the Conference of Worms, 1521. By this last attempt by Charles V. at solving the religious split in Germany was not to be healed by a theological formula. The interlocutors were Gropper, Pflug, and Eck on the one side, Butzer, Pistorius, and Melanchthon on the other. Besides the presidents, Countpalatine Friedrich von Zimmern and Cardinal Granvelle, six witnesses were present, among whom was Jacob Sturm. As basis, was used, not the Confessio Augustana, but the so-called Ratibson Book, in twenty-two articles. In spite of Eck's opposition, an agreement was arrived at concerning the article on justification; and the Roman Catholics granted that faith, with the addition of effigies, was the principal, and indeed the sole, condition of justification. But with respect to the articles on the doctrinal authority of the church, the hierarchy, discipline, sacraments, etc., no agreement was possible; and the only real result of the conference was the general conviction that the religious split in Germany was not to be healed by a theological formula.

Lit. — Reports of the conference were published in Latin and German by Butzer and Melanchthon, and in Latin by Eck. Further documents are found in the correspondence of Reformation time.

RATZBERGER, Matthäus, b. at Wangen in Württemberg, 1501; d. at Erfurt, Jan. 3, 1559. He studied medicine at Wittenberg, and was successively body-physician to the Elector of Brandenburg, the Count of Mansfield, and the Elector of Saxony. He was a relative of Luther, his house-physician, and an intimate friend of his. The best edition of his Life of Luther is that by Neudecker, Jena, 1860.

RAU (RAVIUS), Christian, b. at Berlin, Jan. 25, 1813; d. at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, June 21, 1877. He was graduated at Wittenberg, 1836. In 1838 he visited Augsburg, Ratisbon, and the south of Germany; in 1839 he was in the East, acquiring Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Roman. On his return he taught Orientalia at Oxford (1844-45), Utrecht (1845), Upsala (1850), Kiel (1859), Frankfort-on-the-Oder (1871). He was also at Stockholm for several years, under Charles Gustave, as interpreter and librarian to the king. His most useful work is perhaps his epitome of Buxtorf's Hebrew and Greek Concordance, Berlin and Frankfort, 1877; but besides it he published, among other works, Chronologia Inferi, Upsala, 1898; De adventu et plenitudo temporis in Christi Gematia, Upsala, 1849.

RAUCH, Frederick Augustus, P.h.D., first president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Penn.: b. at Kirchbracht, Hesse-Darmstadt, July 27, 1806; d. at Mercersburg, Penn., March 2, 1841. The son of a minister of the Reformed Church, in his childhood the real boy was trained. At the age of eighteen he entered the university of Marburg, and subsequently studied philosophy and theology in Giessen and Heidelberg. Thereupon he was appointed extraordinary professor of philosophy in the university of
Giesse n, and at the end of one year was comiplimented with an appointment to an ordinary professorship in the university of Heidelberg. But on some public occasion, before leaving Giesse n, he expressed political sentiments which brought upon him the displeasure of the government. A friend warned him of danger, and urged him to escape. He had at midnight a final interview of a few hours with his father, and then took refuge in America, 1831. He located at Easton, Penn., and, being a total stranger, earned a livelihood for some months by teaching music. But his abilities as a scholar, and his high character, soon becoming known, he was made professor of the German language in Lafayette College.

In June, 1832, he removed to York, Penn., and took charge of the high school, which in 1829 had been established by the German Reformed Church in connection with her theological seminary. In the annual meeting held in October of this year he was elected professor of biblical literature. The high school was removed to Mercersburg in the fall of 1835, and incorporated as Marshall College. Dr. Rauch was chosen president; and in the twofold capacity of president of Marshall College, and professor of biblical literature in the theological seminary, he labored with zeal and enthusiasm for the last five years of his life.

As a scholar, Dr. Rauch excelled in classical literature, in natural history, in moral philosophy, and in mental science. He was at home, also, in the sphere of aesthetics, and had his mind richly stored with the creations of genius as they belong to the fine arts generally. The German philosophy, with all its bewildering abstractions, was for him the subject of familiar knowledge; while it commanded, also, his general confidence and respect. He saw in its different cardinal systems, not contradiction and confusion so much as the unity of one and the same grand intellectual movement, borne forward from one stage of development to another. In Heidelberg he was a student and friend of the eminent theologian, Dr. John.ephan, and philosopher, Charles Daub, who represented the right or conservative wing of the Hegelian school, and had firm faith in the triune personality of God and in the other distinctive principles of Christianity. In America, Rauch's Christian ideas became more decided, clear, and fixed.

In both the college and the seminary, Rauch taught by lectures, written and oral. When using a text-book, it was his uniform habit to accompany the examination of students with an informal lecture, expounding, criticizing, illustrating, or commenting upon the contents of the book. He never failed to awaken interest, stimulate thought, create a keen thirst for knowledge, and kindle enthusiasm in his students. He was probably the first man who introduced into the educational system of America what is known as the critical method of teaching, derived from the mechanical method. The parts of a subject were not regarded as externally, but ever as internally related. Mind was not a conglomerate of faculties, but a vital unity. History was not merely a sequence of events, but a growth, a process advancing agreeably to the nature of life. No question in philosophy was to be discussed or settled according to an arbitrary plan or standard, but was to be considered and solved agreeably to principles and laws which were inherent in the idea itself. The truth of a dogma was to be tested or determined by any number of Bible passages, but by its organic connection with that living economy of which Jesus Christ was the author and the animating soul. Rauch, whilst living, was understood and appreciated by few only. The systems of moral and mental philosophy then taught were to him superficial and meagre. He believed it to be his mission to labor for the union of German with Scotch and American modes of thought, or Anglo-German philosophy as he termed it. To accomplish this end he planned a series of works, the most needful of which he believed to be, one on psychology, another on ethics, and a third on aesthetics. But his premature death frustrated this scheme. During the last year of his life he wrote and published his Psychology, and he had completed his plan and preparation of a work on ethics.

Dr. Rauch was properly the founder of Marshall College. This was the principal achievement of his short life. He prepared, organized, and trained the first five classes (1837-41); and in doing this he breathed a soul into the institution. The characteristic features of his philosophic genius and organic method he infused so effectually, that his educational work survived his death. The distinguishing spirit inbreathed by him has lived and flourished in the philosophy and theology of the college and seminary (now located at Lancaster, Penn.), though modified, developed, and matured by his successors, onward to the present time. See Mercersburg Theology.


RAUHE, Haus. See WICHERN.

RAUTENSTRAUCH, Franz Stephan, b. at Plat- ben, Bohemia, 1794; d. at Erlau, Hungary, 1795; entered the Benedictine order, taught philosophy, canon law, and theology, at Braunau; and was in 1774 made director of the theological faculty in Vienna. He was a zealous defender of the re-forms of Joseph II., and drew up the edict of 1778 concerning the re-organization of the theological study in Austria. Among his writings are, Institutum juris ecclesiasticum, Prague, 1769, and Synopsis jur. ecc., Vienna, 1776.

RAVENNA, an important city of Gallia Cispa- dana, forty-three miles south-east from Bologna, and originally situated on the Adriatic, from which, owing to the deposits from the delta of the Po, it is now distant between five and six miles.

It was founded by the Thessalians, according to Strabo, who describes it as traversed by canals, abounding in bridges and ferries, and noted for the abundance of its wine.

Late in the history of the Roman Republic it was the chief military station of Cisalpine Gaul,
and a frequent resort of Julius Caesar during his Gallic administration. Augustus made it one of the three principal naval stations of the empire, and the headquarters of the Adriatic fleet. He constructed a new and spacious harbor, about which a town grew up, known later as the suburb Classe; and between this and the city proper arose, at a later time, another suburb, under the name of Cesarea.

From this time until far on in the history of the later empire, the city appears as an important military and naval station, and as a place of confinement for state prisoners. About 400 A.D. it became the residence of the Emperor Honorius, who fled thither at the approach of Alaric, and continued to be the seat of government until the fall of the Western Empire, in 476. Galla Placidia, the sister of Honorius, and mother of Valentinian III., resided there as regent from 425 to 430, and contributed largely to the adornment of the city. Theodoric besieged it in 487; and the murder of Odoacer placed in his hand the sceptre, which he wielded for thirty-three years. He was succeeded by a series of elective kings, until 539, when Justinian undertook to bring Italy under the Byzantine Empire, and Ravenna opened its gates to Belisarius. Then followed, for a hundred and eighty-five years, the rule of the exarchs or viceroys of the Byzantine court, the last of whom, Eutychius, was expelled by the Lombards in 752.

The chief interest of Ravenna is ecclesiastical. According to a questionable tradition, the gospel was preached there as early as 79 A.D., by a disciple of Peter, Apollinaris, who suffered martyrdom for the destruction of a temple of Apollo. Monumentally the city falls into the line of ecclesiastical history with the era of the Theodosian family; and, within less than a hundred and fifty years, Galla Placidia, Theodoric, and the representatives of the Byzantine Empire, successively enriched it with the Christian monuments which now constitute its principal attraction. Its chief monuments belong to the transitional period, when the Roman and the Teutonic elements of the western world were mingled, and when the mingling of the two had not yet formed a third whole different from either. It was the seat of the first settled Teutonic dominion beyond the Alps.

The monuments fall into three classes, marking three periods,—the Theodosian, the Gothic, and the Byzantine.

Of the Theodosian era, the principal relics are the church of San Giovanni Evangelista, erected by Placidia, 425; the church of SS. Nazaro e Celso, better known as the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia (450), where her huge sarcophagus is still preserved with the bones of at least two Roman emperors; the baptistery of San Giovanni in Fonte (451), one of the most interesting ecclesiastical structures in the world, containing the earliest known mosaics of the fifth century.

The Gothic or Arian era is represented by the church of San Spirito, noteworthy only for its baptistery, Santa Maria in Comedin, with its sixth century mosaics; and San Martino in Calo Aureo, afterwards changed to S. Apollinare Nuovo, in honor of the first bishop of Ravenna, whose remains are said to be interred there. The series of colossal mosaic figures occupying the whole length of the triforium on both sides of the nave may safely challenge the competition of any similar works in the world. The church of S. Apollinare in Classe, in the ancient suburb Classe, was begun eight years after Theodoric's death (528), and consecrated fifteen years later. It now stands almost alone in a desolate marsh. The original mosaics of 671 are interesting as marking the point where the ecclesiastical sentiment begins to rank with the purely Christian. The figure of Apollinaris in the midst of a flock of sheep is on a level with that of Peter, thus asserting the equality of the Eastern and Western churches.

The great illustration of the Byzantine period is the church of San Vitale, begun in 526, and consecrated 547, to the memory of Vitalis, the patron saint of Ravenna. Here the oblong basilica gives place to the octagon, and the lines of columns are replaced by tiers of arches. The mosaics are of the time of Justinian and Theodora. Among them are portraits of the emperor and empress as patrons of the church.

When Honorius chose Ravenna for his residence, the see of Ravenna was raised to metropolitán dignity, increased in importance under the Ostrogothic rule, and maintained its rank during the exarchate. An assembly of bishops was convened there about 419 by Honorius, to decide the contest for the papal chair between Boniface and Eulalius. They could not agree, and left the decision to the emperor. After the establishment of the exarchs, a long struggle began for the independence of the Roman see. Maurus, who was primate (642-671), refused obedience to the Pope, and was sustained by the Emperor Constans in the edict of 666, declaring Ravenna independent of Rome. Under Pope Domnus (679), appointee of Theodoric, the independence of Ravenna lost its formal character. The struggle was renewed between Pope Hadrian and Archbishop Leo (770-779), and again, after nearly a century of quiet, between Pope Nicholas I. and Archbishop John, and was finally ended by the complete submission of John at a synod called by Nicholas at Rome, 861.

Ravenna has been the seat of twenty-five synods, few of which are deserving of special mention. Among the decrees of the synod of 877 it was enacted that bishops must be consecrated within three months after their appointment, on penalty of excommunication. At the synod of 917 the Emperor proposed to Pope John XIII. the city and territory of Ravenna. The synod of 998 condemned the custom of selling the holy Eucharist and chrism; and that of 1131 pronounced against the excessive freedom and luxury of nuns, and the too frequent use of exorcisms. The synod of 1368 granted the permission to monks to preach indulgences.

Ravenna holds the ashes of Dante, who removed thither in 1320. There he completed the last cantica of the Divina Commedia, and died on the 14th of September, 1321. The twenty-eight
RAYMOND OF SABUNDE.

RAYMOND OF SABUNDE, or SABIENDE, a native of Spain; taught medicine and philosophy at Toulouse, and became finally professor regius there in theology. From 1434 to 1486 he wrote his Liber natura sive creaturarum, etc., the only monument he has left of himself, but a work which occupies a most prominent place in the history of natural theology. Augustine was the first who made a distinction between lumen naturae and lumen gratiae; that is, between the truth which may be acquired by natural experience and the truth which is given us only by divine revelation. But after him the distinction was repeated over and over again; and through the whole course of mediaeval theology there was a tendency, that of reconciliation and combination, became prevalent. It was supported by the ruling realism, and capable of assimilating a considerable amount of Platonic elements. Revelation and redemption continued to be considered as indispensable links in the divine scheme of salvation; but it was at the same time generally held that the idea of God could be reached by natural rationalization, and that nature herself had implanted in man the principle of morality. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, however, a complete change took place. From the influx of the Arabico-Aristotelian philosophy, philosophical speculation received a new impulse; but as it was compelled to confine itself to systematic theology without making any fresh researches or any new conquests, and as systematic theology already stood fixed with the character of unquestionable authority, needing no testimony from reason, and even unwilling to accept any, it came quite naturally to pass that reason and faith, philosophy and theology, were placed over against each other. It was against this tendency that Raymond wrote his Liber naturae sive creaturarum, etc., the only book which occupies a most prominent place in the history of natural theology. The book of nature, he says, and the book of the Bible, are both revelations, — the former general and immediate, the latter specific and mediate; and the reciprocal relation between them is this: by the light which the book of nature gives us of God and the prayers of the brethren (Life of S. Eucherius, Muratorii, i. 62). Nevertheless, he represents fairly enough the traditions of the fifth and sixth centuries, though with some subsequent legendary incrustations. His great importance lies in preserving the dates of the buildings, and in showing beyond all doubt, that the churches of Ravenna are really the works of the fifth and sixth centuries (see also Gibbon: Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Millman: History of Latin Christianity, and Hare: Cities of Northern and Central Italy, London, 1876, 3 vols.; and, for history of councils, Philippe Labbe: SS. Concilia, Venet., 1728; E. H. Landon: Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church, Lond., 1846; Hefele: Conciliengeschichte, vol. v. (2d ed., Freiburg-im-Br., 1873 sqq.). MARVIN R. VINCENT.
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RAYMUNDUS LULLUS. 2002

REDEMPTION.

of imitations it found. The editio princeps of it is without date or place, but belongs probably to the year 1484. The best edition is that by Rych. Paffendorf, Dusseldorf, 1488. The latest is that by J. E. von Seidel, Sulzbach, 1852; but it lacks the Prologus, which in 1595 was put on the Index, because it declares the Bible to be the only source of revealed truth. See Fr. Holberg: De theologia naturali R. Sabunde, Halle, 1843; D. Mätzke: Die natürliche Theologie des R. S., Breslau, 1846; M. Huttler: Die Religionsphilosophie R. S., Augsburg, 1851; Klieber: De R. S., Berlin, 1856.

RAYMUNDUS LULLUS. See Lullus.

READER. See Lector.

REALISM. See Scholastic Theology.

REAL PRESENCE. See Lord's Supper, p. 1848.

RE'CHABITES, the descendants of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, whose obedience to their father's command not to drink wine, build houses, sow seed, plant vineyards nor have any, but to dwell always in tents, is held up by Jeremiah as a model for Judah (Jer.xxxv. 19). The promise that Jonadab should not want a man to stand before the Lord forever (Jer. xxxv. 19) was probably fulfilled by the admission of the Rechabites, on account of their piety, into the tribe of Levi; for a son of Rechab is mentioned in Neh. iii. 14 along with the Levites, and, according to 1 Chron. ii. 55, Rechabites were scribes, a Levitical occupation. Besides, the phrase "to stand before the Lord" meant "to minister," as the Levites did (Deut. x. 8, xviii. 5, 7). Where the Rechabites came from originally is unknown, but it is generally supposed they were Kenites (1 Chron. ii. 55).

RE'CLEUSE, a term often applied to all persons who withdraw from the world to spend their days in meditation, but properly applied only to hermits, and especially to monks and nuns who are, at their own request, solemnly sealed up in their cells, there to die. The privilege is only to be accorded to those of tried and extraordinary virtue, and by express permission of the abbot. They were not allowed afterwards to leave their cells, except by the bishop. The practice was commonest in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and among the Benedictines and Franciscans. Aelred, abbot of Rievsey, Lincolnshire, wrote directions for recluse (regula s. instituto inclusurum). Rabanus Maurus was a recluse when elected archbishop of Mainz.

RECO'LLECT (from recolligere, "to gather again"), the term applied to certain congregations inside different monastic orders, because their members have returned to the primitive strict rule of life. So in the latter part of the seventeenth century, there were recollects of the Augustinians; so among the Franciscans there were recollects of both sexes. HERZOG.

RECONCILIATION. See ATONEMENT.

RECTOR (governor), as distinguished from vicar, is a clergyman of the Church of England who receives either the whole revenues of the parish, if there be no vicar or the church was never appropriate, or that part which was of old appropriated to some of the monasteries, while the vicar receives that part which was set out for the maintenance of him who was to supply the cure.

REDEEMER, Orders of the, were founded, (1) in Spain, by Alfonso I., as a reward for bravery against the Moors, which was abolished after their conquest. The latest is that by Vincenzo of Mantua (also called the Order of the Precious Blood of Christ), for the defence of the Catholic faith, which was abolished in the eighteenth century; and (3) in Greece, by King Otto I. on June 1, 1844, as a reward for merit, the king himself being grand master. HERZOG.

REDEMPTION is a fundamental conception of Christianity, and the name Redeemer is applied to Christ as a comprehensive designation of his work. It presupposes a state of bondage and restraint, in which man fails to reach the development for which his powers adapt him, and stands in a false relationship to God. This disturbance of our relation to God is called sin. If there were no sin, there would be no redemption. Redemption is, therefore, liberation from sin and its evil consequences. The promise of redemption which God gave after the fall (Gen. iii. 15) was renewed to the children of Israel in various forms, as a deliverance from their sin, as a deliverance from the hand of the ungodly (Ps. xxii., xxxii., xxxi. 15), a conception which still prevailed in New-Testament times (Luke i. 71), and from guilt and sin (Ps. li.; Isa. xliii. 24, 25, lii., etc.). Jehovah is expressly called the Redeemer of Israel (Isa. xliii. 14, liv. 5, lx. 16). The promises of the Old Testament were fulfilled in Christ. The redemption from the yoke of the Roman dominion, which the mass of his contemporaries expected, he did not procure. His redemption is an infinitely higher and better one, from sin and all evil, and extends to all mankind (John iii. 16, 17). The New Testament speaks of it under a variety of figures, as the payment of a ransom (hærpes), and a rescue from a lost condition (ἀπολύσια). It is regarded as a deliverance from guilt, whereby the forgiveness of sins is made possible (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, etc.), the curse of the law (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), and the wrath of God (Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10, v. 9). This is the juridical side of redemption. It has also an ethical side, and includes deliverance from the power and dominion of sin. In this sense, Christ has redeemed us from all unrighteousness, as his own possession, which the mass of his contemporaries expected, he did not procure. His redemption is an infinite and better one, from sin and all evil, and extends to all mankind (John iii. 16, 17). The New Testament speaks of it under a variety of figures, as the payment of a ransom (hærpes), and a rescue from a lost condition (ἀπολύσια). It is regarded as a deliverance from guilt, whereby the forgiveness of sins is made possible (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, etc.), the curse of the law (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), and the wrath of God (Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10, v. 9). This is the juridical side of redemption. It has also an ethical side, and includes deliverance from the power and dominion of sin. In this sense, Christ has redeemed us from all unrighteousness, as his own possession, which the mass of his contemporaries expected, he did not procure. His redemption is an infinite and better one, from sin and all evil, and extends to all mankind (John iii. 16, 17). The New Testament speaks of it under a variety of figures, as the payment of a ransom (hærpes), and a rescue from a lost condition (ἀπολύσια). It is regarded as a deliverance from guilt, whereby the forgiveness of sins is made possible (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, etc.), the curse of the law (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), and the wrath of God (Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10, v. 9).

The original motive of redemption was the love of God, which wills not the death of the sinner (John iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4). In order to accomplish this, God sent his Son into the world, who gave himself as our ransom, even unto death (Matt. xx. 28; John x. 11, 15; 1 Tim. ii. 6), becoming a curse on the cross to deliver us from the curse of the law (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). What he began in his humiliation on earth, he is consummating in his state of exaltation. Christ is himself redemption (John xiv. 6), and offers to all men, on condition of their repent-
ance, and turning from their evil ways (2 Cor. vii. 10; Jas. v. 20, etc.), believing in the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. i. 16; Eph. ii. 8), and confessing his name (Rom. x. 9,13). The sinner must work out his own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12), acknowledging the Lord, and living unto righteousness (1 Pet. ii. 24).

The post-apostolic writers bring out the different aspects under which the work of redemption is presented in the New Testament; but the majority of the Fathers (Irenaeus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, etc.) treated it as a judicial transaction, in which Jesus gave up his life to the Devil in payment for mankind. Gregory Nazianzen, opposing this conception, treated it as a conflict between Christ and Satan for the possession of man (Orat., xliv.). As heathenism, the manifestation of sin's dominion began to be overcome, the church began to regard redemption more from the standpoint of its power and effects upon the soul itself. Athanasius carried out the idea that the Logos assumed human nature, and gave himself up unto death, because the justice and veracity of God demanded the death of mankind as he had threatened, for sin. Basil the Great, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, and John of Damascus, held this conception. It was Anselm of Canterbury who laid the most stress on man's guilt, and worked out his doctrine in the famous treatise, Why God became Man ("Cur Deus homo"). Starting with the conception of the divine justice and the majesty of the law, he asserted the necessity of an equivalent for the violation of the law. This could be furnished only by the innocent and infinite Son of God. This doctrine of the atonement was further developed by Hugo of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. The Reformers, accepting this view, developed the doctrine in such a way as to render its practical workings very different from what they are in the Roman-Catholic Church, which imposes burdens and penances upon the sinner, admits works of supererogation, and requires a third vow, powers of binding and loosing. The Protestant churches regard redemption as the work of divine mercy, accomplished by the incarnation, obedience, and death of Christ, and made efficacious by the faith of the sinner. This work, which is already accomplished, acts upon the intellectual nature of man as a deliverance from darkness unto light (Col. i. 13), and upon his moral nature, delivering his will from the bondage of sin, and endowing it with the power to choose and execute works of righteousness. Christ redeems us from the world, the flesh, and the Devil; and faith in him overcomes the world (1 John v. 4). Redemption also affects man's physical nature by delivering him from death; Christ himself being the resurrection and the life (John xi. 25), having broken the power of death by his own resurrection. He who believes in Christ already has eternal life (John iii. 36) dwells in the light (3 John), and when Christ returns, our vile bodies shall be changed into the likeness of his glorious body (Phil. iii. 21), and we shall be translated into the communion of the blessed. This is redemption in its narrowest sense (Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 14). [For a still further treatment of the subject, and its literature, see art. Atone-ment.]
RED SEA. The, an inlet of the Indian Ocean, 1,450 miles long, 330 miles broad, separating Egypt from Arabia, begins at Bab-el-Mandeb, in latitude 21° 42' 30" north, and stretches, in the direction of north-west, to Ras Mohammed, in latitude 27° 44' north, where it separates into two arms,—the Gulf of Suez to the west, and the Gulf of 'Akabah to the east. Its name among the ancient Hebrews, Syrians, and Egyptians, was "the Sea of Reeds," among the Greeks and Romans: Herodotus, Agatharchides, Diidorus Siculus, Ptolemy, Pliny, Strabo, Ctesias, Josephus, Pseudoarrian (in his Peripitus), the Greek writers of Scripture (I Mac. iv. 9; Sol. chides, Diodorus Siculus, Ptolemy, Pliny, Strabo, Ctesias, Josephus, Pseudoarrian (in his Peripitus), the Greek writers of Scripture (1 Mace. iv. 9; Sol. chides, Diodorus Siculus, Ptolemy, Pliny, Strabo, Ctesias, Josephus, Pseudoarrian (in his Peripitus), the Greek writers of Scripture (Acts vii. 36; Heb. xi. 29), the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Byzantine writers, Antoninus, and Cosmas Indicopleustes. The Arabs have only local names. The derivation of the Hebrew name, "Sea of Reeds," is uncertain, as reeds are very rare along those shores: nevertheless, Ehrenberg has shown that the reed, which the Hebrews knew so well from the banks of the Nile, is actually growing at the two points of the Red Sea with which they were acquainted; namely, the eastern terminus of the Wadi et Tih and the Gulf of 'Akabah. Equally uncertain is the derivation of the Greek-Roman name "Red Sea." Some derive it from the red corals, which are found in great plenty in the waters, and were much used by the Hebrews and Syrians for ornaments (Ezek. xxvii. 16); others, from Edom ("red"). The Hebrews often added to their "Sea of Reeds," "in the land of the Edomites." The Red Sea has its greatest interest for the student of the Bible on account of its connection with the history of the exodus of the Israelites (which art. see). But it was from the earliest times of importance as the connecting link between the East and the West. The Island Purim, situated in the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, was the bridge across which the Hamites reached Africa after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and across which Sesostris led his army to the conquest of the East. ' Akabah was the harbor of Solomon, Josaphat, Azaris, Rezin, the Romans, and the Byzantines. Rameses II. connected the Gulf of Suez with the eastern arm of the Nile by a canal, and the Ptolemies deepened and widened the canal. But very little was known of the Red Sea until quite recently. The western coast was first explored by Niebuhr, 1763; the eastern, by Holford, 1772. The Sinaitic Peninsula and the Gulf of 'Akabah remained unknown till the days of Rüppell, 1810, and Mosesby, 1829-33. [See art. in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible; and Ebers: Durch Gosen zum Sinai, Leipzig, rev. ed., 1881 passim.]

FREISER.

REED, Andrew, D.D., an eminent philanthropist and divine; was b. in London, Nov. 27, 1788, and d. there Feb. 25, 1862. Nearly all his life was spent in Arabia: begins at Bab-el-Mandeb, and extends its missionary operations to all heathen lands. Although divided, and ever tending to new divisions, it is at the present time the most active and progressive part of Christendom. It has three chief branches,—the Lutheran, in Germany; the Zwinglian and Calvinistic, in Switzerland, France, Holland, and Scotland; the Anglican, in England. Each of these branches has again become the root of other Protestant denominations, especially in England and the United States, under the fostering care of civil and religious freedom. The entire Protestant population now numbers over a hundred millions of nominal members. Protestantism has spread far beyond its strongest limits in Germany, Switzerland, Scandinavia, Holland, the British Empire, and North America, and extends its missionary operations to all heathen lands. Although divided, and ever tending to new divisions, it is at the present time the most active and progressive part of Christendom.

I. PREPARATION FOR THE REFORMATION. — It was not an abrupt revolution, but had its roots in the middle ages. There were many "reformers before the Reformation," and almost every doctrine of Luther and Calvin had its advocates long before them. The whole struggle of medieval Catholicism toward reform and liberty; the long conflict between the German emperors and the popes; the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel; the Waldenses and Albigenses in France and Northern Italy; Wiclif and the Lollards in England; Hus and the Hussites in Bohemia; Arnold of Brescia, and Savonarola, in Italy; the spiritualistic piety and theology of the mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the invention of the printing-press; the revival of letters and classical learning under the direction of Agricola, Reuchlin, and Erasmus, — all these, and similar movements, were preparations for the Reformation. The evangelical churches claim a share in the inheritance of all preceding history, and own their indebtedness to the missionaries, schoolmen, fathers, confessors, and martyrs of former ages, but acknowledge no higher authority than Christ and his inspired organs. The Reformation is similarly related to medieval Catholicism as the apostolic church to the Jewish synagogue, or the gospel dispensation to the heathen dispensation to the dispensation of the law. The discipline of the law looks towards freedom and independence. See the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (the Magna Charta of evangelical Protestantism).

LIT.—On the preparations for the Reformation, see especially ULLMANN: Die Reformatoren vor der Reformation (Hamb., 1842, 2 vols.; Eng. trans. by R. Menzies, Edinb., 1855, 2 vols.), and the
monographs on Wiclif, Hus, Wessel, Savonarola, Erasmus, etc., mentioned under these titles.

II. Principles of the Reformation. — It was originally neither a political, nor a philosophical, nor a literary, but a religious and moral movement; although it exerted a powerful influence on all the branches of Protestantism went farther in their antagonism to the received traditions than the Lutheran and the Anglican Reformation; but all united in rejecting the authority of the Pope (Melanchthon for a while was willing to concede this, but only jure humano, as a limited disciplinary superintendency of the church), the meritoriousness of good works, the indulgences, the worship of the Holy Virgin, of saints and relics, the seven sacraments (with the exception of baptism and the Eucharist), the dogma of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory and prayers for the dead, auricular confession, celibacy of the clergy, the monastic system, and the use of the Latin tongue in public worship, for which the vernacular languages were substituted.

(2) The subjective principle of the Reformation is justification by faith alone, or, rather, by free grace through faith operative in good works. It has reference to the personal appropriation of the Christian salvation, and aims to give all glory to Christ, by declaring that the sinner is justified before God (i.e., is acquitted of guilt, and declared righteous) solely on the ground of the all-sufficient merits of Christ as apprehended by a living faith, in opposition to the theory — then prevalent, and substantially sanctioned by the Council of Trent — which makes faith and good works the two co-ordinate sources of justification, laying the chief stress upon works. Protestantism does not, on that account, by any means reject or depreciate good works: it only denies their value as sources or conditions of justification, but insists on them as the necessary fruits of faith, and evidence of justification.

(3) The social and ecclesiastical principle is the universal priesthood of believers. This implies the right and duty of the Christian laity, not only to read the Bible, but to be enabled to take part in the government and all the public affairs of the church. It is opposed to the hierarchical system, which puts the essence and authority of the church into an exclusive priesthood, and makes ordained priests the necessary and only mediators between God and the people.

Hundeshagen, Schnecknburger, Schweizer, Julius Müller, etc., quoted in Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, vol. iv. N.Y., 1862 (very important for the literature, and extracts from the sources);


The most learned work against the Reformation is by Dr. Düllinger: Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklungs- und ihre Wirkungen, Regensb., 1846-48, 3 vols. But the distinguished author afterwards protested himself against the Pope and the Vatican Council, and was excommunicated in 1871.

I. The Reformation in Germany. — The movement in Germany was directed by the genius and energy of Luther, and the learning and moderation of Melanchthon, assisted by the electors of Saxony and other princes, and sustained by the majority of the people, in spite of the opposition of the bishops and the imperial government. It commenced in the University of Wittenberg with a protest against the traffic in indulgences, Oct. 31, 1517 (ever since celebrated in Protestant Germany as the festival of the Reformation), and soon spread all over Germany, which was in various ways prepared for a breach with the Pope. At first it kept within the bosom of the Roman Church. Luther shrunk in holy horror from the idea of a separation from the traditions of the past, and retained a profound reverence for certain Catholic dogmas and institutions. He only attacked a few abuses, taking it for granted that the Pope himself would condemn them if properly informed. But the irresistible logic of events carried him far beyond his original intentions, and brought him into irreconcilable conflict with the central authority of the church. Pope Leo X., in June, 1520, pronounced the sentence of excommunication against Luther, and the bull, together with the canon law and several books of his opponents. This was the fiery signal of war. The Diet of Worms in 1521, where he made his memorable defence, added to the excommunication of the Pope the ban of the emperor.

The bold stand of the poor monk, in the face of the combined civil and ecclesiastical powers of the age, is one of the sublimest scenes in history, and marks an epoch in the progress of freedom. The dissatisfaction with the various abuses of Rome, and the desire for the free preaching of the gospel, were so extensive, that the Reformation, both in its negative and positive features, spread, in spite of the Pope's bull and the emperor's ban, and gained a foothold before 1530 in the greater part of Northern Germany, especially in Saxony, Brandenburg, Hesse, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Lüneburg, Friesland, and in nearly all the free cities, as Hamburg, Lübeck, Bremen, Magdeburg, Frankfort, and Nürnberg; while in Austria, Bavaria, and along the Rhine, it was persecuted and suppressed. Among the principal causes of this rapid progress were the writings of the Reformers, Luther's German version of the Scriptures (his greatest and most useful work, begun 1521, completed 1534), and the evangelical hymns, which introduced the new ideas into public worship and the hearts of the people. That extraordinary man, as a sort of inspired apostle and prophet of Germany, gave to his people the Bible, the Catechism, and the Hymn-Book, in the purest and strongest idiomatic German; and well may Germany, and all the Protestant churches in Europe and America, celebrate the fourth centennial of his birth on the 10th of November of this year (1888). The Diet of Spire, in 1525, left each state to its own discretion concerning the question of reform, until a general council should settle it for all, and thus sanctioned the principle of territorial independence in matters of religion which prevails in Germany to this day; each sovereignty having its own separate ecclesiastical establishment in close union with the state. But the next Diet of Spire (in 1529) prohibited the further progress of the Reformation. Against this decree of the Roman-Catholic majority, the evangelical princes entered, on the ground of the Word of God, the inalienable rights of conscience, and the decree of the previous Diet of Spire, the celebrated protest, dated April 10, 1555, which gave rise to the name of "Protestants."

= 1. The Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, where the Lutherans offered their principal confession of faith, drawn up by Melanchthon, and named after that city, threatened the Protestants with violent measures if they did not return shortly to the old church. Here closes the first, the heroic, and most eventful, period of the German Reformation.

The second period embraces the formation of the Protestant League of Smalcald for the armed defence of Lutheranism, the various theological conferences of the two parties for an adjustment of the controversy, and the imperial "Interims" or compromises (the Ratisbon, Augsburg, and Leipzig "Interims"), and the Smalcaldian war, and ends with the success of the Protestant army, under Maurice of Saxony, and the peace of Augsburg in 1555, which secured, in turn, Lutheranism as the free exercise of their religion, but with a restriction on its further progress. The third period, from 1555 to 1580, is re-
markable for the violent internal controversies within the Lutheran Church,—the Osianian controversy, concerning justification and sanctification; the adiaphoristic, arising originally from the fruitless compromises with Romanists (called "Interims"); the synergistic, concerning faith and good works; and the crypto-Calvinistic, or sacramentarian controversy, about the real presence in the Eucharist. These theological disputes led to the full development and completion of the doctrinal system of Lutheranism as laid down in the Book of Concord (first published in 1860), which embraces all the symbolical books of that church; namely, the three ocumenical creeds; the Augsburg Confession and its "Apolo,

dure the present century, almost every imaginable form of theoretic belief and unbelief, from the strictest old-school orthodoxy to the least rationalism and scepticism. Theological schools take the place of contending sects. The third period of the Reformation (1817) marks a return to the doctrines and principles of the first; the adiaphorists, the majority of the theological chairs in the universities were gradually filled with men of evangelical convictions. But the conflict is still going on; and every new system of philosophy and theology has a fair chance of success or failure, under the protection of the academic liberty of teaching. Germany is the chief modern work shop of critical and scientific theology in all its branches, especially in biblical and historical studies, and sends forth annually the results of profound and acute research in the line of progress.

LIT. — On the German Reformation, see the works of the Reformers, in the Corpus Reformatorum (so far 54 vols.). A new edition of Luther's works was begun under the auspices of the German emperor, William I., in 1888, in commemoration of the fourth centennial of Luther's birth, and will be published under the direction of Dr. Knake. (The first volume appeared in November, 1888, at Weimar, 710 pages small quarto).


(2) The Reformation in Switzerland.— This was contemporaneous with, but independent of, the German Reformation, and resulted in the formation of the Reformed communion as distinct from the Lutheran. In all the essential principles and doctrines, except that on the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, the Helvetic Reformation agreed with the German; but it departed farther from the received traditions in matters of government, discipline, and worship, and aimed at a more radical moral and practical reformation of the people. It naturally divides itself into three periods,—the Zwinglian, from 1516 to 1531; the Calvinistic, to the death of Calvin in 1564; and the period of Bullinger and Beza, to the close of the sixteenth century. The first belongs mainly to the German cantons; the second, to the French; the third, to both jointly. Zwingli began his reformatory preaching against various abuses, at Einsiedeln, in 1516, and then, with more energy and effect, at Zürich, in 1519. His object was to preach Christ from the fountain, and to "insert the pure Christ into the heart." At first he had the consent of the Bishop of Constance, who assisted him in putting down the sale of indulgences in Switzerland; and he stood even in high credit with the papal nuncio. But a rupture occurred in 1522, when Zwingli attacked indulgences in the Empire, and many of his hearers ceased to observe them. The magistrature of Zürich arranged a public dis-
putation in January, and another in October, 1523, to settle the whole controversy. On both occasions, Zwingli, backed by the authorities and the great majority of the people, triumphed over his papal opponents. In 1526 the churches of the city and the neighboring villages were cleared of images and shrines; and a simple, puritanic mode of worship took henceforward the place of the Roman-Catholic mass. The Swiss diet took a hostile attitude to the Reformed movement, similar to that of the German diet, with a respectable minority in its favor. To settle the controversy for the republic, a general theological conference was arranged, and held at Baden, in the Canton Aargau, in May, 1526, with Dr. Eck, the famous antagonist of Luther, as the champion of the Roman, and Ecclomadarius of the Reformed cause. Its result was in form adverse, but in fact favorable, to the cause of the Reformation. It was now introduced in the majority of the cantons, at the wish of the magistrates and the people, by Ecclomadarius in Basel, and by Haller in Bern, also, in part, in St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Glarus, Appenzell, Thurgau, and the Grisons; while in the French portions of Switzerland William Farel and Viret prepared the way for Calvin. But the small cantons around the Lake of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Lucerne, and Zug, steadfastly opposed every innovation. At last it came to an open war between the Reformed and Catholic cantons. Zwingli's policy was overruled by the apparently more humane, but in fact more cruel and disastrous, policy of Bern, to force the poor mountaineers into measures by starvation. The Catholics, resolved to maintain their rights, attacked and routed the

the spiritual prosperity of the people. Calvin died, after a most active and devoted life, in 1564, and left in Theodore Beza (d. 1605) an able and worthy successor, who, partly with Bullinger, the faithful successor of Zwingli in Zurich, and author of the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), labored to the close of the sixteenth century for the consolidation of the Swiss Reformation, and the spread of its principles in France, Holland, Germany, England, and Scotland.


(3) The Reformation in France. — While the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland carried with it the majority of the population, it met in France with the united opposition of the court, the hierarchy, and the popular sentiment, and had to work its way through severe trial and persecution. The tradition in that country was favorable to a change, as France had always maintained a certain degree of independence of Rome; and the university of Paris, once the centre of European intelligence and culture, had strongly urged a thorough reformation in capite et membra on the country and the Roman Church. The first professed Protestants in France were Lefèvre, Wolmar, Farel, Viret, Marot, Olivetan, Calvin, and Beza, all men of distinguished learning and ability; but most of them had to seek safety in exile. It was only after the successful establishment of the Reformation in French Switzerland, that the movement became serious in the neighboring kingdom. Calvin and Beza may be called the fathers of the French Reformed Church. Their pupils returned as missionaries to their native land. The first Protestant congregation was formed at Paris in 1555, and the first synod held in 1556. In 1559, the first synod held in Geneva, where Farel had prepared the way. Here he developed his extraordinary genius and energy as the greatest divine and disciplinarian of the Reformed Church. The model church for the Reformed communion, and a hospitable asylum for persecuted Protestants of every nation. His theological writings, especially the Institutes and Commentaries, exerted a formative influence on all Reformed churches.

La Rochelle adopted the Gallican Confession, and a system of government and discipline essentially Calvinistic, yet modified by the peculiar circumstances of a Church not in union with the State (as in Geneva), but in antagonism with it. The
The Reformation movement here unavoidably assumed a political character, and led to a series of civil wars, which distracted France till the close of the sixteenth century. The Roman-Catholic party, backed by the majority of the population, was headed by the Dukes of Guise, who derived their descent from Charlemagne, and looked to the throne, then held by the Prince of Condé. The Protestant (or Huguenot) party, numerically weaker, but containing some of the noblest blood and best talent of France, was headed by the Princes of Navarre, the next heirs to the throne, and descendants of Hugh Capet. The queen-regent, Catherine, during the minority of her sons (Francis II. and Charles IX.), although decidedly Roman Catholic in sentiment, tried to keep the rival parties in check, in order to rule over both. But the champions of Rome took possession of Paris, while the Prince of Condé occupied Orleans. Three civil wars followed in rapid succession, when the court and the Duke of Guise resorted to treason, and concertcd a wholesale slaughter of the Huguenots (Aug. 24, 1572), the leaders of the party having been expressly invited to Paris to attend the marriage of Prince Henry of Navarre with a sister of Charles IX., as a general feast of reconciliation. But the party was only diminished in number, by no means annihilated. Other civil wars followed, with varying fortune, and terminated at last in the victory of Prince Henry of Navarre, who after the assassination of Henry III. in 1588, by a Dominican monk, became king of France as Henry IV. This period of the French Reformation. But the Reformed and Calvinistic influences from Switzerland and France. Its first martyrs, Esch and Voes, were burned at Antwerp in 1535, and celebrated by Luther in a famous poem. The despotic arm of Charles V. and his son Philip II. resorted to the severest measures for crushing the rising spirit of religious and political liberty. The Duke of Alva surpassed the persecuting heathen emperors of Rome in cruelty, and, according to Grocius, destroyed the lives of a hundred thousand Dutch Protestants during the six years of his regency (1567-73). Finally the seven northern provinces formed a federal republic,—first under the leadership of William of Orange, and, after his assassination (1584), under his son Maurice,—and after a long and heroic struggle accomplished their separation from the Church of Rome and the Spanish crown. The southern provinces remained Roman Catholic, and subject to Spain. The first Dutch-Reformed synod was held at Dort in 1574, and in the next year the university of Leyden was founded. The Reformed Church of Holland adopted as its doctrinal and disciplinary standards the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, the Belgic Confession of 1561, and the canons of the synod of Dort (1578). Important documents in the history of the Reformation in France are Beza: Hist. ecclé. des églises réform. au royaume de France (to 1593), Antwerp, 1580, 3 vols.; De Serres: De statu relat. et republ. in regno Gall., 1570 sqq., 5 parts; De Thou (Traité des origines des protestants des dix et des vingt ans, 1607); edition, 1620 sqq., 5 vols.; Eng. trans. in 18 vols., 1734 sqq.; Herminjard: Correspondance, etc. (quoted above). Modern histories of the Reformed Church of France by Lavall, De Féléc, Soldan, Von Polenz, Browning, Coquerel, Ranke, Haag, Weiss, Bersier, etc., and the Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français, Paris, 1854-73, 22 vols. Compare also Henri Martin: Histoire de France (1855 sqq. 16 vols.), vols. vii. - x., and Henry M. Baird: History of the Rise of the Huguenots of France, New York, 1873, 3 vols. (4) The Reformation in the Netherlands was kindled partly by Luther's works, but mostly by Reformed and Calvinistic influences from Switzerland and France. Its first martyrs, Esch and Voes, were burned at Antwerp in 1523, and celebrated by Luther in a famous poem. The despotic arm of Charles V. and his son Philip II. resorted to the severest measures for crushing the rising spirit of religious and political liberty. The Duke of Alva surpassed the persecuting heathen emperors of Rome in cruelty, and, according to Grocius, destroyed the lives of a hundred thousand Dutch Protestants during the six years of his regency (1567-73). Finally the seven northern provinces formed a federal republic,—first under the leadership of William of Orange, and, after his assassination (1584), under his son Maurice,—and after a long and heroic struggle accomplished their separation from the Church of Rome and the Spanish crown. The southern provinces remained Roman Catholic, and subject to Spain. The first Dutch-Reformed synod was held at Dort in 1574, and in the next year the university of Leyden was founded. The Reformed Church of Holland adopted as its doctrinal and disciplinary standards the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563, the Belgic Confession of 1561, and the canons of the synod of Dort (1578). This important synod was held in consequence of the Arminian controversy, which violently agitated the country at that time. The Arminians, or Remonstrants, differing in five points from the orthodox Calvinists, and holding to the freedom of the will and a conditional predestination, were condemned by the synod of Dort, but continued as a tolerated sect, and exerted, through the writings of their distinguished scholars and divines,—Arminius, Hugo Grocius, Episcopius, Lamo de Bie, Clericus,—an inscrutable influence upon Protestant theology in England, France, and Germany during the eighteenth century. The Methodists under the lead of Wesley adopted the Arminian views. The orthodox church of Holland has been represented in the United States, since 1828, by the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church (now the "Reformed Church in America"), the oldest, save one, of the denominations in the United States.

The Reformation in Bohemia was thoroughly prepared by the work of Hus and Jerome of Prague, who were burned at the stake as heretics by order of the Council of Constance (the one July 6, 1415, the other May 30, 1416), but left a large number of followers, especially in the Czech or Slavonic portion of the population. The wars which followed would have resulted in the triumph of the Hussites, if they had not been broken up by internal dissensions between the Calixtines, the Utraquists, and the Taborites. From their remnants arose the "Unitas Fratrum," or the "Bohemian Brethren." They endeavored to reproduce the simplicity and purity of the apostolic church, and were in fraternal alliance with the Waldenses. Notwithstanding their violent persecution, they perpetuated themselves in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Reformation broke out, they sent several deputations to Luther; and many of them embraced the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, but the majority passed to the Reformed or Calvinistic communion. During the reign of Maximilian II., there was a fair prospect of the conversion of the whole Bohemian nation; but the bloody Thirty-Years' War (which began in Prague, 1618), and the counter-Reformation of the Jesuits, crushed Protestantism, and turned Bohemia into a wilderness. A Jesuit named Anton Koniasch (1637) boasted that he had burned over sixty thousand Bohemian books, mostly Bibles. The Bohemian Brethren who had fled from Poland for his faith, was called back by Calvin. The most distinguished Protestant of that country was Jan Laski, or John a Lasco, a Calvinist, who fled from Poland for his faith, was called back by the Protestant nobility, aided by several friends, translated the Bible, and labored for the union of the Reformed and Lutherans (d. 1560). A compromise between the two parties was effected by the general synod of Sendomir (Consensus Sendomirianus), in 1570; but subsequently internal dissensions, the increase of Socinianism, and the efforts of the Jesuits, greatly interfered with the prosperity of Protestantism in that country. The German provinces now belonging to Russia — Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia — opened likewise the door to the Reformation, and adopted the Augsburg Confession.

The Reformation in Hungary. — This country was first brought into contact with the Reform movement by disciples of Luther and Melanchthon, who after 1510 preached against the existing state of the church. "The Reformed Church (in Latin), ed. by Kuyper, Amsterdam, 1866, 2 vols.

The Reformation in Scandinavia. — The Reformers of Sweden were two brothers, Olau and Laurentius Petri (Petersen), disciples of Luther, who after 1510 preached against the existing state of the church. Ferdinand I. granted to some magnates and cities liberty of worship, and Maximilian II. (1564-76) increased it. The synod of Emden, in 1545, organized the Lutheran, and the synod of Czenger in 1557, the Reformed Church. The German settlers mostly adopted the Augsburg Confession; the national Magyars, the Helvetic. Rudolph II. having suppressed religious liberty, Prince Stephen Bocskaj of Transylvania, strengthened by his alliance with the Turks, reconquered by force of arms (1608) full toleration for the Lutherans and Calvinists in Hungary and Transylvania, which under his successors, Bethlen Gabor and George Rakoczy I., was confirmed by the treaties of Nicolausburg (1622) and Linz (1645). In Transylvania, Socinianism also found a refuge, and has maintained itself to this day.

The Reformation in Poland. — Fugitive Bohemian Brethren, or Hussites, and the writings of the German Reformers, started the movement in Poland. King Sigismund Augustus (1548-72) favored it, and corresponded with Calvin. It was then that the city of Cracow was opened like a wilderness, and the Reformation was able to spread.
sanctioned the reform; and the synod of Upsal, in 1563, after a fruitless attempt to reconcile the country to Rome, confirmed and completed it. Sweden adopted the Lutheran creed, to the exclusion of every other, and retained the episcopal form of government in the closest union with the State. It did great service to the cause of Protestantism in Europe, especially the idea and hope of a Church of its own, and of a German-Catholic revival. The first Protestant sovereigns were Gustavus Adolphus, in the Thirty-Years' War; and recently the intolerant laws against dissenters have been almost completely abolished. Denmark became likewise an exclusively Lutheran country, with an episcopal form of State-church government, under Christian III. But the episcopal succession was interrupted; the new bishops received presbyteral ordination, and are therefore merely superintendents, as the bishops in the Evangelical Church of Prussia. A diet at Copenhagen in 1536 destroyed the political power of the Roman clergy, and divided two-thirds of the church's property between the crown and the nobility. The remaining third was devoted to the new ecclesiastical organization. Bugenhagen of Wittenberg was then called to complete the reformation. From Denmark, the Reformation passed over to Norway, in 1530. The Archbishop of Drontheim fled with the treasures of the church to Holland; another bishop resigned; a third was imprisoned; and the lower clergy were left the choice between exile, and submission to the new order of things, which most of them preferred. Iceland, then subject to Danish rule, likewise submitted to the Danish reformation.

Lit.—Schinmeyer: Biographies of the Three Swedish Reformers, Andersen, O. and L. Petersen (German), Lübeck, 1788; Thyskelius: CH. Hist. under Gustav I. (Swedish), Stockholm, 1841-45, 2 vols.; Fryxell: Life of Gustav Wasa (Swedish and German), 1831; Geimer: History of Sweden, (German), 1894, Eng. trans. by Turner, 1845; C. M. Butler: The Reformation in Sweden, N.Y., 1883. — Münzer: CHURCH History of Denmark and Norway (Danish and German), 1823-33, 3 vols.; Helvig: History of Denmark (Danish), Copenhagen, 1851, 3d ed., 1867. Comp., also, Genealogical History of Denmark, by Dahlmann, Baden, and Dunham.

(9) The Reformation in England.—The struggle between the old and the new religion lasted longer in England and Scotland than on the Continent, and continued in successive shocks even down to the end of the seventeenth century; but it left in the end a very strong impression upon the character of the nation, and affected deeply its political and social institutions. In theology, English Protestantism was dependent upon the Continental reform, especially the ideas and principles of Calvin; but it displayed greater political energy, and at times overtopped the power of the State. It was from the start a political as well as a religious movement, and hence it afforded a wider scope to the corrupting influence of selfish ambition and violent passion than the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland; but it passed, also, through severer trials and persecutions. In the English Reformation we distinguish five periods. The first, from 1527 to 1547, witnessed the abolition of the authority of the Roman Papacy under Henry VIII. This was merely a negative and destructive process, which removed the outward obstruction, and prepared the way for the reform. Henry VIII., king, continued with the Pope on purely personal and selfish grounds, because the Pope properly refused consent to his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, and his marriage to Anne Boleyn. "The defender of the faith," a title given him by the Pope for the defence of the seven sacraments against Luther, remained in doctrine and religious sentiment a Roman Catholic to the end of his life; and at his death the so-called "bloody articles"—which enjoined under the severest penalties the dogmas of transubstantiation, auricular confession, private masses, and the celibacy of the priesthood—were yet in full force. The very point of radical difference was the royal supremacy. He simply substituted a domestic for the foreign, and a political for an ecclesiastical Papacy, and punished with equal severity Protestant as well as Roman-Catholic dissenters who dared to doubt his supreme headship of the Church of England. But, while he thus destroyed the power of the Pope and of monasticism in England, a far deeper and more important movement went on among the people, under the influence of the revived traditions of Wiclif and the Lollards, the writings of the Continental Reformers, and chiefly of the English version of the Scriptures, commenced by Tyndale (1525), carried on by Coverdale (1535), Matthew alias John Rogers (1537), Taverner (1538), Cranmer (1540), the Generan exiles (1560), the Elizabethan Bishops (1568 and 1572), and completed in the Authorized Version of King James (1611). The second period embraces the reign of Edward VI., from 1547 to 1553, and contains the positive introduction of the Reformation by the co-operation mainly of the Duke of Somerset, protector and regent during the king's minority, and Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, who by his pliable conduct, and submission to the will of Henry, had preserved the idea and hope of a reformation through that reign of terror. Cranmer was assisted in the work by Ridley and Latimer, and by several Reformed divines from the Continent, whom he called to England, especially Martin Bucer of Strassburg, now elected professor at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr of Zürich (originally from Italy), for some time professor at Oxford. The most important works of this period, and in fact of the whole English Reformation, next to the English version of the Bible, are the Forty-two Articles of Religion (subsequently reduced to thirty-nine), or a new and moderately Calvinistic confession of faith, and the Book of Common Prayer, or a new directory of worship in the vernacular tongue, on the basis of the old Latin service, but with essential changes. The third period is the reign of Queen Mary, from 1553 to 1558, and presents to us the attempt of that queen and her friend Cardinal Pole (now made archbishop of Canterbury, after the deposition of Cranmer) to undo the Reformation, and restore the Roman-Catholic religion and the authority of the Pope. This papal interm
The Reformation did more to consolidate the Reformation in England than Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth. Hundreds were martyred in this short reign, among them the three British Reformers, Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer, who were publicly burned at Oxford in 1555 and 1556. Many others fled to the Continent, especially to Geneva, Zurich, Basel, and Frankfort, where they were hospitably received and brought into close contact with the Reformed churches of Switzerland and Germany. The fourth period is the restoration and permanent establishment of the Anglican Reformation during the long reign of Elizabeth. — 1558 to 1603. The Roman-Catholic hierarchy was replaced by a Protestant; and the Articles of Religion, and the Common Prayer-Book of the reign of Edward, were introduced again, after revision. The ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown was likewise renewed, but under a modified form; the Queen refusing the title "supreme head" of the Church of England. Having chosen, in the place, the less objectionable title "supreme governor." The Convocation and Parliament readily sanctioned all these changes. But the Anglican Church, as established by Elizabeth, was semi-Catholic in its form of prelatical government and liturgical worship, a sort of via media between Rome and Geneva. It suited the policy of the court, and the taste of the majority of the English people, but was offensive to the severer school of strict Calvinists who had returned from their Continental exile: hence the agitation in the bosom of the Reformed Church of England, and the growing conflict between the Episcopalian majority and the Puritanic minority. Elizabeth's reign was as intolerant against Puritans as against Papal dissenters, and passed the severest penal laws against both. But, while the Roman-Catholic party was almost annihilated in England, the Puritan party grew more powerful under the successors of Elizabeth, and overthrew the dynasty of the Stuarts, and even the Episcopalian establishment. But the latter revived from the shock, and was restored, with the restoration of the Stuart dynasty, in 1662; while a limited liberty of public worship was given to the dissenting denominations after the Act of Toleration, in the reign of William and Mary (1688). These troubles and agitations constitute the fifth period in the history of English Protestantism, which in some respects is the most important and interesting, but lies beyond the age of the Reformation proper.

**LIT. — Works of the English Reformers, published by the Parker Society (1841–54), 54 vols.; State Calendars, Wilkins: Concilia; Cardwell: Documentary Annals; Strype: Memorials of the Church of England; Burnet: History of the Reformation of the Church of England; Collier, Thomas Fuller, Neal, Hervey, Spottiswoode, Waddington, Blunt, Perry, Gzirke, and others on the Church History of England and the English Reformation. See also arts. on Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Henry VIII., Articles of Religion (Thirty-nine), Puritanism, etc.**

**APPEND. — A few words must be added on the Luther Celebrations of the present year (1888) and their historic significance.** The first impulse to the Reformation in Scotland proceeded from Germany and Switzerland. Copies of the writings of the Continental Reformers and of Tyndale's English Testament found their way to the Far North. The first preacher and martyr of Protestantism in that country was Patrick Hamilton, a youth of royal blood, and for some time a student at Wittenberg and Marburg, who was condemned to death by Archbishop Beaton, and burned at the stake. The movement gradually increased, in spite of persecution, especially after the rupture of England with the Pope, and was carried to a successful conclusion under the guidance of John Knox, the Luther of Scotland. He was a disciple and admirer of John Calvin, with whom he spent several years. He returned, after the accession of Elizabeth, to his native country, resolved to reform the Scotch Church after the model of the Church of Geneva, which he esteemed as "the best school of Christ since the days of the apostles." After a short civil war the Parliament of 1560 introduced the Reformation, and adopted a Calvinistic confession of faith, drawn up by Knox, Spottiswoode, Row, and three others (superseded afterward by the Westminster standards), and prohibited, under severe penalties, the exercise of the Roman-Catholic worship. In 1561 the first Book of Discipline was issued, and gave the new church a complete Presbyterian organization, culminating in a General Assembly of ministers and elders. The mode of worship was reduced to the greatest simplicity, with a decided predominance of the didactic element. When the unfortunate Mary Stuart,—of French education, tastes, and manners, and in no sympathy with the public opinion of Scotland,—began her reign, in August, 1561, she made an attempt to restore the Roman-Catholic religion, to which she was sincerely attached. But her own improprieties, and the determined resistance of the nation, frustrated her plans; and, after her flight to England (1568), Protestantism was again declared the only religion of Scotland, and received formal legal sanction under the regency of Murray. See arts. Knox, Melville, Henderson, Presbyterian Churches, etc.

misrepresentations of ignorance, prejudice, and malice. They were held not only in Eisleben, Eisenach, Erfurt, Wittenberg, and Wornas, memorably by Luther, but in every large city of Europe and North America, even in Rome. In the commemoration at Berlin the emperor and crown-prince of Germany, and eighty thousand children, took part. In London the event was celebrated in three hundred churches at once; and throughout Great Britain and Ireland the same theme resounded from pulpit and platform.

In New York every Protestant minister preached on the blessings of the Reformation; and three public mass-meetings were held beside, in Steinway Hall and the Academy of Music, on the 10th, 11th, and 15th of November which will long be remembered (especially the last) for their interest and enthusiasm. Similar celebrations took place in Philadelphia, Boston, Hartford, Princeton, Baltimore, Washington, and the great cities of the West, under the auspices of prominent citizens of all classes and denominations. Many thousands of addresses and sermons on the Reformation were preached in humble villages in Germany and throughout the world. Many Luther statues were unveiled. All the characteristic merits of the great Reformer were set before the people as never before: he lived his life over again as a man, as a German, as a husband and father, as a Christian, as a theologian, as a Bible translator, as a catechist, as a hymnist, as a preacher, as the founder of the Lutheran Church, as the champion of the sacred rights of conscience, and especially as the originator of a movement for religious and civil liberty which spread over Europe and across the ocean to the new world. His victorious battle-hymn, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," resounded throughout Christendom as never before. Truly the genius of the Reformation is still living and marching on in languages unknown to Luther, in countries not discovered, and nations not born, at the time of his birth.

The Luther bibliography of the year 1888 would fill several columns. See the Bibliographie der Luther-Literatur des Jahres 1888, published at Frankfurt; the Reading Notes on Luther, by John Edmunds, Philadelphia, Oct. 1, 1883; Die deutsche Rundschau for November, 1883; W. E. Foster (of Providence, R.I.): Monthly Reference-Lists, published by Leyoldt, New York, November, 1883. For illustrations, see the Luther-Nummer of the Illustrirte Zeitung of Leipzig, for October, 1883. Among American publications we mention two English translations of KÜSTLI'S popular Life of Luther (New York and Philadelphia), and several biographies by REIN (translated by Behringer), by Wackenagel, Schaeffer, etc.; a beautiful edition of The Hymns of Martin Luther (German and English), with his original tunes, edited by H. C. Allen (Gould & Lincoln, New York); the Luther Document (No. xvii.) of the American Evangelical Alliance, containing the stirring addresses of Drs. Taylor and Phillips Brooks, in the Academy of Music, New York, Nov. 19, 1888; the Symposium on Luther, consisting of the addresses of Professors of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, held Nov. 19, 1888, on the various aspects of Luther's character and labors, edited by Dr. Hitchcock.
affairs of each congregation are managed by a consistory, by a council of elders and deacons chosen for two years, but in such a way that only one-half go out of office at once. The elders, with the pastor, receive and dismiss members, and exercise discipline: the deacons have charge of the aims. Both together are ex officio trustees of the church, hold its property, and call its ministers and councillors, and excommunicate members. No separate board of trustees to manage their temporal affairs, but this is an ill-advised and unhappy departure from the traditional usages and spirit of the church.) Ex-elders and ex-deacons constitute what is called "the General Consistory," who may be summoned to give advice in important matters. The minister and one elder from each congregation in a certain district constitute a classis, which supervises spiritual concerns in that district. Four ministers and four elders from each classis in a larger district make a Provincial Synod, with similar powers. And representatives, clerical and lay, from Provincial classis, proportioned to the size of the classis, constitute the General Synod, which has supervision of the whole, and is a court of the last resort in judicial cases.

3. Doctrine. — The church is eminently confessed, having no less than five creeds,— the Apostles', the Nicene, the Quicumque Vult, 1 the Belgic Confession (1561), and the Canons of Dortrecht (1618-19). It requires the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) to be taught in families and schools, and also to be regularly explained from the pulpit on the Lord's Day, so that the whole is completed in at least four years. A short compendium of this Catechism is the standard of doctrine for all who seek full communion; and ministers are required to subscribe the Confession and Catechism, and to pledge themselves in writing not to promulgate any subsequent change of views without previously consulting the classis to which they belong. Parents offering children for baptism must acknowledge the articles of the faith as taught in this church, and engage to see their children instructed and brought up in the same. The salient characteristic of the body is its hereditary zeal for doctrine and order, which, having low inculcated attachment to its own views and usages with a large charity for all other Christians.

4. Discipline. — This is purely spiritual, and extends to all baptized members. It is in the hands of the ministers and elders, who are required, before every administration of the Lord's Supper, to attend to the censura morum; that is, to inquire if any communicant has become unsound in faith, or disorderly in life, and to take action accordingly. This action is subject to an appeal to a higher court in turn, even to the last. Careful provision is made for the trial of offenses. Consisting of guides and deacons chosen and life, at every spring session of a classis each minister and elder is asked if the doctrines of the gospel are faithfully preached in their congregation, the Catechism explained from the pulpit, and taught in the schools, the censura morum observed, etc.; and the answers are entered in detail on the minutes, for the information of the higher judicatories. The church inherited from Holland a tolerably full Liturgy (formed of Calvin, Bucer, and John a Lasco), which has recently been enlarged, and has appended to it the Psalter, arranged for responsive reading. The use of the greater part of the Liturgy is optional; but the offices for the sacraments, for ordination, and for church discipline, are of imperative obligation. No separate boards of trustees to manage their temporal affairs; but this is an ill-advised and unhappy departure from the traditional usages and spirit of the church.) Ex-elders and ex-deacons constitute what is called "the General Consistory," who may be summoned to give advice in important matters. The minister and one elder from each congregation in a certain district constitute a classis, which supervises spiritual concerns in that district. Four ministers and four elders from each classis in a larger district make a Provincial Synod, with similar powers. And representatives, clerical and lay, from Provincial classis, proportioned to the size of the classis, constitute the General Synod, which has supervision of the whole, and is a court of the last resort in judicial cases.

5. Institutions. — Rutgers College, founded under the name of Queen's College at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1770, is and ever has been controlled by members of this church. It has a hundred and twenty-nine students, who are taught by thirteen professors, and is very flourishing. The Board of Domestic Missions celebrated its jubilee in 1882. It has Tribes and twenty-four churches, thirty-five communicants, and the annual outlay is from $70,000 to $80,000. A Woman's Auxiliary Board has been in operation for several years, and is very flourishing. The Board of Domestic Missions celebrated its jubilee in 1882. It has four professors (soon to be increased to five), forty-five students, commodious buildings, and a well-selected library of nearly 40,000 volumes.

The Christian Intelligencer, a weekly journal of high character, represents the church, but without official sanction. There is a widows' fund, amounting to over $50,000, and also a disabled ministers' fund of $50,000, the income of which, together with the voluntary offerings of the churches for the latter and similar offerings (aided by the annual payments of subscribers) for the former, is distributed twice a year by the treasurer.

6. Statistics. — At the present time (1883) the body numbers 516 churches, 595 ministers, and a more than 80,000 communicants, who are organized into thirty-four Classes, four Particular Synods, and one General Synod. Its chief strength lies in the East; but four classes have been formed among the eighty thousand Hollanders who have settled within a generation in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa. The

1 This was not simply a pastor's school, but a denominational affair. The credit of being the first regular theological seminary is also claimed by Andover. Hope College was primarily designed for the education of ministers.
congregational purposes, over 88,700,000. Contributions of the whole body for the last year were, for benevolent purposes, $224,000, and for congregational purposes, over $570,000.

I. ORIGIN IN EUROPE.—The German Reformed Church traces its origin, in part to the rise of the Protestant Reformation in Switzerland, where Ulrich Zwingli, as one of the leading Reformers, began to preach the Reformation views as early as 1516, just one year before Luther began the Reformation in Germany. A portion of the Protestant Church there was not prepared to indorse all the teaching of Luther, nor could they fully agree with the teaching of Zwingli. A tendency was therefore developed in Germany, under Melanchthon, which subsequently found utterance in Calvin, the great theologian of the Reformation. The church in the Palatinate was of this Melanchthonian type when Frederick III. became elector. In order to set forth the true doctrine for his people, he appointed Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Oelriicus, professors in the university of Heidelberg, to prepare a Catechism, which was first published in 1563, under his direct supervision. This Catechism became the doctrinal standard of the Reformed Church in Germany, and was adopted by the Reformed church in the Palatinate, Bible, Bohemian, and other countries. It is the only doctrinal confession of the German Reformed Church in the United States. In the membership of this church, there is also a number of descendants of Huguenots, whose ancestors came to this country in small companies or families. The church has now under its care and control Frank and other synods. At one time it was formidable, numbering over a hundred churches and as many ministers; but as it had no real basis, refused to co-operate in the benevolent institutions of the age, and was generally Antinomian in sentiment and practice, it began to dwindle in the first generation, and now numbers hardly more than a dozen churches, most of which are small and feeble. It was a great injury to the church from which it seceded, but it is hard to see of what service it has been to its own members or to anybody else. See Minutes of the True Dutch Church; Brinkerhoff: History of the True Dutch Church, New York, 1873; Taylor: Annals of Bergen. T. W. Chambers.

II. ITS ORIGIN AND ORGANIZATION IN AMERICA.—The German immigration to America began as early as 1684, being composed mostly of exiles, who fled to escape persecution in the Palatinate, and seek an asylum in the New World, where they could enjoy religious freedom. The immigration continued at intervals during the following century. Colonies were formed along the Delaware, the Lehigh, the Susquehanna, in New York, Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina. The principal settlement was in Pennsylvania. As early as 1682 the first German Reformed ministers in this country, Rev. George Michael Weiss, reported to the synod of Holland that there were in America many Germans, particularly from the Palatinate and the district of Nassau, Waldeck, Witgenstein, and Wetteren, holding to the Reformed Confession. The first German Reformed minister settled among them was Philip Boehm, who came to America in 1720, and followed for a time the calling of schoolmaster, and was then appointed minister over a congregation in Whitpain township, in Montgomery County, in the neighborhood of what is now known as Boehm's church. Other ministers were likewise welcomed,—George Michael Weiss, Johannes Henricus Goetschey, John Bartholomew Reiger, John Peter Miller, John Bechtel, and in 1746 Michael Schlatter, the missionary father of the German Reformed Church in America (see that art.). The first organization into a catus, or synod, was formed Sept. 27, 1747, under the care of the Reformed Classis of Amsterdam, just fifteen days after the first catus of the Dutch Reformed Church was organized. In 1747 there were 5 ordained ministers and 46 organized churches. In 1798 (at which time the catus became an independent synod) there were 23 ordained ministers, and about 150 churches. Subsequently the Synod of Ohio and adjacent States was organized. Though in friendly relations, there was no organic union between it and the mother-synod. This fact led to a change in the constitution, by which, in 1863, a General Synod was organized, which is the highest judiciary in the church, and is composed of delegates elected by the classes, and meets triennially. Since 1863 these two synods have become six, and the twenty-six classes that then existed have grown into fifty. During the same period of twenty years (till 1883) the number of ministers has advanced from 447 to 817, and the communicant membership from 98,775 to 163,069.

III. EDUCATIONAL AND BENEVOLENT INSTITUTIONS.—The first organization of a theological seminary was effected at Carlisle, Penn., in 1825, after which was established at Mercersburg in 1826, and then to Lancaster, Penn.; and the first college was established at Mersersburg in 1836. The church has now under its care and control Franklin and Marshall College and Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Penn., the oldest and most liberally endowed; Heidelberg College and Theological Seminary at New Castle, O.; Lycoming College and Theological Seminary at Collegeville, Pa.; Catawba College at Newton, N.C.; a collegiate department in connection with a theological seminary at Howard Grove, Ind.; Calvin Institute at Cleveland, O.; Palatinate College at Meyerstown, Penn.; Mercy College at Mersersburg, O., Pennsylvania; a number of select classical schools and female seminaries. The church has fifteen English periodicals and six German. It carries forward two
orphan's homes,—one at Womelsdorf, Berks County, Penn.; and one at Butler, Butler County, Penn.; the former having sixty-eight, and the latter forty, orphan children under their care.

The Reformed Church maintains a board of foreign missions, which has a mission under its care in Japan; and missionary work is carried on also in India, and among the North-American Indians. It has home missionary boards, which have at present about a hundred missionaries under their care. An important part of the home-mission work refers to the wants of the large immigration from Germany to our shores, a considerable portion of which comes properly under the care of the German Reformed Church.

IV. Its Doctrinal Position and Cultus.—The Reformed Church in the United States belongs to the large family of Reformed churches in the world which constitutes the greater portion of Evangelical Protestantism. The name “Reformed” came to be applied to all those Reformation churches that were distinguished from the Lutheran Church. They belong to different nations,—England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, etc.; and they have a number of confessions; but these are all moulded by one general type, with a recognized consensus of doctrine. But, while the Reformed Church in the United States belongs to this general family, it has its distinguishing type of doctrine, cultus, and life.

It differs from the Lutheran Church, in common with all the Reformed churches, in its doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and holds the Calvinistic doctrine of the spiritual real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist, for believers only. It differs from the Church of England in holding to the parity of the ministry, and the presbyterian form of government, and in its more simple ritual in conducting public worship. It differs, on the other hand, from the strictly Calvinistic Reformed churches, in allowing freedom for more moderate views on the doctrine of predestination. The Heidelberg Catechism teaches substantially the old Augustinian doctrine of natural depravity, and salvation by free grace alone; but it does not teach a double decree,—a decree of reprobation as well as salvation, and leaves room for some difference of views on this mysterious subject. The Catechism gives a central position in its system of doctrine to the Apostles' Creed, and points with special emphasis to the person of Christ as the source of redemption and salvation. It regards the children of the church, being born of Christian parents, and baptized, as standing in the covenant; and this view governs the faith and practice of the church on the subject of educational religion. It is required of her ministers that they shall faithfully instruct the young in the teachings of the Catechism, as the best means of preparing them for confirmation, and for their acquaintance to the Lord's Supper, and full membership in the church. While it makes due account of experimental religion, it regards faithful instruction in the truths of God's word as the best means to be used to lead to this end.

In what its mode of public worship, the Reformed Church seeks to combine simplicity with decorum. It provides liturgical forms of service; but it has always allowed a certain degree of freedom in regard to their use, neither imposing such forms upon its congregations, nor forbidding their use if desired. On all other subjects of liturgical or doctrinal controversy, as well as in regard to certain doctrinal views, the church passed through considerable agitation and controversy for a number of years, especially during the rise and progress of the "Mercersburg Theology," which for a time threatened its unity and peace; but the different tendencies at length came to an amicable settlement, by the unanimous adoption of the measure submitted by the Peace Commission, at the general synod held at Tiessen, O., in the year 1881. (See Mercersburg Theology.)

The statistics of the church, as summarized for the year 1883, include under the General Synod six distinct synods,—four of which are English, and two German,—fifty classes (presbyteries), 817 ministers, 1,426 congregations, and 163,669 communicant members.


Thomas G. Apple.

Reformed Presbyterian Church. See Presbyterian Churches, pp. 1911 sqq.

Regalia (Lat. regalia, or jus regale). According to the oldest ecclesiastical legislation, any savings made by a bishop or other member of the clergy were to be spent for the interest of the church; and during vacancies the revenues of an episcopal see or other benefice were to be collected and held in the name of the church, and saved for that purpose. (461), c. 25, Cod. Justin. (545), c. 76, Petr. de Marca: De concordia sacerdotii et imperii, viii. 17. During the middle ages, however, the church received feasts from the State; and such ecclesiastical feasts were subject to exactly the same rules as the secular feasts: during a vacancy the State took the revenues. The custom was general in France from the middle of the twelfth century, and in England even earlier. But while the king tried to extend his right of regalia to all ecclesiastical property, regardless of its historical origin, the Pope labored to abolish the right of regalia altogether; and sharp conflicts arose, as, for instance, between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. By the aid of his Parlemente, Philip was able to vindicate his right; and it was formally recognized by Clement V. and Gregory XI. (see Petr. de Marca, c. 24). There were, however, in France several episcopal sees,—in the province of Bordeaux, in Provence and Dauphine, etc.—exempted from the royal claims; and when Louis XIV., simply in order to carry out consistently his
idea of royal sovereignty, extended his right of _regalia_ also to those sees, it came to a violent embroilment between him and Innocent XI. The general assembly of the French clergy sided with the king in a declaration of Feb. 9, 1682, which was confirmed by a royal edict of March 26, 1682, and, though Innocent XI. condemned the declaration as null and void, he had no means of enforcing his verdict directly. He chose an indirect way: he refused to confirm the bishops appointed by the king; and, as his successors followed the same policy, the affairs of the French Church soon fell into utter confusion, until a compromise was brought about under Innocent XII. See GASPARD ANDOULU: _De l’origine de la régale_, Paris, 1708; PHILLIPS: _Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich_, 1873.

**REGENERATION.** The idea of redemption leads directly to that of regeneration. For Christ’s sake, sin is forgiven: the faithful is redeemed from the curse of his guilt. He is justified; that is, the fundamental condition for a communion between him and God is present. That communion, however, cannot be realized, unless man—whose natural tendency previously was towards sin, and against God—is internally transformed, and made another with respect to the very centre of his personal life. Nor does God forgive, or justify, or restore to favor, without communicating his own spirit: so that man, from the moment his sins are forgiven him, and his guilt is blotted out, feels within himself the germ of a new life; and the power to rise above his former misery; for the inner transformation is a real regeneration. A new man is born. It is not a simple restoration which takes place, a restoration by which man returns to the state of innocence and righteousness and grace before the fall, but a new creation by the quickening spirit of the lost Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45).

The testimony of Scripture concerning regeneration gradually develops under the old dispensation, and in the New Testament it stands forth in full definiteness. The Mosaic law, placing the divine will over against the human will, as its norm and rule of the latter, steadily inculcates the necessity of a moral conversion. Very characteristic in this respect are the passages in Deut. x. 10 and xxx. 6: the demand of the circumcision of the heart, the promise that God will circumcise the heart of his people, and the purpose of that demand and that promise, which is the love of God. But a total transformation of the inner man is not expressed by that simile. Still more characteristic is, for instance, Ps. li., referring in definite and very impressive terms to the gifts from above which the sinner needs in order to begin a new moral life; not simply the forgiveness of sin, but the restoration of a clean heart, and the renewal of a right spirit. But even here a regeneration in the full sense of the word is only hinted at in a vague way. Quite otherwise in the New Testament. Jesus, too, insists upon conversion as the first act of all his disciples in order to become his followers; but the moral character to be accomplished is “perfection,” and the religious character to be realized is “sonship” (Matt. v. 9). The agency is the Word, which falls like a seed into the soul (Mark iv. 26); and the process is that of being born anew, born of God (John iii. 8). In the apostolic writings, and more especially in the Epistles of Paul, the occult depths of this act of new birth, its various stages, and its internal relations, are set forth with matchless lucidity and impressiveness.

Not so in the stodgewise Roman-Catholic Church. Regeneration as a divine act became gradually connected with baptism in such a way that the whole ethical process, with the subjective appropriation of the divine grace, was swallowed up by a magical conception of the divine activity. When grown-up persons were baptized, the demand of faith, penitence, etc., was, of course, not abandoned; but faith itself was considered a kind of offering from man to God, rather than the organ through which divine grace was to be received, and moral conversion to be effected; and as infant baptism became more and more general in the church, the magical view of regeneration also spread. What little the scholastic theology of the middle ages had to say of regeneration, it presented under the head of _gratia infusio_, the first stage of justification. (See Thomas Aquinas: _Summa_, Pt. 2, 1, quest. 110.) And the Council of Trent, when fixing and systematizing the doctrines of the Roman-Catholic Church, had nothing to add to the meagre definitions of the schoolmen. It was, indeed, the German mystics, who, during the middle ages, kept alive the idea of regeneration. (See BÖHNINGER: _Die deutschen Mystiker_, 1855.) In the soul, Tauler says, which has become pregnant with the eternal Word, God bears his Son; and the man in whose soul that takes place is thereby born himself anew, a son of God. However deeply the mystics penetrated into the mysteries of this process, and however sedulously they investigated its ethical development, they always represented the state of man before regeneration, not as a positive degradation and guilt, but simply as a natural deficiency common to all creation.

At this point the Reformation effected a radical modification. Luther placed the idea of regeneration in the closest connection with those of forgiveness of sin, reconciliation with God, and justification; and the only essential difference to this point between him and Calvin was the emphasis he laid on the _contrito_, the pangs of conscience, as a preparation for regeneration, while Calvin referred the act more directly to the reconciliation with God through Christ. Too soon, however, the orthodox party, jealous of keeping the doctrine of justification pure, began to neglect the serious practical labor in behalf of the true internal transformation; but the corrective was rapidly and energetically given by Arndt and Spener. Spener wished to remain true to the orthodox doctrine of the Church, but he could not help reproaching the preachers of his time because they spoke too little of the power of faith as a heavenly light destined to bear the soul anew. The controversy between the pietists and the orthodox was, however, on this point confined to the question whether the intellectual light was or was not conditioned by a preceding act of repenting; but the moral character to be accomplished is “perfection,” and the religious character to be realized is “sonship” (Matt. v. 9). The agency is the Word, which falls like a seed into the soul (Mark iv. 26); and the process is that of being born anew, born of God (John iii. 8). In the apostolic writings, and more especially in the Epistles of Paul, the occult depths of this act of new birth, its various stages, and its internal relations, are set forth with matchless lucidity and impressiveness.
give it a solution as deep as ingenuous, and strictly evangelical in its whole bearing. "In popular religious books, "regeneration" are often used as synonymous terms. But they are properly to be distinguished, as in the Bible, where regeneration (σωσιαίον) is the act of God, and conversion (μεταμορφωσις) is the act of man, who is exhorted to repent, and turn to God."—J. KöSTLIN.

REGENSBURG. See RatIBson.

REGINO, b. at Altrip on the Rhine, near Spies; d. at Treves, in 815; was monk in the monastery of Prüm, and was elected abbot there in 892, but was expelled in 869, and was by Archbishop Ratibod of Treves placed at the head of the monastery of St. Martin. His Chronicon is the first world's history written in Germany. The first book goes from the birth of Christ to the death of Charles Martel; and the second, from that point to 906. From 814 the narrative is based upon personal observation or oral tradition, but it is not so very reliable. The best edition of the work is that in Mon. Germ. i. 536–612. His A Libri duo de synodal. causis, etc., edited by Wasserschleben, Leipzig, 1840, is a collection of ecclesiastical laws for judicial use on diocesan inspections. A little treatise on church music, De harmonica institutione, is printed in Coussemaker: Scriptores ecclesiasticae de musica, Paris, 1897, i. 1–73.

REGIONARIUS is the title of different classes of ecclesiastical officers in Rome who are assigned to certain "regions" or districts of the city. Thus there are regional deacons, subdeacons, notaries, etc.

REGIUS, Urbanus. See Rhegius.

REGULA FIDEI (rule of faith). This term was used in the Fathers of the second half of the second century and of the third century to designate the sum of Christian doctrine as based upon the formula of baptism, and accepted by the orthodox church. Tertullian, Tertullian, and Origen have preserved the earliest form. Ireneus (Her. i. 10) says, "The church, although it is scattered to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples the faith in one God, the Almighty Father, Maker of heaven," etc. Tertullian dwells upon the rule of faith in his De praesc. Haeret., and in his De veland. virg. says, "The rule of faith is everywhere the same, alone unchangeable and immovable." Origen's statement (τοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων) is very important, when he says, "Because many of those who profess to believe in Christ differ not only in the smallest, but also in the greatest, therefore it seems necessary to lay down beforehand a fixed line and clear rule (certam lineam manifestamque regulam ponere) about single matters."

These are the oldest utterances about the rule of faith. What conclusion are we to draw from them and the rules of conversion of the trinitate seu regula fidei connected with Novatian's name, the so-called "Catholic teaching" of the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 14), etc.? The substance of them all is essentially the same, and indicates an incontestable connection with the ancient Roman formula of baptism. This rule of faith was not identical with the Apostles' Creed, which was the accredited formula of the church. Called now lex fidei, fides legitima, regula veritatis, linea, mensura, canon, tradition, etc., it was simply a statement of the subjects of Christion, faith based both on the New Testament and oral tradition. It is probable that the first attempts to formulate such a statement date back to the apostolic age, although the earliest account we have is that of Ireneus. At first it was probably a simple statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, which Tertullian calls "the substance of the New Testament (c. Præzæn, 31). Subsequently polemical affirmations were added in defence against the heresies. Thus formulated, it no doubt formed an important part of the instruction of the catechumens. Ireneus (i. 8, 4) says the believer has in himself "the norm of the truth (τὸ κανόνις τῆς γλυκείας) having received it in baptism."

In the Occident, the rule of faith was developed out of the formula of baptism. In the Orient, on the contrary, it seems to have influenced the formula of baptism; or, in other words, the formula of baptism adapted itself from time to time to the anti-heretical doctrinal statements of distinguished ecclesiastical leaders. The formula which the prebysyers in Smyrna in 230 opposed to Noetus is quite similar to the old Roman formula of baptism, and the Apostles' Creed in Latin seems to have passed from a translation from the Greek (Caspar, iii. 234–238). The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (see art.) of 381 is nothing else than the first ocumenical formula of baptism enlarged. This creed is still used as the formula of baptism in the Eastern Church.

In the Protestant churches the numerous, and, for the most part, bulky confessions are substituted for the rule of faith. The Roman Catholic theologians now pretty generally understand by the expression the utterances of the infallible Church and Pope. See Caspari: Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbool u. d. Glaubensregel, 1866–5, 3 vols.; ZEESCHWITZ: System d. Katechetik (ii. 2), 2d ed., 1875; [SWAINSON: The Creeds of the Church, etc., Camb., 1878; SCHAFF: Creeds of Christendom, N.Y., 1880, vol. i. 14 sqq., vol. ii. 11–40; and the bts. Apostles' Creed, NICENO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED].

REGULARS are those who have made their vows in some religious house, such as monks. A regular priest is in some order, while a secular priest lives in the world. Regular benefices were only conferred on regular priests. Regular places are those within the boundary of a convent, as the cloister, dormitory, chapter, and refectory.

REHOEMAM (enlarger of the people), son of Solomon by the Ammonite princess Naamah (1 Kings xiv. 21), and his successor in his forty-first year. He reigned seventeen years, and was himself succeeded by his son Abijah (Abijam), the child of his favorite wife, Maachah (Michaiah), the granddaughter of Absalom (1 Kings xv. 8). To the new king the straitened inhabitants of Israel brought their grievances, and prayed their amelioration. But he answered harshly, foolishly following the counsel of the contemporary advisers; and then Israel revolted, and under Jeroboam set up a rival kingdom. Only Judah and a part of Israel submitted to Benjamin remained loyal to Rehoemam. But the two kingdoms there was naturally constant friction, giving rise at times to bloodshed (1 Kings xiv. 30); but the prophet Shemaiah repressed Re-
Thomas Reid was a Moravian bishop; b. at Leuba, Altenburg, Germany, May 16, 1752; d. at Berthelsdorf, Saxony, Nov. 17, 1809. He joined the Moravians after he had for four years served as a Lutheran minister, and was for forty years on the executive board of the Unitas Fratrum. In 1775 he was consecrated bishop, and made very extensive episcopal visits, going as far east as the Cape of Good Hope and the East Indies, and as far west as the American Colonies. He staid for four years (1778-82) in America, and healed many a breach occasioned by the Revolutionary War.

Thomas Reid was a student in Marischal College, Aberdeen, where he was a student in the Granite City of the North. Afterwards he was appointed librarian to the college, which office he held till he was twenty-six years of age. A year later he was ordained minister of New Machar, Aberdeen, to which he was presented by King's College, Aberdeen; the duties of the chair, however, requiring the teaching of physical as well as mental philosophy. Twelve years later (1774) he published his Inquiry into the Human Mind; and in the same year he was elected professor of moral philosophy in the university of Glasgow, as immediate successor to Adam Smith, afterwards author of The Wealth of Nations, who had succeeded Hutcheson in the chair. The Inquiry was an investigation into the conditions of knowledge, and produced a deep impression as a bold and resistless argument of the certainty of human knowledge against the scepticism which Hume had developed out of the theory of ideas then current. Its title was, An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense. This formal introduction of the phrase "common sense" by and by afforded the descriptive appellation of the Scotch philosophy, "the philosophy of common sense." The phrase had aptness for the end contemplated, and yet awkwardness, on account of its popular use as an equivalent for "good sense," or sagacity. Its consequent ambiguity led to mistakes and applications of the term to criticism. What Reid meant by the phrase was that any adequate inquiry into the human mind must disclose certain principles or axiomatic truths common to all intelligence, as essential to a sound philosophy as to a healthy intellect. As in the philosophy of Locke, all knowledge had been traced to sensation and reflection, Reid took "sense" in the wide meaning of knowledge; and "common sense" was a knowledge common to all the race. In effect, Reid's title meant "an inquiry into the human mind, on the principles common to rational beings;" and his motto was a quotation from the Book of Job, "The inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Thus he suggested the form of his theory,—the creation of intelligence implies communication of the first principles of knowledge. All language suggesting that some men are highly endowed with a faculty of common sense, and perceive by special insight what others fail to recognize, is language wide of Reid's formula of common sense, and quite alien to his theory. See Hamilton's Note A, in Reid's Works, 742.

When he had prepared his reply to Hume, he submitted the manuscript in part to the author of a Treatise of Human Nature, and received from Hume a friendly reply, reserving full judgment until the book appeared. Hume acknowledged having read it "with great pleasure and attention," adding, "It is certainly very rare that a piece so deeply philosophical is written with so much spirit, and affords so much entertainment to the reader." In reply to this, Reid said to Hume, "I have learned more from your writings in this kind than from all other put together." (Stewart's Life of Reid; Stewart's Works, x. 356, Reid's Works by Hamilton, p. 81; Benton's Life of Hume, ii. 153-158.) Of Reid, Hill Burton says, "His was the greatest mind which set itself in opposition to Hume's system in British literature; and he was great because he examined the works of the sceptical philosophers, not in the temper of a wrangler or partisan, but in the honest spirit of a philosopher, who is bound either to believe in the arguments he is examining, or to set against them a system which
will satisfy his own mind and the minds of other honest thinkers" (Life of Hume, ii. 151). Reid did set himself to develop a system, which he offered to the acceptance of honest thinkers as a refutation of the scepticism of Hume, by refuting the theory of ideas previously in favor among philosophers. But in doing this, Reid, as Kant and the stoics did in a very similar manner, that he was indebted to Hume for rousing him to the task of criticizing the popular philosophy, and endeavoring to replace it by another which could endure the test of sceptical argumentation.

Reid’s Inquiry into the Human Mind is an investigation into the relations of mind to the special senses, dealing in succession with smelling, tasting, hearing, touch, seeing. The work shows that Reid had given considerable attention to the requirements of present knowledge as to the physical and physiological facts. His main purpose is to show the essential position was gained in showing that the theory of things by the application of rational principles, as Kant has done, philosophy(ifI may be permitted to change the metaphor) has no other root but the principles of common sense. Then he adds, "In reality, common sense holds nothing of philosophy," the philosophy of ideas, which had furnished scepticism with its weapons. And in truth he is no more scornful of the popular philosophy of the time than Kant was of the "dogmatic philosophy." Reid’s exaggerated words have been freely condemned by his own followers, Dugald Stewart and Hamilton, who distinguished themselves for their defence of the teaching of common sense. But Reid’s real intention is apparent when he complains, of the received philosophy, that her votaries "have endeavored to extend her jurisdiction beyond its first limits, and to call to her bar the dictates of common sense." Then he adds, "It is really the business of this treatise to show that this is a mistake."

It is evident are given to all men, so that intellect does not need to wait on philosophy for warrant of her procedure; while, on the contrary, all sound philosophy must start with unreserved acknowledgment of the principles of intelligence, which he would name "common sense." Equally for the weapons of defence against scepticism, and for the foundations of a structure which can dwell with satisfaction, he turns to the principles which irresistibly govern the belief and the conduct of all mankind in the common concerns of life." To find out what these principles are is the necessary and most momentous task of a philosophy which would present us with a scheme of the conditions of human knowledge.

The form of philosophy which Reid had thus described and introduced, he further vindicated and developed in his Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man (published in 1785), for which, also, he took as motto a quotation from Job, "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts?" and in his Essays on the Active Powers of Man (published in 1786), for which the motto on title page was from the prophet Micah, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good." These three works present us with Reid’s answer to Hume, and they unify and give the result of his achievements in attempting to construct a theory of knowledge. His first and essential position was gained in showing that the use of the senses implies constant exercise of judgment, and that this implies fundamental principles of thought which could be neither demonstrated, nor disputed, nor dispensed with. His next position was reached in laying open to view certain first principles in reasoning which are essential to intelligence. "The judgment follows the apprehension of them necessarily; and both are equally the work of nature and the result of our original powers" (Intellectual Powers, essay vi. chap. iv.). These are axioms, first principles, principles of common sense, common notions, self-evident truths. His third position was reached when he entered the domain of morals, and maintained, in reference to our knowledge of moral truths, that there must be in morals, as in other sciences, first principles which do not derive their evidence from any antecedent principles, but may be said to be intuitively discerned (Intellectual Powers, essay vii. chap. ii.). Such is Reid’s theory, often involved in considerable obscurity of statement, at times adopting forms of expression which favor the view that there is a measure of intellectual constraint holding man in subjection; but in the main a clear and strong vindication of the adequacy of intelligence as a guide to certainty. He had not Kant’s distinction between reasoning and reason; he did not grasp Kant’s problem, How is a knowledge a priori possible to mind? (see art. KANT); but, when construing or calling to mind the ruling power in mind, he clearly distinguished those two functions,—to reason, and to recognize first principles apart from reasoning. "We ascribe to reason two offices or two degrees. The first is to judgment of things self-evident: the second is to draw conclusions which are not evident from those that are. The first of these is the province, and the sole province, of common sense; and therefore it coincides with reason in its whole extent" (Intellectual Powers, essay vi. chap. ii.). Even though it be granted that there is in Reid’s
works a want of philosophic exactness and meta-
physical range, there is a sagacity, a breadth of
reflection, and a massiveness of thought, fully ac-
counting for the power of his philosophy in Brit-
ain, France, and America. H. CALDERWOOD.

REIHING, Jakob, b. at Augsburg, 1579; d. at Tübingen, May 5, 1628. He entered the Jesuit
order; taught theology and philosophy in their
seminaries at Ingolstadt and Dillingen; and was in 1613 appointed court-preacher to the apostate count-palatine, Wolfgang William. He took a
very active part in the Romanization of the Pa-
latinate, but the careful study of the Bible which he
found necessary in order to dispute with the
Protestants had its influence. In the beginning
of 1621 he suddenly fled to Stuttgart, and towards
the close of the same year he formally embraced
Protestantism. In 1622 he was made professor
of theology at Tübingen. His writings are mostly
polemical, first against the Protestants, afterwards
against the Jesuits: they are described in his life
by Oehler, in MAROTTI's Wahrer protestantien, iii.
1854. OEHLER.

VIMARUS, Hermann Samuel, the author of
the famous Wolfenbüttel Fragments (b. at Ham-
burg, Dec. 22, 1694; d. there March 1, 1768. He
studied philology at Jens and Wittenberg; trav-
elled in Holland and England; and was appointed
rector of the gymnasium in Weimar, 1723, and in
Hamburg, 1739. He was a pupil of Wolff, and
one of the most radical among German rational-
ists. He published Diss. de assessoribus Synedrii
Magni, Hamburg, 1751, and Die vornehmsten War-
heiten der natürlichen Religion, Hamburg, 1754.
His life was written in Latin by Büsch. See also
sketch in Eng. trans. of the Fragments (Lond., vol.
i., 1789), and art. Wolfenbüttel Fragments.

REINHARD, Franz Volkmann, b. at Vohenstrauss
in the Upper Palatinate, March 12, 1758; d. in
Dresden, Sept. 6, 1812. He studied theology at
Wittenberg, and was appointed professor there
in 1780, and court-preacher in Dresden in 1792.
He was a rational supranaturalist, that is, one of
those rationalists who still retained the principal
tenets of supranaturalism, the divinity of Christ,
and the absolute authority of the Bible. His
System der christlichen Moral, Sulzbach, 1788-1815,
vols., was several times reprinted; but he exer-
cised the greatest influence as a preacher. His col-
clected sermons comprise thirty-five volumes. See
his Geständnisse, Sulzbach, 1810, and Tszschir-
nen's Briefe, Leipzig, 1811, thereby occasioned.
His life was written by Böttiger, Dresden, 1813,
in Herzog.

RELAND, Hadrian, b. at Ryp, near Alkmaar,
July 17, 1678; d. at Utrecht, Feb. 5, 1718. He
studied Oriental languages and ecclesiastical anti-
quities in Amsterdam, and was in 1690 appointed
professor at Utrecht. His principal theological
works are, Analecta rabbinica, Utrecht, 1702; De
religione Mohammedica, 1705 (in which he tried to
give a correct representation and description
of the religion of Mohammed); Antiquitates sacrae veterum Hebræorum, 1708 (best edition by
Vogel, Halle, 1769); Palestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata, 1714 (his chief work, often re-
printed, in which he displays such comprehensive
learning and so much penetration and power of
analysis, that it still remains the foundation of
all study of ancient Palestine); De spolia templi
Hierosolymitani in arco Titiano, 1716 (new edition by
SCHULZ, Utrecht, 1775). ABNOLD.

RELICS. The Latin word reliquia meant "re-
main," and was in that sense adopted by the
Church, where, however, while on the one side
its application was confined to the remains of
saints and martyrs, it was on the other extended
to every thing which had been in bodily contact
with the deceased. Thus the church of Jerusa-
lem boasted of the possession of the episcopal
chair of James as a precious relic (EUSEBIUS: Hist.
Eccles., VII. 19). The worship of relics developed with the worship of martyrs. The posse-
ッション of the corpse of a martyr was held to
guarantee the continuous communication between
the deceased and the congregation: hence the
custom of gathering around the tomb of the mar-
tyr for the celebration of the Eucharist. Though
the worship of relics originally had to overcome
a certain aversion founded on the views of the
Old Testament concerning the uncleanness of a
corpse, it easily succeeded, as may be seen from
the Apostolical Constitutions, lib. vi. At the
time of Constantine it was in full bloom; and the
Greek Fathers of that and the next periods are
unanimous in their recommendations (EUSEBIUS:
Præparatio evang., 13, 11; GREGORY NAZIANZEN:
Orat. in Cyp., 17; GREGORY NYSSA: Oratio in
Theod., 740; BASIL: Epistola II. 197; CHRYSO-
tom: Laud. Dros., p. 688; THEODORIT: In
Psalm., 67, 11). In the West it also found zeal-
ous defenders (Jerome and Paulinus of Nola).
From the latter, as well as from Gregory of
Tours, it appears that people in general consid-
ered relics to be the bearers of some hidden
miraculous power; and it became necessary to
protect by laws the corpses of martyrs from being
cut into pieces (Cod. Theod., ix. 17, 7). But so
great was the credulity and superstition of the
people, that the laws proved in vain. The church
authorized this superstition to a certain extent
by decreeing that relics should be deposited in
every altar. Ambrose refused to consecrate a
church when it had no relics (Ep. 22 ad Marcell.);
and though the synod of Agde (506) simply de-
manded the anointing and benediction of altars,
the seventh ecumenical synod of Nicea (787)
forbade the bishops, under penalty of excommunic-
ination, to consecrate a church without relics;
and the synod of Mayence (888) presumes that
even the portable altars contain relics. In the
Roman-Catholic Church the medieval supersti-
tion is still maintained; while the whole Protes-
ant world had adopted the views of Luther, set
forth in his Larger catechism: "This but a dead
thing which sanctifies nobody." HAUCK.

RÉLIEF SYND. See art. PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCHES, p. 1894.

RELIGION and REVELATION are correlative
terms; that is, the relation in which man places
himself to God in religion presupposes the rela-
tion in which God represents himself to man in
revelation. Without revelation there can be no
religion; and it is a fact which should not be
overlooked, that even those, who, on account of
their idea of God, absolutely reject the idea of a
direct divine revelation, recognizing nothing but
Nature in her material existence and mechanical
working, cannot help applying to Nature expres-
RELIGION.

sions and conceptions which tend to raise her above the dumb necessity, and constitute her a higher being, capable of moral relations; nor can they for a longer period escape a feeling of thirst after revelations of the secret depths of that being which they then strive to attain by ways more or less mystical and magical.

1. Religion — either from relegere, "to read over," i.e., to reflect upon what has been written (Chrysostom), or from religare, "to bind together," (Lactantius) — means the conscious relation between man and God, and the expression of that relation in human conduct. It has thus, though it presupposes certain objective conditions both for its origin and for its farther development, a purely subjective character, forming the innermost centre of the human personality, and the only true basis of spiritual growth. But, in spite of its decidedly subjective character, religion is as much a social as an individual affair. Not to speak of the specifically Christian ideal of the kingdom of heaven to be established here on earth by the Christian congregations, in all spheres of the human consciousness, — in the religious no less than in the moral, and in the moral no less than in the intellectual, — reciprocal contact between individual and individual is the general condition of development. Thus originate common forms of the religious consciousness and common forms of its expression in actual life; and thus the word "religion" assumed a new sense, an objective sense, — so objective, indeed, that not only there spring up many different religions, but it becomes possible for an individual to have religion without being religious, to stand in an external relation of recognition and obedience to a certain form of religion, without standing in any living relation to God himself.

It is the business of Christian science by a searching analysis to find those elements which constitute religion, and which must be present in all religious life, even on its lowest and most primitive stage, and to represent the psychological process by which the actual formation of a religion takes place. The New Testament gives a few but very important notices on the subject, which fully sustain the above propositions concerning the relation between religion and revelation (Rom. i. 18 sqq.; Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27; John i. 19).

From a comparison of the various Pagan religions it is apparent, that originally all religious life started from an impression of an overwhelming power; which impression could not fail to engender fear, as it was accompanied by a complete ignorance of the true nature and character of the power observed. But fear naturally leads to attempts at reconciling that which is feared; and as the understanding develops, and one light is lighted after the other, the attempts at reconciliation will result in a partial willingness to submit. Finally both the will hold power, the will dawns upon the consciousness, the willingness to submit will grow into a desire to obey; and religious life has thus reached the highest stage of development which it can attain within the bounds of Paganism. The old dispensation may be referred to the stage in which God made with Abram: "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and multiply thee exceedingly" (Gen. xvii. 1, 2). Here, too, the emphasis is laid upon the omnipotence of God, before whom it behooves man to walk in fear. But a new element, which in Paganism never reached beyond the dim dream, is here added in the form of direct promise, — the love of God to Abram: "And I will multiply thee exceedingly." The law is laid upon the outlines of the old dispensation still more precise and definite. At the same time they introduced a new element in religious life, — that of understanding the will of God, that of true human wisdom; which element, however, was never severed from its moral complement; for "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments" (Ps. cxii. 10). Under the new dispensation, love, God's love to man, appears as the true centre of religious life, instead of fear, man's fear of God. Man has become chiefly receiving. The words of life, forgiveness of sin, the sonship of God, eternal life, etc., is offered him, and he has only to take it. But how? By faith. Faith, however, though a sacrifice of one's self, a submission of one's own righteousness to the righteousness of God (Rom. x. 3), and consequently a moral act which cannot be accomplished without the aid of God (1 Cor. ii. 5), has a much more strongly pronounced intellectual character than the wisdom of the old dispensation, because that which shall be accepted, that to which man shall surrender himself, is the truth. Christ calls himself the truth (John xiv. 6), and even the possession of eternal life is referred back to the knowledge of the truth (John xvii. 3). Thus the elements of religion, though always the same, change as religion grows from its first germ in Paganism to its full maturity in Christianity.

A scientific treatment, however, of the subject was not attempted until quite recent times. The Reformation made a beginning with its comprehensive and penetrating analysis of faith as the informing centre of all religious life. In the Confessio Augustana and the Apologia, faith, as the confidence that in Christ the grace of God has been offered to us, is represented as an act of the will; and this moral act is again represented as the necessary condition of any true knowledge of God. But the old Protestant, more especially the Lutheran, theologians, very soon left that track. Calvinius, Quenstedt, Buddæus, J. Gerhard — they all represent the moral act in faith as preceded by a theoretical acceptance of the divinely revealed truth, thus making the basis of faith purely intellectual; and in this they were followed both by the rationalists and the supranaturalists. Thus the will hold power, and received a much more powerful impulse from the development of German philosophy; though at times it looked as if philosophy were about to dissolve, and finally supersede religion. Kant excluded the idea of God from the competency of theoretical reason to the grounds of practical reason: the existence of God is necessary for the realization of the highest good. But thus religion was defined as a mere recognition
of our duties as divine commandments; that is, it was made a mere appendix to morals, and its innermost kernel, the direct relation between man and God, was set aside as something irrelevant.

The opposite extreme was developed by Hegel. He considered all existence an evolution of the spirit. But the true character of spirit is thought; and the thinking of man, of the human spirit, of the subject, is the medium in which God, the divine spirit, the absolute, becomes conscious of itself.

This process in its lowest form,—in the form of feeling, to be distinguished from the form of imagination (art) and the form of pure thought (philosophy),—Hegel called religion; that is, while Kant had made religion a simple, practical matter, Hegel made it a merely theoretical interest. A reaction against those extremes was started by Jacobi and Schleiermacher. Both agreed in deriving religion from feeling, in making feeling the proper sphere of religion, the place in which it has its roots. But there was, nevertheless, a considerable difference between them. "Faith in God is an instinct in man," said Jacobi: "when spoken to, it will answer." But in order to reach full intellectual connexion to God, Jacobi held that man must rise above his own nature, because nature with its continuous web of cause and effect conceals God, and approach God as a free being, free of the necessity of nature. This rising above nature in order to reach freedom, Schleiermacher completely discarded; making the relation between man and God much deeper and much more direct, and finding its true expression, not in an instinct, ready to respond whenever it is touched, but in a never-dying feeling of absolute dependence. As representing the stand-point of Kant may be mentioned Wegscheider; Hegel is represented by Daub and Marheinecke; Schleiermacher by Nietzsche, Twesten, and Dorner. An attempt to go beyond Schleiermacher may be observed in Lipsius, Biedermann, and Pfeiderer, members of the so-called critical school.

2. Christian faith and Christian theology recognize, and have always recognized, both that religion in general would be impossible without a direct activity for the purpose from the side of God, and that specially the Christian religion is the result of such an activity. In details, and more especially with reference to the different religions, the views of the character and nature of that activity may vary considerably; but there is general agreement with respect to its principal features,—that it must be a direct communication between the divine will and the human consciousness, that is, have the character of a revelation; and that it must be presupposed for acceptance by man, through which God establishes a complete remodelling of the relation between religion and revelation, a complete remodelling of the relation established by rationalism. The idea of revelation, almost extinguished by rationalism, now came to great honor. Yet it is a question, whether the distinction between the general and a special revelation, which Christian apologetics absolutely must insist upon, is not more radically hurt by the new theory than it ever could be by any of the propositions of rationalism. According to Jacobi, every strong religious emotion is a revelation, and outside of this inner enthusiasm there is no revelation; for God is felt only in secret, and the Word, which by itself reveals nothing, is set only to prove and corroborate the
revelations of the inspiration. More especially the term "revelation" is applied to such productions of the religious spirit as exercised a decisive influence in wide circles and for long periods. But what is directly revealed is the inspiration in the sphere of faith, in religion, and genius and originality in the sphere of imagination, in art? Schleiermacher put the so-called natural religion out of the world as a mere abstraction, and defined revelation as the product of a direct, divine activity. But, unable to give his definition the necessary preciseness, he was compelled to recognize every idea which rose in the soul, and could not be explained from external influences, as a revelation. Hence his exertions to stretch the supernatural and supra-reasonable in Christianity, until it will connect with nature and reason, or, rather, his exertions to raise nature and reason until they can reach the supernatural and supra-reasonable. Among the theologians after Schleiermacher, some—Richard Rothe, Isaac August Dorner, etc.—vindicated with great emphasis the claims of Christianity upon an extraordinary, supernatural origin; while others, the critical school—Lipius, Biedermann, etc.—hold that all religions rest in the same manner upon revelations.

RELIGION. The Philosophy of, comprises two elements,—one historical, and one metaphysical,—which must be present, equally developed, and organically combined. On the one side, religion is a fact whose origin and manifold relations must be explained: on the other, that fact claims to contain the final truth, and the claim must be investigated. But a perfect fusion of these two elements is difficult, and the difficulty explains the late development of this branch of philosophy.

Researches concerning the final cause of existence and the true nature of consciousness are as old as philosophy itself; and during the middle ages a relation actually sprang up between metaphysics and religion, as far as the first part of the representation of the theological system generally occupied itself with the question, whether man is able to demonstrate the existence of God, and form a just idea of his nature, without the aid of a direct revelation. But the relation remained barren. Philosophy and religion were more and more sharply separated from each other, the former being confined to that which is mathematically demonstrable, the latter to that which is directly revealed; and an application of the results of metaphysical researches to the various forms of religion was impossible, simply because the history of religion was not yet written. Judaism and Christianity were the only religions known: even concerning Mohammedanism ignorance prevailed. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, however, the study of religion began. The first work of the kind was A. Ross: A View of all the Religions of the World, 1652; which was followed by Baader, Fermenta cognitionis, 1818-25, Vorlesungen über religiöse Philosophie, 1827, and Vorlesungen über speculative Dogmatik, 1829; and Heinrich Steffens: Religionsphilosophie, 1839, 2 vols. All these writers have a more or less pronounced mystical character. The most interesting of them is Baader. He was a strict Romanist, but held that nature and Scripture reciprocally interpret each other, that a true natural philosophy is not a dead identity, always at rest, but the result of a never-ending process by which the opposites reached identity through contest and reconciliation. He was consequently able to give religion a legitimate place in his system, though only as a lower and temporary form of the consciousness of God.

Against Schelling's and Hegel's ideas of the absolute, though in many respects influenced by their methods, wrote Eschenmayer (Religionsphilosophie, 1818-24, 3 vols.), Franz von Baader (Fermenta cognitionis, 1822-25, Vorlesungen über religiöse Philosophie, 1827, and Vorlesungen über speculative Dogmatik, 1829), and Heinrich Steffen: Religionsphilosophie, 1839, 2 vols. All these writers have a more or less pronounced mystical character. The most interesting of them is Baader. He was a strict Romanist, but held that nature and Scripture reciprocally interpret each other, that a true natural philosophy was not a dead identity, always at rest, but the result of a never-ending process by which the opposites reached identity through contest and reconciliation. He was consequently able to give religion a legitimate place in his system, though only as a lower and temporary form of the consciousness of God.

**RELIÉGIOUS DRAMAS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.** Between the ancient and modern theatre there is an absolute void of several centuries. Only a few dramas were produced during that period. — the *Xptordcnaoxuv* of Gregory Nazianzen, was entirely religious: it grew up in the midst of the processions inside and outside the church, the washing of feet on Maundy Thursday, the imitation of the laity, it was quite natural that they, more especially under the influence of the Renaissance, should develop a taste for a drama of a more secular character, — a drama which to a certain extent mirrored their own life, and expressed their own ideas. The *moralités* were invented in France; and in Paris their representation became the special privilege of the Baschiots, the guild of lawyers and advocates; while at the same time (1402) the *Confrérie de la Passion* erected the first stationary scene in Paris for the representation of *mystères*. In England *moralités* also found much favor; and many plays of the kind were produced and became popular. In Germany, on the contrary, they hardly occur.

The *moralités*, as well as the *mystères*, were strictly orthodox; nor so with the *sottises*, or *entremêts* in France, the English *interludes*, the *German fastnachts spiele*. They were from their very origin, while yet mere episodes of the larger plays, humorous and satirical; and, when the *Reformation* began to put men's ideas and passions in commotion, their satire was immediately directed against the Roman-Catholic Church and clergy. Already, in the first half of the thirteenth century, Anselm Faitit of Avignon wrote for Boniface of Montferrat a comedy, *Heresy de la Peyres* ("The Heresy of the Father"), which was presented in the palace of the marquis, and which depicted all the adversities of the Albigneses as heretics. In the beginning of the fourteenth century Luca de Grimoald is said to have written a bitter satirical comedy against Boniface VIII., which, however, he was compelled by force to burn; and in the sixteenth century the satirical drama became a most effective weapon in the hands of the Reformers. In a *sottise* by the French poet Pierre Gringoire (1511), the *Mother of all Fools* enters the stage with the pontifical mantle on her shoulders, and the tiara on her head. In an *auto da fé*, by the Portuguese poet Gil Vincenzo...
### RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

(1508), the church is represented as an inn-keeper. Thomas Heywood, the inventor of the English interludes, launched boldly out in the religious controversies of his time; and Edward VI. is said to have written a drama against the Roman-Catholic Church under the title, *The Whore of Babylon*. The most celebrated specimens, however, of this kind of dramas, are the *fastnachts-spiele* of Pamphilus Gegenbach in Basel, Nikolaus Manuel Deutsch in Bern, and Hans Sachs in Nuremberg.

In England the religious drama of the middle ages connects directly with Shakespeare; in Spain, with Lope de Vega and Calderon de la Barca; in France, with Corneille. Its most direct artistic offspring, however, is the Protestant oratorio. In Catholic Germany the representation of mysteries has continued down to the present time. [See OBER-AMMERSBURG.]

**GRÜNEWALD.**


**Note.**—The value of this table is not in the accuracy and freshness of its figures (for manifestly in the case of the United States a former census has been used, and it is probably so in other cases), but in its presentation of the comparative strength of the various religions. The first column expresses the number of millions and fractions of millions there are in the respective countries: thus in the German Empire there are 43 and 72 hundred millions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>To EVERY THOUSAND INHABITANTS there are</th>
<th>CHRISTIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Africa**    |                         |            |         |         |        |              |
| South Africa  | 18.7                   | 9.0        | 1.0     | 0.7     | 0.1    |              |
| **America**   |                         |            |         |         |        |              |
| Brazil        | 4.2                    | 2.0        | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1    |              |
| **Grand total** | 1,434.9             | 677.4      | 33.6    | 22.3    | 3.0    |              |

**RELLY, James, b. at Jefferson, North Wales, 1720; d. in London about 1780. He may be regarded as the founder of the Universalist denomination from his association with John Murray. Both Relly and Murray were, in the early part of their career, disciples and adherents of Whitefield. Very few particulars in the life of**
Relly have been preserved. Even Mr. Murray, his ardent admirer and convert, tells us nothing which would afford an insight into his personality. He became a Universalist about 1750, and organized a society a year or so later. His society, after his death, until its dissolution in 1830, was ministered to by laymen. He is best known through his writings, which are somewhat voluminous. Mr. Relly's style of writing is remarkably good, indicating more than ordinary culture. His principal works are as follows: The tragioc of spirits, or a treatise upon the nature, offices, and operations of the Spirit of Truth, London, 1756, 2d ed., 1762; Union, or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his Church, 1759, reprinted, Philadelphia, 1843; Antichrist resisted, 1761; The life of Christ, 1762; The Sadducee detected and refuted, 1764; Christian liberty, 1775; Epistles, or the great salvation contemplated, 1778; Salvation completed ("a discourse on that subject by J. R., wrote in the year 1758"), 1779; The salt of the sacrifice, or the true Christian baptism delineated, according to reason and spirit [n. d., 1779 ?]; The Chaldeeical mystery, or an essay on the mission of Daniel the prophet, 1780.

The chief of his works—that in which his doctrinal views are most fully elaborated, together with the grounds on which they rest—is Union. In this he holds to a certain mystical union between Christ and humanity. Christ's relation to men is like that of the head to the different members of the body. His actions and thoughts, therefore, are ours: his obedience and sufferings are ours. He has brought the whole human race into the divine favor as fully as if each member had obeyed and suffered in his own person, and thus has secured a complete salvation. His theology is of the ethical type, maintaining that there must be perfect harmony between the divine attributes. Of the Almighty he says, "that, as a God infinite in goodness, he doth not, will not, act from one attribute to the dishonor of another." He believes in a literal resurrection of the body. He says [see Sadducee refuted], "What does the term 'resurrection' imply, if not the rising again to life of that which was subjected to death? But the soul is immortal. . . . It is the body only that dies. Therefore the future resurrection of the dead, if there be any, must be that of the body." He confesses, however, that the rising again of mankind in the second Adam from the sin in which they were involved in the first Adam implies a quickening and renewal of the mind through the truth. He teaches the millennial coming of Christ, in which the believers shall rise and reign with him. Afterwards, those who are under condemnation shall rise; and, through the mediation of the saints, they shall be brought to Christ: so that at last every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength. He believes in the universal solicitation of Christ and the mediatorial dispensation. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith. Hence he placed special emphasis upon good works, and commended a broad and generous philanthropy. As to the nature of Christ, he views the vicarious atonement as the basis of the atonement and its dispensations. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith. Hence he placed special emphasis upon good works, and commended a broad and generous philanthropy. As to the nature of Christ, he views the vicarious atonement as the basis of the atonement and its dispensations. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith.

Relly have been preserved. Even Mr. Murray, his ardent admirer and convert, tells us nothing which would afford an insight into his personality. He became a Universalist about 1750, and organized a society a year or so later. His society, after his death, until its dissolution in 1830, was ministered to by laymen. He is best known through his writings, which are somewhat voluminous. Mr. Relly's style of writing is remarkably good, indicating more than ordinary culture. His principal works are as follows: The tryal of spirits, or a treatise upon the nature, offices, and operations of the Spirit of Truth, London, 1756, 2d ed., 1762; Union, or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his Church, 1759, reprinted, Philadelphia, 1843; Antichrist resisted, 1761; The life of Christ, 1762; The Sadducee detected and refuted, 1764; Christian liberty, 1775; Epistles, or the great salvation contemplated, 1778; Salvation completed ("a discourse on that subject by J. R., wrote in the year 1758"), 1779; The salt of the sacrifice, or the true Christian baptism delineated, according to reason and spirit [n. d., 1779 ?]; The Chaldeeical mystery, or an essay on the mission of Daniel the prophet, 1780.

The chief of his works—that in which his doctrinal views are most fully elaborated, together with the grounds on which they rest—is Union. In this he holds to a certain mystical union between Christ and humanity. Christ's relation to men is like that of the head to the different members of the body. His actions and thoughts, therefore, are ours: his obedience and sufferings are ours. He has brought the whole human race into the divine favor as fully as if each member had obeyed and suffered in his own person, and thus has secured a complete salvation. His theology is of the ethical type, maintaining that there must be perfect harmony between the divine attributes. Of the Almighty he says, "that, as a God infinite in goodness, he doth not, will not, act from one attribute to the dishonor of another." He believes in a literal resurrection of the body. He says [see Sadducee refuted], "What does the term 'resurrection' imply, if not the rising again to life of that which was subjected to death? But the soul is immortal. . . . It is the body only that dies. Therefore the future resurrection of the dead, if there be any, must be that of the body." He confesses, however, that the rising again of mankind in the second Adam from the sin in which they were involved in the first Adam implies a quickening and renewal of the mind through the truth. He teaches the millennial coming of Christ, in which the believers shall rise and reign with him. Afterwards, those who are under condemnation shall rise; and, through the mediation of the saints, they shall be brought to Christ: so that at last every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength. He believes in the universal solicitation of Christ and the mediatorial dispensation. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith. Hence he placed special emphasis upon good works, and commended a broad and generous philanthropy. As to the nature of Christ, he views the vicarious atonement as the basis of the atonement and its dispensations. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith. Hence he placed special emphasis upon good works, and commended a broad and generous philanthropy. As to the nature of Christ, he views the vicarious atonement as the basis of the atonement and its dispensations. The "one baptism" spoken of in Eph. iv. 5 is spiritual, operating upon the mind and conscience through faith. Hence he placed special emphasis upon good works, and commended a broad and generous philanthropy. As to the nature of Christ, he views the vicarious atonement as the basis of the atonement and its dispensations.
individualism — which is, after all, only another name for the right of private judgment — was boldly avowed, and persistently maintained, by scholars and philosophers, as a distinct general principle, and the outcome of these opinions, and the changes which they produced in the condition of European society, became conspicuous. The first was seed-time, the other the fruit-season; and between the two lay the dark night of nearly a century, in which the "new birth," the Renaissance, seemed to have reached an untimely end.

The following is an outline, in their historical order, of some of the principal events in which this spirit of individualism — afterwards known, from the marvellous changes it produced in European life, as the Renaissance, or "new birth" — exhibited itself.

1. Abelard (1079-1142) was the first great scholar in the middle age who openly maintained the principle of individualism in a definite form against that of the authority of the church as recognized and settled in his time. He did not claim, as later scholars did, that the church had actually reached wrong conclusions in any given case, but that her fundamental theory, that her own declaration of her own infallibility in all cases should be binding upon Christians, was a false one. Anselm had formulated the church's position by asserting that we must believe in order that we may be able to understand; Abelard, on the contrary, insisted that we must first understand before we can believe. Abelard, although condemned by the church for this and other errors, had many disciples, who, adopting his theory, did not hesitate to discuss and condemn many things which were done under the claim of church authority. Indeed, so wide-spread and potent was the influence of Abelard's example, that, according to Hallam, the greater part of the literature of the middle age from the twelfth century may be considered as artillery levelled against the dogma.

2. Arnold of Brescia, who lived in the first half of the twelfth century, was a pupil of Abelard, and applied the principle of free inquiry, as defended by his master, to an examination of the claim of popes and bishops to the exercise of authority as secular princes. His influence was so great that he practically dethroned, for a time, one pope, and became himself the ruler of Rome. He was soon deposed, condemned, and burned; but his career lasted long enough to show that in Italy in the twelfth century there was an opinion strong enough to make itself felt effectually, questioning the authority of the church, not merely to make itself the interpreter of its own jurisdiction over civil as well as over ecclesiastical affairs, but revolting also against the system of government it had established. The same principle we see applied, about the same time, in a different sphere, in the insurrection of the Italian cities, under the name of the "Lombard League," against the authority of their German master, the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, — an authority which had theoretically, in the middle age, the same divine origin and sanction, and the same claim to unquestioning universal obedience, as that of the church. Yet the church of Lombardy did not hesitate to disown the imperial authority; and they acquired, by successful resistance to it, a certain qualified independence of the emperor, thus maintaining, as Sismondi says, the first and noblest struggle ever waged by the nations of modern Europe against the church. But in the thirteenth century may be considered as artillery levelled against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acquit the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the theory of passive obedience to authority as maintained by the church, is seen in the condition of the south of France in the thirteenth century. This movement presents itself under a double aspect. We see a defiance of the church's authority by all classes of the population. The higher nobility and the peasants of that region were both arrayed at the same time against it, but from different motives. The nobility of Provence, affected, no doubt, a good deal by the example of their Saracens neighbors, not only led lives in this era characterized by a worldliness, luxury, and love of display, up to that time wholly unknown in Western Europe among Christians; but many of their opinions were regarded as loose and heretical, and they had become restless under the restraint of church discipline. They professed to be orthodox Catholics; but their practice of an extraordinary exaltation of the passion of sexual love, their pretentious gallantry to women of their own rank, the courts which they established for the formal regulation of the relations between the sexes, their strange notions of the nature and extent of the marriage obligation, the encouragement of the troubadours, whose love-songs are the expression of an important phase in the life of the time, — all this was a genuine revolt, as much directed against the church's ideal conception of Christian virtue based upon poverty and self-denial, as it was against the recognition of the authority which enforced its discipline. The nobles denied the power of the church, whose restraints had become distasteful to them; and naturally they found justification for their course in opinions regarded as heretical. The example of the nobles was followed by the peasants, who, known in history as the Albigenses, had long been ready to revolt against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accordance with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acquit the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acquit the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acquit the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acquit the old to the new, the revolt of individualism against the church for another and opposite reason; viz., that its doctrines, as well as its authority, did not seem to them to be in accord with the principles and examples revealed in the New Testament. As is well known, this revolt against the authority of the church was cruelly crushed in the thirteenth century: still, it must be regarded as one of the most important movements of the earlier Renaissance against that authority which had been recognized as paramount, not merely in settling the belief, but in regulating the lives and actions, of men. While the Provençal poetry was the outgrowth of an age and race thus characterized by disbelief and gross materialism, according to the church standard, the Norman ballads and the lays of the minnesingers in Germany, although the same, seem to have been more consistent with the desire to break the authority of the church, and to acqui
Caccio are called the earliest humanists; that is, they are the earliest and most eminent of the writers who regarded human life as something more than a state of preparation for the life to come, and by the belief in the immortality of the soul. They did not necessarily include all virtue. Dante, with his mind filled with a knowledge of medieval history, and with medieval concepts of life, still does not hesitate, in La Divina Commedia, to try every human action by the standard of right and justice implanted in every conscience, and never makes mere obedience to the order of the church the test of rightfulness of conduct. He strikes at the very foundation of the secular power of the Pope, as understood in his age, by portraying vividly, in a celebrated passage, the evil results of the supposed gift by the Emperor Constantine, of the Roman territory, and with it the temporal authority, to the Bishop of Rome. While Dante thus made, in opposition to the spirit of the age, the conscience the final judge, Petrarch and Boccaccio strove to conceive of human life as a state less gloomy and ascetic, more human and natural, more joyous, in short, as it was supposed to have been in antiquity, than it was under the practice and the discipline of the church. Petrarch sang at the same time the praises of love and of the free spirit of antiquity, exalting human dignity and pride, and claiming that there were objects worth living for in this life outside of those included in the church's ideal. Boccaccio was even more worldly, attracting attention to human interests, and portraying man's passions, joys, and sorrows, the good and the evil so strangely mingled in life, concentrating interest upon man as he actually is, and not upon the ideal man, whom the church by its all-controlling power and discipline sought to make him.

The first or early Renaissance, then, was characterized by a general restlessness in European society; a strong desire making itself manifest through philosophy and art, and by habits of self-indulgence, to free life from those restraints in opinions and acts which the Church and the State, by means of their universal authority, recognized for ages, had imposed upon it.

There was a long eclipse of the light shed by the earlier Renaissance, but at somewhat different epochs in the different countries of Europe. In Italy it occurred during the long struggle which resulted in the downfall of the city republics: in France and England, during the hundred-years war between those countries; and in Germany, during that reign of force and terror which accompanied the decline of the imperial power. During this eclipse the pretensions of the popes to absolutism became more pronounced than ever. The new orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans were their most active agents in repressing heresy; and, the practical control of the universities being in their hands, the most slavish theories of preceding centuries, or, rather, as to be regarded as the spirit of the church's ideal of life, which was that formed by the exaltation of human pride, and dignity, and force,— in other words, individualism,— was substituted, even among orthodox churchmen of the highest rank, for the Christian ideal, which was that of poverty, humility, and obedience. Some of the popes even became the unconscious instruments of sapping the foundations of their own authority. Nicolas V. (1455), for instance, who urged the Greek exiles to accept his hospitality, and to teach Greek literature under his protection, seemed to have no higher ambition in life than the spreading of Greek models. The truth is, that the later Renaissance in Italy, with its wonderful results, may be regarded as a revolution brought about in the human mind and in culture by the study of beauty of form inspired by the literature and art of antiquity. This was the astonishing glory of the fine arts in Italy. While the production of such
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painter</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>Classicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaelangelo</td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>High Renaissance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Renaissance was a period of great artistic achievement, marked by the revival of interest in classical antiquity. Artists like Raphael and Michelangelo were influenced by the works of ancient Greece and Rome, creating a new style that combined classical forms with Christian themes.

**REPENTANCE**

Repentance is the act of acknowledging one's wrongdoings and seeking forgiveness. It is a fundamental aspect of many religious traditions, including Christianity, Islam, and Judaism.

**References**


The concept of repentance is discussed in various religious texts, including the New Testament and the Qur'an.
The Pietists in Germany, and the Methodists in England, laid great stress upon the necessity of a thorough repentance, or change of heart (metanoia). This led to the exaggeration that true repentance necessitates a prolonged and agonizing spiritual struggle. Spener, however, except to say, that whereas many passed into the joys of adoption without experiencing the terrors of the law, others might reach them only after prolonged spiritual gloom and sorrows, or after passing, as it were, through hell itself. Zinzendorf, however, under the influence of the former theory, lingered for a protracted period in a state of spiritual gloom and doubt before reaching conviction.

The subject was warmly discussed by the Pietists on the one hand, and Luther on the other. (See Joh: De desperatione salutari, Wittenberg, 1780; EHRENFORT: D. Geheimnisse d. Bekehrung, 1790; BURGMANN: De luctu pennisimtum, 1736, etc.) The Methodists insisted on a hearty contrition for sin; and under the preaching of Wesley, Whitefield, and their contemporaries, there were manifestations of violent bodily agony. The Rationalists insisted with all earnestness upon a change of the will, but failed to understand the nature of faith. Among the modern presentations of this subject which go back to the view of repentance which prevailed among the Reformers is that of CHR. F. SCHMID, in his Christl. Sittenlehre. [See the theologies of HODGE (iii. pp. 3 sqq.) and VAN OOSTERZEE: SHEDD: Sermons for the Natural Man, New York, 1871, etc.]

REPH'DIM. See WILDERNESS OF THE WANDERING.

REPROBATION. See PREDESTINATION.

REQUIEM. See Predestination.

REQUIEM, a mass for the dead, thus called from the opening words of the text,—Requiem aeternam dona eis domine (“Give them, O Lord, eternal rest”). On account of its peculiar character, the Dies irae, dies illa, is used instead of Gloria in excelsis, the Offertorium instead of the Credo, etc. The most excellent compositions of the kind are those of Mozart and Cherubini.

REDELS (from the French l'arriéredos) is the division wall or screen at the back of an altar, rood-loft, etc., in old churches.

RESERVATION, Mental, is a trick by which, according to the moral school of the Jesuits, it is possible for a man to tell a lie, or even commit perjury, without doing anything wrong; namely, by adding mentally some qualification to the words actually spoken. Thus a man who is the only witness of a crime may, when asked by the court, answer, “I know nothing of it,” when he mentally adds, “as a public fact.” This infamous doctrine was first set forth by the Jesuit Sanchez (d. 1610), and then developed by Fellicinus, Castro Pallo, Escobar, and Jo. Carouuel, in his Haplopes de restrictionibus mentalibus disputates, Leyden, 1672. Outside of the order of the Jesuits, the doctrine found a zealous defender in Antoninus Diana (d. 1663): see his Resolutiones morales. ZOEKLER.

RESERVATION, Papal. The word signifies which the pope or an exarch agrees with the appointment to vacant benefices by the issue of preces and mandata de providendo (comp. the art. MENSES PAPALES) gave the Roman curia occasion for further exertions in that direction. From the end of the twelfth century, instances occur, in which, when a foreign ecclesiastic died in Rome,
the Pope himself undertook to fill his place, because it had become vacant apud sedem apostolicam; and in 1265 Clement IV. formally established the rule concerning the Reservatio ex capite vacationis apud sedem apostolicam. Honorius IV. extended the rule, in 1282, also to cases in which the incumbent resigned his benefice into the hands of the Pope; and Boniface VIII. defined, in 1294, the apud sedem apostolicam as a circuit two days' journey distant from Rome. New kinds of reservations were trumped up; and in 1316 John XXII. decreed that all benefices which became vacant apud sedem apostolicam—not only by death, but also by deposition, cancelling of election, promotion, transference, etc. — were reserved for the Pope. The annoyances and scandalous transactions which were caused by this practice gave rise to much complaining, and the Council of Trent also effected some reforms; but it was the concordates which the popes were compelled to make, and the bond states which finally brought order and justice out of confusion.

H. F. JACOBSON.

RESIDENCE (that is, the personal presence at the place of one's office) seems to be a duty more evident in the case of an ecclesiastic than in that of any other official. Nevertheless, at a very early time it was found necessary to forbid absence. See Concil. Nicaem. (325), can. 15, 16; Antiocch. (341), can. 3; Can. Apost., 15, 16. Similar rules were established also in the Frankish Empire by Boniface. The accumulation of benefices, however, and other still more frivolous reasons, made absence one of the most glaring and widespread misuses of the church in the time of the Reformation. But the Council of Trent succeeded only in introducing partial reforms in the Roman-Catholic Church; while in the Protestant churches the abuse speedily disappeared, and made all legislation superfluous.

H. F. JACOBSON.

RESTORATION. See Apokatastasis.

RESIGNATION, the submission of the soul to the will of God, is a Christian grace distinguishing Christian from heathen ethics. Although the will of God is irresistible, Christian resignation is a voluntary act of the soul. There is no assurance that all things must work together for good to them that love God (Rom. viii. 28). The love of God for man, as revealed in the New Testament, awakens a sense of imperturbable trust in his care, the very hairs of our head being all numbered (Matt. x. 30). Resignation is therefore a mixture of voluntary obedience, humility, and trust. Christ is the fulfilment of this grace, and exhibited its highest manifestation in Gethsemane. Christian resignation is distinguished from Stoic submission and Mohammedan fatalism by being voluntary, and based upon the confidence that God will make all things to combine for the good to them that love him. CARL BECK.

REPOSITORY OF THE DEAD. 1. Definition and Biblical Notices. — The term “resurrection” is a figurative one, taken from the conception of the deposit of the dead body under the ground. In its literal sense, the body lying or resting in the grave. The essential reference of the term, however, is to the revivification of the dead, and the resumption of bodily and spiritual existence by them after a period of interruption. The firm belief in the resurrection and the eternal life is one of the products of Christianity, and rests upon the resurrection of Christ. Outside of Christian circles, death is and always has been the king of terrors. In the Old Testament the hope of the resurrection becomes clearer and clearer as revelation progresses. The prophets declare that the righteous shall participate in the consummation of the face VIII. defined, in 1294, the apud sedem apostolicam as a circuit two days' journey distant from Rome. New kinds of reservations were trumped up; and in 1316 John XXII. decreed that all benefices which became vacant apud sedem apostolicam — not only by death, but also by deposition, cancelling of election, promotion, transference, etc. — were reserved for the Pope. The annoyances and scandalous transactions which were caused by this practice gave rise to much complaining, and the Council of Trent also effected some reforms; but it was the concordates which the popes were compelled to make, and the bond states which finally brought order and justice out of confusion.

H. F. JACOBSON.

REIGN, the submission of the soul to the will of God, is a Christian grace distinguishing Christian from heathen ethics. Although the will of God is irresistible, Christian resignation is a voluntary act of the soul. There is no assurance that all things must work together for good to them that love God (Rom. viii. 28). The love of God for man, as revealed in the New Testament, awakens a sense of imperturbable trust in his care, the very hairs of our head being all numbered (Matt. x. 30). Resignation is therefore a mixture of voluntary obedience, humility, and trust. Christ is the fulfilment of this grace, and exhibited its highest manifestation in Gethsemane. Christian resignation is distinguished from Stoic submission and Mohammedan fatalism by being voluntary, and based upon the confidence that God will make all things to combine for the good to them that love him. CARL BECK.

Resurrection. See Resurrection.
spiritual body occurs at the resurrection, and its present relation to its future condition is represented by the relation of the seed to the ripe fruit. But why should not the soul be its own ethereal body? The soul itself, as J. H. Fichte says, forms the body; and the body of the resurrection will correspond to the individuality of the soul in its present body so far as it is characteristic of the individual.


ROBERT KÜBEL.

RETTBERG, Friedrich Wilhelm, b. at Calle, Aug. 21, 1805; d. at Marburg, April 7, 1849. He was appointed professor of theology at Göttingen in 1824, and at Marburg in 1838. Most of his writings belong to the department of church history, and comprise, besides a number of minor essays and monographs, Cyprians Leben u. Werken (Göttingen, 1831) and Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (Göttingen, 1845-48, 2 vols.), reaching to the death of Charlemagne, and a work of immense industry, excellent method, and great critical talent.

WAGENMANN.

RETTIQ, Heinrich Christian Michael, b. at Gießen, July 30, 1795; d. at Zürich, March 24, 1838. He studied theology in his native city, and was appointed professor at Zürich in 1833. His Die freie protestantische Kirche, oder die kirchliche Verfassungsgrundzüge des Evangeliums (Gießen, 1832) made a great sensation, on account of its modern and original ideas on church organization. He also edited the Gospel Codex Sangallensis, Zürich, 1836.

HERZOG.

REUBEN. See Tribes.

REUCHLIN, Johann, b. at Pforzheim, Feb. 22, 1455; d. at Stuttgart, June 30, 1523; one of the most prominent among the humanist predecessors of the Reformation. He entered the university of Freiburg in 1470; was appointed court-singer to the margrave of Baden-Durlach in 1473; accompanied one of the sons of the margrave as tutor to the university of Paris, where he learned Greek from Andronicus Contoblacos, and settled, after his return, at Basle (where he published a Latin dictionary which ran through twenty-three editions), and began to lecture on Latin and Greek. But the theologians of Basle found that “lectures on Greek” were an impious thing, which might draw away the flocks from the Roman fold; and Reuchlin left the city. He went first to Paris, where for some time he continued his Greek studies under Hermogenes of Sparta, and thence to Orleans, where in 1478 he began to study law. After his return, in 1481, he entered the service of the Duke of Wurttemberg, was made his counsellor, and accompanied him in that capacity to Rome. In Rome he conversed much with Hermolaus Barbarus (who translated his name into the Greek, Capnio), and in Florence with Marcellus Ficinus, Picus de Mirandola, Politian, and others, who inspired him with enthusiasm for the mysticism of Plato and the Cabala. The first Hebrew he learned from Jacob Jehiel Loens, a learned Jew who was court-physician to Friedrich III. Reuchlin was sent to the emperor in 1492, on some diplomatical mission; was very well received, ennobled, etc.; but the Hebrew knowledge he brought back with him he valued higher than any thing else; and in 1494 appeared his De verbo mirifico, the first-fruit of his cabalistic studies. Afterwards, during a whole year’s stay in Rome, in 1497, on business of the elector-palatine, he continued his Hebrew studies under another learned Jew; and in 1506 appeared his Hebrew grammar, from which dates the scientific study of Hebrew. Meanwhile he had published a text-book in universal history, another in civil law, Progymnasmata scenica (a kind of school-comedies for exercise in Latin, which ran through twenty-nine editions), De arte cabalistica, 1516, etc.; and how great a fame and confidence he enjoyed is shown by the circumstance, that in 1502 the Suabian Union chose him for their judge.

In 1509 he first made the acquaintance of Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew holding some office in the government of St. Ursula at Cologne; but from that time his life was filled with anxiety and misery. Pfefferkorn had obtained a decree from the emperor, Maximilian I, ordering all Jews living in the empire to give up their books to Pfefferkorn for examination, and permitting Pfefferkorn to confiscate and burn such books as contained polemical utterances against Christianity. Pfefferkorn wished to have Reuchlin as his partner in this enterprise, but Reuchlin excused himself. He was, nevertheless, dragged into it. Through the elector of Mayence he received an imperial order to present a memorial and protest setting forth the absurdity of such a measure, was shown to Pfefferkorn; and he printed it in his Handspiegel, 1510, with the most venomous commentaries. Reuchlin answered with his Augenspiegel, 1511; but the theological faculty of Cologne then charged a committee with examining the orthodoxy of the Augenspiegel, and the Dominican inquisitor, Hoogostraten, took openly the side of Pfefferkorn. The committee found forty-three condemnable propositions in the Augenspiegel; Hoogostraten stepped forward as formal accuser, 1513, and for seven years Reuchlin always felt the danger of the stake hovering over him. The court of Spires fully acquitted him, March 29, 1514, and sentenced Hoogostraten to pay a fine of a hundred and eleven gulden. But Hoogostraten appealed to the Pope; and Leo X. formed a court, under the presidency of Benignus de Savalciu. But this court, on the 2, 1516, the court gave its verdict, which was an unqualified acquittal of Reuchlin; but the Pope dared not confirm the decision in the face of the powerful party of the Dominicans, who actually
REUTERDAHL.
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threatened him with rebellion. The final solution was accepted by Franz von Sickinger, who politely advised the Dominicans of Cologne to stop all further proceedings, and pay the fine, or to be prepared for a visit from himself and his friends. The Dominicans chose to pay and be silent.

The sensation caused by the trial of Reuchlin was enormous. All the humanists sided with him; and a party with very outspoken reactionary tendencies, and something of an organization, was formed under the name of Reuchlinists. It must not be understood, however, that Reuchlin himself stood at the head of that party. On the contrary, during the whole course of his trial he did his utmost not to fall out with the church. There was in his nature and character not the least trace of a talent for martyrdom. The last years of his life were much disturbed by war-incidents; and the brilliant engagement he accepted in 1521, as professor in Greek at Tubingen, he was by death prevented from fulfilling. After the appearance of Luther he also became estranged from his grand-nephew, Melanchthon, who had previously been his pride. See his biography by Mai, Durlach, 1587 (Latin); Mayerhoff, Berlin, 1830; Lamey, Pforzheim, 1855; Ludwig Geiger, Leipzig, 1871.

REUTERDAHL, Henrik, b. at Malmo, Sweden, Sept. 10, 1793; d. at Upsala, June 28, 1870. He studied theology at Lund, and was appointed adjunct to the theological faculty in 1824, professor ordinarius in 1844, minister of worship and public education in 1852, bishop of Lund in 1855, and archbishop of Upsala in 1856. His principal work is Svenka kyrkans historia (History of the Swedish Church), 1838-63, 5 vols., reaching to the Reformation, — a work based on original and exhaustive researches, but often admitting too much space to secular history. A. Michelsen.

REVELATION, Book of, called, also, by adoption, instead of translation of the Greek title, The Apocalypse, a term, which, according to its original sense, would denote the future glorious revelation of Christ, and only by a later idiom, the prophecy of it, and which is now commonly used to designate that specific kind of prophecy, of which the book is the outcome, which expresses itself in symbolical visions rather than in simple predicative words. According to the usual arrangement, it stands at the end of the New Testament, a position appropriate to its contents, and probably, also, to its date. It is the only prophetic book of the New Testament canon, and, with the partial exception of Daniel, the only prophetic book of either Testament which is planned and written in the form of a carefully ordered and closely concatenated whole. The boldness of its symbolism makes it the most difficult book of the Bible: it has always been the most effectually understood by the literarily interpreted, the most exegetically tortured.

Any question of its genuineness, authenticity, or canonicity, may be considered excluded by the strength of the external evidence. The book asserts itself to be by John in terms which forbid our supposing it to be anything but the genuine product of the mind of John himself, and at first sight the assumption of the unity of the Apocalypse forms the uniform basis of all works upon it. (Völter.) Its text, because of the comparatively few manu-
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scripts which contain it, remains in an uncertain state in comparison with the other New Testament books, though not so, in comparison with other ancient works, or to any such degree as to impair our confidence in its authenticity.

Its date has been much disputed; although the testimony of the early church, which is ancient, credible, and uniform, would seem decisive for A.D. 94-95. Irenæus, who was not only brought up in Asia Minor, and there knew several apostolic men, but was also the pupil of John's pupil, Polycarp, explicitly testifies that it was seen towards the close of Domitian's reign; and he is supported in this by Clement of Alexandria, according to Eusebius' understanding of his words, as well as by Victorinus, Jerome, and later writers generally. Eusebius drops no hint that any other opinion was known to him. Even those who denied the book to the apostle, yet assigned it to this time. Not the slightest trace (except, perhaps, an obscure one in Origen) of another opinion is found until the late fourth century (the Muratori canon has been misunderstood), when the notion of a second writing went on, without a self-contradiction, places the banishment and prophecy of John under Claudius (41-54). Some few writers adopt interpretations of special passages which might appear to imply their writing before the destruction of Jerusalem, but this inference is sometimes clearly excluded. No early writer assigns John's banishment, or the composition of the Apocalypse, to the times of Nero or his immediate successors. The earliest direct statement to this effect is found in the Syriac Apocalypse of the sixth century, which declares that John was banished to Patmos by Nero Caesar. (Is this due to a clerical error for Nerva?) This is thought to be supported, (1) by Theophylact (eleventh century), who places the writing of John's Gospel at Patmos thirty-two years after the ascension, but at the same time assigns John's condemnation to Trajan, and (2) by a false reading (Domitian for Domitianou) in one passage of Hippolytus Thebanus (tenth or eleventh century), which is corrected in another. Certainly, if historical testimony is ever decisive, it assigns the Apocalypse to the closing years of the first century. Nor are supporting internal considerations lacking. (1) The natural implication of i. 9 is, that John was banished to Patmos; and this is in accordance with Domitian's, and not with Nero's, known practice. (2) The churches are addressed after a fashion which suggests intimate, perhaps long-standing, personal acquaintance between them and the author; yet it is certain, that, up to A.D. 93, John was not their spiritual head, and was probably unknown to them. Neither in Second Timothy nor in Second Peter (both sent to this region) is there the remotest hint of the relation between John and these churches, which seems to have been of long standing with the Apocalypse. (3) The internal condition of the seven churches appears to be different from that pictured in Ephesians, Colossians, First and Second Timothy, First and Second Peter; and the difference is such as seems to require not only time, but a period of time,酝酿ed by a persecution for its development. (4) The ecclesiastical usages of the churches seem to have made an advance. The term “the Lord's Day,” for Sunday, is unique in the New Testament; the office of “pastor,” found elsewhere clearly marked in the New Testament only in the case of James, is here assumed as universal in Asia Minor, and settled; the public reading (i. 3) of the Christian writings in the churches is spoken of as a usage of long standing, and a matter of course.

On the other hand, it has of late become the ruling opinion among critics, that the book comes from a time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. The chief arguments which are urged in its support are: (1) The whole tradition of the Domitianic origin of the Apocalypse hangs on Irenæus; and it is quite conceivable that Irenæus has fallen into an error, either as to time alone (e.g., Stuart), or as to matter as well,—the banishment, and hence the time of it, and hence the date of the Apocalypse, all depending on a misunderstanding of Rev. i. 9 (e.g., Düsterdieck). But Rev. i. 9 seems most naturally to imply a banishment. Irenæus does not depend on any inference from the book, but mentions excellent independent sources, not without self-contradiction, places the banishment and prophecy of John under Claudius (41-54). It does not follow, because all the evidence of the first three centuries and a half is consistent, that it is dependent on Irenæus. Eusebius, on the contrary, understands Clement to the same effect, and appeals as well to a plurality of sources (H. E., III. 20). (2) There is not even an obscure reference in the book to the destruction of Jerusalem as a past event,—a catastrophe of too great importance in God's dealings with his church to be passed over in silence in a book of this kind. This would probably be a valid argument if the book were thought to be a history or practical treatise written about 70-80; but, if a prophecy written about 95, it is too much to demand that it should contain reference to a catastrophe the lessons of which had been long since learned, and which belonged to a stadium of development as well as date long past. (3) Jerusalem is spoken of in it as still standing, and the temple as still under destroyed (xi. 1, 2, 3 sq., and even i. 7, ii. 9, iii. 9, iv. 12, 16),—a statement which proceeds on a literalistic interpretation confessedly not applicable throughout the book, or in the parallel case of Ezek. xi. sq. (4) The time of writing is exactly fixed by the description of the then reigning emperor in xiii. 13 and xvii. 7-12. Until, however, it be agreed who this emperor is,—whether Nero (Berthold, Bruston), or Galba (Reuss, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt), or Vespasian (Bleek, De Wette, Düsterdieck, Weiss),—this reasoning is not strong; and the interpretation on which it is founded (implying the assumption that the ideal date of any vision can be the actual date of the book itself) is exceedingly unnatural in itself, cannot be made to fit the description, except by extreme pressure of its language, and seems to fasten false expectations on the prophet, if not, indeed, the invention of what is not in the writing at all. (5) The chief argument with evangelical men, however, is that derived from the literary differences between the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, which are thought by many to be too great to be explained, except on the supposition that a long period of time is a per se effect of the difference between the two books. The differences in dogmatic conception and point of view will hardly, however,
after Gebhardt's investigations, be asserted to be greater than may be explained by the diverse purposes and forms of the two writings; and it is perfectly vain to contend that the differences in style and language are such as are explicable by the lapse of time. The Apocalypse betrays no lack of knowledge of, or command over, Greek syntax or vocabulary; the difference lies, rather, in the manner in which a language well in hand is used, in style, properly so called; and the solution of it must therefore yield itself to prophetic, and not chronological, considerations. Every new investigation diminishes the amount and significance of the difference on the one hand, and on the other renders it more and more clear that its explanation is to be sought in the different requirements of the well-marked types of composition and the divergent mental condition of the writer. The evangelist, dealing freely with his material, takes pains to write better Greek than was customary with him; the seer is overwhelmed with the visions crowding upon him, and finds no other speech fit for their expression than that of the old prophets, and therefore is constrained to adopt the poetic imagery, or the superb sweep of its pro-

tic figures, xii. 1-xiv. 20; (5) The seven bowls, xv. 1-xvi. 21; (6) The sevenfold subdivision of each section is easy to trace in all cases except in (4), (6), and (7), where it is more difficult to find, and is more doubtful.

With this elaborate plan is developed the action of a prophetic poem unsurpassed in sacred or profane literature in either the grandeur of its poetic imagery, or the superb sweep of its pro-

1 (The early date is now accepted by perhaps the majority of scholars. In its favor, besides the arguments mentioned by the author of the article, may be urged the allusion to the temple at Jerusalem (xii. 1 sq.), in language which implies that it has already existed, but was speedy to be destroyed; and, further, that the nature and object of the Revelation are best suited by this allusion to a date, while its historical understanding is greatly facilitated. With the great confiscation at Rome, and the Reformation persecution fresh in mind, with the horrors of the Jewish war then going on, and in view of the destruction of Jerusalem as an impending fact, John received the visions of the future before the close of his earthly life. His book came, therefore, as a comforter to hearts distracted by calamities without a parallel in history. Cf. Schroff, His-

tory of the Christian Church, rev. ed., vol. i. 324-337. — B.S.)

The plan and structure of the book, the whole of which seems to have been seen by John in one day (i. 10), are exceedingly artistic, and are based on progressive repetitions of sevenfold visions. It thus advertises to us at once its copious use of numerical symbolism, and the principle underlying its structure. Ewald, Volkmar, Rinck, Weiss, Farrar, have further correctly seen that the whole consists of seven sections, and thus constitutes a sevenfold series of sevens, and symbolizes the perfection and finality of its revelation. Five of these sections are clearly marked: it is more difficult to trace the other two. But, if we follow the indications of the natural division of the matter, we shall find the separating line between them at xix. 11 (so De Wette, Weiss, Godet, Hilgenfeld). The plan of the book, as above stated, is as follows: Pro-

logue, i. 1-8; (1) The seven churches, i. 9-iii. 22; (2) The seven seals, iv. 1-viii. 1; (3) The seven trumpets, viii. 2-xi. 19; (4) The seven mys-

tic figures, xii. 1-xiv. 20; (5) The seven bowls, xv. 1-xvi. 21; (6) The sevenfold subdivision on the whole, xvii. 1-xix. 10; (7) The sevenfold

triumph, xix. 11-xxi. 5; Epilogue, xxii. 6-21. The sevenfold subdivision of each section is easy to trace in all cases except in (4), (6), and (7), where it is more difficult to find, and is more doubtful.

Within this elaborate plan is developed the action of a prophetic poem unsurpassed in sacred

or profane literature in either the grandeur of its poetic imagery, or the superb sweep of its pro-

phetic vision. It is of the first importance to its correct understanding, that we should grasp the fact that its prime design is not chronological, but ethical. It was not intended to write history beforehand, but to record the struggle between Christ and the enemy, to keep steadily before the eye of the believer the issue to which all tends, and thus comfort him in distress, encourage him in depression, and succor him in time of need. It has always been the re-
course of a persecuted church. In proportion as a church has waxed cold, and settled upon her lees, in that proportion has she neglected this book; but, whenever earthly help and hope have slipped from her grasp, she has addressed herself to it, and found in it all she could need to comfort, encourage, and enhearten. As Luke adjointed to his Acts of the earthly Christ Acts of the risen Christ, conquering the world from Jerusa-

lem to Rome, and establishing his church in the face of all opposition, so John, to his Acts of the God become man, adjoints the Acts of the man be-

come God, triumphing not only over one age, but over all ages, if to a prophetic, antique, Ezekiel-like, Hebrewizing form of speech (Ebrard).

The plan of the whole, then, is as follows: Pro-

logue, i. 1-8; (1) The seven churches, i. 9-iii. 22; (2) The seven seals, iv. 1-viii. 1; (3) The seven trumpets, viii. 2-xi. 19; (4) The seven mys-

tic figures, xii. 1-xiv. 20; (5) The seven bowls, xv. 1-xvi. 21; (6) The sevenfold subdivision on the whole, xvii. 1-xix. 10; (7) The sevenfold

triumph, xix. 11-xxi. 5; Epilogue, xxii. 6-21. The sevenfold subdivision of each section is easy to trace in all cases except in (4), (6), and (7), where it is more difficult to find, and is more doubtful.

Within this elaborate plan is developed the action of a prophetic poem unsurpassed in sacred

or profane literature in either the grandeur of its poetic imagery, or the superb sweep of its pro-

phetic vision. It is of the first importance to its correct understanding, that we should grasp the fact that its prime design is not chronological, but ethi-
but must labor to avoid the two opposite errors,—of considering the book an elaborate puzzle, refusing to find any mystery in it at all. It would be difficult to determine which notion is the more hopelessly wrong,—that which supposes that the original reader readily understood its whole meaning in every particular, and which thus refuses to allow here the brooding shadow which has always hung over all unfulfilled prophecy, especially if only broadly outlined; or that which supposes, that, in delineating each prophetic picture, the seer chose emblems appropriate, not to his own age or all ages, but specifically to that in which this special prophecy was to be fulfilled, and which thus condemns him to write in enigmas unintelligible to all ages alike,—a concourse of meaningless symbols enclosing one single spot of lucidity for each era. Both the analogy of other Scripture and the experience of all time have disproved both fancies. Notwithstanding the naturalists, no one has ever understood all the details of these apocalyptic visions, unto perfection; notwithstanding the pedants, the unlettered child of God has found them always open to his spiritual sight, and fitted to his spiritual need. (3) The Apocalypse is written in a language of its own, having its own laws, in accordance with which it must be interpreted. There is such a thing as a grammar of apocalyptic symbolism; and what is meant by the various images is no more a matter for the imagination to settle than are points of Greek syntax. This is not the same as calling the book obscure, in any other sense than a writing in a foreign language is obscure to those ignorant of it. "As all language abounds in metaphor and other materials of imagery, imagery itself may form the ground of a descriptive language. The forms of it may become intelligible terms, and the combination of them may be equivalent to a narrative of description" (Davison). The sources and explanation of this symbolism are found in the prophets of the Old Testament (especially Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) and our Lord's eschatological discourses, which, moreover, furnish the model on the lines of which the Apocalypse is composed. The study of apocryphal apocalypses has its own laws, and a grammar is also drawn from the canonical prophets; but it is best to draw water direct from the fountain. (4) The question of the fulfilment of the prophecy is totally distinct from and secondary to that of the sense of the prophecy. Nowhere is it more necessary to carry out the processes of exegesis free from subjective preconceptions, and nowhere is it more difficult. There seems no way, except to jealously keep the exegesis of the prophecy and the inquiry after its fulfilment sharply and thoroughly separated. It is only after we know fully what the book says, that we can with any propriety, considering the problems and history of the great conflict between Christ and the Enemy from the first to the second advents. The Jesuit Ribera (1808) was the father of this school. To it belong Lacunza, Tyso, S. R. and C. Maitland, De Burgh, Todd, Kelly, I. Williams, etc. (3) The Historical, which holds that the book contains a prophetic view of the great conflict between Christ and the Enemy from the first to the second advents. It is as old as the twelfth century, when Berengaud, followed by Anselm and the Abbess Joachim, expounded it. It has received in one form or another, often differing extremely among themselves, the suffrages of most students of the book. It is the system of DeLire, Wiclif, the Reformers generally, Fox, Brightman, Pareus, Medina, Vitringa, Sir I. Newton, Fleming, Daubuz, Whiston, Bengel, Gausen, Elliott, Faber, Woodhouse, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Von Hofmann, Auberlen, Alford, W. Lee, etc. The last six of these writers will be found nearest the truth.

LIT. — (1) Introduction. The various introductions to the New Testament, e.g., Credner's, Guericke's, Bleek's, Ebrard's; the arts. in the encyclopedias, e.g., Kitto's (by Davidson), McClintock and Strong's, Smith's, Herzog's, Lichtenberger's (by A. Sabatier), and Ersch and Gruber's (by Reuss); the prolegomena to the commentaries, e.g., Dusander's, Stuart's, Alford's, Lee's (in the Bible Commentary), and Ebrard's; and the sections in the church histories, e.g., Neander's Planting and Training, and Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church (1853, pp. 440-460 and 603-607) and History of the Christian Church (vol. 1., 1859, pp. 525-535); also Godet: Studies on the New Testament, 1870, these saying that "Apocalyptic Studien," in Studien und Kritiken, 1869 (cf. his Leben Jesu, 1882, vol. i. pp. 51-101); Renan: L'Anticherist, 1873; Bleek's review of Lücke's, in Studien und Kritiken, 1854, 1855, and, above all, Lücke's great work, Vernuch einer vollständigen Einleitung d. d. Ap. 2nd ed. 1856, 2nd expanded ed., 1852. — (2) Commentaries.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION. 2038 REVIVALS OF RELIGION.


The ancient people of God were rebuked with great frequency by their priests and prophets for their proneness to spiritual declension. "My people are bent to backsliding from me." "Why is this people of Jerusalem slidden back by a perpetual backsliding?" This proneness was continually coming to the surface, in the days of Moses and the judges, under the kings, and both before and after the exile. Judges and rulers, priests and prophets, Deborah and Barak, Samuel and David, Elijah and Elisha, Jonah and Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, were raised up to beat back the waves of corruption, to arrest the tide of degeneracy, and to heal the backslidings of the people. The fire was kept burning on the altar only by repeated divine interpositions, resulting successively in a revival of religion.

Similar tendencies have from the beginning been developed in the history of the Christian Church: Ephesus loses her first love, Laodicea becomes lukewarm, Sardis defiles her garments, Philippi and Corinth yield to the blandishments of worldly pleasures. Worldliness and carnality, leanness and spiritual death, succeed, too often, a state of pious fervor, godly zeal, and holy living. The annual narratives of ecclesiastical communi-
ties bear painful testimony to this degenerating tendency.

Such being the testimony of universal experience to the proneness of human nature to decline from the spirit and power of godliness, how, it is asked, is this tendency to be checked? Obviously the true and only effective and appropriate remedy for a season of spiritual declension is a season of spiritual revival. Such a season, by whatever agencies or instrumentalties brought about, by whatever adjuncts of questionable propriety it may be accompanied, and of greater or less extent, may properly be termed "a revival of religion."

These manifestations, moreover, are to be regarded as the result of a special and peculiar effusion of the Holy Spirit. All spiritual life, all progress in the divine life, whether in the individual or in the community, in the church or in the nation, is the Spirit of God. The whole period of grace, from the Day of Pentecost to the final judgment, is properly termed "the dispensation of the Holy Spirit." Every true convert is begotten of the Spirit, and so becomes a child of God. The Spirit is always in and with the church, carrying forward the work of redemption.

Revivals in Biblical Times. — Mention, moreover, is made in the Scriptures of special dispensations of the Holy Spirit, of copious effusions of the Spirit, of particular times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." The fulfillment of this prediction of the prophet Joel began, as the apostle Peter testifies, on the Day of Pentecost next following the crucifixion of our Lord. So mightily were men affected, that the Spirit filled the land of Israel with its blessed fruits. Through a continued series of years, whereby the season of spiritual revival. Such a season, by whatever agencies or instrumentalties brought about, by whatever adjuncts of questionable propriety it may be accompanied, and of greater or less extent, may properly be termed "a revival of religion."

Not only at Jerusalem, but everywhere in all the region round about where the apostles and apostolic men preached in those days, and far away among the Gentiles,—at Samaria, at Cesarea, at the two Antiochs, at Lystra and Derbe, at Philadelphia and Thessalonica, at Athens and Corinth, at Ephesus and Rome,—such scenes were witnessed. So many and so mighty were those special manifestations of divine power and grace in the gospel, by reason of such effusions of the Holy Spirit, that Tertullian could say at the beginning of the third century, in his appeal to the civil authorities, "We have filled all places of your dominions,—cities, islands, corporations, councils, armies, tribes, the senate, the palace, the court of judicature." "So mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed."

The Great Protestant Revival. — Passing over the intervening centuries, it may well be asked, What was the Protestant Reformation, that beginning in the fourteenth century under Wiclif, and continued under Hus in the fifteenth, at length culminated in the sixteenth under Luther and Calvin, and a host of kindred spirits? It was a special dispensation of the Spirit, whereby the minds of men everywhere in Christian lands were turned towards the utterances of the Divine Word, the errors of the Papacy were discovered and renounced, the truth as it is in Jesus apprehended and embraced by multitudes, and the churches built up in the faith of the gospel. It was a great and general revival of religion, whereby converts in tens of thousands were born of the Spirit of God. So thorough and wide-spread were those conversions, that the fires of persecution were kindled in vain. In spite of princes and prelates, converts to the pure faith of the gospel were made all over Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, and Great Britain, and not a few in Spain and Italy. It was the greatest revival of religion that the world had witnessed, and the church enjoyed, since the days of Constantine.

Revivals in Great Britain and Ireland. — From that day, all along the centuries, the annals of the church abound in testimonies to the reality and efficacy of those special effusions of the Spirit. The Church of Scotland was born anew in the great revival under Knox and his brethren. "The whole nation," says Kirkton, "was converted by lump." Near the close of the sixteenth century, under the ministry of such divines as Wishart, Cooper, and Welsh, all Scotland was visited by an extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit. So mightily were men affected, that the whole General Assembly, four hundred ministers and elders, while renewing their solemn league and covenant, with sighs and groans and tears, were swayed by the Spirit, as the leaves of the forest by the "rushing mighty wind" of the driving tempest.

Similar scenes were further witnessed in Scotland, beginning in 1625, at Stewarton, extending through the land, and into the north of Ireland, and eventuating in that remarkable display of divine grace in the Kirk of Scotland, where, in June, 1630, under the preaching of Bruce and Livingston, "near five hundred" souls, in one day,
were brought under deep conviction of sin, and presently into the light and liberty of the gospel. So, too, in 1838, on the great covenant, the whole country was stirred as by the mighty hand of God. "I have seen," says Livingston, "more than a thousand persons, all at once, lifting up their hands, and the tears falling down their eyes," as with one heart they "proclaimed the judgment of God on the land."

During the year 1837 a work of peculiar power began at a mission station at Hilo, in Hawaii, under the preaching of Mr. Coan, and continued for a period of the Lord's presence. Many were the revivals of religion among the people as mighty helpers to the churches, and as people as mighty helpers to the churches, and as most salutary in their influence over the church and the world.

The evangelical churches in America very generally, and to a considerable extent in Great Britain and Ireland, as also in the British Provinces, most heartily believe in revivals of religion, look for them, pray and labor for them, and deserve much of their vitality from these effusions of the Spirit. A large proportion of their ministers have been converted in revivals. A class of preachers known as "evangelists," or "revivalists," devote themselves wholly to their promotion. Here and there, serious irregularities have been introduced by enthusiasts, and much harm done to religion. These offences, however, are exceptional, and of very limited influence. Very generally, revivals of religion are regarded by the best people as mighty helpers to the churches, and as most salutary in their influence over the church and the world.

REVOLUTION. The French. In Ecclesiastical
Respects.—The violent commotion, which, towards
the close of the eighteenth century, almost de-
stroyed the whole social and political organization
of the French people, was principally and prima-
ry in the third estate, and especially among the
clergy; the connection between the feudal State
and the Roman-Catholic Church, that an attack
on the former could not fail to affect also the
latter. Moreover, all the writers and teachers
who had engaged in undermining the founda-
tions of the social fabric were utterly hostile, not
only to the church and her officials, but to reli-
gion in general. A supercilious scepticism with
respect to the positive doctrines of the church,
and a fickle-hearted frivolity, which felt the moral
code of Christianity as a galling chain, stirred up
a suspicion that the clergy clung to their political
privileges, their social organization, their wealth,
not from any conviction of having a higher call-
ing, but from mere egoism and arrogance. The
idea of the church as an institution based on
divine authority was gone, and to employ her
wealth in aid of the bankrupt State seemed a
simple and natural expedient.

Before the outbreak of the Revolution, it was
generally believed in the higher circles of French
society, that the clergy, as a privileged class,
would make common cause with the nobility;
but this supposition was rudely shaken at the
very opening of the contest. While the nobility
insisted upon strict class-separation in the debate
and voting of the states-general, nearly one-half
of the delegates of clergy (a hundred and forty-
eight out of three hundred and eight) joined the
third estate on June 22, 1789; and, two days
later, a hundred and fifty-one other ecclesiastical
delegates, led by Talleyrand, bishop of Autun,
followed the example. The clergy began to
become popular, the more so as they proved very
liberal under the discussion of the financial
emergency. The abolition of tithes, Aug. 7, with-
out any recompense, they submitted to almost
without resistance; and when, on Sept. 26, it was
moved that all ecclesiastical states, with house
and garden, should be installed by the metropolitan, or the
archbishop and confirmed by the bishop. Their sal-
aries and the nursing of the sick. The in-
habitants of the monasteries were allowed to re-
turn to civil life by a simple announcement to the
nearest secular authority; and according to the
character of their monastic vows, the circum-
stances of their monastery, their age, etc., they
received a pension of from seven hundred to
twelve hundred francs. The nuns, when they
were not disposed to break their vows, were gen-
erally allowed to remain in their monasteries;
while, under similar circumstances, the monks
were transferred to certain houses set apart for
the purpose. It was evident that the Assembly
considered the church the main-stay of all old
superstition, the corner-stone of the feudal State,
and that her total destruction was the real aim
of the whole movement. On April 19 the admin-
istration of all church-property was transferred
to the State, and the Committee on Ecclesiastical
Affairs was charged with selling four hundred
million francs’ worth of ecclesiastical estates;
and on May 29 the debate on the re-organization
of the church, the civil constitution of the clergy,
began. A new circumscription of the bishoprics,
in order to make them conform with the depart-
ments, reduced their number from a hundred and
thirty-four to eighty-three. The bishops should
be elected by the same body of voters as the
members of the departmental Assembly, and
should be installed by the metropolitan, or the
oldest bishop of the province. To seek papal
confirmation was formally forbidden. The chap-
ters were dissolved, and only a limited number of
ecclesiastical vicars appointed for each see. Priests
should be chosen by the qualified electors of the
parish, and confirmed by the bishop. Their sal-
ary was fixed at from twelve hundred to four
thousand francs, besides house and garden; that
of the bishops, at three thousand and forty-six,
that of the Bishop of Paris, who received
fifty thousand francs. In the debate the clergy
took very little part. Their principal speakers
were the Archbishop of Aix and the Jansenist
theologian Camus, who tried hard to prove that
the plan was in perfect harmony with the New
Testament and the councils of the fourth century. On July 12 the debate was ended, and the civil constitution of the clergy was ready: only the assent of the king was lacking.

The king had been most painfully touched by the attacks on the church, and he actually felt his conscience hurt in giving his assent to the civil constitution of the clergy. In this emergency he addressed a letter to the Pope, dated July 28, 1790; but the Pope’s answer of Aug. 17 was vague and evasive, and on Aug. 24 the king confirmed the decree. Meanwhile the bishops were busy with organizing a passive resistance. Boigiselin, archbishop of Aix, drew up a protest, Exposition des principes, representing the contradiction between the principles of the church and those of the civil constitution; and a hundred and ten bishops signed the instrument, which on Nov. 9 was sent to the Pope through Cardinal Bernis. The National Assembly answered by a law of Nov. 27, which demanded that all ecclesiastics should take an oath on the Constitution, and threatened those who refused with deposition, loss of civil rights, and punishment for disturbance. The priests of the public worship were the first to take the oath; Talleyrand and seventy-one other clergymen followed the next day; but the rest of the three hundred ecclesiastics who sat in the National Assembly refused; and out in the country refusal became, in many districts, the rule. In Southern France, traces of rebellion began to show themselves. By a letter of March 10, 1791, to the archbishop of Aix, and a formal brief of April 13, the Pope now defined the position he proposed to maintain with respect to the papal dominions of Avignon and Venaissin in the maxims of liberty and equality; and on Aug. 25, 1793, a deputation of teachers and pupils presented itself before the convention; and the pupils begged that they should not any longer be trained “to pray in the name of a so-called god,” but be well instructed in the maxims of liberty and equality; and on Nov. 1 another deputation, from Nantes, openly demanded the abolition of the Roman-Catholic service. The granting of the demand was not far off. On Nov. 7 a letter from a priest was read aloud in the convention, beginning thus: “I am a priest; that is, I am a charlatan.” Immediately after, the Archbishop of Paris, an old man, Gobel by name, entered the hall, laid down his staff and his ring on the president’s table, renounced his office in the Roman Catholic Church, and declared, amidst immense applause, that he recognized no other national worship than that of liberty and equality. On Nov. 10 the municipal council of Paris celebrated a grand festival in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, in honor of Reason. Mademoiselle Maillard of the Grand Opera, in white robe and blue cap, represented the goddess of Reason. On men’s shoulders she was carried from the church to the convention. The president embraced her; and the whole convention accompanied her back to the church, and participated in the festival thus sanctioning the abolition of Christianity, and the introduction of
clergy, and all priests were admonished to renounce Christianity; and on Nov. 22 those bishops and priests who willingly abdicated were granted pensions. The church-buildings were used as barracks, as sheep-pens, etc.; not a few were destroyed.

It must not be understood, however, that all religion had died out in France: by no means. Everywhere the people, especially the women, continued to visit the churches; and even in the convention, voices were heard denouncing the ruse, anti-religious demonstrations. Singularly enough, it was Robespierre who gave the first sign of a coming re-action. On Nov. 21 he hotly attacked Hebert in the club of the Jacobins.

There are people," he said, "who, under the pretence of destroying superstition, try to establish a religion but adverse to theirs; but the aristocrats; while the idea of a Supreme Being, who defends innocence, and punishes crime, is for the people." The speech was not without effect, and Robespierre neglected no opportunity to push his plans. Finally, on May 7, 1794, he persuaded the convention to decree that the French people acknowledges the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, and that festivals ought to be introduced tending to re-awaken in men thoughts of the Divinity. The first festival was held on June 8. Robespierre, as president of the convention, appeared with a huge bouquet in his hand, and colored plumes in his hat, and made a politico-moral speech, interspersed with various kinds of childish mummeries. Of course the infidels laughed, and the faithful were scandalized: nevertheless, the festival denotes the turning-point of the movement. The constitution of Aug. 22, 1795, granted religious liberty. Christian worship was tolerated once more; and in many places the congregations received back their church-buildings on the simple condition that they should themselves defray the expenses to keep them in repair; also a great many priests, who were known as 'mercenaries of the revolution,' were given the right to practise their profession. Many restrictions, however, still remained in force;—thus, it was not allowed to use bells; and the persecutions did not cease altogether. After the coup d'état of Aug. 24, 1797, it was demanded that all priests should take an oath on the new constitution, which bound them to hate royalty, and devote themselves wholly to the republic. About seventeen thousand clergymen are said to have taken the oath, but such as would not were treated with great severity. Three hundred and eighty were deported to Guiana, and as many died miserably at Oleron and Rhei. The complete restoration of the Roman-Catholic Church proceeded, generally speaking, along with the growing influence of Napoleon. Immediately after his return from Egypt, the imprisoned clergymen were set free, Dec. 28, 1799; the civil authorities were instructed to let alone all religious affairs; the churches were allowed to be kept open the first day of the decade, but on any day it pleased the congregation; the number of the revolutionary festivals was diminished to two; and the civil oath, binding them to hate royalty, was not demanded. In spite of the rapid spreading of infidelity during the last ten years, and though the people had, so to speak, been weaned from religious worship by the revolution, about forty thousand congregations immediately returned to the Roman-Catholic Church; and on April 18, 1801, service was celebrated, on the order of Napoleon, in the most solemn manner, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. He hoped thus to form a solid party in support of his own power, and he partly succeeded. A peculiar difficulty arose from the dissension which prevailed among the clergy. Those priests who had taken the oath on the Constitution considered themselves as the true bearers of the French Church, and prided themselves on having remained steadfast at their post in the days of danger; while the non-sworn priests—the emigrants, who now returned—looked down upon them as apostates and infidels, who had suffered themselves to be awayed by the circumstances like reeds by the winds. Napoleon first entered into negotiations with the former party, the constitutional priests; but, when he saw that not one of the non-sworn priests was present at the great National Council, opened by Bishop Grégoire on June 29, or took the least notice of its proceedings, he immediately changed policy, and opened direct negotiations with the Pope through the emigrant bishops,—negotiations which finally resulted in the Concordat. See Concordat, France, Huguenots, etc.


REYNOLDS, Edward, D.D., Church-of-England prelate; b. at Southampton, 1599; d. at Norwich, Jan. 16, 1676. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford; became probation-fellow in 1620, on account of "his uncommon skill in the Greek tongue," was preacher at Lincoln's Inn, London, and warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich, in 1661 he was a member of the Savoy Conference. In the latter capacity his weakness...
showed itself. He carried, however, his Puritanic principles into practice even while a bishop, and lived simply for his diocese. His Works were first collected and published in 1658; best edition, with the life of the same name, became early known as a possession of the Knights of Rhodes, was one of the seven wonders of the world. Paul visited the city on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxvii.1). The island vindicated its independence until the time of Vespasian, but under the Roman rule its prospects flourished much as a possession of the Knights of Rhodes, was one of the seven wonders of the world. Paul visited the city on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxvii.1). The island vindicated its independence until the time of Vespasian, but under the Roman rule its prospects flourished much as a possession of the Knights of Rhodes, was one of the seven wonders of the world. Paul visited the city on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxvii.1). The island vindicated its independence until the time of Vespasian, but under the Roman rule its prospects flourished much as a possession of the Knights of Rhodes, was one of the seven wonders of the world. Paul visited the city on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxvii.1). The island vindicated its independence until the time of Vespasian, but under the Roman rule its prospects...
1758. He was a haughty and imperious man, ill suited for the position. To all propositions of reform, from the Pope and from the Roman Catholic princes, he answered, “Sint ut sunt, aut non sint.” The consequence of which was, that the Pope dissolved the order by the bull Dominus ac rebus on July 21, 1753. Ricci was committed to the Castle of St. Angelo, and remained there for the rest of his life. His biography was written by Carraccioli in Italian, and by Sainte-Foi in French.

Ricci, Scipione de’, b. at Florence, Jan. 9, 1741; d. at the Villa Rignano, Jan. 27, 1910. Educated for the church, and ordained a priest in 1766, he was shortly after appointed auditor to the papal nuncio at Florence, in 1776 vice-general to the Archbishop of Florence, and in 1780 bishop of Pistoja and Prato. He was a pious man, and sincerely devoted to the reform of the Church; was promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1791 Ricci felt compelled to abdicate, and retire into private life. In 1794 followed the papal condemnation of the propositions of the synod of Pistoja. See Acta et Decreta Synodi Pistoriensis, Pavia, 1788; Acta congregationis archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hetruriae Florentiae, Bamberg, 1790–94; De Potter: Vie de Scipion de Ricci, Brussels, 1825, 3 vols.; Memorie di Scipione de’ R., edited by Gelli, Florence, 1865, 2 vols.

BEMATH.

RICE, John Holt, D.D., Presbyterian; b. near New London, Bedford County, Va., Nov. 28, 1777; d. in Prince Edward County, Va., Sept. 3, 1831. He studied at Liberty-Hall Academy (later, Washington College); was tutor in Hampden-Sidney College, 1796–99 and 1800–04; in 1800 began the study of theology; was licensed in alluring Protestant children to their schools and also a newspaper, the Western Presbyterian, afterwards merged in the Louisville Presbyterian Herald. From 1841 to 1844 he was stated supply at Paris, Ky. In 1843 he had the famous debate at Lexington, Ky., with Alexander Campbell, founder of the Disciples, on the subject of baptism. He ably held his own, and won great repute. From 1844 to 1853 he was pastor in Cincinnati. During this period he held three other public debates: (1) in 1845, with Rev. J. A. Blanchard, on slavery; (2) in 1845, with Rev. E. Pringree, on universal salvation; (3) in 1851, with Rev. J. B. Purcell (afterwards Roman-Catholic archbishop; see art.), on Romanism. These debates, except the last, were published, and widely circulated. From 1853 to 1858 he was pastor in St. Louis, Mo. While there, edited the St.-Louis Presbyterian. In 1855 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly (Old School) at Nashville, Tenn. From 1858 to 1861 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New-York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowded assemblies. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1855; Immortality, Philadelphia.

RICH, Edmund. See Edmund, Sr.

RICHARD, Fitzralph (Armachanus), Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; d. at Avignon, France, December, 1350. He was fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; was by Edward III. promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1353 became chancellor of the university of Oxford. He was for 45 years a member of the Franciscan rule. His discourses made a great repute. From 1844 to 1853 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New-York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowded assemblies. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1855; Immortality, Philadelphia.
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RICHARD, Fitzralph (Armachanus), Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; d. at Avignon, France, December, 1350. He was fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; was by Edward III. promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1353 became chancellor of the university of Oxford. He was for 45 years a member of the Franciscan rule. His discourses made a great repute. From 1844 to 1853 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New-York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowded assemblies. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1855; Immortality, Philadelphia.

RICHARD, Fitzralph (Armachanus), Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; d. at Avignon, France, December, 1350. He was fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; was by Edward III. promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1353 became chancellor of the university of Oxford. He was for 45 years a member of the Franciscan rule. His discourses made a great repute. From 1844 to 1853 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New-York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowded assemblies. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1855; Immortality, Philadelphia.

RICHARD, Fitzralph (Armachanus), Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; d. at Avignon, France, December, 1350. He was fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; was by Edward III. promoted to be archdeacon of Lichfield; and in 1353 became chancellor of the university of Oxford. He was for 45 years a member of the Franciscan rule. His discourses made a great repute. From 1844 to 1853 he was pastor, and from 1858, also theological professor, at Chicago, Ill.; from 1861 to 1867, pastor in New-York City; from 1868 to 1874, president of Westminster College, Mo.; and from 1874 till his death, professor of theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Dr. Rice was a great debater and an able preacher. In New York he was listened to by crowded assemblies. He was one of the leaders of his denomination. His publications, besides the debates already referred to, include God Sovereign, and Man Free, Philadelphia; Romanism not Christianity, New York, 1847; Baptism, St. Louis, 1855; Immortality, Philadelphia.
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the divine, in contradistinction from cogitation, a single, special subject. The first edition of his mystical works is his De gratia contemplationis, in which he gives the psychological theory of contemplation as an intuition, an immediate vision of a world’s empire; that of his home policy was the humiliation of the house of Austria, the baffling of its aspirations to house of Austria, the baffling of its aspirations to

independence of the islands being guaranteed by England, Belgium, France, and the United States of America, he was sent as ambassador to England and several other foreign courts. In 1845 he returned to Honolulu, and was appointed minister of public instruction, which made him a member of the king’s privy council. See Sprague: Annals, ii. 988.

RICHARD, Charles Louis, b. at Blainville-sur-Eau, Lorraine, 1711; executed at Mons, Aug. 16, 1794. He entered the Dominican order in 1727; taught theology in Paris; and took active part in the polemics against the encyclopedists. At the outbreak of the Revolution he settled in Belgium, and was afterwards taken by the French army of occupation. Too old to flee, he was seized, and sentenced to be shot, on account of his Parall’eledes Juifs qui ont crucifié Jesus Christ avec les Françoises, etc.) are also strongly colored by mysticism. Of his theological works, the principal are, De verbo incarnato, in which he praises sin as the 

felix culpa, because, if there had been no sin, there would have been no incarnation; De trinitate, one of his most original productions; De Emmanuelu, against the Jews, etc. The most celebrated of his mystical works is his De gratia contemplationis, in which he gives the psychological theory of contemplation as an intuition, an immediate vision of the divine, in contradistinction from cogitation, the common reasoning, and meditation, the pondering on a single, special subject. The first edition of his works is that of Paris, 1528; the best, that of Rouen, 1650. See J. G. v. Engelhardt: Richard von St. Victor, Erlangen, 1888; Liebner: Richardi doctrina, Göttingen, 1857-59.

RICHARD, Charles Louis, b. at Blainville-sur-Eau, Lorraine, 1711; executed at Mons, Aug. 16, 1794. He entered the Dominican order in 1727; taught theology in Paris; and took active part in the polemics against the encyclopedists. At the outbreak of the Revolution he settled in Belgium, and was afterwards taken by the French army of occupation. Too old to flee, he was seized, and sentenced to be shot, on account of his Parallèledes Juifs qui ont crucifié Jesus Christ avec les Français qui ont tué leur roi. His Dictionnaire des sciences ecclésiastiques (1780, 5 vols.) and Analyse des conciles (1722-47, 5 vols.) are still of value.

RICHARDS, William, American Congregational missionary; b. at Plainfield, Mass., Aug. 22, 1792; d. at Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, Dec. 7, 1847. He was graduated from Williams College, 1819, and from Andover Seminary, 1822, and on Nov. 16, 1822, sailed for the Sandwich Islands, under commission of the American Board. He was stationed at Lahaina, on the Island of Manu, and was very successful. In 1837 he returned home; went out again the next year; and, being taken into the king’s confidence, he was made his counselor, interpreter, and chaplain, while still continuing missionary labors. In 1842, on the independence of the islands being guaranteed by England, Belgium, France, and the United States of America, he was sent as ambassador to England and several other foreign courts. In 1845 he returned to Honolulu, and was appointed minister of public instruction, which made him a member of the king’s privy council. See Sprague: Annals, ii. 988.

RICHARD, Charles Louis, b. at Blainville-sur-

Eau, Lorraine, 1711; executed at Mons, Aug. 16, 1794. He entered the Dominican order in 1727; taught theology in Paris; and took active part in the polemics against the encyclopedists. At the outbreak of the Revolution he settled in Belgium, and was afterwards taken by the French army of occupation. Too old to flee, he was seized, and sentenced to be shot, on account of his Parallèledes Juifs qui ont crucifié Jesus Christ avec les Français qui ont tué leur roi. His Dictionnaire des sciences ecclésiastiques (1780, 5 vols.) and Analyse des conciles (1722-47, 5 vols.) are still of value.

RICHARDS, William, American Congregational missionary; b. at Plainfield, Mass., Aug. 22, 1792; d. at Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, Dec. 7, 1847. He was graduated from Williams College, 1819, and from Andover Seminary, 1822, and on Nov. 16, 1822, sailed for the Sandwich Islands, under commission of the American Board. He was stationed at Lahaina, on the Island of Manu, and was very successful. In 1837 he returned home; went out again the next year; and, being taken into the king’s confidence, he was made his counselor, interpreter, and chaplain, while still continuing missionary labors. In 1842, on the independence of the islands being guaranteed by England, Belgium, France, and the United States of America, he was sent as ambassador to England and several other foreign courts. In 1845 he returned to Honolulu, and was appointed minister of public instruction, which made him a member of the king’s privy council. See Sprague: Annals, ii. 988.

RICHIELEIL, Armand Jean Duplessis de, b. in Paris, Sept. 5, 1858; d. there Dec. 4, 1842. He was educated for the military profession, but took holy orders, and was in 1607 consecrated bishop of Luçon, and in 1622 made a cardinal. His career as a statesman he began in 1614, when sent as a deputy of the clergy to the states-general; and from 1622 to his death he governed France as its prime-minister. The great aim of his foreign policy was the humiliation of the house of Austria, the baffling of its aspirations to a world’s empire; that of his home policy was the annihilation of the independence of the feudal lords, the establishment of the absolute authority of the crown. He succeeded in both fields. Very characteristic are his relations with the Protestants. Making a sharp distinction between religion and politics, he allied himself with the Protestants in Germany against the emperor; while in France he completely destroyed the political influence of the Huguenots. By the edict of grace (Nîmes, July 14, 1629) the fortifications of the cities of the Huguenots were razed, and their synods were not allowed to meet unless by authority of the state; and Richelieu, who respects the freedom of worship, and the civil equality of Huguenots and Roman Catholics, were fully respected. See Robson: Life of Cardinal Richelieu, 1854; Schybergson: Le duc de Rohan et la chute du parti protestant en France, Paris, 1830.

RICHER, Edmund, b. under humble circumstances at Chourse, a village of Champagne, Sept. 30, 1860; d. in Paris, Nov. 28, 1831. He entered the service of the church; studied theology; was made a doctor in 1850, and director of the College of Cardinal Lemoine in 1854. In 1829 he published his De ecclesiasticopoliticapotentata (Collogne, 2 vols.), a learned and acute argument in favor of Gallicanism, defending the views of the Sorbonne, that the ecumenical council stands above the Pope, that in secular affairs the State is entirely independent of the Church, etc. He entered this mission, there he published his Lecte, and with poison he thrust the knife on his neck, compelled to recant. See his life by Baillet, Amst., 1715.

RICHMOND, Legh, Church of England; b. at Liverpool, Jan. 28, 1772; d. at Turvey, Bedfordshire, May 8, 1827. He was graduated at Trinity
and was appointed professor there in 1835, at which period he was lamed for life. By leaping from a wall, he was lamed for life.

Marburg in 1838, and at Berlin in 1846. His works on ecclesiastical law—Lehrbuch des kathol. Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Leipzig, 1842 (7th ed. 1874); Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, Weimar, 1846; Corpus Juris Canonici, 1833-39 (the best edition of that work); Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Leipzig, 1853, etc.—have exercised a decisive influence on that branch of study.

Richter, Emil Ludwig, b. at Stolpen, near Dresden, Feb. 15, 1808; d. in Berlin, May 8, 1864. He studied jurisprudence, more especially ecclesiastical law, at the university of Leipzig, and was appointed professor there in 1835, at Marburg in 1838, and at Berlin in 1846. His works on ecclesiastical law—Lehrbuch des kathol. und evangel. Kirchenrechts, Leipzig, 1842 (7th ed. 1874); Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, Weimar, 1846; Corpus Juris Canonici, 1833-39 (the best edition of that work); Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini, Leipzig, 1853, etc.—have exercised a decisive influence on that branch of study.

Richter, Christian Friedrich Gottlieb, M.D., German hymnologist; b. at Sorau, Silesia, Oct. 5, 1766; d. at Halle, Oct. 5, 1711. After studying medicine and theology at Halle, he was appointed by Franz Heinrich von der Fecht, president of the academy theology, and later, physician to the famous Halle Orphan House. He was a Pietist. He wrote thirty-three excellent hymns, of which several have been translated; e.g., "Jesus my king! thy mild and kind control," "O watchman! will the night of sin," "My soul before thee prostrate lies, "O God! thy holy will, Thy Lamb of God! thou Prince of peace!" "Tis not too hard, too high, an aim." He also wrote four remarkable treatises upon the bodily sufferings of Christ during his crucifixion, contained in vol. iii. of his Opuscula Medica, Leipzig, 1780-81, 3 vols. For a brief account of his views, see Lange: Matthew, p. 523, note. See Richter's Leben u. Wirken als Arzt, Theol. u. Dichter, Berlin, 1865; and Miller: Singers and Songs of the Church, pp. 141, 142.

Riddle, Joseph Esmond, Church of England; b. about 1584; d. at Cheltenham, Aug. 27, 1658. He matriculated at Oxford, A. at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 1840. In 1852 he was Bampton lecturer. He is best known for his Latin-English Dictionary, founded on Freund, London, 1840, and (with T. K. Arnold) English-Latin Lexicon, 1840; he has also published the valuable Memoir of Christian Antiquities, London, 1839, 2d ed., 1843; Ecclesiastical Chronology, 1840; Natural History of Inf-
ings behind him. They are, A Treatise against Image-Worship : Declaration against Transubstantiation: A Piteous Lamentation of the Miserable Estate of the Church in England in the Time of the Late Recolt from the Gospel, etc. And there have been printed by the Parker Society, London, 1814. See Fox: Acts and Monuments; Dr. Gloucester Ridley: Life of Bishop Ridley, London, 1786.

RIGER, Georg Conrad, b. at Canustadt, March 7, 1687; d. at Stuttgart, April 16, 1743. He studied theology at Tübingen, and was appointed professor at the gymnasium of Stuttgart in 1721, and pastor of St. Leonhard in 1733. He was one of the most celebrated preachers of the Pietistic school of his age, and published a considerable number of sermons, which are still much read in Württemberg, — Herzenspostille, Züllichau, 1742 (latest edition, Stuttgart, 1853-54); Richtiger und leichter Weg zum Himmel, Stuttgart, 1744; Hochzeitpredigten, 1749 (latest edition, Stuttgart, 1856), etc.

PALMER.

RIGHTeousness, Original. (For the Righteousness of Faith see Justification.) The elder Protestant theologians designated by the term Justitia originalis, or "original righteousness," the condition of man as made in the image of God, and before the fall. It is found for the first time in the writings of the scholastics, but the treatment of the doctrine was begun by Augustine. In his treatise De peccator. mer. et remiss. (ii. 37), he uses the term prima justitia, "first righteousness." He considers the doctrine from the standpoint of man's creation in the divine image. Ireneeus, Theophylact, Justin, and others, speak of this first estate as one of childlike simplicity and innocence. The statement of Athanasius (ed. Paris, ii. 225) stands alone: "Those who mortify the deeds of the body, and have put on the new man, which is created after God, have the man after his image; for such was Adam before his disobedience" (lege to en éiagw fóvntos, akribeías de Qd). Prominence was given, in the treatment of this subject, to man's spiritual endowment with reason and freedom, by which he was to secure moral perfection. With Augustine the image of God is the inalienable "rational soul" (anima rationalis). This includes the will, with a positive inclination to holiness. The first man, however, stood in need of divine help to reach full righteousness (plena justitia). At first he was willing not to sin, and by supernatural grace he was able not to sin (posse non peccare). At the fall the concupiscence of the flesh (concupiscencia carnis) took the place of the good will (bona voluntas), and is itself sin: that is, the opposite of righteousness. After Augustine's death, semi-Pelagianism prevailed in the church; and at the synod of Orange, in 529, it was stated, that, "by the sin of Adam, the free will was so inclined and attenuated (attenuatum), that no one was saved except as God, the true God, the one who is to believe in God, or to be influenced concerning God, except the prevenient grace of the divine mercy acted upon him." The scholastic theologians went further. They dated the discord between flesh and spirit before the fall. The divine grace subjected the former to the latter in the case of Adam: therefore man's original righteousness was a superadded gift (donum superadditum). The proof was found in the alleged difference between likeness and image (similitudo imago, Gen. i. 20). The essential elements of man's original righteousness were reason and will. Eternal life was a superadded gift.

The Reformers, with their deep sense of the sinfulness of sin, defined the original state of man as one in which righteousness and goodness were essential elements. Bellarmin developed the Roman-Catholic doctrine. As man came forth from the Creator's hands, he consisted of flesh and spirit, and stood related to the animals and the angels. By the latter he had intelligence and will; by the former, passions and appetite (sensus et affectus). A conflict arose, and from the conflict a terrible difficulty in doing well (ingens bene agendi difficultas). This was the disease of nature (morbus naturae) which inheres in matter: hence God added the gift of original righteousness. It was this perfection of the divine image, and not the image itself, which man lost at the fall.

The question is, whether man began with a state of absolute moral perfection, as the older Protestant theologians, especially the Lutheran theologians, asserted. Against this view, Julius Müller properly brings the objection that it excludes the possibility of the fall. But man's original condition was not one without a positive inclination to goodness. His will had this disposition; but, while it was in harmony with God's will, it might sin, and in the possibility of its sinning consisted its freedom. It was man's duty to preserve his rectitude by his own voluntary choice, thus confirming God's work. The doctrine of man's original righteousness is not necessarily found in Eph. iv. 24, but in Gen. i., ii. Esch. vii. 29, and especially in the scriptural definitions of sin,— as a defiance of the divine will, and the cause of human corruption, and the analogy presented by the righteousness of faith. See Chemnitz: De imag. Dei in hom., Wittenb., 1750; Coffa: De rectitud. hom. primae, Tübingen, 1753; Wernsdorf: De reliq. imag. div., Wittenb., 1720; [A. Ritsch]: Die christl. Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung dargestellt, Bonn, 1870-74, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1882-83; Eng. trans. of vol. i., A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, Edinb., 1872; and the Theologies of Hodge, Van Oosterzee, and Dorner; and the works on Symbols sub "Primitive State".

H. CREMER.

RIMMON (רִמְמוֹן, pomegranate), the name of an Aramaic divinity mentioned by Naaman (2 Kings v. 18). It occurs as the name of three places (Josh. xv. 32; 1 Chron. vi. 77; Judg. xx. 45), and also as a proper name (2 Sam. iv. 2); but it is uncertain whether, in these cases, the name comes from the god, or the pomegranate. The 1.XX. makes a distinction between them, calling the god 'Rimmon, and the pomegranate 'Rimon'. The case of the god is perhaps clearer: Rimmon, indeed, Raman, or Ramman; for he is the Assyrian god Rammu. The best explanation of the word is "the height." The many-seeded pomegranate is the symbol of fruitfulness. The tree was holy, and its fruit appears upon the sculptures in the hands of deities (Baal Hama-
man, Zeas Kasios). Asarthe planted the pomegranate upon Cyprus: hence the close connection between the name "pomegranate" and the god. See Baudissin: Studien; P. Scholt: Götzen-dienst.

WOLF BAUDISSIN.

RXCQ, Melchior, was schoalmaster at Hersfeld, when in 1524 he became acquainted with Thomas Müntzer, and soon, also, one of his most ardent disciples. In the same year he went to Sweden as leader of an Anabaptist movement in Stockholm, but returned shortly after to take part in the Peasants' War. After a visit to Switzerland, he began to preach in the vicinity of Hersfeld, attacking the Lutherns with great violence; but in 1531 he was imprisoned by the landgrave of Hesse, and probably never released. His writings have perished.

RINGS were used as ornaments for the nose, the ears, the arms, and the legs, and more especially for the fingers, as far back in the history of the human race as historical researches reach. The Babylonians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and the barbaric peoples of Tento-nic origin which invaded Europe, or, rather, the Roman Empire, at the beginning of our era, wore them. In course of time, however, the ornament received a special signification, and the finger-ring became a token of authority, or a sign of a pledge. A token of authority was that ring which Pharaoh gave to Joseph (Gen. xli.42), or Ahasue-erus. See Martigny: Des Anneaux chez les premiers Chretiens, 1858.

RIPPON, John, D.D., a prominent Baptist min-ister, and for sixty-three years pastor of a single charge in London; was b. at Tiverton, Devon, April 29, 1751; and d. in London, Dec. 17, 1836. He edited the Baptist Annual Register, 1790-1802, An Arrangement of the Psalms, Hymns, etc., of Dr. Watts, and A Selection of Hymns, 1757, 10th ed., enlarged, 1800. His most important work is a life of the Peaseans, 1767, and he wrote, Memoir of Rev. T. S. Winn, Boston, 1824; Christian Baptism, 1833; Notes on the Four Gospels, 1837-55, 2 vols.; Notes on the Acts of the Apostles, 1844; Sacred Rhetoric, 1849; Notes on Romans, 1857; Exclusiveness of the Baptists, 1857; Church Polity, 1867; Notes on Hebrews, 1868.

RIPON, a town in Yorkshire, Eng. The abbot of Melrose founded a monastery there in 661, which the Danes destroyed in 867. The cathedral was begun in 1311, finished, probably, 1494. The town was made the seat of a bishopric in 1836.
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RITUALISM. This popular catchword is used to describe the second stage of that movement in the English Church which in its earlier condition had been named Tractarianism. The name first appears, probably, in connection with the riots at St. George's-in-the-East in 1859 (cf. quotation from East London Observer of May, 1859 quoted in Letter to Bishop of London by Bryan King, 1850).

The revival of interest in Catholic dogma, effected by the Oxford writers of the Tracts for the Times, was naturally succeeded by a revival of interest in Catholic observances. This practical revival carried the movement into novel circumstances and situations; for the earlier detection and exhibition of that sacerdotal structure of the church which had been secured to it by struggles of doctrine and discipline, had its parallel in the new life which had been named Tractarianism.

The Tractarian writers recognized this necessary order: they anxiously held aloof from precipitating those events, which they nevertheles, distinctly anticipated from this teaching. "We the old Tractarians," wrote Dr. Pusey in the Daily Express, May 21, 1877, "deliberately abstained from introducing in externals. We understood the Juristic to distract men's minds by questions about novating in externals."

"We the old Tractarians," wrote Dr. Pusey in the Daily Express, May 21, 1877, "deliberately abstained from introducing in externals. We understood the Juristic to distract men's minds by questions about novating in externals."

As soon as their teaching had secured belief, they set itself to apply its principles in action; and this active application of recovered belief in a sacerdotal church inevitably took the form of recovering and re-asserting that liturgical structure which still underlay the Book of Common Prayer.

The movement, in making this fresh effort, passed from the study to the street: it became practical, missionary, evangelistic. It insisted that its work upon the masses, in their dreary poverty, demanded the bright attraction and relief of outward ornament, and the effective teaching of the eye. This change from the university to the town was signified by the establishment of, e.g., St. Saviour's, Leeds (to which the Tractarian leaders lent all their authority), and of the Margaret-street Chapel, under F. Oakeley, a devoted companion of J. H. Newman.

The transition to ritual was not only a practical expediency, it was also the logical outcome of the new position; for the doctrinal revival lay in its emphatic assertion of the conception of mediation, of mediatorial offering. This mediation was, it taught, effected by the taking of flesh; i.e., of the outward to become the offering, the instrument of worship. The body of the Lord was the one acceptable offering, sanctified by the Spirit; and in and through that mediatorial body all human nature won its right to sanctification, to holy use. The spirit needs, according to this teaching, an outward expression to symbolize its inward devotion. Its natural mode of approach to God is through sacramental signs; and the use of special sacraments justifies, of necessity, the general use of visible symbols.

If grace comes through outward pledges, then devotion will obviously be right in using for its realization forms and signs and gestures; love will be right in showing itself through beauty; and prayer and praise will instinctively resort to ceremonial.

Nor was the pressure towards ritual merely doctrinal. The double movement in the church had its parallel in the literary world. The practical revival of Wordsworth had its reflex in the emotional revival of Walter Scott. The set of things was running counter to Puritan bareness. The force and reality of imagination in the shaping of life's interests were recognized with the glad welcome of a recovered joy. A touch of kindliness repopulated the earth with fancies and suggestions, and visions and dreams. This world was no longer a naked factory, housing the machinery of a precise and unyielding dogma; nor was it the bare and square hall in which reason mingled itself in with the doctrinal movement.
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...the main work of the Reformation, and yet to restore the beauty of the chancels, in placing the altar at its proper height and distance, in arranging the screen and the stalls, the altarrails and credence-table. This combination of ecclesiastical and architectural sentiment was greatly furthered by the Cambridge Ecclesiological Society; which did much to foster antiquarian exactness, and to promote active efforts at restoration. (Beresford Hope's "Worship in the Church of England.) This architectural movement, which dated from J. H. Newman, who put a
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press, by any pressure in their power, any sharp paternal authority was generally exercised to suppress simpler ritual which had been adopted and allowed as the practicable minimum under Elizabeth and which the weakness of the Bishop of London, and our rioting at St. George's-in-the-East (1858-60), post of dean of arches on its next vacancy. From conflict with this common custom; (3) in defiance and conflicting judgments, had created a deep distrust in its capacity to decide judicially questions so rife with agitated feelings and popular prejudices. This distrust—strongly roused by the Mackonochie judgment (1869) and the Purchas judgment (1871), in which it was supposed, in spite of obvious paradox, that every thing not mentioned in the Prayer-Book was disallowed and illegal—culminated in the Ridsdale judgment (1877), in which it was declared that the "further order" allowed the Queen had been taken in the issuing of the advertisements under Archbishop Parker, and that the divines of Charles II. therefore, when they permitted the ritual of the second year of Edward VI., really intended only so much of it as was required in the Elizabethan advertisements. This startling decision the main block of High-Church clergy found it impossible to respect or accept; and this repudiation of its verdict brought to a head the protest that had been made ever since the Gorham judgment against the validity of the court itself as an ecclesiastical tribunal. This last problem had been made critical by the famous Public-Worship Regulation Act (1874), introduced in the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in disregard of the protest of the Lower House of Convocation, and declared in the House of Commons to be a "bill to put down ritualism" by Mr. Disraeli, then prime-minister, who, in spite of Mr. Gladstone's impetuous opposition, carried it, amid intense excitement, in an almost unanimous House. This bill swept away all the process in the diocesan courts: it allowed any three aggrieved parishioners to lodge a complaint, which, unless stayed by the bishop's veto, was carried before an officer nominated normally by the two archbishops to succeed to the office of dean of any archiepiscopal diocese. From him the appeal would be, as before, to the Privy Council. Thus the scanty fragments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which, under existent conditions might be supposed to balance the civil character of the Court of Appeal, were all but wholly abolished. The bishops were met by absolute resistance, ending, after being challenged at every turn by technical objections, in the imprisonment of four priests.

In this collision with the courts, the Ritualists had the steady support of the mass of High-Church clergy, who had doubts from the advanced and dubious ritual. This support evidenced itself in the "Declaration" of over four thousand clergy, headed by the Deans of St. Paul's, York, Durham, Manchester, etc. (1861). The condition of things had become intolerable; and in 1861 a royal commission was issued to consider the whole position of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. A similar mode of relief had been attempted in 1887, when a royal commission on ritual had been appointed, which under the chairmanship of Archbishop Longley,—after taking an immense mass of evidence, and after prolonged discussions,—had issued a report on the crucial point of the Ornaments Rubric, which recommended the "restraint" of the use of vestments, "by providing some effectual process for complaint and redress," but which, by the use of the word "restrain," declined to declare their illegality, and then had found itself unable to attain anything like unanimous agreement on the nature of the legal process which it proposed to recommend. The inner history of the commission will be found in the third volume of Bishop's Wilberforce's Life. No legislation on the main subject followed this divided report. But convocation in 1879, and the Pan-Anglican Synod in 1880, had come to resolutions more or less in accord with the commissioners' report, in the sense of recommending a prohibitory discretion to the bishop in any case where a change of vesture was attempted. Such a recommendation seemed naturally to allow and assume the abstract legality of the change. Yet the courts of law had finally decreed vestments illegal, and the majority of bishops were prepared to accept their interpretation; and, as long as they did so, no terms of peace could be found on the basis of the proposal in convocation. For even though the bishops were willing to abstain, in favorable cases, from pressing the legal decisions, they were forced to set the law in motion by the action of a society called the "Church Association," which exerted itself to assert and support the rights of any parishioners who might be aggrieved by the ritual used in any church. Thus the exercise of discretion was made all but impossible to a bishop, who could only veto proceedings brought against a clergyman by giving a valid reason, and yet was forbidden to offer as a valid reason the possible legality of the vestments.

The Commission on Ritual, therefore, had left the conflict still severe and unappeased. The Commission on Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is still sitting. It has relieved excited feelings by allowing that the condition of that jurisdiction is open to question. And the last act of Archbishop Tait, on his death-bed, was to suggest a truce to the fierce legal prosecutions which had embittered the long controversy by bringing in a new judgment which would terminate the historic case of Martin v. Mackonochie, round which the contest had turned for eighteen years. Thus the tension has slackened: the possibility of peace seems to have become conceivable. The question has widened from the ritual itself by giving a valid reason, and yet was forbidden to offer as a valid reason the possible legality of the vestments.
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of all reliable law produced had made wilfulness and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men indulged in their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt. The evangelization of the masses grows more urgently needful; and in the view of all reliable law produced had made wilfulness and arbitrary extravagance inevitable. Men indulged in their own ritualistic fancies, without consideration and without reality. But they themselves learned the weariness of disorder and the folly of anarchic revolt. The evangelization of the masses grows more urgently needful; and in the view of his need all men are anxious to be relieved from the fret of a war about external details. In 1632 he removed to Breda as director of the College of Orange. He was a prolific writer, and of his works—exegetical, polemical, and edifying—a collected edition appeared at Rotterdam, 1651, 3 vols. folio. His Isagogae ad Scripturam Sacram (Dort, 1616) is still of value. C. SCHMIDT.

ROBBER-COUNCIL. See Ephesus.

ROBERT THE SECOND. Robert II., king of France, and son of Hugh Capet, was b. at Orleans about 970; and d. at Melun, July 20, 1031. He was crowned 988, and became sole king 996 [997]. He married (1) Leutgarde, or Bosale, widow of Arnoul, Count of Flanders; (2) Bertha, widow of first Count of Chartres and Blois; and (3) Constance, daughter of William, Count of Arles. Bertha being his cousin (four times removed), the Pope, Gregory V. (998), ordered his divorce. Robert resisted, but was forced to submit, and humble himself, before the ban was taken off. In all other particulars Robert is a pattern of conformity, and more a monk than a king. He loved music and poetry, founded four monasteries, built seven churches, and supported three hundred paupers entirely, and a thousand paroissiens. In 1031 he went again to the Continent; while there, while wandering in the Tyrol, he passed through that spiritual crisis which he has so vividly described in his lecture to working-men. In this place he gathered round him a large congregation of intelligent and admiring hearers, and threw himself warmly into special efforts for the welfare of working-men, for whom he formed an institute, and to whom he delivered some of his ablest lectures. But though he was popular as a preacher while he lived,—so popular, indeed, as to become a target for the shot of the Record, and the party whom that newspaper represented,—yet it was not until he died that his influence was appreciably felt by the great world. After his brief pastorate in Brighton, it was natural that
ROBERTSON.

ROBINSON.

some memorial of his ministry should be desired by his people; and so, though he never wrote his sermons before delivery, a volume of posthumous sermons was made up from the written reports of them which he had sent to a friend after they had been preached. When these were published, they were at once seen to be characterized by great freshness of thought, independence of judgment, and fervor of heart; and the volume ran through many editions. A second collection of discourses was soon called for: this was succeeded by a third, and that again by a fourth, comprising Expository Lectures on the Epistles of the Corinthians. These were followed by a collection of Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics, and, so late as 1881, by The Human Race and Other Sermons, preached at Cheltenham, Oxford, and Brighton.

Robertson was greatest in the analysis of character and motive. His biographical sermons are among the best of that class which our language contains: those on Jacob, Elijah, David, and John the Baptist, deserve to be ranked beside those of Butler and Newman on Balaam, and are worthy of the deepest study. His experimental discourses are almost equally admirable; and some of his practical, like that on the parable of the Sower, are exceedingly powerful. But his doctrinal discussions are one-sided and unsatisfactory; and in that department he is not to be unqualifiedly commended, or implicitly followed. No thorough account of the occasion of his change of view from almost ultra Evangelicalism to the opinions of the Broad School is furnished by his biographer. His sermons at Winchester contain all the characteristic doctrines against which he afterwards so deliberately protested at Brighton; and in his later days, as his biographer has admitted, he showed but scant justice to the Evangelical party; and, if there was any intolerance in his nature, it oozed out there. It has always seemed to us that some personal difference must have been at the beginning of his estrangement from those with whom he was first identified; but, in the absence of particulars, it is impossible to determine, and, in the presence of his better sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, so many of which are given in his biography, are as suggestive as his discourses; and the memoir, as a whole, is full of stimulus to all, but especially to those who are looking forward to the office of the ministry. In his life he was often tempted to despond, as if he was spending his strength for nought; but his death has multiplied his works. He wrote, How shall we conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England? London, 1843, 8th ed., 1869; History of the Christian Church to the Reformation, 1553-73, 4 vols., new ed., 1735-75, 8 vols.; Sketches of Church History, 1855-75; 2 vols.; Biographies of Thomas Becket, 1856; Plain Lectures on the Greatness of the Papal Power, 1876; edited Heylyn's History of the Reformation, 2 vols., for the Ecclesiastical Society, 1849; Barmby's Alexander VII. and his Cardinals, 1868; and Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, 8 vols., in the Master of the Rolls series, Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain, 1873-82.

ROBINSON, Edward, D.D., LL.D., an eminent biblical scholar, and pioneer of modern Palestine exploration; b. at Southington, Conn., April 10, 1794; d. in New-York City, Tuesday, Jan. 27, 1863. He was graduated first in his class at Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y., 1816, and after studying law at Hudson, N.Y., in 1817 returned there as tutor in mathematics and Greek. He held the position only a year. On Sept. 3, 1818, he married Miss Eliza Kirkland, daughter of the Oneida missionary, who, however, died the next year. From his marriage until 1821 he worked on his wife's farm, but also pursued his studies. In the autumn of 1821 he went to Andover to superintend the printing of his edition of part of the Iliad (bks. i.-ix., xviii., xxii.), which appeared in 1822, and while there, under Professor Moses Stuart's influence, began his career as biblical scholar and teacher. From 1828 to 1829 he was instructor in the Hebrew language and literature at Andover Theological Seminary, meanwhile busily occupied with literary labors. He assisted Professor Stuart in the second edition of his Hebrew Grammar (Andover, 1823, 1st ed., 1833), and in his translation of Winer's Grammar of the New-Testament Greek (1825), and alone translated Wahl's Clavis philologica Novi Testamenti (1825). In 1826 he went to Europe, and studied at Göttingen, Halle, and Berlin, making the acquaintance, and winning the praises, of Gesenius, Tholuck, and Rödiger; it is in, and not with, Halle, that he determined, and, in the presence of his better sermons, it is invidious to inquire. His letters, so many of which are given in his biography, are as suggestive as his discourses; and the memoir, as a whole, is full of stimulus to all, but especially to those who are looking forward to the office of the ministry. In his life he was often tempted to despond, as if he was spending his strength for nought; but his death has multiplied his works. He wrote, How shall we conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England? London, 1843, 8th ed., 1869; History of the Christian Church to the Reformation, 1553-73, 4 vols., new ed., 1735-75, 8 vols.; Sketches of Church History, 1855-75; 2 vols.; Biographies of Thomas Becket, 1856; Plain Lectures on the Greatness of the Papal Power, 1876; edited Heylyn's History of the Reformation, 2 vols., for the Ecclesiastical Society, 1849; Barmby's Alexander VII. and his Cardinals, 1868; and Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, 8 vols., in the Master of the Rolls series, Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain, 1873-82.


ROBERTSON, James Craigie, Church of England, b. at Aberdeen, 1813; d. at Canterbury, July 9, 1882. He was graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1834; was vicar of Beckesbourne, near Canterbury, from 1846 to 1856, when he was appointed canon of Canterbury. From 1864 to 1874 he was professor of ecclesiastical history, Kings College, London. His historical works take high rank. He wrote, How shall we conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England? London, 1843, 8th ed., 1869; History of the Christian Church to the Reformation, 1553-73, 4 vols., new ed., 1735-75, 8 vols.; Sketches of Church History, 1855-75; 2 vols.; Biographies of Thomas Becket, 1856; Plain Lectures on the Greatness of the Papal Power, 1876; edited Heylyn's History of the Reformation, 2 vols., for the Ecclesiastical Society, 1849; Barmby's Alexander VII. and his Cardinals, 1868; and Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, 8 vols., in the Master of the Rolls series, Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain, 1873-82.
the Gospels (far superior to the earlier editions); in 1836, a translation of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon (5th edition, the last in which Robinson made any changes, 1854) and the independent Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament (revised ed. 1831). In 1837 he was called to be professor of biblical literature in the (Presbyterian) Union Theological Seminary, New-York City. He accepted, on condition that he be permitted first to spend some years (at his own expense) in studying the geography of the Holy Land on the spot. Permission being given, he sailed July 17, 1837, and in conjunction with Rev. Dr. Eli Smith, an accomplished Arabic scholar, and faithful missionary of the American Board in Syria, thoroughly explored all the important places in Palestine and Syria. In October, 1838, he returned to Berlin; and there for two years he worked upon his Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai, and Arabia Petraea. This truly great work, which at once established the author's reputation as a geographer and biblical student of the first rank, appeared simultaneously in London, Boston, and in a German translation carefully revised by him, and edited by Professor Rödiger, 1841, 3 vols. In recognition of his eminent services, he received in 1842 the Patron's Gold Medal from the Royal Geographical Society of London, and the degree of D.D. from the university of Halle, while in 1844 Yale College gave him that of L.L.D. In 1852 he visited Palestine again, and published the results of this second visit in 1856, in the second edition of his Biblical Researches, and in a supplementary volume, — Later Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions; the third edition of the whole work appeared in 1867, 3 vols. Dr. Robinson regarded the work as a mere preparation for a complete physical, historical, and topographical geography of the Holy Land. But repeated attacks of illness undermined his constitution, and an incurable disease of the eyes obliged him in 1892 to lay down his pen. After his death in 1865, the first part, the Physical Geography of the Holy Land, which was all he had prepared, was published in English (London and Boston) and in a German translation by his wife (Berlin).

Meanwhile he had occupied himself with preparing an independent Greek Harmony of the Gospels (1843), which was far superior to any thing of the kind, and in 1846 an English Harmony. He also revised his other works for new editions, wrote numerous articles and essays, and lectured regularly in the seminary. In May, 1862, he made his fifth and last visit to Europe, saw many old friends, but failed to receive any permanent benefit to his eyesight. In November he returned, and resumed his lectures; but at the Christmas holidays he was forced to cease, and after a brief illness died, Jan. 27, 1863.

Dr. Robinson was a man of athletic form and imposing figure, though somewhat bent in later years; of strong, sound good sense; reserved, though when in congenial company often very entertaining and humorous. He was thorough and indefatigable in his investigations, very sceptical of all monastic legends, very reverent to God's revelation. Outwardly cold, his heart was warm, and his sympathies tender. He is the most distinguished biblical theologian whom America has produced, — indeed, one of the most distinguished of the century. Of all his valuable works his Biblical Researches did most to perpetuate his memory. "The first real impulse, because the first successful impulse, towards the scientific examination of the Holy Land is due to the American traveller, Dr. Robinson." Ritter praised his "union of the acutest observation of topographic and local conditions with much preparatory study, particularly the erudite study of the Bible, and of philological and historical criticism" (Die Erkundung von Asien, viii., div. ii. 73). Dean Stanley said, "Dr. Robinson was the first person who ever saw Palestine with his eyes open to what he ought to see." (Addresses in the United States, p. 26). The original manuscript of Dr. Robinson's Biblical Researches and a part of his library are in possession of the Union Theological Seminary.

For further information, see the memorial addresses of his colleagues, Drs. Hitchcock and Henry B. Smith, in Life, Writings, and Character of Edward Robinson the Philologist, published in 1863; Dean STANLEY: Addresses in the United States, 1879, pp. 23-34; and the author's arts. in Herzog's xiii. 13-16, and in McClintock and Strong, ix. 50-63. PHILIP SCHAFF.

ROBINSON, John, M.A. It is not certain where the subject of this sketch was born, probably in or near Gainsborough; but whether in Lincolnshire or Nottinghamshire we have no means of deciding: this we learn, however, that the event happened in 1575 or 1576. At the age of seventeen (in 1582) he was admitted to Corpus Christi (Benet's) College, Cambridge, which was then much inclined to Puritanism, where he remained for seven years. Having taken his degree, he was elected a fellow of his college in 1598-99, and went to Norwich, or some place in its neighborhood, about 1600, where, according to Ainsworth, "the cure and charge of . . . souls was . . . committed to him," and where he labored as a preacher about four years. Whilst here, those doubts which eventually ripened into convictions agitated his mind, and his Puritan practices led to his suspension from the ministry by the bishop of the diocese; after which, being denied the right of preaching in some leased building, and having failed to secure the master- ship of the hospital at Norwich (probably that which Harrison had held some years before), — for which failure Bishop Hall afterwards taunted him,—he left Norwich in 1604, resolved on sepa- ration. The resolution was a painful one; and with reference to it he said, "He had not the truth been in my heart 'as a burning fire shut up in my bones' (Jer. xx. 9), I had never broken those bonds of flesh and blood wherein I was so strictly tied, but had suffered the light of God to have been put out in mine own unthankful heart by other men's darkness." He doubtless knew of the existence of a company of Separatists, under John Smyth at Gainsborough, to whom he went, taking Cambridge on his way, where he consulted with Paul Baynes, Lawrence Chadderton, and others, as to the course he contemplated; and now he resigned his fellowship. When he arrived at Gainsborough, he was welcomed into the com-
pany of many who afterwards chose him for their pastor, and who now are known as the "Pilgrim Fathers." This Gainsborough society, for political reasons, divided, and became two distinct churches. Urged by the persecutions they endured, the original body, under Smyth, emigrated to Amsterdam in 1605. Doubly soled, and ordinarily met at Mr. Brewster's house; but, in consequence of continued persecution, these also resolved to emigrate, and went over to Holland in 1607 and 1608. They first went to Amsterdam, but only temporarily; and then (in February, 1609) Robinson and about a hundred of his friends applied to the burgomasters of Leyden, requesting permission to reside in their town. This permission was granted, and here the exiles remained for eleven years before the first Pilgrims left. In 1611 they purchased a building in the Clock-steeg, which they enlarged, and adapted it to their purposes, and made it their headquarters; and hence Robinson resided. In 1615 he became a member of the university of Leyden, where he honorably disputed with Episcopius on the points of Arminianism, and where he was greatly respected. The church increased under his ministry, but they still were strangers in a foreign land. They felt this, and longed for a dwelling-place where they might feel themselves at home: and, as their native land refused them a peaceful habitation, they turned their thoughts to America; there they thought they might find a home, and spread the gospel, and thither they resolved to go. Brewster was appointed to lead the first company: and Robinson remained with the rest, intending to follow with them when the way should be prepared; but this service he did not live to render. In 1620, after an affecting parting, the first Pilgrims started. Robinson died in Leyden in 1625, and was buried, March 28, 1671. It is principally Norman and Early English in style.

ROCK, Daniel, D.D., Roman Catholic; b. at Liverpool, 1799; d. at Kensington (London), Dec. 26, 1871. He was educated in the English College, Rome; was domestic chaplain to the Earl of Shrewsbury, 1827-40, then pastor at Buckland, near Farringdon, and on the re-introduction of the Roman-Catholic hierarchy in 1852 canon of Southwark. He was an eminent antiquarian, and wrote "The Antiquities of the See of Rochester" (1847), "The Ecclesiastical History of the English Church," and "The Ideas which have been expounded (London, 1833, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1851, 1 vol.), Did the Early Church in England acknowledge the Pope's Supremacy?" (1844). The Church of our Fathers, as seen in St. Osmond's Rite for the Cathedral of Salisbury (vol. i., ii., 1849, vol. iii., pts. 1, 2, 1853-54).

RODGERS, John, D.D., Presbyterian; b. in Boston, Aug. 5, 1737; d. in New York, May 7, 1811. He was licensed by the presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, held at Philadelphia. He was a stanch patriot during the Revolution, and was several times consulted by Washington. He was a 75-85-year-old man, and a great lover of church and city life. See Samuel Miller: Memoir of John Rodgers, New York, 1809, new ed., Presbyterian Board, Philadelphia; Sprague: Annals, iiii. 154.

RODINER, Emil, b. at Sangerhausen, Thuringia, Oct. 18, 1801; d. in Berlin, June 13, 1874.
He studied at Halle, where he became docent, 1826; extraordinary, 1830, and in 1855 ordinary professor of Oriental languages. In 1860 he went to Berlin in the same capacity. He was one of the first editors of the Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenldndischen Gesellschaft. His principal work is his continuation of Gesenius' Novus Testamentus philologicus criticus linguae hebraeae et chaldaeae Vetus Testamenti Editio ii., of which he edited the third volume, y-n (1842), and appended indexes, additions, and corrections (1855). He also edited Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (14th to 21st ed.).

His independent works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiorum interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838.

**ROGATIONS.**

**ROKYNCA.**


**ROGERS, John, English clerical martyr; b. at Birmingham about 1500; burned at Smithfield, Feb. 4, 1555.** He was graduated B.A. at Cambridge, 1526; received an invitation to Christ Church, Oxford; about 1534 became chaplain to the Merchant Adventurers at Antwerp, and there made the acquaintance of Tyndale and Coverdale, and became a Protestant. In 1537 he issued (probably at Wittenberg), under the pseudonym of "Thomas Matthewe," a skilful combination and revision of the Bible translation of Tyndale and Coverdale, which has since been known as Matthew's Bible. (See English Bible Versions.) He married at Antwerp; removed to Wittenberg, where he was pastor until the accession of Edward VI. (1547), when he returned to England. He was in 1550 provided by Bishop Ridley with settlements in London, and in 1551 made prebendary of St. Paul's. On the succession of Queen Mary (1553) he was arrested for his vigorous denunciation of Romanism, and after months of imprisonment was burnt,—the first Marian martyr. On Oct. 20, 1558, his bust was unveiled at Birmingham, Eng., by the mayor. See Chester: Life of Rogers, London, 1861.

**ROHR, Johann-Friedrich, b. at Rossbach, July 30, 1777; d. at Weimar, June 15, 1848.** He studied theology at Leipzig, and was appointed preacher at the university church there in 1802, pastor of Ostrau in 1804, and court-preacher at Weimar in 1820. He is one of the most prominent representatives of the so-called rationalismus vulgaria, and gave a full exposition of his views in his Briefe über den Rationalismus, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1815. Afterwards he maintained a continuous opposition. Of his published writings may be mentioned The Precious Things of Peter, Sermons upon the use of "Thomas Matthewe," a skilful combination and revision of the Bible translation of Tyndale and Coverdale, which has since been known as Matthew's Bible. (See English Bible Versions.) He married at Antwerp; removed to Wittenberg, where he was pastor until the accession of Edward VI. (1547), when he returned to England. He was in 1550 provided by Bishop Ridley with settlements in London, and in 1551 made prebendary of St. Paul’s. On the succession of Queen Mary (1553) he was arrested for his vigorous denunciation of Romanism, and after months of imprisonment was burnt,—the first Marian martyr. On Oct. 20, 1558, his bust was unveiled at Birmingham, Eng., by the mayor. See Chester: Life of Rogers, London, 1861.

**ROHR, Johann-Friedrich, b. at Rossbach, July 30, 1777; d. at Weimar, June 15, 1848.** He studied theology at Leipzig, and was appointed preacher at the university church there in 1802, pastor of Ostrau in 1804, and court-preacher at Weimar in 1820. He is one of the most prominent representatives of the so-called rationalismus vulgaria, and gave a full exposition of his views in his Briefe über den Rationalismus, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1815. Afterwards he maintained a continuous opposition. Of his published writings may be mentioned The Precious Things of Peter, Sermons upon the use of "precious" in Peter’s Epistles, N.Y., 1862. See the privately printed In Memoriam, N.Y., 1882.

**ROGERS, Ebenezer Platt, D.D., Reformed (Dutch); b. in New-York City, Dec. 18, 1817; d. at Montclair, N.J., Oct. 22, 1881.** After a partial course at Yale College and Princeton Seminary, he was licensed in 1840, and settled pastor of the Congregational Church of Chicopee Falls, Mass., 1840–43; of the Edwards Congregational Church of Northampton, Mass., 1843–46; of the Presbytery Church of Augusta, Ga., 1847–53; of the Seventh Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Penn., 1854–56; of the North Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N.Y., 1856–62; and of the South Reformed Dutch Church of New-York City, 1862–February, 1851. He was beloved as pastor and friend; a genial man, useful and honored in his period of service. Among his independent works embrace De origine et indole arabicae librorum V. T. historiorum interpretationis libri duo, Halle, 1838.

**ROGERS, Henry, English essayist; b. Oct. 18, 1806; d. at Pennal Tower, Machynlleth, North Wales, Aug. 20, 1877.** After serving for some time as an Independent minister, he became professor of English language and literature in University College, London, 1839, then professor of philosophy in Spring Hill, Independent College, near Birmingham, until in 1855 he succeeded Dr. Vaughan as principal of the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, and so remained until a few years of his death. From 1839 to 1859 he was connected with the Edinburgh Review, in whose columns he published much of his best work. He particularly distinguished himself in his opposition to the speculative ideas, and ultimate results of the Tractarian movement. His reputation mainly rests upon his Eclipse of Faith, or a Visit to a Religious Sceptic, London, 1852, 9th ed., 1868, and Defence, 1864, 3d ed., 1860 (in reply to Professor F. W. Newman). His other writings embrace Essay on the Life and Genius of Thomas Matthewe, London, 1852; History of the Reformation of the Church of England, 1855; Essay on the Life and Genius of the North Reformed Dutch Church of New-York, 1856–62; and of the South Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, N.Y., 1847–53; ordained in his different spheres of labor. Of his published writings may be mentioned The Precious Things of Peter, Sermons upon the use of "Thomas Matthewe," a skilful combination and revision of the Bible translation of Tyndale and Coverdale, which has since been known as Matthew's Bible. (See English Bible Versions.) He married at Antwerp; removed to Wittenberg, where he was pastor until the accession of Edward VI. (1547), when he returned to England. He was in 1550 provided by Bishop Ridley with settlements in London, and in 1551 made prebendary of St. Paul’s. On the succession of Queen Mary (1553) he was arrested for his vigorous denunciation of Romanism, and after months of imprisonment was burnt,—the first Marian martyr. On Oct. 20, 1558, his bust was unveiled at Birmingham, Eng., by the mayor. See Chester: Life of Rogers, London, 1861.

**ROKYNCA, John, a Bohemian priest, who was the central figure in the ecclesiastical history of Bohemia, 1430–70.** He first became prominent in 1427 by denouncing, in a sermon, the policy of Sigismund Korybut, who was attempting to bring about a reconciliation between Bohemia and the Pope; this fact led to the expulsion of Korybut, and the downfall of the moderate party for a time. Bohemia again resisted the arms of Europe with success; but the success was bought by exhaustion, which led it to listen to the overtures of the Council of Basel. In the conferences held at Basel, Rokycana was
the chief controversialist on the Hussite side, and showed a conciliatory spirit. In the negotiations which followed, and which ended in the acceptance of the Compacts by the Bohemians, Rokycana took a chief part. His policy was that Bohemia should accept reunion with Rome on the basis of the Compacts, but that the national organization of its church, should secure its religious liberties. Before the Compacts were signed (1435), the Bohemians secretly elected Rokycana archbishop of Prag, with two suffragans. After the signing of the Compacts, Sigismund was received as king of Bohemia; but he did not recognize Rokycana as archbishop without the consent of the Council of Basel. The Catholic re-action in Bohemia was so strong, that in 1437 Rokycana was driven to flee from Prag, but resumed his office of archbishop when the influence of George Podiebrad became supreme, in 1444. From that time till his death, he was closely associated with the policy of Podiebrad. He died in 1471, — two months before his master, King George, — at the age of seventy-four. The character and motives of Rokycana were much disputed during his lifetime, and have been so since. Like all men who try a policy of moderation, he encountered the hostility of the extreme parties. His plan of organizing a national church in Bohemia led to his own elevation to the office of archbishop, and the question of his confirmation in his office was the question that stood foremost in the disputes with the Pope. Really Rokycana summed up in his own persons, position the aspirations of the more sagacious of the Bohemian statesmen. It is easy to accuse such a man of vanity, obstinacy, and self-seeking. His policy was proved by events to be impossible, and his position was scarcely tenable. He was driven to alternate between cowardice and rashness. He and King George failed, but their success would have been momentous for the future of Europe. They played a difficult game, but they played it against overwhelming odds with prudence and moderation.

ROMAINE. — See under Podiebrad. For the earlier part of Rokycana's career, the materials are to be found in Palacky: Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Hussitenkriege, Prag, 1873-75, 2 vols.; Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Sveculi XV, vol. 1, Vienna, 1857. M. CHEIGHTON.

ROMAINE, William, a noted English divine of the evangelical class: b. at Hartlepool, Durham, Sept. 23, 1714; d. rector of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, London, July 26, 1795. He was ordained in 1736, and as early as 1739 was bold enough to attack Warburton's Divine Legation in a sermon preached before the university of Oxford, where he had received his education. He was scarcely a match for so redoubtable an antagonist, though he was not wanting in scholarship. A Hutchinsonian in science and learning, he was, nevertheless, chosen professor of astronomy in Gresham College; but an Oxford sermon on The Lord our Righteousness, of an extremely Calvinistic type, excluded him from afterwards from the university pulpit. However, popularity with the London citizens made up for his ejection in the midland seat of learning; and for many years he gathered crowded congregations at St. Andrew's Wardrobe, as well as St. Ann's, Blackfriars. He stood forth as the main pillar of Evangelization, which, in the last half of the eighteenth century, was reviving in the Church of England after the reaction against Puritanism consequent upon the Restoration a hundred years before. His place, therefore, in the history of theological literature is assured. He published a number of books of minor interests and repute; but three books proceeding from his pen became exceedingly popular in his lifetime, and continued to be read long afterwards: i.e., The Life of Faith (1763), The Walk of Faith (1771), and The Triumph of Faith (1794). They have been repeatedly published in one volume, and are highly commended for their spiritual tone by such men as Edward Bickersteth, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Chalmers. The Hon. and Rev. W. B. Cadogan wrote a life of this excellent man, which was prefixed to an edition of his works, in eight volumes, published in 1796.
body of Christians. She stretches in unbroken succession back to the palmy days of heathen Rome, has outlived all the governments of Europe, and is likely to live when Macaulay's New Zealander, "in the midst of a vast solitude," shall take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

I. Doctrine. — The Roman-Catholic system of doctrine is contained in the ecumenical creeds (the Apostles', the Nicene with the Filioque, and the Athanasian), in the dogmatic decisions of the ecumenical councils (twenty in number, from 325 to 1870), the bulls of the popes, and especially in the Tridentine and Vatican standards. The principal authorities are the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent (1563), the Profession of the Tridentine Faith, commonly called the "Credo of Pius IV." (1564), the Roman Catechism (1568), the decree of the immaculate conception (1854), and the Vatican decrees on the Catholic faith and the infallibility of the Pope (1870). The best summary of the leading articles of the Roman faith is contained in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which is binding upon all who are members of the Catholic Church, and must be confessed by all converts. It consists of the Nicene Creed and eleven articles. To these must now be added the two additional Vatican dogmas of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary and the infallibility of the Pope. The Roman-Catholic system of doctrine was prepared as to matter by the Fathers (especially Irenæus, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Leo I., Gregory I.), logically analyzed and defined and defended by the medieeval schoolmen (Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus), vindicated, in opposition to Protestantism, by Bellarmin, Bossuet, and Mühler, and completed in the Vatican dogma of papal infallibility, which excludes all possibility of doctrinal reformation. A question once settled by infallible authority is settled forever, and cannot be reopened. But the same authority may add new dogmas, such as the assumption of the Virgin Mary, which hitherto has been only a "pious opinion" of a large number of Catholics, as the immaculate conception was before 1854. See TRIDENTINE FELLOWSHIP OF FAITH.

II. Government and Discipline. — The Roman Church has reared up the grandest governmental fabric known in history. It is an absolute spiritual monarchy, culminating in the Pope, who claims to be the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ on earth, and hence the supreme and infallible head of the church. The people are excluded from all participation even in temporal matters: they must obey the priest; the priests must obey the bishop; and the bishops, the Pope, to whom they are bound by the most solemn oath. This system is the growth of ages, and has only reached its maturity in the Vatican Council (1870). The claim of the Bishop of Rome to universal dominion over the Christian Church was asserted by Gregory I., and was professed in the Lateran Council of 1214 under Innocent III., and in the Vatican Council of 1870 under Pius IX. On the papal government, see the works quoted sub PAPACY ON P. 1737.

III. Worship and Ceremonies. — They are embodied in the Roman Missal, the Roman Breviary, and other liturgical books for public and private devotion. The Roman Church accompanies its members from the cradle to the grave, receiving them into life by baptism, dismissing them into the other world by extreme unction, and consecrating all their important acts by the sacramental mysteries and blessings. The worship is a most elaborate system of ritualism, which addresses itself chiefly to the eye and the ear, and draws all the fine arts into its service. Gothic cathedrals, altars, crucifixes, Madonnas, pictures, statues, and relics of saints, rich decorations, solemn processions, operatic music, combine to lend it great attractions for the common people and for cultured persons of prevailing aesthetic tastes, especially among the Latin races. But while the external splendor dazzles the senses, and excites the imagination, the mind and heart, which crave more substantial spiritual food, are often left to starve. Converts from Rome usually swing to the opposite extreme of utmost simplicity. Every day of the calendar is devoted to the memory of one or more saints. The greatest festivals are Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Annunciation (March 25), Purification (Feb. 2), Assumption of the Virgin Mary. But the weekly sabbath is not near as well observed in Roman-Catholic countries as in Great Britain and the United States. Catholic worship is the same all over the world, even in
language; the Latin being its sacred organ, and the vernacular being only used for sermons, which are subordinate. Its throne is the altar, not the pulpit (which usually stands away off in a corner). It centres in the mass, and this is regarded as a real though unbloody repetition or continuation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross. At the moment when the officiating priest pronounces the words, "This is my body," the elements of bread and wine are believed to be changed into the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour; and these are offered to God the Father for the sins of the living and the dead in purgatory. The Reformers saw in the mass a relapse into Judaism, a refined form of idolatry, and a virtual real though unbloody repetition or continuation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross. For fifteen centuries had perfected forever them that are sanctified (Heb. x. 14). But Catholics deny the charge, and, reverently regard the mass as a dramatic commemoration and renewed application of the great mystery of redemption, and the daily food of the devout believer. On the Roman-Catholic worship, see the standard editions of the Missale Romanum, the Breviarium Romanum, and the Pontificale Romanum, also George Lewis: The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary, or Ritualism Self-illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome (Edinburgh, 1853, 2 vols.); and John, Marquess of Bute: The Roman Breviary translated out of Latin into English (Edinburgh, 1879, 2 vols.).

IV. HISTORY.—The earliest record of a Christian church in Rome we have in Paul's Epistle to the Romans (A.D. 58). Though not founded by Peter or Paul, who came to Rome after the year 60, it may possibly be traced to those "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes," who witnessed the death of the apostles and St. Peter was crucified, became the Calvary, and produced most of those doctrines, rites, and institutions which are to this day held in common by the Greek and Latin churches. There are few dogmas and usages of Romanism which may not be traced in embryo to the Greek and Latin fathers: hence the closer resemblance of the Greek and Roman churches, notwithstanding their rivalry and antagonism. But, alongside with these Romanizing tendencies, we find also, in the school of St. Augustine, the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace, which were next to the Bible, the chief propelling force of the Reformation. Wiclif in England, Hus in Bohemia, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, and the revival of letters, prepared the way for the great movement of the sixteenth century. It is the missionary age of Catholicism among the Latin and Teutonic races in Europe. Here we have the conversion of the barbarians in the north and west of Europe, under the fostering care of the bishops of Rome; here the growth of the Papal hierarchy, though in constant conflict with the secular power, especially the German Empire; here the scholastic theology, but, in opposition to it, also the Protestant reformers of mysticism, and a more liberal biblical theology; here an imposing theocracy, binding all the nations of Europe together, yet with strong elements of opposition in its own communion, urging forward toward a reformation in head and members. The middle ages cradled the Protestant Reformation as well as the Papal counter-Reformation. Wiclif in England, Hus in Bohemia, Wessel in Germany, Savonarola in Italy, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, and the revival of letters, prepared the way for the great movement of the sixteenth century, which emancipated Christendom from the spiritual bondage of Rome.

(3) The age of modern Romanism, dating from the Reformation, or, rather, from the Council of Trent (1563). This is Roman Catholicism, in opposition, not only to the Greek Church, but also to evangelical nationalists. In the aspects it was an advance upon the middle ages, and experienced great benefit from the Reformation. No Alexander VI., who was a monster of wickedness, nor Julius II., who preferred the sword to the staff, nor Leo X., who had more faith in classic art and literature than in the fábula de Christo, could now be elected to the chair of St. Peter. No such scandal as the Papal
schism, with two or three rival popes cursing and excommunicating each other, divided the Church since the sixteenth century. On the other hand, the Papacy has given formal sanction to those scholastic theories and ecclesiastical traditions against which the Reformers protested. It expressly condemned their doctrines; and, by claiming to be infallible, it made itself doctrinally invulnerable.

In modern Romanism we must again distinguish two periods, which are divided by the reign of Pope Pius IX.

(a) Tridentine Romanism is directed against the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and fixed the dogmas of the rule of faith (scripture and tradition), original sin, justification by faith and works, the seven sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and indulgences. The "Old Catholics," who seceded in 1870, and were excommunicated, took their stand first on the Council of Trent, and charged the latter with apostasy and corruption; although in fact, and as viewed from the Roman pontiff. These questions concerning the Virgin Mary, and the power and infallibility of the Roman pontiff. The same Pope, in 1864, issued the "Syllabus of Errors," which must be considered by von Schulte, and other eminent Catholics, whose learning and conscience did not permit them to submit to the Vatican decrees of 1870. For particulars, see PAPACY, POPE, JESUITS, GALICANISM, ULTRAMONTANISM, IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, INFALLIBILITY, TRENT, TRIDENTINE CONFESSION, VATICAN COUNCIL. etc.

(b) Vatican Romanism is directed against modern infidelity (rationalism), and against liberal Catholicism (Gallicanism) within the Roman Church itself. It created, or rather brought to full maturity and exclusive authority, two new dogmas and two corresponding heresies,—concerning the Virgin Mary, and the power and infallibility of the Roman pontiff. These questions were left unsettled by the Council of Trent, and under the lead of Drs. Dollinger, Reinkens, and von Schulte, and other eminent Catholic scholars, whose learning and conscience did not permit them to submit to the Vatican decrees of 1870.

Pope Pius IX. involved himself in difficulties with Italy, Spain, Germany, France, and Russia, and excited the sympathies of the masses, first as an exile, and then as a prisoner in the Vatican. Yet his reign was longer than that of any Pope, and exceeded the traditional twenty-five years of Peter. The policy of his successor, Leo XIII., is wiser and more conciliatory.

The history of the Roman Church during the present century shows the remarkable fact, that she has lost on her own ground, especially in Italy and Spain, but gained largeaccessions on foreign soil, especially in England, by the secession of Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, and several hundred Anglican clergymen and noblemen, since 1845, who sought rest in absolute submission to an infallible authority. On the other hand, this gain has been more than neutralized by the Old-Catholic secession in Germany and Switzerland, under the lead of Drs. Dollinger, Reinkens, and von Schulte, and other eminent Catholic scholars, whose learning and conscience did not permit them to submit to the Vatican decrees of 1870.

For particulars, see PAPACY, POPE, JESUITS, GALICANISM, ULTRAMONTANISM, IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, INFALLIBILITY, TRENT, TRIDENTINE CONFESSION, VATICAN COUNCIL, etc.

LIT. — The standard writers in explanation and defence of the doctrinal system of Romanism are BELLARMIN (Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae fidei advers. huius temporis hereticos, 1580, 3 vols. folio, and often since), BOSSUET (Exposition de la doctrine de l'église catholique, 1871), MOHLER (Symbalik, 8th ed., 1872), PERRONE (Prælectiones theologicae, 36th ed., 1881), KLEE, DIERINGER, FRIEDHOF, WISEMAN. The chief historical works by Roman Catholics are the Annales of BARONIUS, the Church Histories of Rohrbacher, Mohler (edited by Gamez), ALZOG, KRAUS, HERPEL (Continentgeschichte, down to the Council of Constance, a very valuable work), DÖLLINGER (before his secession in 1870), CARDINAL HERGENRÖther (Kirchengeschichte, in 3 vols., 2d ed., 1880). Of Spanish works, the able defence of Romanism by BALMES is still the best known and most read by a translation. Protestantism and Catholicism compared in their Effects on Civilization, 1851. In recent times the Roman Church has found its most zealous advocates among converts such as Dr. Hurter (the historian of Innocent III.), Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning. Dr. Orestes Brownson (1844-76), who carried the weapons of Protestant learning and culture with them. The fullest repository of Roman-Catholic theological learning may be found in Abbé MIGNE: Nouvelle Encylopédie Théologique, Paris, 1850 sqq., 52 vols. (a series of dictionaries on all branches of sacred literature), and in WETZEN and WEIß: Kirchenlexikon oder Encycl. der kathol. Theologie, in 12 vols. (Freiburg, 1847-58), which is now coming out in a revised form, begun by Cardinal HERGENRÖther, and continued by Dr. KAULEN, Freiburg-im-B., 1882 sqq. See also BERINGTON and KIRK: The Faith of Catholics, on Certain Points of Controversy, connected with the Scriptures, and attested by the Fathers, London, 1846, 3 vols.; 3d ed. by James Waterworth.

Protestant works on and against the Roman
to Mexican sees. As Catholics increased in the United States by natural growth and immigration, sees were erected in 1808 at New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Bardstown. After the cession of Louisiana to the United States, sees were established at St. Louis and New Orleans; and, while Oregon was a disputed territory, a vicariate apostolic, and, soon after, an episcopal see, was founded (1846), dependent on Canada. In the territory subsequently acquired from Mexico, a bishopric existed, that of the two Californias, the bishop residing in Northern California. The other portions were soon placed under American bishops. These original dioceses have been, as the growth of the country required, subdivided, till there were in 1883 twelve archbishoprics, fifty-two bishoprics, nine vicariates apostolic, and one prefecture apostolic.

Each archbishopric, with the dioceses of the suffragan bishops, forms an ecclesiastical province. On the vacancy of a see by death, resignation, or removal, the archbishop and bishops of the province select three priests, whose names are sent to Rome; and if the see is vacant for a year, the Holy See chooses one, who is appointed to the vacant see. His bulls are then issued, and despatched to the bishop-elect, who is consecrated and installed.

The Clergy, and Mode of Recruiting.—There were in the United States, in 1888, 6,540 priests. For the training of candidates for the priesthood, there were thirty-one seminaries under the direction of bishops, and also several similar institutions connected with the religious orders, in which members of those bodies pursued their theological course. The most important seminaries are, St. Mary's, Baltimore, founded in 1791, and directed by the Sulpitians; Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md.; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N.Y.; the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, near Milwaukee; St. Vincent's Theological Seminary, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and the Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels, Niagara Falls, N.Y., directed by the Lazarists. Of those connected with the regular orders, the most important are the House of Studies at Woodstock, Md., for scholastics of the Society of Jesus; the House of Studies at Ilchester, Md., for the Redemptorists; St. Vincent's Abbey, Westmoreland County, Penn., for the Benedictines; and St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N.Y., for the Franciscans. There are also in Europe the American College at Rome, and the American College at Louvain, where candidates for the priesthood are prepared for duty in this country. The Missionary College of All Hallows, Drumcondra, Ireland, prepares young men for the priesthood to serve in other countries, and among them many are accepted by bishops in the United States. Besides these, many priests of different nationalities come with the general emigration, and are incorporated into the body of the clergy.

The Regular Orders.—Besides the secular priests, subject directly to the bishops, and constituting most of the parochial clergy, there are many religious orders. The oldest of these is the Society of Jesus, which began its labors in Maryland in 1683, and down to the Revolution supplied almost exclusively the priests who labored among the Catholics in the South. The members of the same order from Canada established
Indian missions, and attended the white settlements along the northern frontier and in the valley of the Mississippi. The Jesuit fathers at present conduct colleges at Georgetown (D.C.), Baltimore, New-York City, Fordham (N.Y.), Jersey City, Worcester (Mass.), Cincinnati, Detroit, St. Louis, Mobile, New Orleans, Denver (Col.), Omaha (Neb.), Santa Clara (Cal.), and some others, and have churches in many cities and towns. The Dominicans have had convents and churches doing parochial work in Ohio and Kentucky since the beginning of the century, and more recently in California, New York, and New Jersey; the Augustinians, in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. Several orders have come in to labor principally among the Germans,—the Redemptorists (who have parish-churches, and also give missions to German and English speaking congregations), branches of the Franciscan order, Reformed Franciscans, Conventuals, Capuchins, engaged mainly in parochial work. The Passionists are devoted more especially to the giving of missions. The Lazarists, or Priests of the Mission, are engaged chiefly in the direction of seminaries and colleges; Priests of the Holy Cross, in directing colleges, seminaries, and parochial work; the Benedictines, who have several abbeys, with colleges, schools, and churches in all parts of the country.

Churches and their Tenure. — The churches are in some cases held by the bishop or archbishop as trustee; in other States, by a board of trustees. As there is no membership in the Catholic churches, in the sense that the term is used in Protestant bodies, the application of the general laws made for the latter threw the choice of trustees into the hands of those who contributed least to the maintenance of the churches, and who seldom joined in the ordinances of the church. This led to vesting the title in the bishop as trustee, but the plan created other difficulties. In many parts the title to the church is now vested in a board consisting of the bishop, the pastor of the church, and two lay-trustees. The churches, colleges, abbey, and headquarters of the religious, and are generally held by them under acts of incorporation.

The churches have been built almost exclusively by voluntary contributions, and are, as a rule, encumbered by mortgage-debts; the congregations being unable to meet the whole cost, and none of the churches possessing funded property. Large bequests, devises, and donations to churches or church-work, are as rare among Catholics in the United States as they are common among Protestants. A system grew up in churches, of accepting deposits, and paying interest, as a means of avoiding mortgages; but, as matters were rarely managed with the judgment of business-men, the result has often been financial ruin, as at St. Peter's Church, New York, Cincinnati, and Lawrence, Mass.

Education. — Prior to the Revolution, any distinctively Catholic schools were almost impossible; an academy for boys, Maryland, which was covertly maintained for several years, being almost the only example. Schools in connection with the churches were established as soon as Catholics were free; and, until public schools began to be established by State authority, the schools maintained by the different denominations were almost the only schools accessible to the children of the poorer classes. The Catholics have since been compelled to retain and extend their parochial system, as the State schools, in their general tone, influence, and text-books, are so decidedly Protestant as to make them a powerful means in alienating the young from Catholicity. The number of Catholic parochial schools in the United States is estimated at 2,500, and the number of pupils at nearly half a million. In these, religious instruction is given, with the usual branches taught in schools; and text-books are used free from matter offensive to Catholics. These books, in their educational form and mechanical execution, have been greatly improved within the last twenty years. Parish schools are, to a great extent, taught by members of religious orders and communities which make instruction their special work. Of these the chief are the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brothers of the Holy Cross, Brothers of Mary, Xaverian Brothers, Franciscan Brothers, for boys' schools; Ursulines, Benedictine, Presentation Nuns, Sisters of Charity, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Immaculate Heart, for girls. For higher education, there are academies under some of the orders of Brothers; and, for young ladies, under the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, Ursuline Nuns, Sisters of Notre Dame, of the Holy Child, St. Dominie, St. Joseph, etc. The number of these academies was given in 1853 as 579. The colleges and universities for young men numbered 81; that at Georgetown, D.C., being the oldest. None of these institutions are endowed, or possess founded professorships. They are, with a few exceptions, owned and directed by religious orders,—Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustinians, Franciscans, Lazarists, Priests of the Holy Cross, Brothers of the Christian Schools. There is no Catholic college in the United States with a lay faculty, and only a few with a faculty of secular priests. Sunday schools are generally maintained in the cities, and there is a resident pastor; but, as religious instruction is given in the parochial and other schools during the week, the Sunday-school system does not hold the same importance as among Protestant bodies.

The Catholic Press. — The necessity of diffusing religious intelligence among Catholics, and of meeting charges against the church, led to the establishment of Catholic newspapers. Of these the United-States Catholic Miscellany, founded by Bishop England of Charleston, was one of the first and ablest. There are in 1858 many published in various parts of the country, in English, German, French, Spanish, and Portuguese; the Freeman's Journal, published in New York, under the editorship of J. A. McMaster, being the most able and influential. There are several monthly publications of a literary and devotional character, such as the Catholic World, which has one review, The American Catholic Quarterly, which fills the place long occupied by Brownson's Quarterly Review. For the diffusion of books among Catholics, attempts were twice made to establish publishing societies; but the Metropolis Press and the Catholic Publication Society.
both failed to maintain themselves, and fell into private hands. The publication of Catholic books is left to individual publishers. The Sisters of Charity meet the wants, directing orphan and founding asylums, homes for neglected children, reformatory for the vicious, industrial and parochial schools, general hospitals, insane-asylums, homes for the aged, and visiting the sick; the Sisters of Mercy visit the sick and prisons; and have houses for unemployed servant-girls; the Little Sisters of the Poor are devoted to the care of the aged; the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, to hospital-work; the Bon Secours Sisters, to the nursing of the sick at their homes. The total number of charitable institutions reported for 1883 was 460. Almost without exception, these depend on voluntary contributions; none being endowed, and bequests of the wealthy being comparatively rare. Asylums for the treatment of insanity and the care of deaf-mutes have been established by sisterhoods in several places.

Charitable Institutions.—The relief of the poor and afflicted calls for the services of a number of religious communities of women, devoted to general or special work. The Sisters of Charity meet almost all wants, directing orphan and founding asylums, homes for neglected children, reformatory for the vicious, industrial and parochial schools, general hospitals, insane-asylums, homes for the aged, and visiting the sick; the Sisters of Mercy visit the sick and prisons; and have houses for unemployed servant-girls; the Little Sisters of the Poor are devoted to the care of the aged; the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, to hospital-work; the Bon Secours Sisters, to the nursing of the sick at their homes. The total number of charitable institutions reported for 1883 was 460. Almost without exception, these depend on voluntary contributions; none being endowed, and bequests of the wealthy being comparatively rare. Asylums for the treatment of insanity and the care of deaf-mutes have been established by sisterhoods in several places.

Liturgical. — The Liturgy in use in the Catholic Church in the United States is the Roman, the Roman missal, breviary, pontifical and ritual, being exclusively used; and none of those which acquired local tolerance in parts of Europe have ever obtained at any time in any district of this country. The regular orders have also in most cases a Proper, containing offices of saints belonging to their rule, which the Holy See permits in the churches and houses of the order. As the emigration has brought over few if any Catholics belonging to the Oriental rites, Latin alone has been used in the Catholic churches of the United States, except where a United Greek or Syrian priest visiting the country has celebrated mass according to his own rite. The discipline of the Western Patriarchate in regard to communion under one kind, and the celibacy of the clergy, are universal.

Government.—The canon law of the church, as modified by special grants or customs in France, was established in the churches under the French rule in New York, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and, as modified in Spain, was established in Florida and Louisiana and the former Mexican territory, with the regulations adopted by synods at Quebec and Santiago de Cuba, and by provincial councils at Santo Domingo and Mexico; but as, in most parts except New Mexico, the old population merged in the expansion of Catholics from the original territory of the republic, the early ecclesiastical law was well known at the time. The United States is regarded as a missionary country, and the affairs of the Catholic Church here are conducted at Rome through the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. No parishes have been canonically instituted, as in Canada and Mexico; and consequently there are, except in a few instances, actually no parish priests properly so called. The priests are ordained "sub titulo missionis," and bound to obedience to their bishop, and have, when assigned to quasi parishes, no canonical immobility. The church here tends to the establishment of canon law and the control of bishops as much as is possible in this country and at this time. At present, however, the position of the priest is not so clearly defined as to prevent frequent appeals to Rome, and occasional suits in the State courts. An instruction issued at Rome a few years since led to the establishment of a committee of clergymen in each diocese who are to investigate all charges against a priest, and whose report is to some extent a necessary step in withdrawing a priest's faculties, or removing him from a pastoral charge.

The first legislation in the Catholic Church in the United States was the synod of Baltimore, held by Bishop Carroll in 1791; and its regulations, with rules adopted by the bishops in 1810, were the only specific laws till the assembling of the first Provincial Council of Baltimore, convened in 1829, under the sanction of Pope Leo XII., by Archbishop Whitfield. The decrees of this council and of others held at Baltimore in 1833, 1837, 1840, 1843, and 1849, were approved by the popes, and became law in the church east of the Mississippi, and were accepted generally west of the river. In 1846 Oregon City was made a metropolita see with two suffragans; and in 1847 St. Louis became the head of a province embracing the dioceses of Dubuque, Nashville, St. Paul, Chicago, and Milwaukee. In 1850 New York was made an archiepiscopal see, and the bishops of Boston, Hartford, Albany, and Buffalo, were made suffragans to it; Cincinnati was also made a metropolitan see, having Louisville, Detroit, Vincennes, and Cleveland as suffragans. In 1855 San Francisco became a metropolitan, with Monterey as a suffragan see; and in 1875 Boston was made an archiepiscopal see, with the bishops of Portland, Burlington, Springfield, Providence, and Hartford as suffragans; Philadelphia, with Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Erie, and Scranton, with Wilmington as suffragans; Milwaukee, with Green Bay, La Crosse, Marquette, and St. Paul as suffragans; Santa Fé was also made an archiepiscopal see in 1875; and in 1880 Chicago, with Alton and Peoria as suffragans. In most of these new provinces, councils were also held by authority of the Holy See,—in Oregon in 1848; in New York, 1864, 1861, 1888; in Cincinnati in 1855, 1858,
1861, and 1882; in St. Louis in 1855, 1858; in New Orleans in 1856, 1860; in San Francisco in 1874 and 1882, in all of which, decrees were passed binding in those provinces, as those of Baltimore, continued in 1855, 1858, and 1860, were in that respect. To secure general action, however, throughout the United States on some important points, and to express clearly the faith and discipline of the whole church in this country, plenary councils were held at Baltimore in 1862 and 1868, in which many decrees were adopted by the archbishops and bishops of the whole country. The decrees of these councils conform in their dogmatic part with the established doctrines of the church, and in matters of discipline are gradually bringing the economy of the church in this country into harmony with the discipline in other and older portions of the church.

The oldest Catholic body of population in the United States is the population of New Mexico, of Spanish and Indian origin. The white population is essentially descended from the first settlers, who occupied the country about 1580, and who, though expelled a century after, soon returned. The original Spanish population of Florida all retired in the last century when the Colony passed into the hands of England. During the British sway, a number of Minorcans and Greeks were introduced by Mr. Turnbull, whose descendents form the nucleus of the present Catholic population of that State.

The English settlements at Vincennes, Kaskaskia, Cahokia, influenced by Rev. Mr. Gibault, welcomed Gen. Clark during the Revolutionary War; and their descendents form part of the Catholic population of the West, and South. Detroit was long retained by England; and its French population underwent few changes, and their descendents still form a considerable part of the Catholic population.

The nucleus in the English Colonies was the body of colonists who came over in 1633 with Leonard Calvert. Many of the settlers were Protestants, and Calvert at once put up a church for their use; but the leading settlers who took up lands in their own name were mainly Catholics, who settled in New York on account of their adherence to the American cause, and might easily have been won. A number espoused the American cause, and settled in Northern New York. The Maryland ex-Jesuits became part of the Established Church in order to recover the provinces they had lost; no churches being permitted in Maryland, where only small chapels, under the same roof as the residence of the priest, were allowed. In 1735 seven thousand Catholic Acadians were, for refusing to take the oath of supremacy, seized, and scattered in settlers through the thirteen Colonies. Most of them who survived the hardships of their terrible transportation straggled to Canada or Louisiana, only Maryland retaining any permanency.

During the Revolution the Canadians were friendly, and might easily have been won. A number espoused the American cause, and settled in Northern New York. Two Canadian regiments were formed, which fought in the Continental Army to the close of the war, and had a Catholic chaplain commissioned by Congress.

After the Revolution, a new emigration set in, bringing in Catholics, who settled in New York and New England. The Maryland ex-Jesuits were the only clergy, their society having been dissolved by Clement XIV., and the Vicar Apostolic of London having virtually abandoned them on account of their adherence to the American cause. Priests, not always of the high standard, straggled over with the emigrants; and some chaplains of the French and Spanish naval and military forces remained to do mission-work here. After the Rev. John Carroll was appointed Prefect Apostolic, some order was established; and from the erection of the see of Baltimore
the growth was steady. Churches were begun in New York and Boston, and then at other cities near the coast, from Boston to Savannah. In consequence of the outbreak of the Revolution in France, a community of Carmelite nuns came to Maryland; the English Dominicans, expelled from Bornheim, sent a part of their community to Kentucky; the Sulpicians began a seminary; and a number of learned and pious French priests and their imitators, showed the influence of the liberty given to Catholics. This freedom was not absolute. In some States they were still disfranchised. In New York they could not sit in the Legislature. In Massachusetts the highest court in 1800 decided that a Catholic must pay for the support of the Protestant religion among the older and more recently arrived Catholics. Conversions to the Catholic religion became more frequent. Gov. Lee of Maryland, Rev. John Thayer of Boston, Rev. Mr. Kewley of New York, the Rev. Mr. Barber and his family, Ironside, Richards, Holmes, and others, showed their influence of the liberty given to Catholics.

Kentucky was settled largely by Catholics from Maryland, and bad priests laboring there soon after the Revolution. The church there took form under the labors of Rev. Mr. Badin, Nerinckx, and Bishop Flaget, with the English Dominicans. The French priests of Kentucky visited the old French settlements in Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan; the Rev. Gabriel Richard becoming the chief missionary in the last State. In the East the French priests Matignon and Cheverus attended the Catholics of Boston and those scattered throughout New England.

Bishop Carroll had sought a division of his diocese at the very commencement of the century; but it was not till 1810 that bishops were appointed to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Bardstown, Ky. Increasing emigration soon led to a growth of the Catholic body in the other dioceses. When the agitation for Catholic emancipation began in England and Ireland, a counter-movement led to the publication of many works attacking the Catholic doctrines, discipline, and institutions. This brought increased controversies. Many of the works were reprinted in the United States; and the controversial literature begun by Carroll, Thayer, and Fleming, was continued, and reached its height about 1836, when works like the _Apostolical Briefs of Maria Monde_ were issued. The falsity of that book was shown by William L. Stone, editor of the _Commercial Advertiser_, and was established in a chancery suit; but a similar work led to the burning of an Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass. After this period, the opposition to Catholics became political, rather than theological, as was apparent in the Native American riots in Philadelphia in 1844, in which two churches and many residences were destroyed. Since that time, political parties and associations hostile to Catholics appear from time to time.

These have not, however, affected sensibly the growth of the Catholic Church, in the cities and large towns. In New York and Boston, and then at other cities near the coast, from Boston to Savannah, in which two churches and many residences were destroyed. Since that time, political parties and associations hostile to Catholics appear from time to time.

These have not, however, affected the growth of the Catholic Church in the cities and large towns. In New York and Boston, and then at other cities near the coast, from Boston to Savannah, in which two churches and many residences were destroyed. Since that time, political parties and associations hostile to Catholics appear from time to time.

The earlier Catholic emigration was mainly Irish; but for the last forty years the German-Catholic element has been increasing steadily; so that, especially in the West, the Germans by the 1840s had made their imprints on the Catholic body. The first Catholic churches erected in this country, except in Spanish parts, were generally plain and inexpensive; but with the growth of the body, churches and institutions of great solidity and beauty were erected, often beyond the means of the community, and involving loads of debt under which many churches are struggling. Of the churches, the finest is St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, one of the most striking ecclesiastical buildings in America.

The Catholic population is mainly in the North.
ern and newly settled Western States, and is comparatively small in the States which till recently were almost wholly Louisiana, where the original population was exclusively Catholic. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Louisiana have about one-third of the population Catholic, according to Catholic estimates; New York, Wisconsin, and California, one-fourth; Maryland, Minnesota, Colorado, and Dakota, one-fifth; Illinois, New Jersey, Idaho, and Washington Territory, one-sixth; Pennsylvania, one-seventh; Michigan and Kentucky, one-eighth; Ohio and Nebraska, one-ninth; Maine and New Hampshire, one-tenth; but in Virginia the Catholics are one in forty to the population; in Georgia, one to sixty; in Tennessee, one to fifty; in Alabama and Mississippi, one to eighty; in South Carolina and Arkansas, one to one hundred; and in North Carolina, where there is the smallest proportion of Catholics, one to nine hundred.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLIC CHURCH IN UNITED STATES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Priests</th>
<th>Churches</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>8,241</td>
<td>6,882,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Catholic body includes many of foreign nationality. The German and Irish Catholics, with their immediate families born here, each constitutes probably about one-fourth of the whole; most of the other half being American-born, with a smaller proportion of other nationalities.

Missions.—No missionary society exists among the Catholics of the United States for home or foreign missions; nor is there any tract society to reach the negroes of the South. There are Catholic missions among the Indian tribes. A few Indians of the old conversion remained at Indian Oldtown in Maine, St. Croix, and neighboring States. In recent times Catholic priests have charge of colored churches in several places; but the work has not attained any great development. All these missions to Indians and negroes are under the bishops of the dioceses in which they are situated.

LIT. — The sources to be consulted for the history of the Catholic Church in the United States are, for the Spanish portion, GIL GONZALEZ DAVILA: Teatro Eclesiastico, Madrid, 1849; BEHAVIDES: Memorial, 1830; TORQUEMADA: Monarquía Indiana, 1793, 3 vols.; AYETA: La Verdad Defendida: Espinosa, Historia del Colegio Apostólico de Querétaro, 1740–92, 2 vols.; and Vida del Padre Antonio Margil: PALOU: Vida del Padre Junípero Serra, 1787; ALEGRE: Historia de la Provincia de Mexico; Concilio Mexicano, 1790–70, 3 vols; Sinodo Diocesano de Santiago de Cuba, Habana, 1844; ARIEGE, Memorial, 1812; The Pious Fund of California (Documents), San Francisco, 1875; GLEESON: History of the Catholic Church in California, 1872. For the French portion, BIARD: Relation, Lyons, 1616; Letters in the Annales Historiae, 1611, 1613; The Series of Jesuit Relations (reprinted), Quebec, 1855, 3 vols.; MARTIN: Vie du P. Isaac Jogues, 1873; Lives in Die Katholische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten, Regensburg, 1864; Relations by GRAVIER, BIGOT, the URSulinEN, MILET, CHAUMONOT, DABLO, MONTIGNY, etc., in SHEA'S Cramoisy Series; LE CLERCG: Establishment of the Faith, New York, 1861; KIP: Jesuit Missions; CHARLEVOIX: Catholic Church in Pittsburgh and Alleghany, 1880. For the church in the original English Colonies, the best collection of material is in FOLEY'S Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus (1877–88), with WHITE'S Relatio Itineris, for the church under the French Provincial, DE COURCY's Catholic Church in the United States (ed. of 1879); SHEA: History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes, 1855; FITTON: Sketches of the Church in New England, 1844; Connecticut Catholic; BAYLEY: Catholic Church on the Island of New York; MULRENA: Catholic Church of New York City; BAYLEY: Catholic Church of Long Island; 1871; TIMON: Missions in Western New York, 1892; LAMBERT: Catholic Church in Pittsburg and Alleghany, 1880; St. Vincenz in Pennsylvania and the Benedictine Album; O'CONNELL: Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia, 1879; SPALDING: Sketches of Kentucky, 1844; minor histories of particular churches; DE SMET: India Sacra let, 1828; and Western Missionaries; Archbishop BLANCHET: Catholic Church in Oregon, works in Italian on the church in this country by GRASSI, VILANS,

**Roman Empire and Christianity, The.**

A view of the relations of Christianity to the Roman Empire would embrace a consideration of three distinct epochs in Roman history: (1) That period (about three hundred years) when Christianity was brought into conflict with the old religious beliefs and policy of the empire, and was gradually converting the Roman world to the faith; (2) The period during which Christianity became the official religion of the empire, from the reign of Constantine to that of Charlemagne, about five hundred years; (3) That long period, commonly called the "middle age," when Western Christendom was ruled under a system called the "Holy Roman Empire," formed by a close alliance of the Popes with Charlemagne and his successors.

The religion of the Romans had its origin in the worship by each family of its own household and tutelary divinities, in whom the souls of their ancestors were supposed to be enshrined. The religion of the *civitas* consisted in honoring, under the name of *numina,* those physical forces of nature, which, unpropitiated, might, it was feared, prove dangerous to the safety of the State. The Romans were regarded by the ancients as a most religious people. The forms of family and of state religion were carefully observed by them in every event of life. The safety and protection of the State was the great object of all Roman policy, and it had for its basis religious beliefs. The *cultus* was entirely under the control of the civil authority. There was no priestly caste at Rome, after the manner of the Orientals. Pontiffs, augurs, and priests performed certain special functions in ascertaining the will of the gods; but they did so only under the direction of the lay authorities. Devotion, accompanied by enthusiasm or demonstrative feeling, was considered wholly out of place in the worship of the Roman divinities. Calmness, moderation, self-possession, on the part of the worshippers, were essential qualities when the favor of the gods was to be invoked. The most important peculiarity in their ritual was the exact observance of those forms, which, it was supposed, their ancestors had employed successfully in their worship. In the most religious of the Romans the objects of public worship were gradually developed, religion presented itself to the minds of the people as having one sole object in view; namely, the safety and prosperity of the State, and as providing, as the only method of reaching that object, the maintenance and exact observance of the ancestral ritual.

When Rome became mistress of the world, this intensely national religious system had been a good deal weakened by Plague, Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian, and the old national worship was gradually kept up. (2) The introduction of the worship of foreign deities, chiefly from Egypt and the East, such as Isis, Serapis, and, later, the Mithraic ritual; (2) The destructive criticism of the basis of the popular religion by philosophers and poets, who followed the example given them by the Greeks. To meet these assaults, it was said that any one was free to believe what he chose, provided he punctually observed the ancient prescribed ritual of worship.

And such, strange to say, was the belief and practice of the Romans when their power was greatest, and when patriotic virtue was strongest amongst them. The fitting types of the religion they professed are Cicero, who has, of all the ancient authors, written most fully in its praise, and who believed in no gods whatever; and the supreme pontiff, Julius Cæsar, who, notwithstanding he was the official head of the Roman religion, stoutly denied the immortality of the soul in the Senate House.

The new gods and the new philosophy worked a great change towards the close of the republic; and Augustus found, when he became emperor, that the practice of the old religious rites had been almost given up. Incredulity and materialism had driven the worshippers of the old gods from their temples, so many of which had fallen into ruin, that Augustus rebuilt no less than eighty-two of them in Rome alone. His policy was to found his empire upon a conservative basis. It would appear that there was still left some faith in the old forms, and he selected the religious sentiment of the people as most convenient for his purpose. At the same time the conquests of Rome had impressed him, in common with many statesmen of the time, with the belief that the religions of all countries had a similar basis, and that their diverse gods were really manifestations of the same divine power under different names. On this principle, foreign religions were tolerated in Rome and throughout the empire, always, however, under the condition, express or implied, that they did not interfere with that of the state. The *apostesos,* or deification of the emperors, which began under Augustus, is, perhaps, the truest expression of the actual religious sentiment of the time. It formed the empire religion, which, in imitation of the narrow worship of the *civitas,* made the supremacy of the empire the great object of religious interest, devotion, and worship. Still, the observance of the rites of the old national worship was carefully kept up. Foreign religions asked for no exclusive privileges; and the only restriction which was placed on their votaries was, that they should do no act which was inconsistent with the preservation of the safety and supremacy of the Roman Empire.

Christianity had thus at the outset presented (1) the old Roman popular religion; (2) the devotion to foreign deities, chiefly Egyptian and Oriental, which had become fashionable among the higher classes; (3) the religion which was based upon the deification of the emperors. Of course, the hostility between its system and these forms of religion was irreconcilable. The point at which
the conflict was first to take place is accurately shown in the book of Acts. The Romans did not persecute the early Christians for mere opinion's sake. On the contrary, we learn, that, when the Jews were exciting popular clamor against St. Paul and his companions in the cities of Greece and Asia Minor, the Roman officials were wholly unwilling to see in the conduct of the apostle an offence against Roman law, while they contemptuously declined to consider questions concerning the Jewish religion, as beyond their jurisdiction. It would appear that neither the belief nor the worship of the early Christians, as long as they were so obscure as not to attract public notice, subjected them to the penalties of Roman law. The cruel sufferings which they endured at Rome, under Nero (A.D. 64), seem to have been due to a desire on the part of that tyrant to make the Jews odious by attributing the burning of Rome to one of the parties or sects of that people, as the Christians were then popularly supposed to be. At any rate, it is very certain that the Christians had nothing to do with burning the city; and the persecution of Nero, so called, was a local one, not extending beyond the limits of Rome itself. The letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan (A.D. 108), asking his advice as to the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia, shows that both parties seem to be dealing with a new problem, at any rate, with one which had not yet been settled by imperial legislation. Doubtless, Pliny had, by virtue of the imperium confided to him, punished severely those who had been guilty of overt acts of impiety by refusing to pay divine honors to the emperor; but he is evidently puzzled to know what he is to do with those persons, who, while their belief and worship are not in accord with the national rites, have been guilty of no outward act of disobedience to the government. Heresy was a crime the punishment for which had not then been provided for in the Roman code; and hence these two men, certainly among the most enlightened of their age, agree, while having absolute power, upon a policy of moderation and conciliation towards those whose religious opinions differed from those of the old Roman faith.

While the government thus forbore persecuting the Christians for heresy, still the populace in the large cities in the East, where the Christians were numerous, became, for various reasons, intensely imbittered against the new religion. The Christians naturally kept themselves more and more aloof from their fellow-subjects. They regarded the order to throw a few grains of incense upon the altar of the gods or of the emperor, not as a test of loyalty, but as an invitation to do with burning the city; and the persecution of Nero, so called, was a local one, not extending beyond the limits of Rome itself. The letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan (A.D. 108), asking his advice as to the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia, shows that both parties seem to be dealing with a new problem, at any rate, with one which had not yet been settled by imperial legislation. Doubtless, Pliny had, by virtue of the imperium confided to him, punished severely those who had been guilty of overt acts of impiety by refusing to pay divine honors to the emperor; but he is evidently puzzled to know what he is to do with those persons, who, while their belief and worship are not in accord with the national rites, have been guilty of no outward act of disobedience to the government. Heresy was a crime the punishment for which had not then been provided for in the Roman code; and hence these two men, certainly among the most enlightened of their age, agree, while having absolute power, upon a policy of moderation and conciliation towards those whose religious opinions differed from those of the old Roman faith.

While the government thus forbore persecuting the Christians for heresy, still the populace in the large cities in the East, where the Christians were numerous, became, for various reasons, intensely imbittered against the new religion. The Christians naturally kept themselves more and more aloof from their fellow-subjects. They regarded the order to throw a few grains of incense upon the altar of the gods or of the emperor, not as a test of loyalty, but as an invitation to do with burning the city; and the persecution of Nero, so called, was a local one, not extending beyond the limits of Rome itself. The letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan (A.D. 108), asking his advice as to the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia, shows that both parties seem to be dealing with a new problem, at any rate, with one which had not yet been settled by imperial legislation. Doubtless, Pliny had, by virtue of the imperium confided to him, punished severely those who had been guilty of overt acts of impiety by refusing to pay divine honors to the emperor; but he is evidently puzzled to know what he is to do with those persons, who, while their belief and worship are not in accord with the national rites, have been guilty of no outward act of disobedience to the government. Heresy was a crime the punishment for which had not then been provided for in the Roman code; and hence these two men, certainly among the most enlightened of their age, agree, while having absolute power, upon a policy of moderation and conciliation towards those whose religious opinions differed from those of the old Roman faith.
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thus gave to the Christians permission for the free and public exercise of their religion. The Edict of Milan (312), issued in the joint names of Constantine and Licinius, has been called the “great charter of the liberties of Christianity;” but it was no more than an edict of unlimited toleration. Still, it withdrew official recognition from old paganism; and under its operation the old Roman religion gradually and slowly died out. Christianity was not recognized as the official religion until the reign of Theodosius, 380. Whether Constantine was a Christian is an historical problem not easy to solve. He purposely delayed baptism until he was in articulo mortis. But, whether Christian or not, vast changes took place during his reign, caused not merely by the unrestricted progress of Christianity, but by the relations which the emperor held towards its organized form, the Church. No one can read the account of the proceedings of the Council of Nicaea (325) which formulated the creed which, from that period to this has been regarded as the basis of the faith of the universal church, without being convinced that the emperor was regarded as something more than the honorary president of that body, that he considered himself at least as Pontifex Maximus in the new religion, as his predecessors had been in the old; and thus at the very outset was forced upon the infant Church that unholy alliance with the State, which, among other things, has helped to make Christianity so conspicuous an element in all subsequent history. The modern conception of the union of Church and State had its origin under Constantine. His successors, Theodosius and Gratian, define or ratify the definition of doctrines, and condemn heretics. Justinian evidently thought himself Pope and emperor combined; and Charlemagne, in his Capitularies, is at once the legislator of the Church and of the State.

The Christian Church received from Constantine another distinguishing mark, which it retained for nearly fifteen hundred years; namely, the principle and the practice of punishing heretics by civil penalties. It is an humiliating confession to make, that heresy — which is defined to be a evident advocacy of opinions which have been condemned by the church — is an offence which has never been punished as a crime by the civil magistrate under any ecclesiastical system save the Christian. But Constantine provided by an edict that the Donatist heretics should be so punished in 316, and his example was followed by Theodosius and others; so that before the close of the fourth century no less than seventeen edicts had been promulgated, directing the magistrates to punish Christian dissenters. By these edicts they were deprived of their property, and made incapable of holding office, and they were liable to be scourged and banished. The first blood judicially shed for religious opinion is said to have been that of certain Manicheans in 385; but it is alleged that their condemnation was extorted from an usurping emperor, and that the infliction of death as a punishment was highly disapproved by such saints as Martin of Tours and Ambrose of Milan.

During the fourth century the pretensions of the Christian hierarchy to power were greatly increased, and the primitive simplicity of the conduct of Christians no longer existed. The Church had vast possessions; its clergy formed the larger portion of the educated classes, and held conspicuous positions at the imperial court. Christian beneficence was not only recognized as a duty, but it became the fashion, or, rather, a passion among people of rank and wealth, to lavish gifts on the Church. The larger portion of the town worked generally harmoniously with the bishop in the administration; the bishop, indeed, becoming the most conspicuous officer in the municipla. In short, society during the fourth century, both in the East and the West, became Christianized. A revolution had begun which not only destroyed the outward forms of Paganism, but which gradually worked out its spirit from the minds of the people. Nowhere can we find a better illustration of the recognized power of the clergy than where Ambrose, archbishop of Milan, has the courage to forbid the Emperor Theodosius (400) to enter the church, much less to receive therein the sacraments, until he had undergone penance for the crime of the massacre at Thessalonica, of which he had been guilty.

To this new condition of society a good deal of the legislation of Constantine and his successors corresponds. Much of that legislation is characterized by its humane spirit, and is in such striking contrast with the old Roman ideas, that we can hardly mistake in tracing in it the direct influence of Christian doctrine and moral example: such, for instance, are the edicts forbidding the exposition of infants, and restraining excessive cruelty towards slaves, as well as those concerning adultery, divorce, unnatural crimes, etc. How much of all this was due to what may be called the “reflex action” of Christianity, and how much to the humane principles of stoicism, it is not easy to say.

As the fourth century witnessed a succession of Christian emperors, and the firm establishment of the dogmatic creed of Christianity in the empire, so the fall of Pagan and imperial Rome, and the building-up of a new and Christian Rome, proceed in unison. The fall of Rome (476), opens, therefore, a new era in history. Rome then ceased to be the conqueror of the world in the old sense; but, as soon as she became Christian, she prepared to wield a far greater power over mankind than she had ever yet done. As the imperial power declined through corruption, weakness, and the assaults of the Barbarians, that of the Church, which availed herself freely of the imperial methods and organization, constantly increased. The power of civil government, especially in the West, fell into her hands naturally and necessarily, simply because the rulers, in the general confusion, were incapable of affording protection to those whom they governed. The capture of Rome by Alaric, therefore, was one of the great steps by which the popes, bishops of Rome, rose to power. The Pope at that time was doubtless the most important man in Rome; he alone, had — not merely the attributes of supremacy, but authority very extensive in practice, although undefined. To him the panic-stricken Senate and people turned for help in time of danger;
and he (Leo I.) justified their confidence by striving, first to mitigate the anger of Alaric, and, secondly, to induce the cowardly Honorius, safe amidst the morasses of Ravenna, to send succor to the sorely pressed people of Rome. For the life of the real emperor was in the hands of his bishop. No emperor ever afterwards resided there. Meantime, in the East the union between Christianity and the imperial government became more thoroughly consolidated. The provisions of the Code of Justinian (528–565) are the best illustration how far this process had been carried; this code being a revised edition, so to speak, of the existing imperial law. It begins with a profession of belief in the Nicene Creed and in the authority of the first four General Councils. It acknowledges the supremacy of the Roman Church, commanding all the churches to be united with her. Justinian legislates, therefore, in this code, for Rome as well as for the East. The theory that the emperor is the religious as well as the civil head of the empire is maintained throughout his legislation. The church officials are as much under his jurisdiction as the civil magistrates. There are no exemptions from the operation of the civil law. The hierarchy in the Church, as in the State, is regulated by the provisions of this code; and the bishop is made an imperial officer for certain temporal affairs. There are also minute regulations in this code concerning the discipline of the monasteries. These provisions in regard to the relations of the Roman Government to Christianity in the sixth century form, of course, but a small portion of the great Code of Justinian; but they seem to show very clearly, either that the hierarchical and sacerdotal pretensions of later ages were not then put forward, or that the imperial government wholly ignored them. Religion and civil law, Church and State, appear in the legislation of Justinian to be practically identified under the common supremacy of the emperor; and church law throughout the world is based on Roman ideas and methods, which were an outgrowth of the theory of the absolute unity of the State.

As far as we can say that the progress of Christianity was henceforth dependent upon human agencies, we may affirm that its special course and direction, so different in the eastern and in the western portions of the empire, was determined by the different relations it held to the government at Constantinople and at Rome.

The strength of Christianity as organized by the emperors of the East was very much wasted in perpetual controversies in regard to the nature of Christ. The Pope was permitted to participate actively in these discussions, which were regarded as matters of the highest State concern. They resulted in rending asunder the Christian organization of the East; and the Oriental sects of the Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites, etc., were not only heretics in religion in the eyes of the authorities at Constantinople, but they were also affected to the imperial government because it did not maintain what they regarded as the orthodox creed. These religious dissensions were, no doubt, a main cause of the increasing weakness of the Byzantine government in its control of the lands forming the basin of the Mediterraneans, and contributed largely to the ease with which they were overrun and subdued by the followers of Mohammed.

In the West, although the church in Rome may be called a Greek missionary church, the curious and subtle meshing of that church with the imperial government was, so to speak, a Greek missionary church, the curious and subtle meshing of that church with the imperial government was, according to its own interests, much to the convenience of the imperial government, which was to its advantage. The church did not maintain what it regarded as the orthodox creed. These religious dissensions were, no doubt, a main cause of the increasing weakness of the Byzantine government in its control of the lands forming the basin of the Mediterranean.
transaction is, that it was intended by the parties to it to divide the government of the world between them. To the new emperor and his successors, kings of the Franks, duly crowned by the Pope, was assigned universal rule in temporal affairs, as also the duty of defending the church, and of maintaining the true or Catholic faith throughout the world. To the Pope was given not only a supreme dominion in matters ecclesiastical, but a certain great but undefined power in civil affairs. It was supposed, that, under this dual system, no collision between the Christian emperor and the Christian pontiff was possible, each being necessarily moved by the same impulse. This scheme was a strange mixture of the Roman idea of universal dominion and absolute unity of government with St. Augustine's theory, that it was the chief purpose of God in creating man that there should be a visible society on earth, called "the church," by means of which the city of man should become in some sense the city of God.

Under this new or revived Roman Empire the relations of the Popes with the kings of the Franks or of Germany — "Roman Emperors," as they were styled — were maintained during the middle age and up to the time of the Reformation. Practically it was a great failure; because it was found impossible for the parties to it to agree upon what special powers were reserved by it to the emperor, and what belonged to the Pope. Disputes on this subject were kept alive during the reigns of the kings of Germany of the three dynasties, the Saxon, the Franconian, and the Hohenstauffen, founded upon claims made by them by virtue of their office as emperors, as opposed to those of the Popes; and yet the system of the Holy Roman Empire, unsuited as it proved itself to be to the feudal society which had succeeded the imperial system of Charlemagne, was maintained legally and nominally in the public law of Europe until long after the Reformation. It held its place notwithstanding the long quarrel of "the Investitures," in which the real question at issue was whether the Pope or the emperor should control the bishops (that is by far the largest landholders in Europe) by conferring upon them with their office the estates belonging to their sees. Even the humiliating scene of the world's titular master, Henry IV., imploring in abject penitence the forgiveness of the Pope, Gregory VII., because he had previously disavowed the Pope's authority, did not disabuse men's minds of the belief that a Roman empire with an emperor and a pope at its head was part of the eternal order. Nor did the haughty sacerdotal pretensions of the popes during the middle age; nor the enforced payment of tribute to the court of Rome; nor the constant interference of the popes in the internal government of states within the empire, such as wars of succession and the like; nor even the purely secular ambition which led many of the popes to maintain their pretensions in Italy as against the emperor by all the weapons of the spiritual armory, and which in the end forced the emperors to abandon Italy, — none of these things seemed to interrupt the legality of the relations at least which had been established between the popes and Charlemagne and Otho the Great.

But the Reformation destroyed in the end this strange medieval creation. More than half of Germany was Protestant in 1648, when the Peace of Westphalia closed the wars of religion by providing for the direct sovereignty of the different princes, and abolishing that of the emperor, and granting "equal and exact" toleration to Catholics and Protestants. This really made the former empire a federation; for its affairs were ruled by a diet representing the different states, and it was inconceivable that an empire in the medieval sense could exist where the jurisdiction of the Pope was disavowed. Still, the lawyers in Germany cling obstinately to the old forms of the Roman law; and when a vacancy occurred the elections were held, and the Roman emperor duly installed in the Römer Saal at Frankfort. This mockery was kept up until 1806, when Napoleon, having become Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, and refusing to recognize any longer the existence of the Holy Roman Empire, Francis II., then emperor, voluntarily gave up the title, and took that of "Emperor of Austria;" and thus the Holy Roman Empire came to an end a thousand and six years after the coronation of Charlemagne, and eighteen hundred and fifty-eight years after Caesar had conquered at Pharsalia.


ROMANCE BIBLE VERSIONS. See Bible Versions.

ROMANS, Epistle to the. See Paul.

Romanus ascended the papal throne in 897, after the assassination of Stephen VII., but reigned only four months. See Jaffé: Regesta Pont. Rom., p. 303.

Rome has been more closely interwoven with the history of the civilization of the human race than any other city on the globe. In affairs single point other cities may excel it. It has no Gothis, and it has no Acropolis; but all the single threads of ancient history were gathered in Rome, and from Rome issued all the single threads of modern history.

More especially Rome may be said to have been the centre of the history of the Christian Church. From the third to the sixteenth century it was, in spite of the schism of the Eastern Church, and in spite of a never fully suppressed opposition in the Western, the pivot on which the Christian Church rested; and from the Reformation down to the civil questions of the moment, it was the head of the largest section of the Christian Church. It owes this its prominent position in the Christian world to the circumstance of its being the residence of the popes. It was the pope who with great courage and tact, and sometimes, also, with great sacrifices, saved the city from utter destruction by the hands of the Barbarians; and it was a simple and natural consequence of the course which events took, that in time it became not only the residence, but the possession, of the popes. By degrees, however, as
the papal idea of transforming Christianity into a kind of Thibetan Lamaism developed, imperial Rome, with its temples, palaces, theatres, and baths, disappeared, and on its ruins, and from its materials, papal Rome was constructed, with its churches and monasteries. The connection between the two cities was maintained as intimate as that between body and soul: nevertheless, it must not be overlooked, that the city actually sank lowest at the very moment when the Papacy rose highest. When the popes removed to Avignon, Rome was nothing more than a number of short stretches of grass, bushwood, and ruins, in which the robbers lay in ambush for the pilgrims who wandered from church to church, or from monastery to monastery; and it was not so much the return of the popes as the revival of letters which this time saved the city, and once more made it the centre of civilization. During the whole period of the Renaissance, Rome was indeed the true hearth of science and art, of learning and taste, until in the eighteenth century it met with a rival, which finally outshone it, namely, Paris. In the middle of the nineteenth century the city again changed character. It became a political centre, and, after some convulsions, the capital of the kingdom of Italy; and by degrees, as royal Rome unfolds itself with its schools, factories, hotels, and commodious citizens' dwellings, papal Rome is pressed into the shade, and becomes a memory.

On Sept. 16, 1870, the French troops were withdrawn from Civita Vecchia; and on Sept. 20, Rome surrendered to the king of Italy, after a short resistance by the papal mercenaries. A proclamation loudly that he was kept a prisoner in the Vatican. But his protestshad no effect, and his complaints found no sympathy. The syllabus of errors condemned by the Pope to live in the Vatican as a sovereign, not subject to the laws of the land, and granting him an annual appanage of 3,225,000 livres. The Pope protested against all these proceedings, excommunicated every one who had taken part in the establishment of the kingdom of Italy, refused to accept the appanage granted, and complained loudly that he was kept a prisoner in the Vatican. But his protests had no effect, and his complaints found no sympathy. The syllabus and the decrees of the Vatican Council proved utterly unable to prevent the floods of modern civilization from pushing their waves against the very walls of the Vatican. A new police-force, a new board of health, a better illumination of the streets, a new press-law, a new school-law, etc., transformed the city in an incredibly short time, as if it had been touched with a magic wand. Out of a population of between 200,000 and 300,000 inhabitants, there were 14,389 pupils in 1873 in the new elementary schools established under the control of the State. In the same year the new Protestant Church of St. Paul-within-the-Walls was dedicated, and the first female seminary was opened. There are now about twelve Protestant congregations and chapels in the city, representing the leading denominations, but mostly supported by English and American friends.

In spite of these changes, and many others of the same tendency, Rome has not as yet lost its character of being a pre-eminently ecclesiastical city. Of its hundred and sixty churches and other conventual institutions, some have been suppressed by the Italian Government, and their buildings employed for other purposes. But its three hundred and sixty churches are still standing; and they are by no means deserted, or in any way bereft of their splendors. Besides the churches of St. Peter, St. John Lateran, and St. Maria Rotonda (Pantheon), which are separately spoken of in this work, we may mention the Church of St. Paul, situated outside the city, on the road to Ostia, and on the spot, where, according to tradition, the apostle suffered martyrdom. The original building was one of the oldest and most magnificent churches in Rome, but was burned down on July 17, 1823. The falling roof, which was of wood, completely spoiled the columns and walls, with their costly mosaics and pictures. The new building, however, for whose construction the viceroy of Egypt presented the Pope with several shiploads of the finest alabaster, is a grand and no less magnificent structure. The Church of Sta. Maria Maggiore, situated on the Esquiline Hill, is one of the five patriarchal churches of Rome. It was built by Pope Liberius (352-366), and is probably the oldest Mary-church in Christendom. It is a basilica; and its flat wooden ceiling, excellently carved, and profusely gilded, is supported by forty-two magnificent columns. From the balcony on its front the Pope blesses the multitude on Aug. 15, the feast of the Assumption of Mary. The Church of St. Laurentius, situated outside the gate of the Tiburtine Road, was originally built by Constantine the Great, and consists really of two structures, connected with each other by a chapel over the tomb of the saint. The Church of St. Peter in Montorio, situated in the Trastevere, was built by Ferdiand and Isabel, 1871. Salvin, the Pope, according to tradition, St. Peter suffered martyrdom. The Church of Sta. Maria in Araceli, situated on the Capitoline Hill, was built before the tenth century, and occupies the site of the ancient temple of Juno Moneta. It is, however, not so much the great number of churches in Rome which give the city its specifically ecclesiastical character as the life which is developed in the churches, and which, so to speak, is continued in the streets and in the houses.


Ronsdorf Sect. See Eller.

RooD is the Anglo-Saxon word for "cross," crucifix."
ROOS, Magnus Friedrich, b. at Sulz-on-the-Neckar, Sept. 6, 1727; d. at Anhausen, March 19, 1803. He studied theology at Tubingen, and was appointed vicar in Stuttgart 1755, diakonatus at Goppingen 1757, and at Bebenhausen 1757, and prior of Anhausen 1784. A pupil of Bengel, and inclining towards pietism, he exercised a great influence, not only by his writings, but also by his powerful and impressive personality. His principal works are, Einleitung in die biblischen Geschichten, 1774 (last edition, 1876); Christliche Glaubenslehre, a popular representation of the system of Christian doctrines, 1786 (last edition, 1880); Christliches Haushbuch, Kreuzschule, 1799 (last edition, 1864); Soldatengespräche, Etwas für Seefahrer, etc.

H. BECK.

ROSA OF LIMA, the principal saint of Peru; b. at Lima in 1586; d. there in 1617, in consequence of the ascetic practices she performed in imitation of Catharine of Siena. She was canonized in 1671. See Act. Sanct., Aug. 26.

ROSA OF VITERBO, d. in her native city of Viterbo in 1252, about eighteen years old; preached repentance in the streets with the cross in her hand. See Act. Sanct., Sept. 4.

ROSALIA, St., the principal saint of Sicily, lived in the twelfth century as a hermit on Mount Quisisina, where her remains were found in a cave in 1624. She died between 1160 and 1180. See Act. Sanct., Sept. 4.

ROSS, John, d. at London, May 14, 1520; b. at London, May 14, 1520; d. at London, May 14, 1520; b. at London, May 14, 1520. In 1552 he was appointed vicar in Southampton, and in 1553 he was sent to the Spanish embassy in Paris, where he was imprisoned for his views of the unity in the Trinity. He was canonized at the order of Paul III., in 1553. See Act. Sanct., Aug. 26.

ROSELIN, or RUCCELIN, ROCELIN, or RUCCELIN, often spoken of in the history of Christian doctrines as trinitist, and in the history of philosophy as nominalist, but nevertheless very imperfectly known. He seems to have been born in the diocese of Soissons, and to have been educated at Rheims. He was a canon at Compiègne, where his peculiar conception of the Trinity first startled his pupils, and attracted public attention. In harmony with his philosophic nominalism, he could conceive of God as existing only under the form of an individual, and consequently the Trinity became to him three gods. One of his pupils, Johannes, afterwards cardinal-bishop of Fusco, addressed himself to Anselm, at that time abbot of Bec; and Anselm answered, promising to write a complete refutation. (See BALZIUS: Miscell., iv. p. 478, and Ep. Anselm., ii. 35.) A synod was convened at Soissons in 1092; and as Roscelin used to quote both Lanfranc and Anselm in favor of his views, the latter sent an exposition of his ideas to the synod, and Roscelin was compelled to recant. Anselm then finished his De fide trinitatis, which is a refutation of Roscelin; and the latter, as he, in spite of his recantation, continued to teach his old views, was deposed. He went to England, and attacked Anselm, now archbishop of Canterbury, for his views of the unity in the Trinity. A controversy had just sprung up between the archbishop and the king; but, as they shortly after were reconciled, Roscelin's attack had no effect, and he left England. (See ROSCELIN: Epist., p. 187.) He settled at Tours; and, shortly after, his controversy with Abelard began. Abelard had been his pupil; but, in his book De trinitate (afterwards called Introductio in theologiam), Abelard, evidently with an eye to the decisions of the synod of Soissons, very strongly emphasized the unity in the Trinity. Roscelin denounced him to Gisbert, bishop of Paris, for other heresies, and Abelard answered with a violent attack on Roscelin. (See ABEILDA: Ep. xxi.) But from that time the latter disappears from history. See the several works on the history of philosophy by RITTER, PRANTL and HAUREAU; Histoire littéraire de la France, ix. p. 358; J. SCHWANE: Die Dogmengesch. d. mittleren Zeit (757-1517), Freih.-im-B., 1892, pp. 18, 152, 245 sqq.

LANDERER. (HAUCK.)


ROSE, Henry John, Church of England; b. at Uckfield, 1801; d. at Bedford, Jan. 31, 1873. He was graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, 1821; fellow, 1824; Hulsean lecturer, 1833 ("The Law of Moses viewed in connection with the History and Character of the Jews"); rector of Houghton Conquest, Bedfordshire, 1857; archdeacon of Bedford, 1886. He edited the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana (London, 1817-45, 2d ed. of part, 1849-58) from 1839, from which he reprinted, with additions, his History of the Christian Church from 1700 to 1858, 1858. He also edited the first volume of the New Biographical Dictionary (1839-47, 12 vols.), wrote in part the comments upon Daniel for the Biblië (Speaker's) Commentary (London and New York, 1870), and was a member of the English Old Testament company of revisers.

ROSE, Hugh James, brother of the preceding; b. at Uckfield, 1795; d. in Florence, Italy, Dec. 22, 1838. He was graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1817; vicar of Horsham, 1822-30; prebendary of Chichester, 1827-38; Christian advocate in the university of Cambridge, 1829-33;
Johann Adam Rabe of Erlangen; gave up his trade, and wandered through Germany, from Tübingen to Hamburg, 1703-06, preaching, and holding prayer-meetings, but generally persecuted by the clergy and the police. From Germany he went to Holland, and there the track of him has become lost. He published Glaubens-Bekenntniss, preaching, but generally persecuted by the clergy and the police. From Germany he went to Holland, and there the track of him has become lost. He published Glaubens-Bekenntniss, 1708, Wunder-Bekährung, 1704, Wunder-Führung Gottes, etc.

ROSENBAU., Johann Georg, a native of Heilbronn, a spar-maker by trade; was seized with religious enthusiasm by the readings of Johann Adam Rabe of Erlangen; gave up his trade, and wandered through Germany, from Tübingen to Hamburg, 1703-06, preaching, and holding prayer-meetings, but generally persecuted by the clergy and the police. From Germany he went to Holland, and there the track of him has become lost. He published Glaubens-Bekenntniss, 1708, Wunder-Bekährung, 1704, Wunder-Führung Gottes, etc.

ROSENMÜLLER, Ernst Friedrich Karl, b. at Hossberg, near Hildburghausen, Dec. 10, 1798; d. at Leipzig, Sept. 17, 1858. He studied Oriental languages and archaeology at Königsberg, Gießen, and Leipzig, and was in 1796 made professor at the last-mentioned university. For the study of the Arabic language and literature, his Institutiones ad fund. ling. Arab. (Leip., 1815) and Analecta Arabica (Leip., 1824-37, 5 vols.) were of great importance; and his linguistic and archaeological explanations of the Old Testament, Scholia in V. T. (Leip., 1788-1817, 16 vols., abridged into 5 vols., Leip., 1828-35), Handbuch für bibl. Kritik und Exegete (Göttingen, 1797-1800, 4 vols.), and Handb. d. bibl. Alterthumskunde (Leip., 1823-31, 4 vols.). ALRECHT VOGEL.

ROSICRUCIANS. In 1614 there appeared at Cassel an anonymous pamphlet under the title Fama Fraternitatis des lüchten Ordeins des Rosenkreuzes. It gave a full report of the foundation of the secret society of the Rosicrucians two hundred years before, and an elaborate account of the life of the founder, Christian Rosenkreutz. He was a German by birth, of a distinguished family, and made as a monk a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Having studied physics and mathematics among the Arabs, and mastered the whole science of magic, he returned to Germany, and founded the order. The members, who were in the possession of all the deepest secrets of science, and absolutely exempted from sickness or suffering, should devote themselves to the curing and nursing of the sick; but they should wear no peculiar dress, and the existence of the society should be kept a secret for a hundred years. The rebuilding of a house, the book goes on, divulged the secret to the world; and people are now in the second century. In 1615 appeared Confession oder Bekanntsache der Societat und Bruderschaft R. C., and in 1616 Chymische Hochzeit Christian Rosenkreutz. The sensation which these publications produced was immense; and vehement controversies arose, both among theologians and physicians. Andreas Libavius protested that the whole purpose of the society was to destroy the authority of Galen, and put Theophrastus Paracelsus in his place. Others — as, for instance, the English alchemist, Robert Fludd, and the body-physician of the Emperor Rudolph II., Michael Maier — defended the society with enthusiasm. Various mystic philosophers and theologians, as also the Jesuits, tried to take advantage of the movement; while others saw in it a perfidious attempt against Lutheranism. Singularly enough, it proved absolutely impossible to discover the least trace of the actual existence of the original society. New societies appropriated the name, but the old seemed entirely to have disappeared. People began to consider the whole affair as a mystification; and it has been established with tolerable certainty, that the author of the Fama was Johann Valentin Andreae, the noted Wurttemberg theologian.

LIT. — Missiv an die hocherleuchtete Bruderschaft, etc., Leipzig, 1788, giving a survey over the whole literature of the subject from 1614 to 1783; CHR. VON MURN: Uber den wahren Ursprung der Rosenkreutzer, Sulzbach, 1808; G. E. GUHR AUER: Kritische Bemerkungen über den Verfasser der Fama Fraternitatis, in Niedner's Zeitschrift für historie Theologie, 1852; [HARGRAVE JENNINGS: The Rosicrucians, their Rites and Mysteries, London, 1870, 2d ed., 1879.]

ROSWITHA lived in the latter part of the tenth century as nun in Gandersheim, and wrote, at the instance of her abbess (Gerberga, 959-1001, a daughter of Duke Henry of Bavaria), an epic in praise of Otho I. (Hrotsitha carmen de genis Oddonis I. imperatoris), and another on the history of her monastery (De primordiis coenobii Gandersheimensis). She became still more famous by her comedies, written after the model of Terence, and for the purpose of weaning people from reading the slippery but charming plays of that writer. Her collected works were edited by K. A. Barack, Nuremberg, 1868. Her two epics have not come down to us complete, but have some value as historical sources. German trans. by THOMAS G. PFUND, in Geschichtsschreibern d. Deutsch. Vorzeit, vol. 5.

ROTHE. See CURIA.

ROTHE, Richard, b. at Posen, Jan. 28, 1799; d. at Heidelberg, Aug. 20, 1867. He was educated at Breslau, the headquarters of the opposition to Napoleon; but he nevertheless began his theological studies in 1817 at Heidelberg, “the Prussian temper being repugnant to him.” In 1819 he went to Berlin, but neither Schleiermacher nor Neander made any great impression on him. By Baron von Kottwitz he was introduced to the Berlin circle of Pietists; and that influence continued predominant with him, even during his stay at Wittenberg (1820-22), where he finished his studies. He was also intimate associated with Tholuck. In 1823 he was appointed chaplain to the Prussian embassy in Rome. There he became intimate with Chevalier de Bun, and the somewhat narrow bounds of his doctrine began to give way to the free development of his own speculative genius. In 1828 he returned to Wittenberg as director of the theological seminary. He lectured chiefly on church history, and his lectures have been published by Weingarten.
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Wittenberg, 1875—76, 2 vols.); but he was thirty-eight years old when he published his first independent work, a commentary on Rom. v. 12—21 (Wittenberg, 1837), a masterpiece of acute and penetrating exegesis. In 1856 he was made professor of theology at Heidelberg; and there he spent the rest of his life, with the exception of a short period (1849—54), during which he lectured at Bonn. At Heidelberg he lived in a quiet and almost retired fashion; though he took an active, and at times even a decisive, part in the development of the somewhat entangled church affairs of Baden, and though he exercised a profound and wide-spread influence, both as professor and as author. Personally he was distinguished by purity, simplicity, and modesty, and by the completeness and perfect harmony of his character; no element, moral, intellectual, or aesthetic, was lacking; and none was unduly developed. His authorship bears the same stamp. No Christian idea, no phase of Christian life, is forgotten in the theological system he elaborated; and none is made a party question. His two principal works are, Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Ver- fassung (1837), and Theologiiche Ethik (1845—48, 3 vols., 2d ed., thoroughly revised, 1867—72, in 5 vols.). They supplement one another. The first is based on the idea that the Church is destined to be wholly absorbed by the State as soon as it has reached its merely pedagogical goal,—to make religion penetrate into every fibre of human life; the second, on the idea that religion and morals are absolutely identical, so that no Christian dogma is fully realized until it finds its way out in human action, and no act of man is really moral, unless illumined from within by the light of the Christian dogma. The development of these ideas is often very bold, and sometimes a little singular; but through the whole wafts the spirit of true Christian humility and love. The following noble confession of his humble belief is worth quoting: "The ground of all my thinking, I can truly say, is the simple faith of Christians, independent of dogma, or any system of theology, which for 1800 years has overcome the world. It is my last certitude to oppose constantly and determinedly every other pretended knowledge which asserts itself against this faith. I know no other firm ground on which I could anchor my whole being, and particularly my speculations, except that historical phenomenon, Jesus Christ. He is to me the unimpeachable Holy of Holies of Humanity, the highest Being known to man, and a sun-rising in history whose light by which we see the world" (1st ed. Ethik, pref., p. xvi.). His Ethik is the greatest work of German speculative theology next to Schleiermacher's Der Christliche Glaube. Next in importance is his Zur Dogmatik, 1863, and his lectures on Dogmatik, imperfectly edited from his manuscripts by Schenkel, Heidelberg, 1870, 2 vols. Roth also published some sermons and minor treatises. His sermon on Peter the Carthusian in an English translation, Edinburgh, 1877. His life was written by Nippold, Wittenb., 1873—75, 2 vols.

ROUMANIA comprises 4,595,219 inhabitants belonging to the Greek Church, 115,420 to the Church of Rome, 8,908 to the Armenian Church, and 7,790 to the Evangelical Church, also 401,051 Jews, and 25,033 Mohammedans. The Greek Church is the State Church, organized on strictly hierarchical principles. The higher clergy, from the archbishops of Bucharest and Jassy to the protopopes, are paid by the State. The lower clergy and the priests, who are called menenivice, perform the ceremonies, or support themselves by agriculture. They are educated in eight State seminaries; but nothing more is demanded from them than reading the formularies, and performing the ceremonies. Evangelical congregations have been formed in Jassy, Bucharest, Galatz, etc., in connection with, and under the protection of, the Prussian State Church. J. Samuelson: Roumania, Past and Present, London, 1882. G. Dörschlag.

ROUS, Francis, b. at Halton, Cornwall, 1579; d. 1658; was educated at Oxford; member of Parliament during the reign of Charles I., and provost of Eton, 1643. He published various theological and other works, which were collected in a folio volume, 1657. His Psalms translated into English Metre were recommended by the House of Commons to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, Nov. 20, 1643, and published 1646. As revised by its appointment, then in Scotland by J. Adams's Ethik (1840—41), and F. R. N. in 1866, it was "allowed by the authority of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and appointed to be sung in congregations and families" (1849), and has ever since been so used. It is a curious fact, that what was for a century the entire, and is still the main, metrical provision of the Scottish Church, was made mainly by one whose whole life was spent in Southern England. In the Reformed and United Presbyterian communions it is even now regarded as the only legitimate vehicle for God's praise in song; the argument being that the Book of Psalms is "a complete manual of praise," and has alone "the seal of divine appointment;" "that there is no warrant for making or using any other hymns in the worship of God;" and that this version is "more plain, smooth, and agreeable to the text than any heretofore." (See The True Psalmody, Philadelphia, 1838, reprinted at Belfast, 1861—67.) Critics have usually regarded it as beneath contempt; and readers for whom it has no charm of association find it, with rare exceptions (eminently Ps. xiii.), rough, dry, tasteless, and profitless to the last degree. Yet Rufus Choate said, "An uncommon pith and gnarled vigor of sentiment lie in that old version: I prefer it to Watts's." And Sir Walter Scott found it, "though homely, plain, forcible, and intelligible, and very often possessing a rude sort of majesty, which perhaps would be ill exchanged for mere elegance." F. M. Bird.

ROUSSEAU, Jean Jacques, b. at Geneva, June 28, 1712; d. at Ermenonville, near Paris, June 3, 1778. He grew up in an unhappy home. His mother died at his birth. His father, a watchmaker by trade, was a fool; and the son passed his time in idleness, reading romances. But there were powers in him which early showed themselves. When only three years of age, Plutarch filled his soul with enthusiasm. Apprenticed to an engraver on copper, he was ill treated, and found no better consolation than idle day-dreams in the woods. At last he ran away. He sought refuge with a Roman-Catholic priest in Conflagnon, in the neighborhood of Geneva; and the priest brought him to Madame de Warne
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at Annecy, a recent convert to Romanism, and a lady of disgusting immorality covered over with a thin film of external respectability. By them he was placed in a monastery in Turin, where he was converted to Calvinism and Cartesianism, and then let loose. Sixteen years old, he became valet in one house, where he stole, and then in another, whence he was dismissed for laziness. He returned to Madame de Warens, and was placed in a seminary, where he learned some music, and then for many years he was cast about in a rather adventurous manner, chiefly living as the lover of Madame de Warens. But at the same time he studied mathematics, Latin, music, etc. He read Locke, Leibnitz, Malebranche, Descartes, etc.; and when in his twenty-ninth year, in 1741, he found himself superseded by somebody else in the service of Madame de Warens, and went to Paris, he was not altogether unprepared for a literary career.

In Paris he formed a connection with Thérèse Levasseur, a bar-maid from Orléans, a woman who never could learn the names of the months, nor distinguish between the common coins. He afterwards married the rich, but not the beautiful, wife; but the five children she had borne to him he carried to the foundling-hospital. He made his living by copying music,— he also wrote two operas (Les Muses galantes, 1742, and Le devin de village, 1752) which were successfully brought on the stage, and some letters on French music, which, though they gave much offence, have some critical value,— and he continued the business even after he had become a famous author. He did so as a speculation, and the speculation succeeded. Everybody wanted to see him, and to have some music copied by him; and high persons did not fail to leave some golden present in the hands of Madame Levasseur. In 1750 he published his first essay, Le progrès des sciences et des arts, a-t-il contribué à corrompre ou à épurer les maux, by which he won the prize of the academy of Dijon. Concerning the principles, the fundamental relation between nature and civilization, he was in utter confusion; but the passion with which he threw himself on the side of nature, the vigor of his argumentation, the keenness of his observations, and the inexhaustible wealth of his eloquence, made his book irresistible, and the more so because it struck a latent but powerful current of sympathy in the public. For a century, people's knowledge of nature had been increasing almost day by day; for a century the artificiality of society had been growing almost beyond endurance: hence the success of Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, of Thomson's The Seasons, of Gessner's Idyllen, etc.; and hence the success of Rousseau. In 1753 followed his Discours sur l'origine et les fondemens de l'inégalité parmi les hommes, which set another shrill string vibrating,— the difference between rich and poor; and shortly after he returned to Geneva, re-entered the reformed Church, and recovered his lost citizenship.

In 1760 appeared La nouvelle Héloïse, and in 1762, Le contrat social, and Emile,— the three principal works of Rousseau. In the history of fiction La nouvelle Héloïse denotes a turning-point. It is the dawn of the romantic school: it inaugurates a new kind of characters, of which the unspoiled child of nature, "the beautiful soul" Julie, is the chief type. If Le contrat social and Emile, which followed rapidly one upon the other, are put in relation to each other, and considered under one view, they form an in-contradiction. In Emile, the State, the Church, every institution the history of the race has developed, is sacrificed in order to produce the perfect man such as nature meant him to be: in Le contrat social, every element of true humanity, even religious freedom, is sacrificed in order to produce the perfect citizen such as the State demands him. But each by itself exercised a tremendous influence. Le contrat social, with its false premise, that the State rests upon a contract between the ruler and the ruled, became one of the watchwords of the French Revolution, and made all the thrones of Europe tremble. Still deeper and more immediate was the effect of Emile, ou de l'Education. The education it advocates culminates in desir. Of a divine revelation, of Christianity, the author knows nothing; but the opposition which he offers to the surrounding atheism and materialism is vigorous; the consciousness with which he advocates a religion more immediate and personal, and the most fundamental truths — the existence of God, the freedom of the will, and the immortality of the soul — is impressive; and the system of education which he places over against the training in use, with its dead scholasticism and merely mechanical methods, denotes a decisive progress. The book was burned, however, both in Paris and Geneva.

As his genius developed, his character broke down. The sensitiveness which formed part of Rousseau's nature grew into a disease, and the vanity and suspicion which necessarily resulted from the unprincipled life he led made it at last impossible for him to converse in a free and noble way with his fellows. He was seized by melancholy and misanthropy. He fancied that he was the victim of a widespread conspiracy. He left Geneva in 1756, driven away by Voltaire, who had settled at Ferney, and who hated him cordially. He went back to Paris, and lived for six years in the solitudes of Montmorency. But in 1762 the Parliament of Paris condemned Emile as a "godless" book, and an order of arrest was issued against the author. Rousseau fled, he did not know exactly whither. On an invitation from Hume, he went to England; but he soon fancied he had found out that Hume was one of his worst enemies. In 1767 he returned to Paris, not sane any more. He died very suddenly, suspected of having taken poison. But, in spite of the mental disturbances from which he suffered, he wrote in the last years of his life his Confessions, — one of his most brilliant achievements. It involuntarily reminds the reader of Augustine's Confessions, though there is one very striking difference. Rousseau is as candid as Augustine in acknowledging his faults, and confessing his shortcomings; he does not spare himself; he goes into the most disgusting details; but his candor does not make the same impression of truth and uprightness that Augustine's does. Somehow his confessions of faults and crimes always end in a kind of self-glorification. To the last years of his life belongs also a treatise on the origin of religion, which was found in 1858. When com-
ROWLANDS, Daniel, a powerful Welsh preacher; was b. at Pant-y-beudy, near Llanegitho, Wales, about 1718; d. at Llanegitho, Oct. 16, 1790. Of his youth and early manhood nothing is known, except that he studied at the grammar-school of Hereford. Orained at London, 1788, he would have moved to America, but hearing of his brother at Llanegitho, holding that position till his brother's death, 1760. The Bishop of St. Davids refused to induct him into the office of rector, but inducted his son in his stead. In 1763 the bishop revoked his licensure on account of his "irregularities." Thus was lost to the Church of England one of the most powerful preachers of the century. Lady Huntingdon, a good judge, spoke of him as having no superior in the pulpit, except Whitefield; and Bishop Ryle calls him "one of the spiritual giants of the last century." He preached to immense audiences in the church and in the fields. Once in his history a revival began with his reading of the Litany of the Church of England. At the words, "By thine agony and bloody sweat, good Lord, deliver us," the congregation began to weep loudly. Eight of Rowland's Sermons were translated into English in 1774. See the Biographies by John Owen (London, 1840) and E. Morgan; and Ryle: Christian Leaders of the Last Century, London, 1889.

ROYAARDS, Hermann Jan, b. at Utrecht, Oct. 3, 1794; d. there Jan. 2, 1854. He studied theology in his native city, and was appointed professor in 1823. He devoted himself chiefly to church history and canon law; and his works, Geschiedenis van het Christentum in Nederland (Utrecht, 1849-53, 2 vols.) and Hedendaags kerk-regten in Nederland (Utrecht, 1834-37, 2 vols.), exercised considerable influence on the study of those departments.

RUBRICS (Latin rubrica, from ruber, "red," because they were originally written in red ink) are in the ecclesiastical sense the directions in service-books which show how the various parts of the Liturgy should be performed. It is no longer customary to print or write them in red ink, but such directions are distinguished by different type from the body of the text. The word was borrowed by the church from the law, in which it was applied to the titles or headings of chapters in certain law-books.

RUCHAT, Abraham, b. at Grandcour in the canton of Vaud, Sept. 15, 1708; d. at Lausanne, Sept. 29, 1760. He studied at Bern, Berlin, and Leyden, and was appointed professor of belles-lettres in 1721, and of theology in 1738, at Lausanne. His fame rests upon his excellent Abrégé de l'histoire ecclesiastique, du Pays-de-Vaud (1707) and Histoire de la réform. de la Suisse (1727-38, 6 vols.)

The seventh volume was not printed until a hundred years later, in the edition by Vulliemin, 1835, which contains Ruchat's biography and a complete list of his writings.

RÜCKERT, Leopold Immanuel, b. at Gross-Hennersdorf, near Herrnhut, in Upper Lusatia, 1777; d. at Jena, April 8, 1810. He was, like Schleiermacher, a pupil of Jakob Michael Mohr, and entered the school of Niesky, and studied theology and philosophy at Leipzig. In 1825 he was appointed teacher at the gymnasium of Zittau, and in 1844 professor of theology at Jena. From early youth the great goal of his life was to become a uni-
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Lutheranism against the Prussian union of the two confessions. He also left an unfinished autobiography. G. FRANK.

RUDELBACH, Andreas Gottlob, b. in Copen- hagen, Sept. 29, 1792; d. at Slagelse, in the Danish Island of Seeland, March 3, 1862. He studied theology at the university of his native city, and in 1825 appointed superintendent at Glauchau-in-Saxony; which position he resigned in 1845. From 1846 to 1849 he lectured in the university of Copenhagen, and in 1848 he was appointed pastor at Slagelse. His literary activity was chiefly in German. Besides several collections of sermons and devotional tracts, he published Hieronymus Savonarola, Hamburg, 1835; Reformation, Lutheranism, and Union (his principal work), Leipzig, 1839; Einleitung in die Augsburgische Konfession, Leipzig, 1841; Über die Bedeutung des apostolischen Symbolums, Leipzig, 1844. Together with Guerzke he founded in 1889 the Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche, which he continued to edit till his death. He was one of the most prominent champions of strict Lutheranism against the Prussian union of the two confessions. He also left an unfinished autobiography. G. FRANK.

RUEDINGER (RUDIGER), Esrom, b. at Bam- berg, May 19, 1828; d. at Nuremberg, Dec. 2, 1861. He studied at Leipzig, and was appointed rector of the gymnasium of Zwickau in 1849, and professor at Wittenberg in 1855. But in 1854 he was compelled to leave Wittenberg; it having become known that he rejected the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and otherwise deviated from Lutheran orthodoxy. He fled to Berlin, and finally settled at Nuremberg, where his heterodox teachings were not given any offence. He was a prolific writer. His most interesting works are Libri psalmorum paraphrasis Latina, De origine ubiquisitatis, etc. HERZOG.

RUET, Francisco de Paula, b. in Barcelona, Oct. 29, 1828; d. in Madrid, Nov. 18, 1878; one of the most prominent growth of the Waldenses. In 1855 he returned to Spain, and began to preach in Barcelona. Repeatedly thrown into the most prominent controversies of the time, he was excommunicated by the Waldensian authority; but finally he was summoned before the ecclesiastical court, convicted of heresy, and condemned to death at the stake, which punishment was commuted into exile for life. He went to Gibraltar, and formed an evangelical congregation there. Afterwards he preached, also, with great success, to his countrymen in Algeria; and after the revolution of 1868 he was able to open a chapel in Madrid, and celebrate evangelical service in the very capital. FRITZ FLEIDNER.

RUFinus, Tyrannius (Turranius, Toranus), b. in Turin, Sept. 29, 1792; d. at Aquileja; entered the monastery of his native city, where he became acquainted with Jerome, and received baptism in 376 or 377. In the following year he went to Egypt, where he lived for six years, and visited the most famous hermits of the Nitrian mountains and the deserts. In 379 or 380 he went to Jerusalem, and built his cell on the Mount of Olives. Though leading a life of severe asceticism, he was a man of means, and entertained friendly relations both with Melania, who had founded a monastery in Jerusalem, and Jerome, who lived at Bethlehem. The Origenist controversy, however, brought him into conflict with Jerome. They were reconciled; but when Rufinus, after his return to Rome in 387, began to translate the works of Origen into Latin, the estrangement was renewed. The latter part of his life Rufinus spent in his native city. He died in Sicily in 410, flying before the hordes of Alaric.

His principal importance Rufinus has as interpreter of Greek theology. He translated many of Origen's exegetical works, and we owe to him our knowledge of the important work, De principiis. He also translated the church history of Eusebius (leaving out the tenth book, and adding two books of his own, thus carrying the narrative down to the death of Theodosius the Great), the Recognitions Clementis, the Instituta Monachorum of Basil, the Sententiae of Sixtus, an unknown Pagan philosopher, whom he mistook for the Roman bishop and martyr, Sixtus (Xystus). Whether he wrote the famous Hist. Monachorum sive de vitis patrum, or whether he simply translated it from a Greek original, is doubtful: the latter, however, seems the more probable. Finally, he wrote an Expositio Symbols Apostolicus, of historical rather than doctrinal interest, and two books, De benedictionibus duodecim patriarcharum. Collected editions of his works have been given out by De la Barre (Paris, 1580), Vallarsi (Verona, 1775), and Migne: Pat. Lat., xxxi.


RUINART, Thierry, b. at Rheims, June 10, 1657; d. in the monastery of Hautvillers, in the vicin- 2079

RUINART. ty of his native city, Sept. 27, 1709. In 1674 he entered the Congregation of St. Maur, and in 1682 he settled at St. Germain-des-Prés as the pupil, and soon as the friend and co-worker, of Mabillon. His first great work was the Acta primorum Mar- tyrum, Paris, 1689 (2d ed., Amsterdam, 1713; 3d, with his biography, Verona, 1781); then followed his Historia perfida: the mi- lar authority for the history of the African Church), and his excellent edition of the works of Gregory of Tours. Together with Mabillon, he edited the eighth and ninth volumes of the Act.
RULE OF FAITH.
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RUSSEL, Charles William, D.D., Roman-Catholic theologian, and one of the papal domestic chaplains; b. at Killough, County Down, Ireland, in 1802; d. at Maynooth, Feb. 26, 1880. He was educated at Maynooth, where he was chosen professor of humanit in 1825, in 1845 professor of ecclesiastical history, and in 1877 president. Although personally unknown to the leaders of the Oxford movement, he was in correspondence with them; and Dr. Newman says that Dr. Russell had more to do with his conversion to Romanism than anybody else. Dr. Russell joined Wiseman in editing the Dublin Review. He was a member of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1869), and published a translation of Leibnitz's System of Theology (London, 1850), and Life of Cardinal Mazzolani (1858, new ed., 1863). See Cooper: New Biographical Dictionary (Supplement, 1883).

RUSSIA. The vast empire of Russia is about equal in territorial extent to the British Empire, and twice as large as any other country in the world. In 1878 it had an estimated area of 8,500,000 square miles, and a population of 67,000,000 souls. The territory is almost constantly increasing. Its government is an autocracy, there being no constitutional limits to the power of the Tsar.

The prevailing religion of the Russian Empire is the Orthodox Oriental, or Greek Church. More than three-fourths of the entire population belong to it, and it is established by law in the following terms: "The ruling faith in the Russian Empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of belief. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans; so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors." This religious liberty, however, is qualified by the following conditions. No Christian can change his religion for any other than the Russian Church, nor can a non-Christian embrace any other form of Christianity; and any apostasy from the State Church is punished by severe penalties, such as banishment from the empire.

Next to the Christian inhabitants of Russia, the Mohammedans are the most numerous, and their numbers are constantly increasing by territorial extension in Central Asia. They number at present no less than 7,500,000, of whom 2,364,000 are in European Russia, 3,000,000 in Central Asia, 2,000,000 in the Caucasus, 61,000 in Siberia, and 426 in Poland. Their clergy consists of about 20,000 muflis, mollahs, and teachers.

The number of Russian Jews in 1878 was stated to be 1,944,378; in Poland, 815,433; in Germany, 2,364,000 are in European Russia, 3,000,000 in Central Asia, 2,000,000 in the Caucasus, 61,000 in Siberia, and 426 in Poland. Their clergy consists of about 20,000 muflis, mollahs, and teachers.

The number of Russian Jews in 1878 was stated to be 1,944,378; in Poland, 815,433; in Germany, 2,364,000 are in European Russia, 3,000,000 in Central Asia, 2,000,000 in the Caucasus, 61,000 in Siberia, and 426 in Poland. Their clergy consists of about 20,000 muflis, mollahs, and teachers.

Second in point of numbers to the Established Church of the empire, which includes within its pale between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000 souls, come Christians who adhere to the Roman-Catholic Church. Prior to the partition of Poland, this church had no settled organization in the Russian Empire; but since 1818 there has been an ecclesiastical organization, confirmed by a papal bull.
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Out of a total population of 5,210,000 in Russian Poland, no less than 4,507,000 are Roman Catholics, while only 34,135 are Orthodox Russians. Outside of Poland, Russia in Europe had (in 1878) a Roman-Catholic population of 2,898,000; in Caucasus, 28,616; in Siberia, 24,916; in Central Asia, 1,316. The Russian Church has formerly had a large population belonging to the United Greek Church, but nearly all of these have now been reconciled to the Russian Church. The United Armenians number about 33,000.

As the acquisition of Poland added a large Roman-Catholic population to Russia, so the annexation of the Baltic provinces and Finland gave many Lutherans to the empire of the Czar. They enjoy entire liberty of ecclesiastical government, and worship under the superintendence of the minister of the interior, but are not allowed to interfere in any way with the national church. The total number of Lutherans is 2,400,000 in Russia proper, 300,000 in Poland, and 12,000 in Central Asia.

The Reformed Church numbers about 200,000, one-half of whom reside in Lithuania. The Moravians have about 250 chapels, and a membership of 90,000. In 1878 there were about 15,000 Mennonites, but many have since emigrated to the United States. There are also some German Baptist missions.

The Catholics of Etchmiadzin, the head of the ancient Gregorian-Armenian Church, has been since 1826 a subject of Russia. The Armenian Church and its clergy enjoy all the privileges conceded to foreign creeds. The subjects of the catholicos number 38,720 in European Russia, 595,310 in Caucasus, 15 in Siberia, and 1 in Central Asia.

The condition of the State Church demands our careful consideration. Its origin dates back to the tenth century of the Christian era. According to an ancient tradition, the gospel was first preached in Scythia by Andrew the apostle; but no record has been left by which this tradition can be verified. But in the year 988 the Grand Duke Wladimir, with all his court and subjects, received baptism in the river Dnieper. The administration of the newly established church was for a long time in the hands of the Patriarch of Constantinople; but after the conquest of that city by the Turks, 1453, the Grand Duke Theodore applied to the Patriarch of Constantinople for the establishment of a patriarchal see in Moscow. The request was granted, and the patriarchate of Moscow founded in 1588. The most eminent of these Russian patriarchs was Nikon (1652-57), who introduced many reforms into the service-books. These reforms encountered much opposition, and led to the separation of sects, called Starnit, or "Old Believers," which continue to exist to the present day. (See Russian Sects.)

Peter the Great, about the year 1700, effected other changes, the most important of which was the abolition of the patriarchate of Moscow, and the substitution for it of what is called the Holy Governing Synod as the supreme authority, subject only to the will of the Czar. This body consists of twelve members.

The Russian Church is divided into fifty-eight eparchies, or dioceses, each of which is under a bishop. The bishops are of three classes. Those of the first class are called metropolitans, of whom there are but three in Russia, viz., Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg. The second class are called archbishops, and the third are simply bishops. Besides these, there are some vicars, or suffragan bishops, who are assistants. The inferior clergy are divided into the white or secular priests, and into the black clergy, or monks. The number of the secular clergy, including all grades, is estimated at nearly 100,000. In 1878 the number of monks was 10,512, and of nuns, 14,574 in 147 nunneries.

The creed of the Russian Church is that of the ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325), with the additions made to it by the First Council of Constantinople (381). In common with all branches of the Greek Church, the Russians reject the Filioque, and teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, and not from the Father and the Son. They also receive as binding on the consciences all the decrees of seven ecumenical councils (from 325 to 787). This erects a barrier of separation between the Russian Church on the one side, and Protestants on the other.

The Russians acknowledge seven sacraments (or mysteries, as they term them); viz., baptism, chrism, the eucharist, confession, orders, matrimony, and theunction of the sick. As soon as a child is born, the clergyman is sent for to say a prayer over the mother, and give a name to the child; which is usually (but not always) the name of the saint for the day of its birth or baptism. The sacrament of baptism is usually administered in the house; and the child is baptized by trine immersion, dipping it three times into the font. The Russian Church, however, acknowledges the validity of baptism by pouring water, in which respect it differs from the church in Greece. Forty days after the birth of the child, it is brought to the church with its mother, for the purification of the mother, and reception of the child. The sacrament of the holy chrism (or confirmation, as it is called in the West) is administered by priests, with fragrant oils consecrated by the bised priest in the river Dnieper. The administration of the holy Eucharist is called in the Oriental Church the Divine Liturgy. Leavened bread is used, and wine mingled with water; and communion is given in both kinds. The priest receives each element separately; but the other communicants receive the consecrated bread dipped in the wine, administered with a golden spoon. The adult communicants receive the sacraments standing, but even young children and infants are communicanted. It is customary in Russia to receive the communion once a year,—in the season of Lent, immediately before Easter.

Auricular confession and absolution are administered, as in the Catholic Church; but the confessions are somewhat more publicly made in the church,—in the sight, but not the hearing, of others; and the penitents are questioned more generally on the Ten Commandments.

The Russian Church recognizes three orders in
the clergy as of divine appointment, viz., bishops, priests, and deacons; but it has other ecclesiastical grades above and below those, as metropolitan, archbishops, proto-presbyters, archimandrites, proto-deacons, sub-deacons, psalmists, singers, and sextons. Ordinations are administered by bishops only.

Matrimony is attended by great festivity, and some curious and interesting ceremonies, the most important of which is the wearing of a crown by the newly-wedded pair. During the service, two crowns, which are often made of silver or of gold, are held over the heads of the bridegroom and the bride, by friends appointed for that purpose. The crown being a symbol of triumph and joy, this custom is intended to signify the triumph of Christian virtue, and joy at the entrance of a new life. Bishops and monks are forbidden to marry; and marriage is allowed but once to secular priests and deacons before their ordination. The laity are allowed, when deprived by death of their partners, to marry thrice; but fourth marriages are strictly forbidden. It must be added that divorces are not infrequent in Russia.

The service connected with the celebration of the Easter festival, and with the burial of the dead, are quite interesting and peculiar. Peter the Great was the first to establish schools in the capitals of the principal cities, where boys, and especially the sons of priests, could be educated for the priesthood. These schools for more than a century have been supported and controlled by the Holy Governing Synod. The country is divided into four school-districts,—Petersburg, Kiev, Moscow, and Kazan. At the head of each district is a church academy, and each academy has a rector consisting of a rector, archimandrite (abbot), one hieromonach (monk-priest), two secular priests, and several professors. The metropolitan superintends all, acting under the decrees of the synod of the archbishops, proto-presbyters, archimandrites, proto-deacons, sub-deacons, psalmists, singers, and sextons. Ordinations are administered by bishops only.

RUSSIAN SECTS. comprehended under the general name Raskolnik. This word is from the Russian word raskol, "cleft," and means separatist, schismatic, and dissenter. It designates all the dissenters from the Established Church of Russia, i.e., from the Greek-Eastern Church. The Bible was translated from the Greek into the Slavonian in the ninth century by Cyril (d. 869) and Methodius (d. 855), the Slavonian apostles (both canonized: see Cyril and Methodius), and the ritual books somewhat later. Owing to a lack of knowledge on the part of translators and transcribers, the Slavonian church-books were full of mistakes, and needed revision. Again: up to the seventeenth century the parishioners usually elected their priests, and the people had much influence on the church administration. Patriarch Nikon (1652-58), a man of great knowledge and of autocratic tendencies, undertook to revise the ritual books, and to secure the power of appointment of priests and the church administration in general, exclusively to the bishops. Being supported by the Czar, Nikon succeeded in his reforms. But many priests and parishes refused either to accept the revised books, or to submit to the supreme authority of the bishops and patriarch. Thus the great schism, or raskol, took place in the Church of Russia.

Originally the Raskolnitsks differed from the Established Church rather in rites than in principles. They called themselves "Staroveri," or the "Old Believers," in opposition to the "New Believers," or "init to that, of whom the most eminent is John of Damascus.

The most celebrated theologians of the Russian Church proper are Peter Mogila, who published the Orthodox Confession in 1643; Adam Zoerikav, who published an important treatise, On the Procession of the Holy Ghost, in 1752; Simeon Zadonsk, who published an important treatise, On the Procession of the Holy Ghost, in 1752; and Stephen Javorsky (about the same date), both of whom are somewhat inclined to Roman-Catholic views; and Tichon of Zadonsk, who is not unfavorable to Protestantism.

The historical and doctrinal works of Mouraviess, the metropolitan Platon and Philaret, the Abbé Gueutte, and the arch-priest Basaroff, are also worthy of an attentive perusal.


NICHOLAS SJERRING.
RUSSIAN SECTS.

churches, and regarded the outsiders as impure; they said Isaac (Jesus) instead of Iscous; they never shaved their beard, being afraid of spoiling God's image; they never used tobacco, or practiced vaccination. In the course of time the Raskolniks have been subdivided into numerous sects, and their religious views have been greatly modified. To-day, while some sects do not differ from the Russian Church in regard to principles, others keep pace with the most advanced sects of the American and European Protestants.

The Raskolniks are divided into two classes; namely, Popovtzi, or those who have priests (popes), and Bezpopovtzi (without popes), who have no regular and constant priests. Popovtzi as yet hold those views characteristic of the Old Belief. However, a large number of them have realized that there is no dogmatic difference between them and the New Believers; therefore they treat both the State and the Church of Russia in a friendly spirit. These are known under the name of Edinovertzi (those of one belief), they treat both the State and the Church of Russia in a friendly spirit. These are known under the name of Edinovertzi (those of one belief, that is, of the same belief). The late Czar, Alexander II., granted them liberty of religious service. Their old churches were opened, and new ones built. The archbishop of the Edinovertzi resides at Moscow. The Popovtzi recognize the priestly hierarchy: they have priests and bishops of their own. Some of them fanatically denounce both the Czar and the Church, and for that reason are regarded as dangerous, and treated as such; for instance, the Dostiheans (the followers of Dositheus).

The Bezpopovtzi hold that every Christian is a priest, and therefore there is no need of a special priestly order. In support of their view they cite Rev. i. 6: "And [Christ] hath made us kings and priests unto God." However, in their religious meetings they appoint some one from among themselves, one more learned in Holy Scriptures, to act as a spiritual teacher; but such a person has no special authority, and does not need to be ordained. They believe that we are living in the reign of Antichrist: but they explain that under "Antichrist" must be understood the impious spirit of our time; under "crown," the present society; and under "birth," the regeneration from the Christian truth. They believe that the authorities of to-day are the Antichrist's servants, and therefore they consider it a great sin to pray for them. They affirm that the churches are unnecessary to Christians; for St. Paul said, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16). They have abolished almost the entire ritual of the Greek-Eastern Church, partly by command of the Bible (as they understand it), and partly in accordance with their own idea of the Antichrist's reign.

Among the Bezpopovtzi there are many sects holding very radical views. Thus some (E. Blokhin) do not recognize the authority of the Bible, but yet believe they are guided simply by "inspiration from above:" they do not adore the holy images, nor keep any religious meetings. Others (M. D.) say, that they regard the Bible which is printed with ink, but in that one which is laid down in their heart and conscience. Among the Bezpopovtzi the following sects are particularly known:
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- The PHILIPPINES (the proselytes of Philipp Pustovoit) observe only two sacraments— baptism and the Lord's Supper; they refuse to take the oath of allegiance to the Czar, do not pray for the Czar, and decline to enter the military service.

- The NEMOLIAKI ("those not praying") are an extreme type of the Bezpopovtzi. Their creed is reduced to these three points— the strictly literal interpretation of the New Testament, spiritual prayer, and a pure life. Cossak Zimin was the founder of this sect. He taught that there are "four ages." From the creation of the world to Moses was spring, or the age of ancestors; from Moses to Christ's birth was summer, or the age of fathers; from Christ's birth to 1666 (when a council of Russian bishops anathematized the Raskolniks) was autumn, or the age of sons; from 1666 down to our time is winter, or the age of the Holy Ghost. "No external rites are needed in our time," they say.

- The VOZDYKHANTZI ("the Sighers") hold, that, in the time of the Old Testament, there was the reign of God the Father; in that of the New Testament, the reign of God the Son; with the completion of the seventh thousandth year from the creation of the world began the reign of the Holy Ghost. Now the true believers must serve the Holy Ghost by spiritual prayers and by sighing.

Both the Nemolaki and the Vozdykhantzi adapt their Bible to their views by explaining it allegorically. Some of them go so far as to affirm that there is no need even of spiritual prayer, for "God knows what we need without our prayers." Evidently these come to pure deism.

The STRANNIKI ("the Travellers") or BREGOONI ("the Runners") do not stay in one place more than a few days. They do not revere the cross, but call it simply a piece of wood. They affirm that all God's promises concerning the church are already fulfilled; that now we are living in the "future age" and in the "new heaven;" that the resurrection of the dead has already taken place, or rather that it takes place each time that one leaves the sinful life, and begins to walk in the ways of truth and piety.

There are many Bezpopovtzi who object to being called the "Old Believers." "Only Hebrews are old believers," they say; and we are the Spiritual Christians." To this group belong the Dokhoborzi, the Molokaneh, the Obschie, the Stundists, the Khilist, and the Skoptzi.

The DOKHOBORZI are those denying the existence of spirit, or rather spiritual beings and spiritual life. They hold that there is no personal God, that he is inseparable from the society of pious men. "God is the good man:" that is their maxim. They do not believe in a life after death: therefore they deny the existence both of paradise and hell. They do not recognize the authority of the Bible, but believe they are guided simply by "inspiration from above," which is traditions of their own. However, those traditions are nothing else but different Bible-passage which sustain their own views. They consider Christ to be only equal to any good man of our day. They often quote, and explain in their not believe in the existence of a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth" (John iv. 24). "Spirit is in us," they say: "therefore we are gods, and therefore we have to adore living good men."
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They reverently bow before each other, be it man, woman, or child. They discard all the rites of the Greek Church. They deny the authority of the Czar on the ground, that, being God's people, they do not belong to this world, and therefore they are not subject to the rule of worldly authorities; they are opposed to the State, as such, and do not pray for the Czar.

The Molokaneh ("Milk-eaters") call themselves "the truly spiritual Christians." They believe only in the New Testament, but explain it in their own way. They affirm that baptism with water is invalid; purification from sins by pure life and good deeds, that is a true baptism. They object to all external rites, crossing, prayers, temples, etc. They consider themselves free from all state laws, on the ground, that, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii.17).

The Obsche ("Communists") are a branch of the Molokaneh, and differ from them only in holding property in common. In each commune there are twelve elected apostles, who direct works and the distribution of goods.

The sect of Stundists is of recent origin: it became known only in 1860. The Stundists strive to get rid of the authority both of the State and the Church. They hold that everybody is free to understand the Bible in his or her way. So far they have come to these conclusions,—the priestly hierarchy is invalid; there is no sense in adoration of the cross and holy images; of the seven sacraments, only baptism and communion are to be retained.

Of all the sects of the Raskolniki, only Khilzti and Skoptzi are despised by Russian people at large. The Khilzti ("Self-lashers"), though they do not recognize the church-rites, practise many rites of their own kind. They are ascetics, and the married life is regarded by them as the greatest sin. They wage a constant war against human nature; and for that reason they continually lash themselves, both in private and in religious meetings. They believe that among them sometimes appears the Lord Sabachthain the person of one of their brothers, and that Christ and the Virgin have many times, among them, inReady times, really obey their prophets and prophetesses, who are guided by their own inspiration. For whole nights they lash themselves, and turn around a sacred basin of water, and in their state of excitement they believe they see Christ or the Holy Ghost.

The Skoptzi ("Self-mutilators") are an extreme branch of the Khilzti. They act literally according to the words, "If thy right hand causeth thee to stumble," etc. (Matt. v. 30).

The number of the Raskolniki is constantly increasing in spite of all efforts both of the State and the Church to thwart their propaganda. There are about fifteen millions of them all told, or over six per cent of the whole population of Russia. The Bezpopovtzi count nine millions; the Popovtzi, three millions; the Spiritual Christians, two millions; the Khilzti and the Skoptzi, sixty-five thousand: the rest belong to undetermined sects. The Bezpopovtzi, the Popovtzi, and the Spiritual Christians embrace the most advanced of the Bezpopovtzi.

The Raskolniki in general have been always regarded by the State and the Church authorities as a dangerous element, and were treated with utmost severity. The death-penalty, mutilations, tortures, chains, exile to Siberia, and other punishments, have been freely resorted to against them. In the last century many Raskolniki used to hide themselves in the forests of Siberia; and on being discovered by the officials, they often preferred to burn themselves over the military service, and do not pray for the Czar.

The Molokaneh ("Milk-eaters") call themselves "the truly spiritual Christians." They believe only in the New Testament, but explain it in their own way. They affirm that baptism with water is invalid; purification from sins by pure life and good deeds, that is a true baptism. They object to all external rites, crossing, prayers, temples, etc. They consider themselves free from all state laws, on the ground, that, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii.17).

The Obsche ("Communists") are a branch of the Molokaneh, and differ from them only in holding property in common. In each commune there are twelve elected apostles, who direct works and the distribution of goods.

The sect of Stundists is of recent origin: it became known only in 1860. The Stundists strive to get rid of the authority both of the State and the Church. They hold that everybody is free to understand the Bible in his or her way. So far they have come to these conclusions,—the priestly hierarchy is invalid; there is no sense in adoration of the cross and holy images; of the seven sacraments, only baptism and communion are to be retained.

Of all the sects of the Raskolniki, only Khilzti and Skoptzi are despised by Russian people at large. The Khilzti ("Self-lashers"), though they do not recognize the church-rites, practise many rites of their own kind. They are ascetics, and the married life is regarded by them as the greatest sin. They wage a constant war against human nature; and for that reason they continually lash themselves, both in private and in religious meetings. They believe that among them sometimes appears the Lord Sabachthain the person of one of their brothers, and that Christ and the Virgin have many times, among them, inReady times, really obey their prophets and prophetesses, who are guided by their own inspiration. For whole nights they lash themselves, and turn around a sacred basin of water, and in their state of excitement they believe they see Christ or the Holy Ghost.

The Skoptzi ("Self-mutilators") are an extreme branch of the Khilzti. They act literally according to the words, "If thy right hand causeth thee to stumble," etc. (Matt. v. 30).

The number of the Raskolniki is constantly increasing in spite of all efforts both of the State and the Church to thwart their propaganda. There are about fifteen millions of them all told, or over six per cent of the whole population of Russia. The Bezpopovtzi count nine millions; the Popovtzi, three millions; the Spiritual Christians, two millions; the Khilzti and the Skoptzi, sixty-five thousand: the rest belong to undetermined sects. The Bezpopovtzi, the Popovtzi, and the Spiritual Christians embrace the most advanced of the Bezpopovtzi.

The Raskolniki in general have been always regarded by the State and the Church authorities as a dangerous element, and were treated with utmost severity. The death-penalty, mutilations, tortures, chains, exile to Siberia, and other punishments, have been freely resorted to against them. In the last century many Raskolniki used to hide themselves in the forests of Siberia; and on being discovered by the officials, they often preferred to burn themselves over the military service, and do not pray for the Czar.
RUTGERS SEMINARY.

RUTGERS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. See NEW Brunswick Theological Seminary.

RUTH. This book relates an episode among the Israelites in the days of the Judges,—the story of the marriage of Ruth the Moabitess to her kinsman, Boaz, and so, how another heathen ancestor was introduced into the pedigree of David and of Jesus Christ. The grace and beauty of the story are universally praised. By it we get a glimpse into the domestic life of the period. The very simplicity of the book, which constitutes its charm, is also the best proof of its truthfulness. What forger would invent such a tale, in which, to the royal house of David, a foreign and idolatrous ancestor was attributed? Numerous attempts have been made to rob the book of its historical character. It has been considered as written in advocacy of Levirate marriage, so that the lefl from Israel and the Gentiles might be bridged (Berthold and Benyson); but Boaz was not Mahlon's brother, but only his kinsman; hence his action was purely voluntary. Reuss considers it as invented by a North-Palestinian, after the fall of Ephraim under Assyria, as a political romance, prophesying the re-union of Ephraim to Judah, because Naomi the Ephraimite recognized the child of Ruth, the progenitor of Judah's royal line, as her heir. But there is really no reason for considering it as other than an old, true, but long-time unwritten, traditional history of the Davideic family. At what time in the Judges period the incidents occurred cannot be definitely determined, but at least a hundred years before David (Ruth iv. 18). The book itself, as its Aramaicisms and late grammatical forms show, was written many years afterwards, probably not until after the exile. The late date is therefore the reason why the book appears in the Jewish Hagiographa. It is true the LXX. put it with Judges; and Josephus testifies to the Jewish custom of his day, of reckoning these two books as one (Contra Apion, i. 8). But the supposition that Ruth was originally a part of Judges, and, as some say, constituted its third appendix (Berth. Anbem.), lacks Evidence, and is rendered improbable by the independence of the story. It is complete in itself.


RUTHERFURD, Samuel, a distinguished Scotch divine. b. in the village of Nisbet, Roxburghshire; d. at St. Andrews, March 20, 1661. In 1617 we find him studying at Edinburgh, where he received the degree of M.A. in 1621, and was soon after appointed to the professorship of humanity. He demitted this office in 1625, and after studying theology was settled at Anworth in 1627. He was regarded as an able and impressive preacher. In 1634 he attended the death-bed of Lord Kenmure, and gave an account of the death-bed scene, fifteen years later, in the work, The Last Heavenly Speeches and Glorious Departures of John, Viscount Kenmure. In 1638 he issued Exercitationes de Gratia, a work in defence of the doctrines of grace against the Arminians. It established his reputation on the Continent, and brought him a call to the chair of theology at Utrecht, and one to Hardewyk. On July 27, 1680, he was cited before the High Commission Council; and his work against the Acts of Episcopacy, and his work against the Arminians. Deprived of his living at Anworth, he was banished to Aberdeen. When the Covenant was again triumphant, in 1658, he returned to Anworth, and in 1660 was made professor at St. Andrews. In 1843 he was chosen one of the Scotch commissioners to the Westminster Assembly; and during his four years of service in that capacity wrote The Due Right of Presbytery, Lex Rex, and The Trial and Triumph of Faith. The Lex Rex was burned under the author's windows at St. Andrews in 1660. He was soon afterwards deprived of his offices, and cited to appear before the next Parliament on the charge of high treason, but death prevented him from going. He replied to the citation, referring to his condition, "I am summoned before a higher Judge and judicatory: that first summons I behave to answer; and ere a few days arrive, I shall be where few kings and great folks come." Among his other works are Covenant of Life (1655), Civil Policy (1657), Life of Grace (1660). Stanley calls him "the true saint of the covenant." Rutherford's letters are particularly interesting and edifying. See A. A. Bonar: Letters of Rev. Samuel Rutherford, gathered by Rev. W. F. Breed, Phila., 1865; STANLEY: The Church of Scotland, London and New York, 1872 (pp. 100-108); A. F. Mitchell: The Westminster Assembly, Lond., 1888; and the histories of Scotland.

RUISBROECK, or RUSBROEK, doctor ecstaticus, the most prominent of the Dutch mystics; b. in the village of Ruisbroek, between Brussels and Hal, in 1293; was educated in Brussels, but never learned so much Latin that he could write it, though he seems to have been acquainted with the writings of the Aesopagite, as also with the earlier German mystics. He was for a long time vicar of the Church of St. Gudula in Brussels, but retired in 1633 to the Augustine monastery Gronendal, in the forest of Soigny, near Brussels, and died there in 1361. His four principal works are Die Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit, Der Spiegel der Seligkeit, Von dem funkelnden Stein, and Samuel: his other writings are only more or less interesting repetitions. They were originally written in Dutch, but soon translated into Latin (Raubrockii Opera, Colog. b. about 1600; ten editions); the works of G. Arnold, Offenbach, 1701, and French. There is collected edition of Ruisbroeck's works, by J. David, Ghent, 1857—89, 5 vols. Arnswald edited his principal works, Hanover, 1848. In opposition to Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, but in agreement with the German mystics, his chief speculation of Ruisbroeck describes a movement from God to man, and then back to God, not always clearing the banks of pantheism. The
details are often very acute, subtle, and charming by their beauty and freshness, but often also very obscure and overloaded. Ullmann: [Reformers before the Reformation]; Bohringer: Die deutschen Mystiker, pp. 462 sqq. C. Schmidt.

Ryerson, Adolphus Egerton, D.D., LL.D., Methodist; b. in Charlotteville, Norfolk County, Canada, March 24, 1803; d. in Toronto, Feb. 19, 1882. His father was a native of New Jersey. His parents were in easy circumstances, yet Egerton spent his early years in healthful labor on the farm. He was endowed with a healthy, vigorous constitution, and great intellectual power. His thirst for knowledge was most intense, and his reading was extensive and varied. In early life he connected himself with the Methodist Church; and on Easter Sunday, 1826, he began his work as a preacher in that body. He soon became famous as one of the most eloquent, effective, and promising preachers in the connection. He early began to write for the periodicals of the day; and some of his articles having attracted attention, and provoked discussion, he was chosen editor of the Christian Guardian by the Conference in 1829,—an office which he filled with eminent ability and fearlessness during a period of great interest in Canadian history. In 1833 he was sent by the Conference as a delegate to the Wesleyan body in England, where his rare gifts and persuasive eloquence were at once recognized. He was repeatedly intrusted with similar missions; and so ably and skilfully did he conduct the matters committed to him, that he secured the confidence and approval of the leading men on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1841 he was elected the first president of Victoria University; where for three years, both as principal and professor, he won the confidence and affection of the students, and did much to establish the rising institution. In 1844 he was appointed by the governor-general, Sir Charles Metcalfe, chief superintendent of education for Upper Canada. Into this new arena he entered with a resolute determination to succeed; and he spared no pains, effort, or sacrifice to fit himself thoroughly for the onerous duties to which he had been appointed.

He steadfastly prosecuted his work with a firm, inflexible will, unrelaxing tenacity of purpose, an amazing fertility of expedient, an exhaustless amount of information, a most wonderful skill in adaptation, a matchless ability in unfolding and vindicating his plans, a rare adroitness in meeting and removing difficulties, great moderation in success, and indomitable perseverance under discouragement, calm patience when misapprehended, unflinching courage when opposed, until he achieved the consummation of his wishes,—the establishment of a system of education second to none in its efficiency, and adaptation to the circumstances of the people. He proved to be just the man for the place, and the work he accomplished is his enduring monument.

He was frequently elected secretary of the conference, and in 1874 was its president. His brethren conferred on him every honor at their disposal. In 1841 he received the degree of D.D., and in 1861 that of LL.D. He wrote extensively on all subjects connected with public affairs, specially on questions relating to civil and religious liberty and education. He was an able, vigorous, and successful controversialist. He issued numerous pamphlets, wrote many elaborate reports, and published several works,—a treatise on moral science, Epochs of Canadian Methodism, 1882; in 1880 The History of the United Empire Loyalists, in two large volumes. William Ormiston.

Ryland, John, D.D., a distinguished Baptist minister; was b. at Warwick, Jan. 29, 1753; d. at Bristol, May 25, 1825; pastor at Northampton, 1781; pastor at Bristol, and president of the Baptist college there, from 1794 to his death. He published some sermons, and one or two other books. His Hymns and Verses, numbering nearly a hundred, were collected by D. Sedgwick, 1862. Some of them have been extensively used, and at least two retain a place in most of the collections. A Memoir by Dr. Hobey is prefixed to Sedgwick's edition. F. M. Bird.
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