NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06819257 8

THE NEW
SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

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

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
[VOLUMES I—VI]

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

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

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

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

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

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

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

Complete in Twelve Volumes

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
329786B
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
B 1945 L

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

Printed in the United States of America
Published October, 1910

EDITORS

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.)
Professor of Church History, New York University.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(ASSOCIATE EDITOR.)
New York,
Formerly Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion,
Bangor Theological Seminary.

DEPARTMENT EDITORS, VOLUME VIII

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology.*)
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations.*)
Secretary of Executive Committee of the Western Section for the Fourth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders.*)
Rector of St. Ambrose's, New York City.

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament.*)
Professor of Oriental Languages, University College, Toronto.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament.*)
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History.*)
Professor of Church History, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Waco, Tex.

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography.*)
Managing Editor of the STANDARD DICTIONARY, etc.,
New York City.

CONTRIBUTORS AND COLLABORATORS, VOLUME VIII

ERNST CHRISTIAN ACHELIS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Marburg.

HANS ACHELIS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Halle.

WILLIAM ADAMSON, D.D.,
Pastor of the Carver Memorial Church, Windermere, England.

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Yale Divinity School.

FERENCZ BALOGH,
Professor of Church History, Reformed Theological Academy, Debreczin, Hungary.

ANTON CHRISTIAN BANG, Ph.D.,
Bishop in Christiania.

HERMANN GEORG JULIUS BECK,
Consistorial Councilor and First Preacher, Baireuth.

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

KARL BENRATH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Königsberg.

IMMANUEL GUSTAV ADOLF BENZINGER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
German Orientalist and Vice-Consul for Holland in Jerusalem.

CARL ALBRECHT BERNOULLI, Th.Lic.,
Author at Arlesheim, near Basel.

CARL BERTHEAU, Th.D.,
Pastor at St. Michael's, Hamburg.

HEINRICH BOEHMER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Bonn.

AMY GASTON CHARLES AUGUSTE BONET-MAURY, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Independent School of Divinity, Paris.

GOTTLIEB NATHANAEL BONWETSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

GUSTAV BOSSERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Retired Pastor, Stuttgart.

ALBERT BRACKMANN, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Marburg.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THEODOR PAUL OSKAR ARTHUR VON BROECKER, Th.D.,
Chief Pastor of Jacobikirche, Hamburg.

KARL BURGER (†), Th.D.,
Late Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Munich.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.,
Secretary of Executive Committee of the Western Section for the Fourth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

WALTER AUGUST ANTON NATHAN CASPARI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
University Preacher and Professor of Practical Theology, University of Erlangen.

JACQUES EUGÈNE CHOISY, Th.D.,
Pastor in Geneva.

FRANCIS ALBERT CHRISTIE, D.D.,
Professor of Church History in Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pa.

FERDINAND COHRS, Th.Lic.,
Consistorial Councilor, Ilfeld, Germany.

SAMUEL CRAMER, Th.D.,
Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Amsterdam, and Professor of Practical Theology, Mennonite Theological Seminary, Amsterdam.

FRIEDRICH WILHELM CUNO (†), Th.Lic.,
Late Pastor at Eddigehausen, Hanover.

GUSTAV ADOLF DEISSMANN, Th.D., D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Berlin.

SAMUEL MARTIN DEUTSCH (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Berlin.

ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Breslau.

ISAAC AUGUST DORNER (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Berlin.

PAUL GOTTFRIED DREWS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Halle.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.,
Rector of St. Ambrose's Church, New York City.

WILLIAM EDWARD BURGHARDT DuBOIS, Ph.D.,
Professor of Economics and History, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia.

EMIL EGLI (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Zurich.

JOHN OLUF EVJEN, Ph.D.,
Professor of Theology in Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of History, Olivet College, Michigan.

EMIL ALBERT FRIEDBERG, Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical, Public, and German Law, University of Leipsic.

GUSTAV GIESELBUSCH,
Pastor of the Third Baptist Church, Berlin.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.,
Formerly Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary, Associate Editor of THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA.

FRANZ GOERRES, Ph.D.,
Assistant Librarian, University of Bonn.

WILHELM GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Honorary Professor of Geography, Technical High School, and Professor, Military Academy, Munich.

JOHANNES FRIEDRICH GOTTSCHICK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Ethics, and Practical Theology, Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Tübingen.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, Ph.D., Th.D., D.D., LL.D., Dr. Jur.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

GEORG GRUETZMACHER, Ph.D., Th. Lic.,
Extraordinary Professor of Church History, University of Heidelberg.

HERMANN GUTHE, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

KARL HACKENSCHMIDT, Th.D.,
Pastor in Strasburg.

WILHELM HADORN, Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Bern and Lecturer on New Testament Exegesis, University of Bern.

ARTHUR CRAWSHAY ALLISTON HALL, D.D., LL.D.,
Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Vermont.

ADOLF HARNACK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr. Jur., M.D.,
General Director of the Royal Library, Berlin.

THOMAS SAMUEL HASTINGS, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.,
Emeritus Professor of Pastoral Theology, Union Theological Seminary.

ALBERT HAUCK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr. Jur.,
Professor of Church History, University of Leipsic, Editor-in-Chief of the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie.*

HERMAN HAUPT, Ph.D.,
Professor and Director of the University Library, Giessen.

CARL FRIEDRICH GEORG HEINRICI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

MAX HEINZE (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Philosophy, University of Leipsic.

LUDWIG THEODOR EDGAR HENNECKE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Betheln, Hanover.

WILHELM HERRMANN, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Marburg.

JOHANN JAKOB HERZOG (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

JOHANNES HERZOG,
City Pastor in Esslingen.

OSWALD HOLDER-EGGER, Ph.D.,
Professor at Berlin and Director for the Publication of the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.*

GEORG HOLZ, Ph.D.,
Professor of German Language and Literature, University of Leipsic.

ERNST HUEMPEL, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Bramstedt, Holstein, Germany.

DAVID HUPFELD, Th.Lic.,
Pastor Emeritus at Halle.

ALFRED JEREMIAS, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Privat-docent for Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

ADOLF HERMANN HEINRICH KAMPHAUSEN (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

FERDINAND FRIEDRICH WILHELM KATTENBUSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Halle.

EMIL FRIEDRICH KAUTZSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Halle.

PETER GUSTAV KAWERAU, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Provost of St. Peter's, Berlin, and Honorary Professor, University of Berlin.

KONRAD KESSLER (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Greifswald.

GOTTLOB KIRCHHOFER,
Minister at Schaffhausen, Switzerland.

RUDOLF KITTEL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

HEINRICH AUGUST KLOSTERMANN, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Kiel.

KARL AUGUST KLUEPFEL (†), Th.D.,
Late Librarian in Tübingen University Library.

JOSEPH KNAPP (†),
Late Dean in Stuttgart.

WALTHER KOEHLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Zurich.

HEINRICH ADOLF KOESTLIN (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Privy Councilor in Cannstadt, formerly Professor of Theology, University of Giessen.

JULIUS KOESTLIN (†), Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Halle.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH HERMANN KOLDE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Erlangen.

HERMANN GUSTAV EDUARD KRUEGER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Giessen.

JACOB KUENDIG,
President of the Reformed Preachers' Seminary in Basel-land.

JOHANNES WILHELM KUNZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Greifswald.

EUGEN LACHENMANN,
City Pastor, Leonberg, Württemberg.

WILLIAM HENRY LARRABEE, LL.D.,
Plainfield, New Jersey.

GEORG RITTER VON LAUBMANN (†), Ph.D.,
Late Director of the Royal Library, Munich.

KARL LUDWIG LEIMBACH (†), Ph.D.,
Late Provincial Councilor for Schools, Hanover, Germany.

LUDWIG LEMME, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Heidelberg.

RUDOLF LIECHTENHAN, Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Buch, Canton of Zurich, Switzerland.

FRIEDRICH LIST (†), Ph.D.,
Late Studienrektor, Munich.

FRIEDRICH ARMIN LOOFS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Halle.

DUNCAN JAMES McMILLAN, D.D.,
Presbyterian Pastor, New York City.

WILHELM JULIUS MANN (†), D.D.,
Late Professor of Hebrew, Exegesis, Homiletics, and Ethics, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

OTTO MEJER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late President of the Consistory, Hanover.

PHILIPP MEYER, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Hanover.

GEROLD MEYER VON KNONAU, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of History, University of Zurich.

CARL THEODOR MIRBT, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Marburg.

IZAAK MOLENAAR,
Pastor at Zaandam, North Holland.

ERNST FRIEDRICH KARL MUELLER, Th.D.,
Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

GEORG MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Inspector of Schools, Leipsic.

NIKOLAUS MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Christian Archeology, University of Berlin.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.,
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

THEODOR JULIUS NEY, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Speyer, Bavaria.

FREDERICK KRISTIAN NIELSEN (†), D.D.,
Late Bishop of Aarhus, Denmark.

FRIEDRICH AUGUST BERTHOLD NITZSCH (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Kiel.

CARL THEOPHILUS ODHNER,
Professor of Theology in the Academy of the New Church, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

CONRAD VON ORELLI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and History of Religion, University of Basel.

CARL PFENDER,
Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Paris.

ROBERT VON POEHLMAN, Ph.D.,
Professor of Ancient History, University of Munich.

ERWIN PREUSCHEN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor at Hirschhorn-on-the-Neckar, Germany.

PAUL MARTIN RADE, Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Marburg.

ERNST RANKE (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology at Marburg.

GEORG CHRISTIAN RIETSCHEL, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology and University Preacher, University of Leipsic.

ARNOLD RUEGG,
Pastor at Birmensdorf and Lecturer at the University of Zurich.

REINHOLD SCHMID, Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Oberholzheim, Württemberg.

CARL SCHMIDT (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Strasburg.

CARL WILHELM SCHOELL (†), Ph.D., D.D.,
Late Pastor of the Savoy Church, London.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH SCHOTT (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Librarian and Professor of Theology, University of Stuttgart.

MAXIMILIAN VICTOR SCHULTZE, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archeology, University of Greifswald.

A. SCHUMANN (†),
Late Gymnasial Professor in Aarau.

ALEXIS SCHWARZE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Cunow-an-der-Strasse, Pomerania.

ALEXANDER SCHWEIZER (†),
Late Professor of Theology in Zurich.

REINHOLD SEEBERG, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Berlin.

EMIL SEHLING, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical and Commercial Law, University of Erlangen.

WILLIAM AMBROSE SHEDD,
Missionary, Urumia, Persia.

FRIEDRICH ANTON EMIL SIEFFERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

EDUARD SIMONS, Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Practical Theology, University of Berlin.

JOSEPH FIELDING SMITH, Jr.,
Assistant Historian of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

PHILIPP FRIEDRICH ADOLPH THEODOR SPAETH (†), D.D., LL.D.,
Late Professor in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

GEORG STEINDORFF, Ph.D.,
Professor of Egyptology, University of Leipsic.

EMIL ELIAS STEINMEYER, Ph.D.,
Professor of German Language and Literature, University of Erlangen.

HERMANN LEBERECHT STRACK, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Semitic Languages, University of Berlin.

ULRICH STUTZ, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical Law, University of Bonn.

ARTHUR BENEDIKT TITIUS, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology in Göttingen.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN TRUEBLOOD,
Secretary of the American Peace Society, Boston.

PAUL TSCHACKERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

P. M. TSCHIRNER (†), Ph.D.,
Late of Leipsic, Germany.

JOHANN GERHARD WILHELM UHLHORN (†), Th.D.,
Late Abbot of Lokkum, Germany.

JOHN ROBERT VAN PELT, Ph.D.,
Professor of Philosophy and Biblical Literature, Cornell College, Iowa.

SIETSE DOUWES VAN VEEN, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archaeology, University of Utrecht.

WILHELM VOGT, Ph.D.,
Gymnasial Rector, Nuremberg.

WILHELM VOLCK (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Rostock.

NATHANIEL WEISS,
Pastor in Paris, France.

FRIEDRICH LUDWIG LEONHARD WIEGAND, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Greifswald.

JOHN CAMPBELL WHITE,
General Secretary of the Laymen's Missionary Movement.

EDWARD ELIHU WHITFIELD, M.A.,
Retired Public Schoolmaster, London.

MARY ANGELINE WRIGHT,
Formerly Honorary Secretary for the United States of the Palestine Exploration Fund.

HERBERT ALDEN YOUTZ, Ph.D.,
Richards Professor of Christian Theology, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, New York.

FRANZ THEODOR RITTER VON ZAHN, Th.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Introduction, University of Erlangen.

RUDOLF ZEHNPFUND, Ph.D.,
Pastor in Oranienbaum, Germany.

OTTO ZOECKLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History and Apologetics, University of Greifswald.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX—VOLS. I—VIII

The following list of books is supplementary to the bibliographies given at the end of the articles contained in vols. I.-VIII., and brings the literature down to July, 1910. In this list each title entry is printed in capital letters. It is to be noted that, throughout the work, in the articles as a rule only first editions are given. In the bibliographies the aim is to give either the best or the latest edition, and in case the book is published both in America and in some other country, the American place of issue is usually given the preference.

AFRICA: G. Simon, *Islam und Christentum im Kampf um die Eroberung der animistischen Heidenwelt*, Berlin, 1910.

AKED, C. F.: *The Lord's Prayer; its Meaning and Message for To-day*, New York, 1910.

ALEXANDRIA: A. M. de Zogheb, *Études sur l'ancienne Alexandrie*, Paris, 1909.

ANDREWES, L.: D. MacLeane, *Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction*, London, 1910.

APOCRYPHA, O. T.: *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV Ezra)*, part 1, *Die Ueberlieferung*, ed. B. Violet, Leipsic, 1910.

APOLOGETICS: K. Gutberlet, *Gott und die Schöpfung. Begründung und Apologie der christlichen Weltauffassung*, Regensburg, 1910.
A. C. Headlam, *History, Authority, and Theology*, Milwaukee, 1910.
P. M. Muir, *Modern Substitutes for Christianity*, London, 1910.
F. S. Schenck, *Christian Evidences and Ethics*, New York, 1910.
B. Scott, *The Contents and Teachings of the Catacombs at Rome. A Vindication of pure and primitive Christianity and an Exposure of the Corruptions of Romanism: Derived from the sepulchral Remains of the early Christians*, London, 1910.
G. Thomas, *Christianity in Christ*, vol. iv. of *Anglican Church Handbooks*, London, 1910.
Note also Ballard, under ATHEISM, below.

ARAM: S. Schiffer, *Die Aramäer. Historisch-geographische Untersuchungen*, Leipsic, 1910.

ARISTOTLE: H. Meyer, *Der Entwicklungsgedanke bei Aristoteles*, Bonn, 1909.
C. Werner, *Aristote et l'idéalisme platonicien*, Paris, 1910.

ASSYRIA: F. Delitzsch, *Asurbanipal und die assyrische Kultur seiner Zeit*, Leipsic, 1910.
P. Dharme, *La Religion assyro-babylonienne*, London, 1910.
L. W. King, *History of Babylonia and Assyria from Prehistoric Times to the Persian Conquest*, 3 vols., London, 1909.
V. Scheil and J. E. Gautier, *Annales de Tukultininip II., roi d'Assyrie 889–884*, Paris, 1910.
W. H. Ward, *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, Washington, D. C., 1910.

ATHEISM: F. Ballard, *The Miracles of Unbelief*, Edinburgh, 1910.
N. J. Laforet, *Causes and Cure of Unbelief; ed. by Cardinal Gibbons, with a chapter by the Rev. P. J. Ryan*, Philadelphia, 1910.

ATONEMENT: J. B. Oldroyd, *The Doctrine of the Atonement, chiefly as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1910.
M. Scott, *The Atonement*, London, 1910.

BABYLONIA: P. Dharme, see above, ASSYRIA.
L. W. King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad: an Account of the early Races of Babylonia from prehistoric Times to the Foundation of the Babylonian Monarchy*, London, 1910; see also above, ASSYRIA.

BAPTISTS: M. T. Whitley, ed., *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England, with kindred Records*, London, 1909.

BARDESANES: F. Haase, *Zur bardesanischen Gnosis*, Potsdam, 1910.

BEET, J. A.: *Holiness, Symbolic and Real: a Bible Study*, London, 1910.

BELGIUM: T. F. Bumpus, *The Cathedrals and Churches of Belgium*, New York, 1910.

BIBLE TEXT: E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, Leipsic, 1910.
Agnes Smith Lewis, *Codex climaci rescriptus. Fragments of sixth Century Palestinian Syriac Texts of the Gospels, of the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Paul's Epistles. Also Fragments of an early Palestinian Lectionary of the Old Testament*, etc., Cambridge, 1909.

BIBLE VERSIONS: O. Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta: Die Propheten*, Leipsic, 1910.
J. Wright, *Grammar of the Gothic Language and the Gospel of St. Mark. Selections from the other Gospels and Timothy with Notes and Glossary*, London, 1910.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM: R. Kittel, *Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen mit Berücksichtigung des Religionsunterrichts*, Leipsic, 1910.
W. B. Riley, *The Finality of the Higher Criticism, or the Theory of Evolution and false Theology*, Minneapolis, 1910.

Biblical Theology: J. Adams, *Israel's Ideal; or, Studies in Old Testament Theology*, New York, 1910.

A. B. D. Alexander, *The Ethics of St. Paul*, Glasgow, 1910.

G. R. Berry, *The Old Testament among the Semitic Religions*, Philadelphia, 1910.

C. Clemen, *Die Entwicklung der christlichen Religion innerhalb des Neuen Testaments*, Leipsic, 1908.

P. Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Leipsic, 1910.

U. Z. Rule, *Old Testament Institutions: their Origin and Development*, London, 1910.

A. J. Tait, *Christ and the Nations. An Examination of Old and New Testament Teaching*, London, 1910.

D. Westphal, *The Law and the Prophets; or, the Revelation of Jehovah in Hebrew History from the Earliest Times to the Capture of Jerusalem by Titus*, New York, 1910.

Brahmanism: L. de La Villée Poussin, *Notions sur les religions de l'Inde. Le Brahmanisme*, Paris, 1910.

S. Tattvabhusan, *The Philosophy of Brahmanism, Expounded with Reference to its History*, London, 1910.

M. Walleser, *Der ältere Vedānta Geschichte. Kritik und Lehre*, Heidelberg, 1910.

Brazil: S. R. Gammon, *The Evangelical Invasion of Brazil; or, a half Century of Evangelical Missions in the Land of the Southern Cross*, Richmond, Va., 1910.

Buddhism: *Psalms of the Early Buddhists. I. Psalms of the Sisters*, by Mrs. R. Davids, London, 1910.

J. W. Sinha, *The Singularity of Buddhism*, London, 1910.

Canon of the Bible: L. Dennerfeld, *Der alttestamentliche Kanon der antiochenischen Kirche. Evaristus Radus, Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker*, in *Biblische Studien*, Freiburg, 1910.

Carthage, Synods of: On the chronology consult the Fr. transl. of Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 1088–1124, Paris, 1907.

H. von Soden, *Sententiæ LXXXVII Episcoporum: Das Protokoll der Synode von Karthago am 1. September, 256*, Göttingen, 1909.

Cartwright, P.: P. M. Walters, *Peter Cartwright*, New York, 1910.

Catharinus, A.: J. Schweizer, *Ambrosius Catharinus Politus (1484–1553), ein Theologe des Reformationszeitalters. Sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Münster, 1910.

Celibacy: Note should be made of the dissertation on conciliar legislation concerning celibacy in the Fr. transl. of Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 1320–48, Paris, 1908.

Celtic Church: D. Davies, *The Ancient Celtic Church of Wales: Where is it?* London, 1910.

Challoner, R.: E. H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner, 1691–1781*, 2 vols., London, 1910.

China: W. Grube, *Religion und Kultus der Chinesen*, Leipsic, 1910.

Christology: W. Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, Oxford, 1910.

G. S. Streatfield, *The Incarnation*, London, 1910.

Chronicles, Books of: A. A. Madsen and E. L. Curtis, *Chronicles*, in *The International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1910.

Chrysostom: J. A. Nairn, *The De sacerdotia of St. John Chrysostom*, London, 1910.

Church: J. C. Barry, *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, Edinburgh, 1910.

J. Denney, *The Church and the Kingdom*, London, 1910.

Church History: E. de Faye, *Étude sur les origines des églises de l'âge apostolique*, Paris, 1910.

W. S. Hooton, *Turning Points in the Primitive Church*, London, 1910.

P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. v., part 2, *The Middle Ages, from Boniface VIII., 1294, to the Protestant Reformation, 1517*, by D. S. Schaff, New York, 1910.

Clare, St.: *The Life of St. Clare Ascribed to Fr. Thomas of Celano of the Order of Friars Minor, A.D. 1255–61; transl. and ed. from the earliest MSS. by Fr. Paschal Robinson of the same Order; with an Appendix containing the Rule of St. Clare*, Philadelphia, 1910.

Clemen, C. C.: *Quellenbuch zur praktischen Theologie*, part 1, *Quellen zur Lehre vom Gottesdienst (Liturgik)*, part 2, *Quellen zur Lehre vom Religionsunterricht*, Giessen, 1910.

Clement of Alexandria: *Stromata VII., und VIII.—Excerpta ex Theodoto Eclogue propheticæ—Quis dives salvetur-Fragmente. Mit drei Handschriftenproben in Lichtdruck*, ed. O. Stählin, Leipsic, 1910.

Coke, T.: F. B. Upham, *Thomas Coke*, New York, 1910.

Common Prayer, Book of: *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward*, London, 1910. *The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, 1559, to which are appended some occasional Forms of Prayer, issued in her Reign, with an historical Introduction*, by E. Benham, Edinburgh, 1910.

Communism: G. J. Holyoke, *The History of Cooperation*, London, 1910.

Comparative Religion: J. Dechelette, *Le Culte du soleil aux temps préhistoriques*, Paris, 1910.

J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy; a Treatise on certain early Forms of Superstition and Society*, New York, 1910.

J. King, *The Development of Religion; a Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology*, New York, 1910.

J. C. Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1910.

J. Warneck, *Die Religion der Batak*, Leipsic, 1909.

Concordances: S. Herner, *Verbesserungen zu Mandelkerns Grosser Konkordanz*, Lund, 1910 (cf. the discussion in vol. iii., p. 206, of this work).

Congregational Union Lecture: P. T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, Boston, 1910.

Congregationalists: W. E. Barton, *A Congregational Manual; Theory and Practice, for the Use of Ministers, Churches, and deliberative Assemblies governed by Congregational Usage*, Oak Park, Ill., 1910.

C. S. Nash, *Congregational Administration*, Boston, 1910.

Creation: M. Sabiston, *The Biblical Account of the Creation; shown to be in Accordance with the Discoveries of Science*, New York, 1909.

C. M. Walsh, *The Doctrine of Creation*, London, 1910.

Conybeare, F. C.: *The Ring of Pope Xystus, together with the Prologue of Rufinus, now first rendered into English with an Historical and Critical Commentary*, London, 1910.

Curia: J. Simier, *La Curie romaine. Notes historiques et canoniques, d'après la constitution "Sapienti consilio," et les autres documents pontificaux*, Paris, 1910.

Cyprian: H. Koch, *Cyprian und der römische Primat. Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Studie*, Leipsic, 1910.

Cyril of Alexandria: A. Struckmann, *Die Eucharistielehre des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandrien*, Paderborn, 1910.

Dante: W. M. Rossetti, *Dante and his Convito. A Study with Translations*, London, 1910.

Denney, J.: See above, **Church**.

Doctrine, History of: C. Guignebert, *L'Évolution des dogmes*, Paris, 1910.

O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, Leipsic, 1908.

Druids: G. Coffey, *Intercourse of Gaul with Ireland Before the First Century*, London, 1910.

Easter: *The Book of Easter, with an Introduction by W. C. Doane*, New York, 1910.

Eastern Church: Margaret G. Dampier, *Organization of the Orthodox Eastern Churches*, London, 1910.

Eckhardt, M.: *Meister Eckhardt's Sermons*, Eng. transl. by C. Field, London, 1910.

Egypt: E. A. W. Budge, *The Liturgy of Funerary Offerings*, London, 1910; idem, *The Book of the Opening of the Mouth*, 2 vols., London, 1910.

V. Ermoni, *La Religion de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris, 1910.

J. Lieblieu, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilization de l'ancienne Égypte*, Leipsic, 1910; idem, *Hieroglyphisches Namenwörterbuch*, Leipsic, 1910.

Egyptian Exploration Fund: *Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, part VII., ed. A. S. Hunt, with Translations and Notes, London, 1910.

Elam: G. Hüsing, *Die Sprache Elams*, Breslau, 1908.

England, Church of: C. Bastide, *L'Anglicanisme, l'église d'Angleterre, son histoire et son œuvre, la diffusion de l'anglicanisme*, Saint Blaise, 1909.

N. N. Bond, *The Earnest Churchman, being England's Reply to the Pretensions of Rome and Dissent*, London, 1910.

J. H. Burn, *The Struggle with Puritanism*, London, 1910.

C. S. Carter, *The English Church in the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1910.

W. L. P. Cox, *The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed: an Exposition and an Eirenicon*, London, 1910.

A. C. Headlam, *History, Authority, and Theology*, London, 1910.

A. Plummer, *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1910.

R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, New York, 1910.

Enlightenment: J. G. Hibben, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, New York, 1910.

Erasmus: Erasmus Desiderius, *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterdami; denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. Allen*, vol. ii., *1514–17*, London and New York, 1910.

Ethics: E. Dürr, *Grundzüge der Ethik*, Heidelberg, 1909.

B. Rand, *The Classical Moralists. Selections from the Great Authors in the History of Ethics from Socrates to Martineau*, London, 1910.

Eucharist: M. Goguel, *L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, Paris, 1910.

A. Struckmann, *Die Eucharistielehre des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandrien*, Paderborn, 1910.

Eusebius of Cæsarea: *Epistulæ. Pars I., Epistulæ I.–LXX.*, ed. I. Hilberg, Vienna and Leipsic, 1910.

Eutychius of Alexandria: *Annales*, in *CSCO*, vol. vii., part 2, 1909.

Evolution: F. J. Hall, *Evolution and the Fall*, New York, 1910.

Exegesis: W. H. K. Soames, *Old Theology. An Attempt to Expound some of the Difficult or Obscure, or Misunderstood Texts, Passages, and Expressions in the New Testament*, London, 1910.

Fénélon: J. Lemaitre, *Fénélon*, Paris, 1910.

Fowler, C. H.: *Patriotic Orations; prepared for Publication by his Son C. H. Fowler, Introduction by J. W. Hill*, New York, 1910.

Francis, Saint, of Assisi: A. Bailly, *The Divine Minstrels; a Narrative of the Life of St. Francis of Assisi with his Companions*, New York, 1910.

B. Berenson, *A Sienese Painter of the Franciscan Legend*, New York, 1910 (the painter is Stefano Sassetta, and his subject was St. Francis).

Freemasons: *Fraternalism and the Church: by a Devotee to both*, Dowagiac, Mich., 1910.

French Revolution: P. Pisani, *L'Église de Paris et la révolution*, Paris, 1909.

Fry, E.: Georgina K. Lewis, *Elizabeth Fry*, London, 1910.

George, St.: C. S. Hulst, *St. George of Cappadocia in Legend and History*, London, 1910.

Gnosticism: F. Haase, see above, under **Bardesanes**.

Gospel and Gospels: B. Bonkamp, *Zur Evangelienfrage*, Münster, 1910.

V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, part 2, *The Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1910.

Gregory VII.: A. H. Mathew, *The Life and Times of Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII.*, London, 1910.

Hall, A. C. A.: *The Apostolic Ministry; a Charge . . . with Notes and Appendices*, New York, 1910.

Harmonies: J. M. Thompson, *The Synoptic Gospels arranged in Parallel Columns*, New York, 1910.

Headlam, A. C.: See above, **England, Church of**.

Hebrews, Epistle to: B. Weiss, *Der Hebräerbrief in zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Leipsic, 1910.

E. C. Wickham, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. With Introduction and Notes*, London, 1910.

Hegel: McTaggart, *A Commentary on Hegel's Logic*, London, 1910.

Hellenism: A. Deissmann, *Die Urgeschichte des Christentums im Lichte der Sprachforschung*, Tübingen, 1910.

Henson, H. H.: *Westminster Sermons*, London, 1910.

Herbert, G.: E. S. Buchanan, *George Herbert, Melodist (1593–1633)*, London, 1910.

Hexateuch: B. D. Erdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, III., *Das Buch Exodus*, Giessen, 1910.

A. F. Puukko, *Das Deuteronomium*, Leipsic, 1910.

J. Skinner, *Genesis*, in the *International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1910.

Holiness: See above, Beet, J. A.

Holy Spirit: E. B. Spurgin, *The Work and Fruits of the Holy Spirit*, London, 1910.

Hymnology: G. M. Dreves, *Ein Jahrtausend lateinischer Hymnenbildung, Eine Blütenlese aus den Analecta Hymnica*, Leipsic, 1910.

Idealism: H. Jones, *Idealism as a Practical Creed*, Glasgow, 1910.

A. Upward, *The New World*, New York, 1910.

Immortality: G. Björklund, *Death and Resurrection from the Point of View of the Cell Theory*, Chicago, 1910.

A. M. Crane, *A Search after Ultimate Truth; the divine Perfection inherent in Man and in all Creation*, Boston, 1910.

H. Frank, *Modern Light on Immortality*, London, 1910.

G. Heinzelmann, *Der Begriff der Seele und die Idee der Unsterblichkeit bei Wilhelm Wundt*, Tübingen, 1910.

J. B. Hunt, *Existence after Death, Applied by Science*, London, 1910.

India: H. Oldenburg, *Aus dem alten Indien. Drei Aufsätze über den Buddhismus Altindische Dichtung und Geschichtschreibung*, Berlin, 1910.

Indians of North America, Missions to the: T. J. Campbell, *Pioneer Priests of North America, 1642–1710*, vols., i.–ii., New York, 1910.

Note also Hughes, un 'er Jesuits, below.

Infallibility: J. A. Beckett, *Papal Infallibility in the Light of Holy Scripture and History*, London, 1910.

Inspiration: J. Orr, *Revelation and Inspiration*, London and New York, 1910.

Ireland: D. A. Chart, *Ireland, from the Union to Catholic Emancipation, 1800–29*, London, 1910.

G. B. O'Connor, *Stuart Ireland: Catholic and Puritan*, Dublin, 1910.

C. Plummer, *Vitæ sanctorum Hiberniæ partim hactenus ineditæ ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum recognovit prolegomenis notis indicibus instruxit*, 2 vols., New York, 1910.

Isaiah: *Isaiah I.–XXXIX.*, ed. C. H. Thomson and J. Skinner, London, 1910.

Israel, History of: A. T. Abernethy, *The Jew a Negro: being a Study of the Jewish Ancestry from an impartial Standpoint*, Moravian Falls, N. C., 1910.

A. Albrecht, *Israel und Aegypten. Die politischen Beziehungen der Könige von Israel und Juda zu den Pharaonen*, Leipsic, 1910.

Israel, History of: M. Harris, *Modern Jewish History from the Renaissance to the Russian Exodus*, New York, 1910.

C. F. Lehman-Haupt, *Israel. Seine Geschichte im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1910.

A. Lewin, *Geschichte der badischen Juden seit der Regierung Karl Friedrichs (1738–1909)*, Carlsruhe, 1909.

J. B. Shearer, *Hebrew Institutions, Social and Civil*, Richmond, Va., 1910.

L. Simon, *Aspects of the Hebrew Genius. A Volume of Essays on Jewish Literature and Thought*, London, 1910.

R. Weill, *Le Séjour des Israélites au désert et le Sinaï dans la relation primitive, l'évoluion du texte biblique et la tradition christiano-moderne*, Paris, 1910.

Ives, L. S.: M. de L. Haywood, *Lives of the Bishops of North Carolina from the Establishment of the Episcopate in that State down to the Division of the Diocese*, Raleigh, N. C., 1910.

Jessup, H. H.: *Fifty-three years in Syria*, 2 vols., New York, 1910.

Jesuits: T. A. Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Documents:* vol. i. pt. 2: *nos. 141–224, 1605–1838*, Cleveland, 1910.

H. Stoeckius, *Forschungen zur Lebensordnung der Gesellschaft Jesu im 16 Jahrhundert*, I., *Ordensangehörige und Externe*, Munich, 1910.

Note also Campbell, under Indians of North America, above.

Jesus Christ: A. Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus; a critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, New York, 1910.

W. B. Selbie, *Aspects of Christ*, London, 1910.

H. L. Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den älteren jüdischen Angaben*, Leipsic, 1910.

Jesus Christ, Pictures and Images of: E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, Leipsic, 1910.

Jesus Christ, Threefold Office of: N. Dimock, *Our One Priest on High; or the Present Sacerdotal Function of Christ in Heaven; what it is not and what it is*, New York, 1910.

Joel: A. C. Gaebelein, *The Prophet Joel; an Exposition*, New York, 1910.

John the Apostle: J. Culross, *John, Whom Jesus Loved*, London, 1910.

M. Goguel, *Les Sources du récit johannique de la passion*, Paris, 1910.

M. Lepin, *La Valeur historique du quatrième évangile*, 2 vols., Paris, 1910.

Julius Africanus, Sextus: W. Reichardt, *Die Briefe des Sextus Julius Africanus an Aristides und Origines*, in *TU*, xxxiv. 3, Leipsic, 1910.

Kingdom of God: J. Denney, *The Church and the Kingdom*, London, 1910.

Kittel, R.: *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2 Band, *Das Volk in Kanaan*, 2d ed.. Gotha, 1909; idem, *Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen mit Berücksichtigung des Religionsunterrichts dargestellt*, Leipsic, 1910.

Lewis, A. H.: *Spiritual Sabbathism*, Plainfield, N. J., 1910.

Lombards: C. Blasel, *Die Wanderzüge der Langobarden*, Breslau, 1909.

Lord's Prayer: See above, **Aked**, C. F.

Lord's Supper: N. Dimock, *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper; with an Appendix on the Augmentation Theory*, New York, 1910.

Los von Rom: A. Robertson, *The Papal Conquest: Italy's Warning "Wake up John Bull,"* London, 1910.

McCheyne, R. M.: J. C. Smith, *Robert Murray McCheyne*, London, 1910.

McLaren, A.: *Philippians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians, and I Timothy*, London, 1910.

Magic: J. Cumbarieu, *La Musique et la magie. Étude sur les origines populaire de l'art musical, son influence et sa fonction dans les sociétiés*, Paris, 1909.

Mani, Manicheans: A. von Le Cog, *Exploration archéologique à Tourfan*, Paris, 1910.

Marcus Aurelius: F. W. Bussell, *Marcus Aurelius and the Later Stoics*, Edinburgh, 1910.

Mary: *CSCO, Scriptores æthiopici*, series I., vol. VII. *Apocrypha de B. Maria virgine*, ed. M. Chaine, Leipsic, 1909.

Medo-Persia: F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden und Seleukiden*, Leipsic, 1910.

Melanchthon: N. Müller, *Philipp Melanchthons letzte Lebenstage, Heimgang und Bestattung nach den gleichzeitigen Berichten der Wittenberger Professoren*, 1910.

Methodists: *Wesley's Veterans: Lives of Early Methodist Preachers Told by themselves*, 2 vols., London, 1910.

Meyer, F. B.: *At the Gates of the Dawn*, London, 1910.

Missions to the Heathen: W. E. and M. T. Gardner, *Winners of the World during Twenty Centuries. A Story and Study of missionary Efforts from the Time of Paul to the present Day*, London, 1910.
  S. L. and E. L. Gulick, *Outline Studies of the Growth of the Kingdom of God*, Boston, 1910.
  J. C. Lambert, *Missionary Heroes in Oceania*, London, 1910.
  J. P. Lilley, *The Victory of the Gospel. A Survey of world-wide Evangelism*, London, 1910.
  R. H. Malden, *Foreign Missions: Being a Study of Some Principles and Methods in the Expansion of the Christian Church*, London, 1910.
  T. Moscrop, *The Kingdom without Frontiers: A Missionary Survey*, London, 1910.
  J. Richter, *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*, London and New York, 1910.
  C. H. Robinson, *The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to non-Christian Races; an Apology for Christian Missions*, New York, 1910.
  R. E. Speer, *Christianity and the Nations*, New York and Chicago, 1910.
  Mrs. A. C. Wilson, *The Expansion of Christianity: a Study in religious History*, London, 1910.

Mithra, Mithraism: A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithras-Liturgie*, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1910.

Moab: G. Robinson Lees, *Life and Adventures beyond Jordan*, New York, 1909.

Modernism: C. Beaurredon, *Le Modernisme ou les bases de la foi*, Paris, 1910.
  T. Engert, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte modernistisch-katholischer Wissenschaft*, Munich, 1910.
  Letters to his Holiness, Pope Pius X., by a Modernist, Chicago, 1910.

Mohammed: Baij Nath Singh, *Letters from a Sufi Teacher Treating of the Philosophy of Islam and Consisting of English Translation of Extracts from the Persian Book entitled "Maktubât-i-Sadi," an old Sufistic Work*, Benares, 1909.
  T. Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorans*, part 1, *Ueber den Ursprung des Qorans*, Leipsic, 1909.

Mohammedans, Missions to: A. Thomson, *Crusaders of the Twentieth Century, or the Christian Missionary and the Muslim*, ed. W. A. Rice, London, 1910.

Molinos, M. **de**: *Extracts from the Spiritual Guide*, ed. and compiled by R. Y. Lynn, London, 1909.

Monasticism: *The Life of an Enclosed Nun. By a Mother Superior*, London, 1910.

Mormons: J. H. Evans, *One Hundred Years of Mormonism; a History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1805–1905*, Salt Lake City, 1910; idem, *Birth of Mormonism in Picture: Scenes and Incidents in early Church History from Photographs, Narratives and Notes*, Salt Lake City, 1910.

Moses: M. Fluegel, *Exodus, Moses and the Decalogue Legislation; the central Doctrine and regulative Organum of Mosaism*, Baltimore, 1910.

Moulton, W. F.: See above, **Findlay**.

Mysticism: J. Mühlethaler, *Die Mystik bei Schopenhauer*, Berlin, 1910.

Mythology: Florence V. Farmer, *Nature Myths of Many Lands*, New York, 1910.
  Symbolism of the Bible and of Ancient Literature Generally. Being a Study in Comparative Mythology. By 34 Expectans, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1910.

Naturalism: C. R. Chapman, *Naturalism and the Church*, Boston, 1910.

Negro: W. Archer, *Through Afro-America*, New York, 1910.
  W. E. B. DuBois, *Efforts for Social Betterment among Negro Americans; Report of a special Study made at Atlanta University under the Patronage of the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund; together with the Proceedings of the 14th annual Conference for the Study of Negro Problems, held at Atlanta University on Tuesday, May 24th, 1909*, Atlanta, 1910.

Oesterley, W. O. E.: *The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation*, London, 1910.

Organization of Christianity: J. A. Kern, *A Study of Christianity as Organized, its Ideas and Forms*, Nashville, Tenn., 1910.

BIOGRAPHICAL ADDENDA

Bardenhewer, O.: named by the pope apostolic prothonotary, 1910.

Beer, G.: became ordinary professor of Old Testament at Heidelberg, 1909.

Benham, W.: d. at London, July 30, 1910.

Bosse, F.: became first librarian in the Kaiser Wilhelm Library at Posen, 1909.

Bowne, B. P.: d. at Brookline, Mass., Apr. 1, 1910.

Budde, K. F. C.: chosen rector of the University of Marburg for 1910–11.

Buder, P. von: retired from active duties, 1910.

Clemen, C. C.: became extraordinary professor of comparative religion and philosophy of religion at Bonn, 1910.

Cobb, H. N.: d. at East Orange, N. J., Apr. 17, 1910.

Conder, C. R.: d. at Cheltenham (96 m. w.n.w. of London), England, Feb., 1910.

Day, C. O.: d. at Andover, Mass., Apr. 5, 1910.

Deutsch, S. M.: d. at Berlin, Germany, July 3, 1909.

Dobschuetz, E. A. A. O. A. von: became professor of New-Testament exegesis at Breslau, 1910.

Dubbs, J. H.: d. at Lancaster, Pa., Apr. 1, 1910.

Duchesne, L.: Elected a member of the French Academy, 1910

Feine, P.: became professor of New Testament at Halle, 1910.

Grewing, K. M. N. J.: became professor of church history at Münster, 1909.

Gunkel, J. F. H.: became professor of Old-Testament exegesis at Giessen, 1907.

Hammond, E. P.: d. at Hartford, Conn., Aug. 14, 1910.

Harnack, K. G. A.: retired from editorial staff of *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1910.

Holtzmann, H. J.: d. at Baden-Baden Aug. 4, 1910.

James, W.: d. at Chocorua, N. H., Aug. 26, 1910.

Jessup, H. H.: d. at Beirut, Syria, Apr. 28, 1910.

Jordan, H. S. A.: became extraordinary professor of church history and patristics at Erlangen, 1907.

Kautzsch, E. F.: d. at Halle May 9, 1910.

Kropatscheck, F.: became professor of systematic theology at Breslau, 1907.

Loehr, M.: became professor of the Old Testament at Königsberg, 1909.

Loisy, A. F.: became professor of the history of religions, College of France, Paris, 1909.

McLaren, A.: d. at Edinburgh May 5, 1910.

Merrill, S.: d. at Fruitvale, Cal., Jan. 22, 1909.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Vol. i., p. 103, col. 2, line 1: Read "Concorrezani" for "Concorezenses."

Vol. i., p. 248, col. 2, line 19 from bottom: Add "and Succession, Apostolic."

Vol. i., p. 276, col. 2, line 9: Add "See Paul the Apostle, I., 1, § 1."

Vol. ii., p. 52, col. 2: Insert "Bengel, Ernst Gottlieb. See Tuebingen School, The Older."

Vol. ii., p. 57, col. 1, line 26 from bottom: Read "1887" for "1897."

Vol. ii., p. 59, col. 2, line 26: Read "Sevres" for "Paris."

Vol. ii., p. 144, col. 1, line 38: Read "Notker 5" for "Notker 4."

Vol. iii., p. 37, col. 1, line 18 from bottom: Read "Choreutæ" for "Chorentæ."

Vol. iii., p. 145, col. 2: Insert "Clericis Laicos. See Boniface VIII."

Vol. iv., p. 163, col. 2, line 34: Read "28" for "25"; ib., line 22 from bottom: Read "Time, Biblical Reckoning of" for "Chronology."

Vol. v., p. 9, col. 1, line 23 from bottom: Read "Shedd" for "Stead."

Vol. v., p. 52, col. 2, line 9 from bottom: Read "Feb. 10, 1900" for "May 4, 1896"; ib., line 4 from bottom: Read "1847–49" for "1847."

Vol. v., p. 53, col. 1, line 9 from bottom: Read "Boston" for "Philadelphia"; ib., line 8 from bottom: Read "Philadelphia" for "in the same city."

Vol. v., p. 321, col. 2, line 2 from bottom: Read "Limburg" for "Limbursch."

Vol. v., p. 345, col. 2, lines 29–30: Read "Lutherans, the article Lutherans, at the end" for "home mission . . . Mission."

Vol. v., p. 466, col. 2, lines 12–14: Read "or what may, more correctly, be called their forensic or 'judicial' sense, that is putting . . ."

Vol. vi., p. 23, col. 1: Insert "International Apostolic Holiness Union. See Miscellaneous Religious Bodies, 13."

Vol. vi., p. 68, col. 2, line 14: Read "Paleario" for "Palerio."

Vol. vi., p. 163, col. 2, upper boxhead: Read "Luke" for "John."

Vol. vi., p. 485, col. 1: Insert "Light, Friends of. See Free Congregations in Germany, § 1."

Vol. viii., p. 91, col. 1: Insert: "Nazarene, Church of the. See Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene."

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations in common use or self-evident are not included here. For additional information concerning the works listed, see vol. i., pp. viii.–xx., and the appropriate articles in the body of the work.

ADB	*Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq., vol. 53, 1907
Adv	*adversus*, "against"
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, 1880 sqq.
AJT	*American Journal of Theology*, Chicago, 1897 sqq.
AKR	*Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, Innsbruck, 1857–61, Mainz, 1872 sqq.
ALKG	*Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1885 sqq.
Am	American
AMA	*Abhandlungen der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1763 sqq.
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edition by A. Cleveland Coxe, 8 vols. and index, Buffalo, 1887; vol. ix., ed. Allan Menzies, New York, 1897
Apoc	Apocrypha, apocryphal
Apol	*Apologia*, *Apology*
Arab	Arabic
Aram	Aramaic
art	article
Art. Schmal	Schmalkald Articles
ASB	*Acta sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland and others, Antwerp, 1643 sqq.
ASM	*Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. J. Mabillon, 9 vols., Paris, 1668–1701
Assyr	Assyrian
A. T.	*Altes Testament*, "Old Testament"
Augs. Con	Augsburg Confession
A. V	Authorized Version (of the English Bible)
Baldwin, *Dictionary*	J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3 vols. in 4, New York, 1901–05
Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*	O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1902
Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*	O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1901
Bayle, *Dictionary*	*The Dictionary Historical and Critical of Mr. Peter Bayle*, 2d ed., 5 vols., London, 1734–38
Benzinger, *Archäologie*	I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1907
Bingham, *Origines*	J. Bingham, *Origines ecclesiasticæ*, 10 vols., London, 1708–22; new ed., Oxford, 1855
Bouquet, *Recueil*	M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, continued by various hands, 23 vols., Paris, 1738–76
Bower, *Popes*	Archibald Bower, *History of the Popes . . . to 1758, continued by S. H. Cox*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1845–47
BQR	*Baptist Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, 1867 sqq.
BRG	See Jaffé
Cant	Canticles, Song of Solomon
cap	*caput*, "chapter"
Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*	R. Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, 16 vols. in 17, Paris, 1858–69
Chron	*Chronicon*, "Chronicle"
I Chron	I Chronicles
II Chron	II Chronicles
CIG	*Corpus inscriptionum Græcarum*, Berlin, 1825 sqq.
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863 sqq.
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 sqq.
cod	codex
cod. Theod	*codex Theodosianus*
Col	Epistle to the Colossians
col., cols	column, columns
Conf	*Confessiones*, "Confessions"
I Cor	First Epistle to the Corinthians
II Cor	Second Epistle to the Corinthians
COT	See Schrader
CQR	*The Church Quarterly Review*, London, 1875 sqq.
CR	*Corpus reformatorum*, begun at Halle, 1834, vol. lxxxix., Berlin and Leipsic, 1905 sqq.
Creighton, *Papacy*	M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*, new ed., 6 vols., New York and London, 1897
CSCO	*Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium*, ed. J. B. Chabot, I. Guidi, and others, Paris and Leipsic, 1903 sqq.
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, 1867 sqq.
CSHB	*Corpus scriptorum historiæ Byzantinæ*, 49 vols., Bonn, 1828–78
Currier, *Religious Orders*	C. W. Currier, *History of Religious Orders*, New York, 1896
D	Deuteronomist
Dan	Daniel
DB	J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols. and extra vol., Edinburgh and New York, 1898–1904
DCA	W. Smith and S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 2 vols., London, 1875–80
DCB	W. Smith and H. Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 4 vols., Boston, 1877–87
DCG	J. Hastings, J. A. Selbie, and J. C. Lambert, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 2 vols., Edinburgh and New York, 1906–1908
Deut	Deuteronomy
De vir. ill	*De viris illustribus*
DGQ	See Wattenbach
DNB	L. Stephen and S. Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols. and supplement 3 vols., London, 1885–1901
Driver, *Introduction*	S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 10th ed., New York, 1910
E	Elohist
EB	T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 4 vols., London and New York, 1899–1903
Eccl	*Ecclesia*, "Church"; *ecclesiasticus*, "ecclesiastical"
Eccles	Ecclesiastes
Ecclus	Ecclesiasticus
ed	edition; *edidit*, "edited by"
Eph	Epistle to the Ephesians
Epist	*Epistola*, *Epistolæ*, "Epistle," "Epistles"
Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*	J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipsic, 1818 sqq.
E. V	English versions (of the Bible)
Ex	Exodus
Ezek	Ezekiel
fasc	fasciculus
Fr	French
Friedrich, *KD*	J. Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Bamberg, 1867–69
Gal	Epistle to the Galatians
Gams, *Series episcoporum*	P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, Regensburg, 1873, and supplement, 1886
Gee and Hardy, *Documents*	H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, London, 1896
Germ	German
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Göttingen, 1824 sqq.
Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*	E. Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, 7 vols., London, 1896–1900
Gk	Greek,
Gross, *Sources*	C. Gross, *The Sources and Literature of English History . . . to 1485*, London, 1900
Hab	Habakkuk
Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*	A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–78

Hær	Refers to patristic works on heresies or heretics, Tertullian's *De præscriptione*, the *Pros hairesis* of Irenæus, the *Panarion* of Epiphanius, etc.
Hag	Haggai
Harduin, *Concilia*	J. Harduin, *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, 12 vols., Paris, 1715
Harnack, *Dogma*	A. Harnack, *History of Dogma . . . from the 3d German edition*, 7 vols., Boston, 1895–1900
Harnack, *Litteratur*	A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 vols. in 3, Leipsic, 1893–1904
Hauck, *KD*	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1904; vol. ii., 1900; vol. iii., 1906; vol. iv., 1903
Hauck-Herzog, *RE*	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, founded by J. J. Herzog, 3d ed. by A. Hauck, Leipsic, 1896–1909
Heb	Epistle to the Hebrews
Hebr	Hebrew
Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*	C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, continued by J. Hergenröther, vols. i.–vi., viii.–ix., Freiburg, 1883–93
Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2d ed. 3 vols., Paderborn, 1907
Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*	P. Helyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires*, 8 vols., Paris, 1714–19; new ed., 1839–42
Henderson, *Documents*	E. F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, London, 1892
Hist	History, *histoire, historia*
Hist. eccl	*Historia ecclesiastica, ecclesiæ*, "Church History"
Hom	*Homilia, homiliai*, "homily, homilies"
Hos	Hosea
Isa	Isaiah
Ital	Italian
J	Jahvist (Yahwist)
JA	*Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1822 sqq.
Jacobus, *Dictionary*	*A Standard Bible Dictionary*, ed. M. W. Jacobus, . . . E. E. Nourse, . . . and A. C. Zenos, New York and London, 1909
Jaffé, *BRG*	P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73
Jaffé, *Regesta*	P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum . . . ad annum 1198*, Berlin, 1851; 2d ed., Leipsic, 1881–88
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven, 1849 sqq.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, first appeared as *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Middletown, 1882–88, then Boston, 1890 sqq.
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols., New York, 1901–06
JE	The combined narrative of the Jahvist (Yahwist) and Elohist
Jer	Jeremiah
Josephus, *Ant*	Flavius Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews"
Josephus, *Apion*	Flavius Josephus, "Against Apion"
Josephus, *Life*	Life of Flavius Josephus
Josephus, *War*	Flavius Josephus, "The Jewish War"
Josh	Joshua
JPT	*Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq.
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, London, 1888 sqq.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1834 sqq.
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, 1899 sqq.
Julian, *Hymnology*	J. Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, revised edition, London, 1907
KAT	See Schrader
KB	See Schrader
KD	See Friedrich, Hauck, Rettberg
KL	*Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon*, 2d ed., by J. Hergenröther and F. Kaulen, 12 vols., Freiburg, 1882–1903
Krüger, *History*	G. Krüger, *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries*, New York, 1897
Krumbacher, *Geschichte*	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed., Munich, 1897
Labbe, *Concilia*	P. Labbe, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1759–98
Lam	Lamentations
Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist*	J. Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1829
Lat	Latin, Latinized
Leg	*Leges, Legum*
Lev	Leviticus
Lichtenberger, *ESR*	F. Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 13 vols., Paris, 1877–1882
Lorenz, *DGQ*	O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed., Berlin, 1887
LXX	The Septuagint
I Macc	I Maccabees
II Macc	II Maccabees
Mai, *Nova collectio*	A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38
Mal	Malachi
Mann, *Popes*	R. C. Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, London, 1902 sqq.
Mansi, *Concilia*	G. D. Mansi, *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio nova*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1728
Matt	Matthew
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, ed. G. H. Pertz and others, Hanover and Berlin, 1826 sqq. The following abbreviations are used for the sections and subsections of this work: *Ant.*, *Antiquitates*, "Antiquities"; *Auct. ant.*, *Auctores antiquissimi*, "Oldest Writers"; *Chron. min.*, *Chronica minora*, "Lesser Chronicles"; *Dip.*, *Diplomata*, "Diplomas, Documents"; *Epist.*, *Epistolæ*, "Letters"; *Gest. pont. Rom.*, *Gesta pontificum Romanorum*, "Deeds of the Popes of Rome"; *Leg.*, *Leges*, "Laws"; *Lib. de lite*, *Libelli de lite inter regnum et sacerdotium sæculorum xi. et xii. conscripti*, "Books concerning the Strife between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries"; *Nec.*, *Necrologia Germaniæ*, "Necrology of Germany"; *Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, *Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, "Latin Poets of the Caroline Time"; *Poet. Lat. med. ævi*, *Poetæ Latini medii ævi*, "Latin Poets of the Middle Ages"; *Script.*, *Scriptores*, "Writers"; *Script. rer. Germ.*, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, "Writers on German Subjects"; *Script. rer. Langob.*, *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, "Writers on Lombard and Italian Subjects"; *Script. rer. Merov.*, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, "Writers on Merovingian Subjects"
Mic	Micah
Milman, *Latin Christianity*	H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to . . . Nicholas V.*, 8 vols., London, 1860–61
Mirbt, *Quellen*	C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholicismus*, Tübingen, 1901
MPG	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Græca*, 162 vols., Paris, 1857–66
MPL	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Latina*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844–64
MS., MSS	Manuscript, Manuscripts
Muratori, *Scriptores*	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, 28 vols., 1723–51
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, Hanover, 1876 sqq.
Nah	Nahum
n.d.	no date of publication
Neander, *Christian Church*	A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 6 vols., and index, Boston, 1872–81
Neh	Nehemiah
Niceron, *Mémoires*	R. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustrés . . .*, 43 vols., Paris, 1729–45
Nielsen, *Papacy*	F. K. Nielsen, *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1906
Nippold, *Papacy*	F. Nippold, *The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1900
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Leipsic, 1890 sqq.
Nowack, *Archäologie*	W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1894
n.p.	no place of publication
NPNF	*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1st series, 14 vols., New York, 1887–92; 2d series, 14 vols., New York, 1890–1900
N. T.	New Testament, *Novum Testamentum, Nouveau Testament, Neues Testament*
Num	Numbers
Ob	Obadiah

O. S. B.	*Ordo sancti Benedicti*, "Order of St. Benedict"
O. T.	Old Testament
OTJC	See Smith
P.	Priestly document
Pastor, *Popes*	L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols., London, 1891–1908
PBA	*Patres ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, ed. J. A. Giles, 34 vols., London, 1838–46
PEF	Palestine Exploration Fund
I Pet	First Epistle of Peter
II Pet	Second Epistle of Peter
Platina, *Popes*	B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes from . . . Gregory VII. to . . . Paul II.*, 2 vols., London, n.d.
Pliny, *Hist. nat.*	Pliny, *Historia naturalis*
Potthast, *Wegweiser*	A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke*, Berlin, 1896
Prov	Proverbs
Ps	Psalms
PSBA	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology*, London, 1880 sqq.
q.v., qq.v.	*quod (quæ) vide*, "which see"
Ranke, *Popes*	L. von Ranke, *History of the Popes*, 3 vols., London, 1906
RDM	*Revue des deux mondes*, Paris, 1831 sqq.
RE	See Hauck-Herzog
Reich, *Documents*	F. Reich, *Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History*, London, 1905
REJ	*Revue des études juives*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Rettberg, *KD*	F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1846–48
Rev	Book of Revelation
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*	E. C. Richardson, *Alphabetical Subject Index and Index Encyclopaedia to Periodical Articles on Religion, 1890–99*, New York, 1907
Richter, *Kirchenrecht*	A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts*, 8th ed. by W. Kahl, Leipsic, 1886
Robinson, *Researches*, and *Later Researches*	E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Boston, 1841, and *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 3d ed. of the whole, 3 vols., 1867
Robinson, *European History*	J. H. Robinson, *Readings in European History*, 2 vols., Boston, 1904–06
Robinson and Beard, *Modern Europe*	J. H. Robinson, and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols., Boston, 1907
Rom	Epistle to the Romans
RTP	*Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, Lausanne, 1873
R. V.	Revised Version (of the English Bible)
sæc	*sæculum*, "century"
I Sam	I Samuel
II Sam	II Samuel
SBA	*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, Berlin, 1882 sqq.
SBE	F. Max Müller and others, *The Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford, 1879 sqq., vol. xlviii., 1904
SBOT	*Sacred Books of the Old Testament* ("Rainbow Bible"), Leipsic, London, and Baltimore, 1894 sqq.
Schaff, *Christian Church*	P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vols. i.–iv., vi., vii., New York, 1882–92, vol. v., 2 parts, by D. S. Schaff, 1907–10
Schaff, *Creeds*	P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols., New York, 1877–84
Schrader, *COT*	E. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 2 vols., London, 1885–88
Schrader, *KAT*	E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902–03
Schrader, *KB*	E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1889–1901
Schürer, *Geschichte*	E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 3 vols., Leipsic, 1902 sqq.; Eng. transl., 5 vols., New York, 1891
Script	*Scriptores*, "writers"
Scrivener, *Introduction*	F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 4th ed., London, 1894
Sent	*Sententiæ*, "Sentences"
S. J.	*Societas Jesu*, "Society of Jesus"
SMA	*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1860 sqq.
Smith, *Kinship*	W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, London, 1903
Smith, *OTJC*	W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, London, 1892
Smith, *Prophets*	W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel . . . to the Eighth Century*, London, 1895
Smith, *Rel. of Sem*	W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894
S. P. C. K.	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
S. P. G.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts
sqq.	and following
Strom	*Stromata*, "Miscellanies"
s.v.	sub voce, or sub verbo
Swete, *Introduction*	H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, London, 1900
Syr	Syriac
Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*	O. J. Thatcher and E. H. McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*, New York, 1905
I Thess	First Epistle to the Thessalonians
II Thess	Second Epistle to the Thessalonians
ThT	*Theologische Tijdschrift*, Amsterdam and Leyden, 1867 sqq.
Tillemont, *Mémoires*	L. S. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires . . . ecclésiastiques des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols., Paris, 1693–1712
I Tim	First Epistle to Timothy
II Tim	Second Epistle to Timothy
TJB	*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Leipsic, 1882–1887, Freiburg, 1888, Brunswick, 1889–1897, Berlin, 1898 sqq.
Tob	Tobit
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Tübingen, 1819 sqq.
TS	J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891 sqq.
TSBA	*Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, London, 1872 sqq.
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1826 sqq.
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, ed. O. von Gebhardt and A. Harnack, Leipsic, 1882 sqq.
Ugolini, *Thesaurus*	B. Ugolinus, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69
V. T.	*Vetus Testamentum, Vieux Testament*, "Old Testament"
Wattenbach, *DGQ*	W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 5th ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1885; 6th ed., 1893–94; 7th ed., 1904 sqq.
Wellhausen, *Heidentum*	J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin, 1887
Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*	J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed., Berlin, 1905, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1885
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Leipsic, 1886–88, Berlin, 1889 sqq.
Zahn, *Einleitung*	T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d ed., Leipsic, 1907; Eng. transl., *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909
Zahn, *Kanon*	T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1888–92
ZATW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1881 sqq.
ZDAL	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur*, Berlin, 1876 sqq.
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipsic, 1847 sqq.
ZDP	*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Halle, 1869 sqq.
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, Leipsic, 1878 sqq.
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah
ZHT	*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, published successively at Leipsic, Hamburg, and Gotha, 1832–75
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Gotha, 1876 sqq.
ZKR	*Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Berlin, Tübingen, Freiburg, 1861 sqq.
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1877 sqq.
ZKW	*Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, Leipsic, 1880–89
ZNTW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1900 sqq.
ZPK	*Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, Erlangen, 1838–76
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jena, 1858–60, Halle, 1861–67, Leipsic, 1868 sqq.

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

The following system of transliteration has been used for Hebrew:

א = ' or omitted at the beginning of a word.
בּ = b
ב = bh or b
גּ = g
ג = gh or g
דּ = d
ד = dh or d
ה = h
ו = w

ז = z
ח = ḥ
ט =
י = y
כּ = k
כ = kh or k
ל = l
מ = m
נ = n
ס = s

ע = ‘
פּ = p
פ = ph or p
צ = ẓ
ק = ḳ
ר = r
שׂ = s
שׁ = sh
תּ = t
ת = th or t

The vowels are transcribed by a, e, i, o, u, without attempt to indicate quantity or quality. Arabic and other Semitic languages are transliterated according to the same system as Hebrew. Greek is written with Roman characters, the common equivalents being used.

KEY TO PRONUNCIATION

When the pronunciation is self-evident the titles are not respelled; when by mere division and accentuation it can be shown sufficiently clearly the titles have been divided into syllables, and the accented syllables indicated.

ɑ as in sof*a*	o as in n*o*t	iu as in d*u*ration
ɑ̄ " " *ar*m	ō " " n*o*r	c = k " " *c*at
a " " *a*t	u " " f*u*ll[2]	ch " " *ch*urch
â " " f*a*re	ū " " r*u*le	cw = qu as in *qu*een
e " " p*e*n[1]	ʊ " " b*u*t	dh (*th*) " " *th*e
ê " " f*a*te	ʊ̄ " " b*u*rn	f " " *f*ancy
i " " t*i*n	ɑi " " p*i*ne	g (hard) " " *g*o
î " " mach*i*ne	ɑu " " *ou*t	H " " lo*ch* (Scotch)
o " " *o*bey	ei " " *oi*l	hw (*wh*) " " *wh*y
ō " " n*o*	iū " " f*ew*	j " " *j*aw

---

[1] In accented syllables only; in unaccented syllables it approximates the sound of e in over. The letter ṇ, with a dot beneath it, indicates the sound of n as in ink. Nasal n (as in French words) is rendered n.

[2] In German and French names ū approximates the sound of u in dune.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG
ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

MORALITY, MORAL LAW.

The Kantian Basis (§ 1).
His Results (§ 2).
Schleiermacher's Basis (§ 3).
Relation of Morality to Moral Law (§ 4).
Conclusion (§ 5).

1. The Kantian Basis.

To establish a clear distinction between these terms and their relation to one another, it is best to start with the treatment of the subject by Kant and Schleiermacher. According to Kant's system of critical rationalism, to found morals on true principles morality must be derived from the general conception of a reasonable being. It must then be developed as a pure philosophy or metaphysics to be applied to man. Previous attempts to establish the principles of morality failed either because they were purely empirical or, when rational, lacked the critical element. Kant's *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (Riga, 1785) and *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (1788) contain his contribution to the subject. Naturally there were systems of moral law before Kant's time and moral legislators of all kinds, but the content of moral prescriptions had been derived from nature, custom, or arbitrary will. Man had indeed established himself as deciding moral questions on the basis of the individual conscience, but Kant in his critical analysis of the power of reason first recognized the secret of morality. The essence of moral legislation which he discovered was legislation by self. An act is moral which the will imposes upon itself in the consciousness that the maxim which it is following in any particular case can be erected into a universal law. Such acts are recognized as duty and done as duty. Man in giving moral commands to himself plays the rôle of both ruler and subject. The law once accepted must be followed even against man's will, neither threats nor flattery can be brought into relation with it. That will is good which fulfils duty on account of duty's sake, recognizing it as a principle of application. Universal and necessary elements condition morality, so the moral law is like the law of nature, but it expresses a necessity without force. It is an imperative act of will, not hypothetical but categorical, valid under all conditions. But, applicable only to a reasonable being, it is not possible without freedom. This character of freedom established a place for morality in a world different from that occupied by the phenomenal world with its subjection of things to causal relations. As autonomous morality is a fact, so freedom is a fact. Man has an empirical character as a natural being subject to the causal system of nature, but he is also an intelligent being belonging to a moral supersensible world that proves its existence in no way more clearly than by the fact of man's freedom.

2. His Results.

But this reality can not be established by psychological analysis or historical investigation. The moral law and all that it involves must be determined by the method of transcendental criticism. The world of phenomena must be critically penetrated until the a priori element of reason is sought and found; this is the element that makes the objects of the phenomenal world moral. But the principle of morality is a formal one as it appears in the categorical imperative. It must be applied to persons, wills, and aims, and takes the practical form of acts done in such a way that the individual uses humanity in his own person, as in the person of every other individual, always as an end, never simply as a means. As to the relation established by Kant between morality and religion, he rejects all eudemonistic elements, such as those which regard happiness as a motive for action. But a moral final end must be accepted, so the postulates of the practical reason for the existence of God and the immortality of the soul are introduced. By immortality and God, he establishes an effect adequate to the general exercise of the moral law. It becomes a necessity of reason to assume a power, the supreme cause of nature and the moral creator of the world. In this way man's duties are recognized as divine commands. Without God as the moral creator and law-giver, knowledge and action, even that willed freely by man, remains aimless and incomplete. This was Kant's reply to the riddle—man autonomous in the midst of the world with the duty of making out of it his moral world. The recognition of the categorical imperative, or moral law, makes man a moral being. The accommodation of his character to the law is virtue. Evil is the constant tendency to transgress the law, but there is hope for an unending progress. Kant considered that his system was essentially Christian, since the precepts of the Gospel recognize a perfection not to be reached by any creature, yet offering a model to which man could approximate. Even the most difficult parts of his teaching, that dealing with the intelligible world, intelligible character, and freedom have a remarkable relationship to the morality of the Gospels. His system approached also German popular morality through its rational character, its dualistic basis, and its attention to practical problems.

3. Schleiermacher's Basis.

Schleiermacher moves in a thoroughly different world. He deals with moral being, moral impulse, moral feeling, moral activity, and, above all, moral process. Nature becomes reason and reason, nature. The highest good is the unity of reason and nature, so there exists no specific difference between natural law and moral law. Over against natural law stands not the moral law but the law of reason, but a distinction is not made between what happens and what ought to happen. The moral law is the law given by reason itself, respect for the law determines it to be the law. This internal recognition is of more importance than the external act; it is the real element of moral being, in which the phenomenal act may share more or less completely. The moral law is a law then that determines being, not simple obligation; morality is the being or becoming demanded by this law. The first stage has been entered upon, but the transformation of reason into nature is not yet completed. The question arises whether the subject of this being or becoming is man alone. Schleiermacher is not an individualist. The morality of the individual man is only a part of the morality of the collective person, the family, the State, the Church. It is wrong, he says, to make the individual the subject and the substratum of moral life. Man's acts can not be isolated; individuals are to be regarded as organs and symbols of reason which really deal with the whole of nature. It is not easy to see why God, who is the cause of the opposition between reason and nature, is not himself the subject of the moral process. It will be seen that Schleiermacher's discussion of morality takes up exactly that sphere and occupies those interests which were entirely neglected by Kant. The field of history is made the field of ethical investigation. Schleiermacher's ethics, therefore, must be regarded as being a religious philosophy, a discussion of civilization, a view of the world and its progress, as much as a system of morality. He treats the subject as an organic whole. Moral predicates are associated with the phenomenal world, with its things and its processes. Anything which can serve its special end can be called good, can have a value. This extension of the application of the term morality to finite being under the power of reason leads really to Hegel's position by which all being is found to be reasonable, in whose system ethics has properly no place. The highest good is, according to Schleiermacher, the unity of the being of reason in nature. It comes into consciousness only through the mutual relations of all examples of good. He shows remarkable power in bringing together for this purpose the whole of life in its various concrete forms. Elementary moral conceptions are prior to the conception of morality. The activity of the formative functions, as in friendship, hospitality, community of class interest, produces an identity of type seen in all. He gave a wider significance to Christian ethics than was accorded to it in philosophic systems. For him it meant the orderly arrangement of rules by which the member of the Christian Church directs his life. Without experience no moral rule is possible. In regard to religion, he insisted on the full independence of religion from morality. As distinguished from Kant, his view of the ethical element in facts had a broader horizon, but the obligatory element in morality seems to be dissolved in the study of its static relations.

4. Relation of Morality to Moral Law.

It is plain, therefore, that Kant supplies a more important and purer type of ethical knowledge. Kant is normative where Schleiermacher is descriptive. Apart from Kant's formulation of the categorical imperative, ethical interest finds itself without a guiding principle in the wide survey of moral values, powers, and aims. The conception of duty is all-important, and without moral autonomy duty is impossible. Moreover, the character of duty can not be decided by investigating its origin, its necessary character is not related with its historical manifestations. History has established the right of this autonomous treatment, but it does not explain the secret. After all biological, psychological, and sociological methods of investigation have been drawn upon, that very factor without which the whole moral world can not be grasped at all is still left in obscurity. The problem of freedom can not be solved in this way, for in the sphere of natural law there is no freedom. Nobody has brought out this contrast better than Kant, who insisted upon the natural capacity of the human will to lay down moral laws for itself. On the basis of these laws freely given there arises a realm of good persons, voluntarily true to duty, setting no other law for themselves than what can be a maxim for their neighbors also. Kant's moral man is not the individual man, but the universal man. This capacity of laying down the moral law in universal terms can not be drawn out by some mysterious power from within; it depends on education, on instruction of every kind. Philosophy and history must contribute their share, especially history. But a clear idea of what morality is must exist before the matter supplied by history can be justly discriminated. Is there not in this a danger of simple relativism? Is not to comprehend everything to pardon everything? So one sees in monism how the distinction between good and evil is faint or passes away altogether. The only solution is in practise. The constant exercise of the feeling of duty with its practical discrimination leads to virtue. Christian morality is, in the first place, autonomous, dependent on nothing outside of it. The morality of Jesus and of Paul is concerned with the inner man, is deep, pure, and true. Its expression is conditioned by the prevalent ideas of the time as is seen in the eschatological expectations of the early Christians. The characteristics of Roman Catholic morality are its dependence on authority and its casuistic development. It is obvious that in the absence of independence man ceases to be a moral being. So the surrender of one's moral freedom from pious motives is evil. The same criticism must be based on the absolute dependence of Protestants on the actual letter of the Bible. In the scientific sense this is immoral, it violates the freedom of the Christian man.

5. Conclusion.

The English word morality is connected with the Latin *mos*, "custom." The German *Sitte* contains the same idea, since it means "manner of life," "usage" in a general external sense, or refers to an internal characteristic. Thus it appears that in wide circles the customary is regarded as the good and the proper, morality therefore meaning what is accepted through the force of custom, hardly to be differentiated from habit. Naturally these traditional customs can be good or bad, but in their origin they are natural; without the force of custom social institutions, such as the family and the State, are incomprehensible. In these forms, of course, morality is at work, but custom does not make morality. Through processes of change the old and the new custom contend for the mastery. Forms of morality or immorality come into question in these processes only from the fact that the persons who take part in them are by nature moral beings. It is through morality that the individual man emancipates himself from custom, establishes his freedom, and creates a place where he can legislate by himself for himself so far as his conduct is concerned. In the ethics of the New Testament the word "old" is almost always used interchangeably with bad and new is equivalent to good; in dogma, with its acknowledgment of original sin, bad is anterior to good. Both Jesus and Paul, in their contests with old traditions and old customs, were contending for the sphere of freedom. Yet a revolutionary attitude against custom such as is found in Rousseau and in the whole romantic school up to Nietzsche has no absolute moral worth in itself. The question is complicated, old customs give way, but custom itself does not disappear, novel teachings and novel practises become themselves customs, as is seen in the case of the Social Democratic party in Germany with its claim not only to erect a political program but to control the details of the life of its individual members. Advocates of the new may, besides, easily confuse ethical with esthetic interests. It must be remembered, too, that traditions which at one time possess a moral value may lose that character if they are not sincerely appropriated by those who maintain them. Custom is not the source of morality, but it is the ground on which morality can work. The Church above all is an institution which creates custom; but in its reformed Evangelical type it is bound to adhere to its original claim and purpose of giving the freest play in custom to morality. In popular usage, the word morality has come to have a restricted sense. Associations for improving morality have brought up practical problems and numerous proposals for solving them. There is only one morality, the self-legislation of a personality under the control of the categorical imperative. Practical questions, no matter how novel they may be, can be answered only under the influence of the old ethics. For each person moral freedom is decisive; and similarly for the entire social whole and its conduct as a whole, which is nothing but the working together of moral individual decisions. See ETHICS; and MORALISTS, BRITISH. (MARTIN RADE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal works of Schleiermacher bearing upon the subject are: *Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre*, Berlin, 1803; *Entwurf eines Systems der Sittenlehre*, ed. A. Schweizer, Gotha, 1835; *Grundriss der philosophischen Ethik*, ed. D. A. Twesten, Berlin, 1841; *Philosophische Sittenlehre*, ed. J. H. von Kirchmann, ib. 1870; *Christliche Sittenlehre*, ed. L. Jonas, Gotha, 1891. Discussions of the ethics of Kant and Schleiermacher are named under the articles on these philosophers. A considerable list of works germane to the subject will be found under ETHICS. Consult further: R. Rothe, *Theologische Ethik*, 4 vols., Wittenberg, 1868–71; G. Rümelin, *Ueber den Begriff eines sozialen Gesetzes*, Freiburg, 1875; idem, *Ueber das Wesen der Gewohnheit*, ib., 1881; L. Wiese, *Ueber den sittlichen Wert gegebener Formen*, Berlin, 1878; T. Hoppe, *Christliche Sitte*, Hanover, 1883; D. Frick, *Ueber das Wesen der Sitte*, Heilbronn, 1884; R. von Ihering, *Der Zweck im Recht*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1898; C. Stange, *Einleitung der Ethik*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1900–01; M. Wentscher, *Ethik*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1902–05; B. Bauch, *Luther und Kant*, Berlin, 1904; H. Cohen, *Ethik des reinen Willens*, Berlin, 1904; W. Heremann, *Ethik*, Tübingen, 1904; W. Koppelman, *Kritik des sittlichen Bewusstseins*, Berlin, 1904; F. Troeltsch, *Politische Ethik und Christentum*, Göttingen, 1904.

MORAN, mo-ran′, **PATRICK FRANCIS**: Roman Catholic archbishop of Sydney, Australia, and cardinal-priest of Santa Susanna; b. at Leighlinbridge (7½ m. s.w. of Carlow), County Carlow, Ireland, Sept. 16, 1830. He was educated at the Irish College of St. Agatha at Rome from 1842 to 1856, and in 1856 was appointed professor of Hebrew in the College of the Propaganda, as well as vice-president of the Irish College. From 1866 to 1872 he was private secretary to Cardinal Cullen, besides being a professor in the seminary at Dublin. In 1871 he was consecrated titular bishop of Olba to be coadjutor to the bishop of Ossory, whom he succeeded in the full administration of the diocese in the following year. In 1884 he was elevated to the archdiocese of Sydney, and within a year was created cardinal. He is a member of the Congregations of the Consistory, Bishops and Regulars, the Propaganda, and Indulgences. He has written, among other works, *Memoirs of the Most Reverend O. Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh* (Dublin, 1861); *Historical Sketch of the Persecutions suffered by the Catholics of Ireland under the Rule of Cromwell and the Puritans* (1862); *Essays on the Origin, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Early Irish Church* (1864); *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation*, i (1864); *Spicilegium Ossoriense: being a Collection of original Letters and Papers illustrative of the History of the Irish Church from the Reformation to 1800* (3 series, 1874–84); *Irish Saints in Great Britain* (1879); *Catholic Prayer Book and Manual of Meditations* (1883); *Occasional Papers* (1890); *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia* (Sydney, 1897); *The Catholics of Ireland under the Penal Laws in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1899); *The Three Patrons of Ireland* (1905); and *The Priests and People of Ireland* (1905). He has also edited M. Archdall's *Monasticon Hibernicum: or, A History of the Ab-*

bies, Priories, and other Religious Houses in Ireland (Dublin, 1871–73) and *Acta Sancti Brendani* (1872).

MORATA, OLIMPIA: Italian Protestant; b. at Ferrara 1526; d. at Heidelberg Oct. 26, 1555. She received a thorough education in Latin under the direction of her father, the Humanist Fulvio Pellegrini, who lived at the court of Ferrara as teacher of the Princes Ippolito and Alfonso, and in Greek under the Protestant Kilian Sinapi (Senf). In 1540 Olimpia was drawn to the court as companion and fellow pupil of Princess Anna of Este; and "soon shone as a star in the choir of the Duchess Renata." She likewise took part in producing, before Paul III., 1543, the *Adelphi* of Terence; the leading rôles falling to the ducal princes and princesses. Her life in court came to an end in 1548 by reason of the marriage of the princesses. Soon after she was stricken by the sudden death of her father, and her return to court did not eventuate, possibly because of her Lutheran bent and the duke's opposition to that tendency. She married, in 1550, the physician Gründler of Schweinfurt. In spring the young couple journeyed across the Alps, taking with them Olimpia's brother, a lad of eight years, with a view to fixing their home at Schweinfurt, in the following October. Olimpia's letters testify to the happiness of her marriage, and to her deep Evangelical piety. In 1553 the so-called "wild Margrave" Albrecht of Brandenburg-Ansbach captured the town of Schweinfurt, after the mercenaries of the bishop had camped about the town and introduced the plague. The capture of the city was attended with murder and plundering, from which Gründler barely saved his life, and fled with Olimpia through the Spessart and Odenwald, finding shelter finally in the castle of the count of Erbach. He contrived to obtain a medical professorship at Heidelberg in 1554; but afflictions and hardships had undermined his wife's health, and she died in the very next year. A contagious disease soon carried off her husband and her brother, and all were laid to rest in the cemetery of St. Peter's Church, where their resting-place is marked by a gravestone with a touching inscription. The town of Schweinfurt has also marked the house in which Olimpia dwelt, with a tablet inscribed:

Vilis et exilis domus hæc quamvis, habitatrix
Clara tamen claram sat facit et celebrem.
"A famous woman dwelling in this house,
Though cheap and poor it be,
Has by her simple dwelling there
Made its celebrity."

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Her *Opera*, including her letters, were edited by C. S. Curione, Basel, 1558, 1562, 1570, 1580. Biographies are by G. A. Nolten, Frankfort, 1775; R. Turnbull, Boston, 1846; and (best) by J. Bonnet, Paris, 1850. Consult also B. Fontana, *Renata di Francia*, ii. 283 sqq., Rome, 1893; E. Rodocanachi, *Une protectrice de la réforme en Italie et en France. Renée de France, duchesse de Ferrare*, Paris, 1896.

MORAVIANS. See Unity of the Brethren.

MORE, HANNAH: English authoress and philanthropist; b. at Stapleton (3 m. n. of Bristol) Feb. 2, 1745; d. at Clifton (a suburb of Bristol) 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 Captive*, and several poems; in 1777 a tragedy, *Percy* (brought out by Garrick, and played for fourteen nights); and in 1779 her last tragedy, *The Fatal Falsehood*. But, her views having changed, after Garrick's death in 1779, 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 tales in the monthly publication entitled *The Cheap Repository*, begun in Bristol, 1795. Such stories as *Parley the Porter*, *Black Giles the Poacher*, and above all, *The Shepherd of Salisbury 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* (1791); *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (London, 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); *Cœlebs in Search of a Wife* (1809; her most popular work, ten editions having been sold in first year); *Practical Piety* (1811); *Christian Morals* (1813); *Essay on the Character and Writings of St. Paul* (1815); *Modern Sketches* (1819); *Spirit of Prayer* (1825). Her collected works were published 8 vols., London, 1801; 19 vols., 1818, in 11 vols., 1830. Her poems were collected in 1816 and 1829.

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 1786, 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; and together, upon the suggestion of Wilberforce, they began to establish Sunday-schools and other religious and philanthropic meetings at Cheddar and a number of other places. In these, Hannah taught the Bible and catechism. In 1802 they all moved to Barley Wood. In 1828 Hannah, who survived 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. She received, it is said, upward of thirty thousand pounds sterling for her writings, and bequeathed ten thousand pounds sterling for pious and charitable purposes.

Bibliography: Her life has been written by H. Thompson, London, 1838 (best); W. Roberts, 4 vols., ib. 1835, abridged ed., 1872; C. L. Balfour, ib. 1854; A. J. Buckland, ib. 1882; and C. L. Yonge, ib. 1888. Consult: L. B. Walford, *Twelve English Authoresses*, London, 1892; A. Birrell, *Essays about Men, Women and Books*, ib. 1894; *DNB*, xxxviii. 414–420.

MORE, HENRY: One of the most distinguished members of the school of Cambridge Platonists (q.v.); b. at Grantham (23 m. s.s.w. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, 1614; d. at Cambridge Sept. 1, 1687. He was educated at Eton and Christ's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1635; M.A., 1639) and was elected to a fellowship, being ordained about the same time. He passed practically the entire remainder of his life within the walls of his college, refusing all preferment except a prebend at Gloucester, which he held for a short time in 1676, though three collegiate headships, the deanery of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and two bishoprics were offered to him. He was strongly attached to the cause of Church and king, even in the period of parliamentary supremacy, and was an indefatigable and voluminous author. His works, by their mystical character, did not commend themselves to the practical and skeptical eighteenth century; but John Wesley praised them highly, and Coleridge declared that they contained more original, enlarged, and elevating views of the Christian dispensation than he had met with in any other single volume. His best-known book is the *Divine Dialogues*, 1668, in which various speakers discuss the attributes and providence of God. This book contains in a condensed form most of his characteristic views in philosophy and religion. In his method and the basis of his thought he occupies the common ground of the Cambridge school. He was a vigorous advocate of the rights of reason, and the main scope of his studies was to demonstrate the rationality of the Christian religion. But while reason was to him the only sure foundation of divine truth, he advocated strongly the recognition of a higher principle " more noble and inward than reason itself," to which he gives the name of " divine sagacity." The emphasis laid by him upon the fact that in order to apprehend higher divine truth it must be approached with a right disposition as well as a free and unprejudiced intellect became the key-note of his whole system. With such a rational basis for his thought, it is surprising that he developed so strong an element of mysticism and even of credulity. He was a firm believer in the current tales of witchcraft and recounts at great length stories of ghosts and apparitions, setting them forth as attestations of the supernatural. In his *Antidote against Atheism*, 1652, the first and second books present the theistic argument in an acute and logical manner, while the third is entirely devoted to tales of this kind. His tendency to mystical extravagance partially explains why, after being at first an ardent admirer of Descartes, he came later to oppose him even with bitterness, and the *Manual of Metaphysics*, 1671, was expressly designed to refute Cartesianism. His aim, and that of the Cambridge philosophy in general, was the vindication of a true sphere of spiritual being; the proof and definition of incorporeal substances seems to him the sole object of metaphysics. His *Manual of Ethics*, 1666, is the clearest and most compact of his works. In it he defines morality as " the art of living well and happily "; goodness and happiness are to him merely different aspects of the highest law of our being, or what the older moralists spoke of as the *summum bonum* (see GOOD, THE HIGHEST). Moral goodness is simple and absolute; right reason is the judge of its nature, essence, and truth, but its attractiveness and beauty are felt by a certain capacity, the " boniform faculty," not unlike the " moral sense " of later writers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Ward, *The Life of . . . Dr. H. More*, London, 1710; J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology . . . in England in the 17th Century*, ii. 303-409, Edinburgh, 1872; *DNB*, xxxviii. 421-423.

MORE, SIR THOMAS: Lord chancellor of England, the foremost English representative of the learning and aspirations of the earlier Renaissance, was born in Milk Street, Cheapside, London, Feb. 7, 1478; he was executed on Tower Hill, London, July 6, 1535. His father, Sir John More, a lawyer, was a judge, and his maternal grandfather, Thomas Graunger, was sheriff of London. More attended St. Anthony's School in Threadneedle Street and in 1491 became a member of the household of John Morton (q.v.), archbishop of Canterbury and chancellor, on whose recommendation he was sent to Oxford, entering Canterbury Hall (afterward absorbed in Christ Church) about 1492. He was not a plodding scholar, but he learned to read Greek readily and to write good Latin; he also studied French, mathematics, and history and mastered the viol and the flute. After about two years, however, he was back in London studying law in accordance with his father's wish. He was speedily called to the bar, became a highly esteemed lecturer on law at Furnival's Inn, and later ranked among the first lawyers of England. Between 1499 and 1503 he passed through a period of strong religious emotion and contemplated becoming a priest. He adopted a severely ascetic life and even thought of joining the Franciscans. At this time he gave lectures on Augustine's " City of God " in the church of St. Lawrence Jewry, of which his former Oxford tutor, William Grocyn, was rector.

Life.

Ever afterward More remained abstemious in life and wore sackcloth next to his skin. In 1503, however, he returned with ardor to his profession and entered the field of politics. He became member of parliament (1504), undersheriff of London (1510), envoy to Flanders to negotiate in favor of English commerce (1515) and to Calais to arrange disputes with France (1516), master of requests (i.e., examiner of petitions presented to the king on his progresses through the country) and privy councilor (1518), subtreasurer to the king (1521), speaker of the house of commons (1523), high steward of Cambridge University and chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster (1525), and succeeded Wolsey as lord chancellor in 1529. He was knighted in 1521. Not favoring the divorce of Catharine of Aragon and disapproving of ecclesiastical changes desired by the king, he resigned as chancellor in May, 1532. For a year and a half he lived in retirement mainly engaged in religious controversy with Tyndale and Frith. But he was too notable a man to be suffered to maintain even a tacit opposition to the royal wishes and policy. He barely escaped conviction in connection with the proceedings against the Holy Maid of Kent (see BARton, Elizabeth) and in April, 1534, was committed to the Tower for refusing to take an oath impugning the pope's authority. In spite of entreaties and threats he steadfastly refused to acknowledge the king as head of the Church and July 1, 1535, was indicted of high treason. On his trial he declared that he had made a seven years' study of the history of the papacy and was convinced that it rested on divine law and prescription; he admitted that he had never consented to the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn. He was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged, but was ultimately beheaded by royal commutation of the sentence.

More as a Man.

To continue faithful to principle no matter what it cost, to be honest, kindly, ever active in some good and useful work, were the guiding motives of More's life. When he first entered parliament he successfully opposed extortionate demands of Henry VII., who, so it is said, imprisoned and fined his father in consequence. His brilliant success in public life later was won by no compromising self-seeking, and he dared antagonize the powerful Wolsey and his master when duty demanded. In the practise of his profession he gave clients disinterested service and strove to prevent unjust and frivolous suits. As chancellor he despatched the business of his court with an unprecedented rapidity and often settled disputes without trial; he listened to the poor as readily as to the rich and was deaf to pleas of kindred and friends. He advised all judges to temper the rigor of the law with equity. He had invincible courage, an active mind, and ready wit, and was an inveterate jester, and with an element of whimsicality in his character. In 1505 he married Jane Colte of Newhall, near Chelmesford, Essex, who died about 1511. More then married a widow, seven years older than himself, described as "neither beautiful nor well educated, but a good housekeeper." His devotion to duty and strong command over himself made More a good husband and both marriages were happy. Indeed, it is in his family and private life perhaps that he is most winsome. In 1523 he bought land in Chelsea and built there a famous house (demolished in 1740; its site is marked by the present Beaufort Street). More's hospitality was boundless and of the finest and best. He sought eagerly the company of the men of the new learning—Linacre and Grocyn after they came from Oxford to London, John Colet and William Latimer, the grammarian William Lily, and others like them in England. He met Erasmus when the latter first visited England in 1497; thereafter they corresponded regularly. Erasmus was one of the first to be entertained by More in his house after his marriage and he finished his *Moriæ encomium* (i.e., "Praise of Folly") under the same hospitable roof on another visit in 1508; the book is dedicated to More and the title is a play upon his name. At Antwerp in 1515 More met Peter Giles (Ægidius), and he added Buddæus to the circle of his friends at the field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. Holbein, the painter, introduced by Erasmus, came to the Chelsea house in 1526 and is said to have stayed three years. He painted pictures of More and his family. More's interest in art was strong and he filled his house with the curious things dear to the collector.

He was scrupulously exact in all religious observances, yet encouraged simplicity in the church service; but he was not insensible to ecclesiastical abuses. He wished, however, for reform of the Church from within, orderly, and guided by the regular and competent authorities. Furthermore, he saw beneath the surface and deprecated removal of one evil by setting up another. As chancellor he pronounced severe judgments in religious cases and has been sharply criticized therefor. But his course herein was consistent with his character and his life, and his motives were correct. He hated heretics, he wrote to Erasmus—their vices, not their persons, he explained in the *Apology* (chap. xlix.; the work was published in 1533; in it More defends his course in controversy and advocates severe treatment of heretics). More was beatified by Pope Leo XIII. in 1886.

His Writings.

While a law student More wrote verses and comedies "for his pastime." He entered the field of religious controversy in 1523. Henry VIII. (perhaps with More's help) issued an *Assertio septem sacramentorum* (1521) in answer to Luther's "Babylonish Captivity." Luther replied vehemently and More then took up the dispute in an *Opus quo refellit Lutheri calumnias* (London, 1523) under the pseudonym of William Ross. His first controversial book in English was *A Dialogue . . . wherein be Treated Divers Matters . . . Touching the Pestilent Sect of Luther and Tyndale* (London, 1529). It was written chiefly against Tyndale and was followed by a series of similar writings which was interrupted only by More's death. His manner in controversy was in no better taste than that of others of the time. His translation (from the Latin) of the life of Pico della Mirandola by the latter's nephew is significant (printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1510) as the Italian philosopher was in a certain sense the model of More's life. An incomplete *History of Richard III.* was printed in an incorrect version in 1543 and then from an authentic copy in More's *Works* (1557); there is a Latin version, which differs somewhat from the English and is thought by some to have been written by Cardinal Morton and served as the basis of the English, in the 1566 edition of More's Latin works. More's famous book, the *Utopia*, consists of two parts, the second written while he was in the Netherlands in 1515, the first in London the next year. Erasmus arranged for its publication (Louvain, Dec., 1516; 2d ed., Paris, 1517; 3d ed., illustrated by Holbein, Basel, 1518). More relates that in Antwerp he was introduced by Peter Giles to one Raphael Hythloday, a Portuguese, who had just returned from extensive travels in the New World. At the mention of England in the conversation which followed Hythloday criticized its social condition and laws, especially in relation to theft. The land, he said, was overrun by discharged soldiers after the frequent and fruitless wars; an idle gentry maintained idle servants who were liable to lose their places by the death of their masters; and the new landlords were raising rents, establishing sheep farms, and evicting husbandmen. The sufferers must steal to live; and then the law hanged them. All this was to make thieves first and then punish them with a penalty too severe for the offense. More advised Hythloday to enter the service of some prince. But the latter replied that it would be futile; princes were too bent on enlarging their dominions and governed for their own ambition, not the good of their subjects; moreover, they would not listen to his remedy, which was community of goods. More expressed doubts of the remedy, and Hythloday replied that it worked in Utopia, an island which he had visited in his travels. Then follows the description of Utopia (equivalent to "Nowhere"; from Gk. *ou*, "not," and *topos*, "place") in the second book. It is an ideal commonwealth (in Hythloday's estimation) where vices do not flourish and poverty is unknown because there is no private property and no money. Agriculture is the chief industry and all persons work. Sanitary conditions are carefully looked after in the cities. Magistrates are elected. Meals are enjoyed at a table common to thirty families. Travel is not permitted without leave of the magistrate. War is considered inglorious, but is waged in self-defense, and then they think it more creditable to conquer by guile than by prowess. Prisoners of war and those guilty of moral offenses are made slaves. There is religious toleration with slight restriction. The book is a keen satire on social and economic conditions. Certain it is that judged by his other writings and his practise More's political philosophy was not that of Utopia. In the book itself he counsels Hythloday so to order "that which you can not turn to good that it be not very bad. For it were not possible for all things to be well unless all men were good. Which I think will not be yet this good many years." The *Utopia* was written in Latin; translations were issued as follows: French, Paris, 1550, 2d ed., Lyons, 1559; others, Amsterdam, 1643 and 1715, Paris, 1780; English, by Ralph Robinson, London, 1551; by Gilbert Burnet, 1684; by Arthur Cayley, London, 1808; and by V. Paget, New York, 1909; German, Basel, 1524; Leipsic, 1753, 1846; Italian, Venice, 1548; Dutch, Antwerp, 1553, 1562; Spanish, Madrid, 1790.

More's nephew, William Rastell, published a collected edition of his English writings at London, 1557. His Latin works were collected at Basel, 1563, more fully, Louvain, 1565, and most complete collection of all at Frankfort and Leipsic, 1689.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The original Life was by William Roper (More's son-in-law), *The Life, Arraignement, and Death of . . . Syr Thomas More*, Paris, 1626, later editions, London, 1716, 1729, 1886 (in the *Camelot Classics*, prefixed to the *Utopia*); another was by C. More (the scholar's great-grandson), London, 1626; T. Stapleton's *Tres Thomæ*, Douay, 1588, is valuable. Original and valuable material is found in the *Epistles* of Erasmus. The best modern account is by T. E. Bridgett, London, 1891. Other lives or sketches are: J. Hoddesdon, London, 1652; G. T. von Rudhart, Nuremberg, 1829; W. J. Walter, London, 1840; J. Mackintosh, ib. 1844; C. Wordsworth, in *Christian Ecclesiastical Biography*, 4 vols., ib. 1853; F. Seebohm, in *Oxford Reformers of 1498*, ib., 1867, new ed., 1896; D. Nisard, in *Études sur le renaissance*, Paris, 1877; J. H. Marsden, *Philomorus*, London, 1878; R. Baumstark, Freiburg, 1879; A. M. Stewart, London, 1887; T. Ziegler, *T. Morus und seine Schrift von der Insel Utopia*, Strasburg, 1889; W. H. Hutton, London, 1895; *Story of Blessed Thomas More, by a Nun of Tyburn Convent*, ib. 1908; *DNB*, xxxviii. 428–449.

MORELAND, WILLIAM HALL: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Sacramento; b. at Charleston, S. C., Apr. 9, 1861. He was graduated from the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. (1881), and at Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. (1884). He was ordered deacon in the same year and was advanced to the priesthood in 1885. After being curate of Christ Church, Hartford, Conn. (1884–85), he was rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Nashua, Vt. (1885–93) and of St. Luke's, San Francisco, Cal. (1893–98). In 1898 he was consecrated first bishop of Sacramento. He has written *What is Christianity?* (Milwaukee, 1887), and *The Church or the Churches, Which?* (1894).

MORELSCHIKI, mo″-rel-tshi′ki ("Immolators"): A fanatical dissenting sect of Siberia and other parts of Russia, so called from their practise 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.

MORGAN, GEORGE CAMPBELL: English Congregationalist; b. at Tetbury (22 m. n.e. of Bristol), Gloucestershire, Dec. 9, 1863. He was educated at the Douglas School, Cheltenham, from which he was graduated in 1881, and after teaching in the Islington Wesleyan day schools in Birmingham in 1882, and being master in the Jewish Collegiate School, Birmingham (1883–86), was a mission preacher (1886–88). In 1889 he was ordained to the ministry of his denomination, and held pastorates at Stone, Staffordshire (1889–91), Rugeley, Staffordshire (1891–93), Westminster Road, Birmingham (1893–97), and New Court, Tollington Park, London (1897–1901). He was then Northfield Bible Conference Extension lecturer from 1901 to 1904, and since 1904 has been pastor of the Westminster Congregational Chapel, Buckingham Gate, London. He has written: *Discipleship* (London, 1897); *The Hidden Years at Nazareth* (1898); *God's Methods with Man* (1898); *Wherein?* (1898); *Life's Problems* (1899); *The Spirit of God* (1900); *The Ten Commandments* (1901); *God's Perfect Will* (1901); *A First Century Message to Twentieth Century Christians* (1902); *True Estimate of Life and How to Live* (1903); *Evangelism* (1904); *Crises of the Christ* (1905); *To Die is Gain* (1905); *The Fulfillment of Life* (1905); *The Practice of Prayer* (1906); *The Parables of the Kingdom* (1907); *The Simple Things of the Christian Life* (1907); *Christian Principles* (1908); *The Missionary Manifesto* (1909); and *The Teaching of the Lesson; Commentary on the International Sunday School Lessons for . . . 1910* (1909).

MORGAN, THOMAS: English Deist; d. 1743. He was of Welsh descent and was educated at the expense of his friends. In 1716 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church at Marlborough, Wiltshire. Though very orthodox at the time, he soon after adopted Arian views, and was dismissed. He then took up the study of medicine, practised in Bristol, and then went to London to take up literary work. He was known as a free-thinker and styled himself "Christian Deist." He left numerous writings, the principal of which was the theological work, *The Moral Philosopher, in a Dialogue between Philalethes, a Christian Deist, and Theophanes, a Christian Jew* (London, 1737–40). See DEISM, I., § 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature under DEISM, and *DNB*, xxxix. 35–36.

MORGANATIC MARRIAGE. See MARRIAGE, I., § 10.

MORIAH ("appearance of Jehovah"): The hill upon which Abraham was to offer Isaac, according to divine direction (Gen. xxii. 2), and on which, later, the temple was built (II 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-exilian books. See TEMPLE.

MORIGIA, GIACOMO ANTONIO. See BARNABITES.

MORISON, JAMES: Scotch Secession Church, theologian and founder of the Evangelical Union; b. at Bathgate (17 m. w. of Edinburgh) Feb. 14, 1816; d. at Glasgow Nov. 13, 1893. He was the son of Robert Morison, minister of the Secession Church of Bathgate; received his early education at the parish school and the academy of the town; entered the University of Edinburgh in 1830, proving an excellent student and a prizeman in many of his studies; studied theology in the Theological Hall of the United Secession Church, and while there was especially influenced by Prof. John Brown, then occupying the chair of exegetical theology, though his independent and liberal habit of thought brought him into conflict with the teaching of other professors. He was licensed as a probationer May 7, 1839, and his first appointment was to the parish of Cabrach, west of Aberdeen, the congregation of which was composed of agriculturists. To meet their needs he adopted a simple and direct dealing with the hearers of his sermons. In his studies of the Scriptures for practical purposes he discovered that he could preach that Christ died for all men, and that each was authorized to say "Christ loved me and gave himself for me." A wide-spread revival of religion was the result. Morison became an evangelist and his service was sought in many parts of the north of Scotland. To meet the demand made upon him by letters and otherwise for instruction he published a short tract entitled *The Question, "What must I do to be saved?" Answered* (1840), in which he advocated the doctrine of a universal atonement, and this was regarded as a departure from the creed of his Church. On Apr. 14, 1840, he received a call from Clerks Lane Secession Church, Kilmarnock, which he accepted. On Oct. 1, 1840, the presbytery met to ordain him, when he was severely taken to task for the publication referred to. Some of the members refused to go on with the ordination, until he promised to suppress the offending tract. Their scruples were overcome by his promise to withdraw the publication from sale, and the service was carried through. Under his ministry the church became crowded and the center of a religious movement, the influence of which was felt widely. By his labors with voice and pen the thoughts of thousands were turned to consider specially the doctrines of the third chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith. Some of the older ministers became alarmed and steps were taken to silence the young man who preached that Christ died for all men, and that through faith in him the worst sinner might have eternal life. He was arraigned before the presbytery on Mar. 2, 1841, on two charges: first, for teaching, among other doctrines, a universal atonement; and, second, for not having legally prevented a gentleman in London from publishing his tract. He was admonished and suspended from the exercise of his ministry until he should retract his errors, upon which he protested and appealed to the synod, the highest court of the Secession Church. This enabled him to continue his work, and in this he was supported by his whole congregation. The synod met in Glasgow on June 8, 1841, and the issue was that he was expelled from the United Secession Church. The controversy produced by the trial affected the whole of Scotland, and the conduct of the synod in condemning the doctrine of a universal atonement led many to consider other doctrines of the Westminster Confession as well. Morison continued to minister to his flock with renewed energy and increased success. His own doctrinal views became more liberal. The conclusion he came to shortly afterward was that God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, desired and provided the means for the salvation of all men, and if any were not saved it was because they resisted the Holy Spirit and refused to believe the Gospel. In 1843 Morison, with a few other ministers, originated the Evangelical Union (q.v.) for the purpose of combining the churches which had been formed to preach and defend his views of divine truth. A theological hall was instituted for the training of young men for the ministry, of which he was the principal and professor of New-Testament exegesis from 1843 till his death in 1893. He became also the pastor of North Dundas Street Evangelical Union Church, Glasgow, 1851, and retained the pastorate till his death.

Dr. Morison was an extensive author. His early writings were largely practical and controversial. Besides a number of pamphlets, he published: *The Nature of the Atonement* (Glasgow, 1841); *The Extent of the Atonement* (1841); *Saving Faith* (1842); *Lectures on the Ninth Chapter of . . . Romans* (Kilmarnock, 1849); *A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of . . . Romans* (London, 1866); a commentary on Matthew (1870) and one on Mark (1873); *St. Paul's Teaching on Sanctification* (1886); *Sheaves of Ministry* (1890). *The Evangelical Repository; A Quarterly Magazine of Theological Literature* was edited and in great part written by Dr. Morison (1854–67). WILLIAM ADAMSON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographies have been written by W. Adamson, London, 1898; and O. Smeaton, Edinburgh, 1901. Consult further: F. Ferguson, *Hist. of the Evangelical Union*, Glasgow, 1876; *Memorial Volume of the Ministerial Jubilee of Principal Morison*, 1889; *DNB*, xxxix. 57–58.

MORMONS.

I. Official (Mormon) Statement.
  Joseph Smith; Early Life and Visions (§ 1).
  Founding of the Church; First Period (§ 2).
  Movement to Utah (§ 3).
  The "Utah War" (§ 4).
  Doctrines and Organization (§ 5).
  Polygamy; Conflicts with the Government (§ 6).
II. Critical (Non-Mormon) Statement.
  The Founder's Family; Environment in Youth (§ 1).
  Translation of the Book of Mormon (§ 2).
  Summary of the Book of Mormon (§ 3).
  Its Literary Character (§ 4).
  Theories of its Source (§ 5).
  The Founder's Character; Opportunism (§ 6).
  The New Church; Various Centers (§ 7).
  Industrial Development; Opposition (§ 8).
  Developing Organization; Missionary Operations (§ 9).
  History, 1836–38 (§ 10).
  Nauvoo Period; Polygamy; Smith's Death (§ 11).
  Brigham Young; Removal to Utah (§ 12).
  Defiance of the United States (§ 13).
  Suppression of Polygamy; Statehood (§ 14).
  Late History; Present Status (§ 15).
  Doctrinal System (§ 16).
  Ordinances in Theory and Practise (§ 17).
  Priesthood and Government (§ 18).
III. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
IV. Anti-Mormon Movements.
  To 1869 (§ 1).
  From 1869 to the Present (§ 2).

1. Joseph Smith; Early Life and Visions.

I. Official (Mormon) Statement: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called the "Mormon" Church, was organized Apr. 6, 1830, at Fayette, Seneca County, N. Y. Joseph Smith, its founder, was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vt., Dec. 23, 1805, and moved with his parents in 1815 to Palmyra, Wayne County, N. Y., and in 1819 to Manchester, N. Y. In the year 1820 a number of protracted revival meetings were held at that place among the various sects, which resulted in contention among the preachers who sought to influence the new converts to join their respective churches. Some of the members of the Smith family had joined the Presbyterian church, but Joseph, then fourteen years of age, being unable to decide which of these sects was right, held aloof from all, but pondered upon the matter, knowing that all could not be right. One day, while thus reflecting, he opened the Bible at the epistle of James and was deeply impressed with the promise in i. 5: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." This passage aroused his earnest attention and deep reflection, until he decided to take it literally. Accordingly he retired to the woods near his father's house and called upon the Lord in fervent prayer; while thus engaged he beheld two glorious personages wrapped in a brilliant light, standing near, but above him in the air. One of them spoke to him, calling him by name, and, pointing to the other, said, "This is my beloved son, hear him." As soon as he was able to speak, Joseph asked this personage which of all the sects of Christendom he should join, and was told to join none of them, for they were all wrong; that the people drew near to the Lord with their lips, but their hearts were far from him. Among other things he was taught that the Gospel of Christ in its power and simplicity was not among men; but that shortly it should be restored again. The vision closed and the youth was left to ponder over the things he had both seen and heard. Three years passed and on the evening of Sept. 21, 1823, after he had retired for the night, he engaged in prayer; while thus calling upon the Lord, the room was filled with light and suddenly a messenger appeared at his bedside clothed in glory beyond description, who called him by name and said he had been sent from the presence of God, that his name was Moroni, that God had a work for Joseph to do, and that his name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindred, and tongues. The angel declared that the Gospel in all its fulness was about to be restored, preparatory to the second advent of Messiah, which was near at hand, and that this young man had been chosen as an instrument in the hands of the Lord in bringing about his purposes in the latter days. He was also informed that there was a record written on gold plates giving an account of the former inhabitants of the American continent, and the source from whence they sprang. These plates contained the fulness of the everlasting Gospel as delivered by the Savior to the inhabitants of this continent whom he visited after his resurrection; also there were two stones in silver bows deposited with the record, constituting what is called the Urim and Thummim which God had prepared for the purpose of translating the characters on the record. These stones were fastened to a breastplate. He was permitted to see these things in vision, also the place of deposit in the hill Cumorah, near Palmyra, N. Y. After receiving many visits from the angel, who unfolded to him many of the events about to take place, he received the plates on Sept. 22, 1827. These he subsequently translated through the medium of the Urim and Thummim and "the gift and power of God," which translation was published in 1830 as the Book of Mormon.

2. Founding of the Church; First Period.

In 1829 Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery received the priesthood, which is divine authority, under the hands of Peter, James, and John, and by command of God, on Apr. 6, 1830, they organized the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints with six souls. The next year the church numbered several hundred members and moved to Kirtland, O., and also began to settle in Jackson County, Mo., where, according to their belief, the city Zion was to be built, a holy city with a temple of surpassing splendor, erected for the salvation of the souls of men. In 1833 the Saints who had located in Missouri were driven from Jackson County; they had incurred the ill-will of the original settlers, partly on account of their religion and partly because they were abolitionists from the eastern states. They sought refuge in Clay County, where they were permitted to remain for a short time, but the opposition increased and they were forced to seek a home in the more thinly settled counties of Daviess and Caldwell, also in that state. In 1839 Gov. Lilburn W. Boggs issued an exterminating order against the Latter-day Saints. Their prophet (Joseph Smith) and leading men were cast in prison and the people, after being forced to deed away their property, were driven from the state. In this destitute condition—having been robbed and plundered of all they possessed—they went to Illinois, where in 1839–40, on the site of a previous settlement called Commerce, in Hancock County, they established the city of Nauvoo. The legislature granted them a liberal charter and the city grew rapidly, soon numbering several thousand inhabitants with over 2,000 comfortable homes. A temple was built according to plans their prophet claimed were revealed to him, and the work of salvation for the dead commenced. It is a teaching of the Saints that the Savior visited the spirits in prison, while his body was in the tomb, and taught them the Gospel. For this reason the Latter-day Saints, in their temples, perform by proxy the rites of salvation, such as baptism, in behalf of the dead who die without a knowledge of the Gospel.

3. Movement to Utah.

In 1844 a number of discontented parties, who had left the church, issued a paper at Nauvoo called the *Expositor*, in which the prophet, Joseph Smith, was bitterly assailed. The city council passed an ordinance declaring the printing-office, where this paper was published, a nuisance, and it was destroyed by officers of the law. Joseph Smith was blamed for maintaining this nuisance, and a warrant was issued for his arrest. He declared that if he were taken he would be killed, and therefore, with his elder brother Hyrum and a few faithful friends, crossed the Mississippi River for the purpose of going to the Rocky Mountains. This action created much excitement among some of his followers who declared that in time of danger he was fleeing from the flock. His reply to these was, " If my life is of no value to my friends, it is of none to myself." Returning to Nauvoo he submitted to arrest, and with his brother Hyrum was taken to Carthage, the county seat of Hancock. There they were imprisoned. While thus confined and under pledge of protection by the governor, a mob surrounded the jail on June 27, 1844, overpowered the guard and shot to death Joseph and Hyrum Smith and severely wounded John Taylor. After the assassination the twelve apostles, under the leadership of Brigham Young, became the presiding quorum of the church, and by right of their authority assumed control and were sustained by the people. Instead of putting an end to " Mormonism " the assassination of the leaders only increased its membership, and it began to spread with renewed vigor. This caused the enemies of the Latter-day Saints to rage so fiercely that the Saints were again driven from their homes in 1846. Crossing the Mississippi River they made temporary settlements in the territory of Iowa and in the spring of 1847 the advance company of pioneers, under the leadership of Brigham Young, left Winter Quarters on the west side of the Missouri River near the present site of Omaha, for the Salt Lake Valley in search of a new home. They arrived at their destination Saturday, July 24, 1847, and decided to make it their permanent place of settlement. This little band remained in the valley for some time, planting, building, surveying, and preparing the foundation of a city. The soil they found parched and barren, save for the salt grass and sage-brush that abounded everywhere; there were no trees excepting the scattering cotton-woods that lined the streams; but here they decided to remain and trust in Providence. The soil was hard and dry, so the pioneers diverted the water of City Creek that it might moisten the ground which had for unknown ages remained in its primitive state. Before the summer was past most of the pioneers left the valley and returned to Winter Quarters to assist the Saints to gather to the Rocky Mountains. That autumn other companies arrived, Salt Lake City grew rapidly, and other settlements were formed until they were scattered over the face of the entire arid region. For a number of years the Saints suffered extremely, being forced to boil rawhides and dig sego and thistle roots for subsistence.

4. The " Utah War."

Shortly after the settlement of Salt Lake Valley, the " Mormons " set up the " provisional government of the State of Deseret," and petitioned Congress for admission into the Union. In 1850 the territory of Utah was created and Brigham Young appointed governor. Four years later Col. E. J. Steptoe, of the United States Army, was appointed to succeed him but declined, and Brigham Young was reappointed for a second term. Most of the territorial officers were non-residents and were unfriendly to the " Mormons," which caused considerable friction. Reports were carried to Washington to the effect that the people in the territory were in rebellion, had no respect for law, and had burned the public court records. Influenced by these false reports, and without an investigation, the president of the United States ordered an army to Utah to suppress the " rebellion." This is known in history as " The Utah War," or " Buchanan's blunder." Alfred Cummings, who had been appointed governor to succeed Brigham Young, came with the army. When the Latter-day Saints learned that the army was on the way to suppress a supposed rebellion, their indignation knew no bounds; they were filled with alarm and forebodings of evil. The reports carried to the president they knew to be false and his action unjustifiable. Many times they had been driven and plundered by mobs under the guise of law, therefore they resolved that they would resist what they felt to be an unlawful invasion by a hostile force. When the army approached the borders the " Mormons " harassed it and burned some of the supplies and in this way prevented it from entering the territory before winter set in. The Saints were determined, if forced to flee again, to leave their lands as barren as they had found them, not permitting their oppressors to reap the fruits of their labors. As the army neared the valley, the people moved southward, taking with them a few necessary articles and provisions, leaving guards behind with instructions to burn all dwellings and destructible property and lay the country waste, should the army enter the valley with hostile intentions. By the interference of friends, however, the difficulties were adjusted. Governor Cummings entered the valley in advance of the army and was received with due respect and consideration. A few days later, after investigating matters, he sent a truthful report to the president in relation to affairs in Utah. A peace commission was sent and met with President Young and others in June, 1858, and peacefully concluded the unfortunate and unhappy difficulties. The army, under command of Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston, entered Salt Lake Valley June 26, 1858, and camped on the west side of the Jordan River; subsequently it marched to Cedar Valley, about forty miles south of Salt Lake City, and there located Camp Floyd. It remained in Utah until the breaking out of the Civil War.

In 1877 Brigham Young died and was succeeded in the presidency of the church by John Taylor, who was severely wounded at Carthage when Joseph and Hyrum Smith were killed. President Taylor died in 1887 and was succeeded by Wilford Woodruff, who, in 1890, issued the manifesto prohibiting plural marriages in the church. He died in 1898 and was succeeded by Lorenzo Snow, who died Oct. 10, 1901. Joseph F. Smith, nephew of the prophet Joseph Smith, is the present presiding officer. The membership of the church is about 400,000 and the headquarters are in Salt Lake City.

5. Doctrines and Organization.

The "Mormons" believe in the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as three separate personages, infinite and eternal; that men will be punished for their own sins and not suffer the penalty of Adam's transgression; that Christ atoned for original sin and that all mankind, through the atonement of Christ, may be saved by obedience to the principles of his Gospel, of which faith in God, repentance from sin, baptism by immersion for the remission of sin, and the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit, are essential. They believe that little children who die are redeemed without baptism through the blood of Christ which was shed for them, and that men must be called of God and ordained by those who hold authority to officiate in order to preach the Gospel and administer acceptably in its ordinances. The church organization comprises the officers found in the primitive Church, and they believe in the gifts of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, the divine power of healing, and all the gifts and blessings exercised by the Savior and his apostles. They accept the Bible as the word of God, and the Book of Mormon also as the word of God given to the ancient inhabitants of the American continent. They believe that God does now reveal to his people many things as in days of old; that the heavens are not sealed, but that many important things are yet to be revealed pertaining to the kingdom of God; in the literal gathering of Israel; in the restoration of the ten tribes; that Jerusalem will be rebuilt; that Zion shall be established on the American continent, and that the Savior, in the millennium, will reign personally on the earth, which shall eventually become a celestial sphere and the eternal abode of the righteous. The president of the church is the supreme authority in all church matters and acts in concert with two counselors, or advisors, forming the presiding quorum of the church. Next to them stand the twelve apostles, then patriarchs, high priests, seventies, elders, bishops, priests, teachers, and deacons, all of whom have specific duties to perform and work in harmony with the whole.

6. Polygamy; Conflicts with the Government.

At one time the "Mormons" taught and practised the doctrine of plural marriage, holding the doctrine to be entirely Biblical and that the revelation concerning the same was received by Joseph Smith, but was withheld from the body of the church in general and from the world till they were settled in Utah. After 1852 plural marriage was preached and practised openly and most of the leading men were polygamists. In 1862 a law was enacted by Congress against the practise, but little attention was paid to it for many years. In 1884 the supreme court of the United States declared the law against plural marriage constitutional, and more than 1,000 "Mormon" men were convicted and sent to the penitentiary, while others fled or went into hiding. In 1887 Congress disincorporated the church, confiscated its property, with the exception of $50,000, and, finally, in Sept., 1890, after the vast property holdings of the church had been lost, Pres. Wilford Woodruff issued his manifesto against plural marriages and since that time they have not been permitted by the church, though many of the men who entered into these relations before that time have continued to support and care for their families, feeling that these obligations could not be discarded. Statehood was granted to Utah in 1896 and plural marriage was prohibited forever by law in the state. The "Mormons" have four temples erected at a cost of over six millions of dollars. The Salt Lake Tabernacle is 250 feet long, 150 feet wide, 80 feet high, with a wooden roof without any supporting pillars. Its great organ and choral services are among the remarkable features; services are held each sabbath day, and the building will seat comfortably 7,000 souls. JOSEPH F. SMITH, JR.

II. Critical (Non-Mormon) Statement: The early history of Mormonism has its center in the person of its founder. Joseph Smith was the fourth among ten children. His father was a man of unstable, restless disposition. He had no settled occupation, but tried his fortune—always without success—at various pursuits, and was a believer in witchcraft. Occasionally he gained money by fortune-telling and selling blessings. The prophet's mother was superior to the father in intelligence and force of will, but not less ignorant, and a firm believer in supernatural visions, apparitions, and dreams, also in cures by faith. Moreover, both the grandfathers of the prophet were much given to religious superstition. These facts are not without significance for the understanding of Smith's personality and activity. After many changes of residence in Ver-

1. The Founder's Family; Environment in Youth.

mont and New Hampshire his father removed with the family in 1815 to Palmyra, in Wayne (then a part of Ontario) County, N. Y., and after about four years to a farm near Manchester. Here their reputation was no better. They were considered deficient in honor and veracity, though not as positively malicious. The boys were lazy and roving, several of them could not read. Joseph was unkempt and immoderately lazy. He could read, though not without difficulty, wrote a very imperfect hand, and had a limited understanding of elementary arithmetic. The evolution of such a boy into the prophet and founder of a new religion is a highly interesting psychological problem, which can not be solved without a knowledge of his ancestry, of his mental peculiarities, and of his early environment. Four years after the vision of the plates (see I., § 1 above) he claimed to have been led to the spot and to have received from the angel the golden plates. They were covered with small and beautifully engraved characters in " reformed Egyptian." Joseph received besides a pair of crystals set in silver rings, a sort of supernatural spectacles, the veritable Urim and Thummim of the Old Testament, without which the mysterious writing could not be translated.

2. Translation of the Book of Mormon.

The first person to take an active interest in the Golden Bible was a farmer, Martin Harris, who had been in turn Quaker, Universalist, Baptist, and Presbyterian, but always a dreamer and fanatic, and affirmed that he had visited the moon. Smith needed financial help in order to publish his book, which Harris was ready to grant, if only he could be fully convinced that the book was from God. He wished to see the golden plates; but Smith, with the help of a special revelation, was able to make him content to believe without seeing. The prophet, however, made a copy of some of the letters found on the plates. These "caractors" Harris showed to Prof. Charles Anthon in New York, whose warnings were unable to shake the new disciple's confidence. Harris now became Smith's first amanuensis in the translation of the Golden Bible. When he had written 116 pages, Harris' unbelieving wife destroyed them. Smith doubted whether the sheets had been actually destroyed, and was therefore for some time in embarrassment, until he was instructed by revelation that the translation had fallen into the hands of godless persons, whom Satan had inspired to alter the words. He was therefore directed not to translate again what was lost; he should instead translate from the plates of Nephi, which contained a more detailed account than the book of Lehi, the source of the first translation. Smith now made his wife his amanuensis until the appearance of Oliver Cowdery, who became his first secretary. Cowdery had been a blacksmith, but had acquired a measure of knowledge sufficient to enable him to become a schoolmaster. The work of translating proceeded in the following manner: A curtain was drawn across the room in order to shield the holy document from profane eyes; seated behind the curtain, Smith, with the help of the Urim and Thummim, read from the golden plates to Cowdery, who wrote down the translation sentence for sentence. The translation of this, the " Book of Mormon," was begun at Manchester soon after the alleged discovery of the golden plates, continued at Harmony, Pa., and finished at Fayette, N. Y., June, 1829. Before the work was finished, Smith and Cowdery were ordained by heavenly messengers to the Aaronic and Melchisedec priesthood; to the first by John the Baptist, to the latter by the apostles Peter, James, and John. The Aaronic priesthood gave them the authority to preach repentance and faith and to baptize by immersion for the remission of sins. The Melchisedec priesthood gave them the power to impart the Holy Ghost to the baptized through the laying on of hands. This power, the Mormons say, could at that time be imparted only by heavenly messengers; the true Church had utterly ceased to exist upon earth; there was no one who had the Holy Spirit. With Harris' help Smith had the book printed in the year 1830 in an edition of 5,000 copies. As the sale was slow at first, Harris forfeited his property; though within ten years two more editions were published. Prefixed to the book is the sworn statement of Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris that they had seen the plates; moreover, the testimony of eight other men that they had both seen and handled them. The Rev. John Alonzo Clark once put the question to Harris: "Did you see the plates with your natural eyes just as you see the penholder in my hand? " Harris replied: " Well, I did not see them just as I see the penholder, but I saw them with the eye of faith. I saw them as plainly as I see anything whatever about me, although at the time it was covered with a cloth " (*Gleanings by the Way*, Philadelphia, 1842). A few years later all of the " three " witnesses fell away from Mormonism and declared their previous testimony to be false.

3. Summary of the Book of Mormon.

The book of Mormon contains about one-half as much matter as the Old Testament, and in respect of style is a crude imitation of the historical and prophetic books. About one-eighteenth of the book is taken directly from the Bible, about 300 passages, namely, large portions of Isaiah, the entire Sermon on the Mount (according to Matthew), and a few verses from Paul. There are passages also which betray a dependence upon other books, such as the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Methodist *Discipline.* The work is divided into fifteen books, which purport to have been written by as many different hands, containing a " Sacred History of Ancient America from the Earliest Ages after the Flood to the Beginning of the Fifth Century of the Christian Era." Smith himself has summarized its contents as follows:

> " The history of America is unfolded from its first settlement by a colony that came from the Tower of Babel to the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era. We are informed by these records that America, in ancient times, has been inhabited by two distinct races of people. The first were called Jaredites, and came directly from the Tower of Babel. The second race came directly from the city of Jerusalem, about 600 before Christ. The Jaredites were destroyed about the time that the Israelites came from Jerusalem. The principal nation of the second race fell in battle toward the close of the fourth century. The remnant are

> the Indians. This book also tells us that our Savior made his appearance upon this continent after his resurrection; that he planted the Gospel here in all its fulness and richness and power and blessing, that the inhabitants had apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, and evangelists; the same order, the same priesthood, the same ordinances, gifts, powers, and blessing as was enjoyed on the Eastern continent; that the people were cut off in consequence of their transgressions; that the last of their prophets [Mormon] who existed among them was commanded to write an abridgment of their prophecies, history, etc., and to hide it in the earth."

In the last days the Book of Mormon was to come to light, and, being joined with the Bible, was to serve the fulfilment of the thoughts of God. Mormon was accordingly the collector and reviser of the books; his son, Moroni, brought the work to its completion and about the year 420 A.D. hid the plates under the stone on the hill Cumorah.

4. Its Literary Character. Judged as a literary work the Book of Mormon is tedious, utterly devoid of taste, poetic grace, and depth of thought, exhibiting no religious inspiration or moral earnestness. It is full of grammatical blunders and teems with anachronisms. In the matter of doctrine the book—compared with the later revelations called forth by the exigencies that arose in the course of the system's development—contains little that is markedly characteristic. It foretells the call of Joseph Smith to be the prophet of the latter day; it is strictly chiliastic, and declares that all gifts, powers, and offices of the apostolic Church are to be found in the true church; it acknowledges the doctrine of the Trinity, rejects infant baptism, and commands baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; it asserts that the Bible is from God, but also that this fact does not exclude further revelations; finally, it contains three passages which, naturally interpreted, must be understood as condemning polygamy.

5. Theories of Its Source. The question of the source of the Book of Mormon is important. For Mormon believers there is, of course, no problem here. The majority of anti-Mormon critics have accepted the so-called Spaulding-Rigdon theory of the origin. Much of the more recent criticism, however, tends to establish the theory of Smith's authorship. The Spaulding-Rigdon theory is, in brief, as follows: About the year 1809 there lived in Conneaut, O., a man named Solomon Spaulding. He had studied at Dartmouth College and had served some years as a Presbyterian minister. Later he took up a secular calling and devoted a part of his time to literary pursuits. Becoming interested in the Indian antiquities in the neighborhood of Conneaut he conceived the idea of a romance about the Indians before the discovery of America by Columbus. The work which he composed was finished about 1812, and bore the title, "The Manuscript Found." Spaulding availed himself of the well-known fable that the American Indians are the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. To make his narrative more piquant he gave it the form of a translation of a manuscript composed by a member of an ancient tribe and recently discovered in an Indian mound. Spaulding took his manuscript to Pittsburg, intending to have it printed there. It lay a considerable time in a printing-office, but was never printed. At last it was returned to the author, who at the time was living at Amity, Pa., where in 1816 he died. When the Book of Mormon appeared, Spaulding's widow and others, who had heard him read from his manuscript, declared that the book must have been taken in large part from the unpublished romance, with many theological interpolations. As, however, Spaulding's manuscript could never be found, a direct comparison with the Book of Mormon was impossible. (A manuscript discovered in Honolulu in 1885, which purported to be Spaulding's Indian romance and bears no resemblance to the Book of Mormon, is generally believed to be a forgery.) Beyond these well-established facts the claim is that Sidney Rigdon, who from 1829 on stood in close relation to Smith, may have had access to the Spaulding manuscript when he was employed as a printer in Pittsburg about 1812 and later, and may have made a copy of it and have placed the copy at Smith's disposal. This theory has been rendered fairly plausible by various external and internal evidences; yet the evidences fall far short of proof. Against the theory of Smith's authorship it has been urged that so ignorant a man could not have produced the work. But it may be replied that only an ignorant man could have produced it. In intellectual grasp and force Smith's later (well authenticated) utterances surpass it, but they resemble it in style. The style and contents of the Book of Mormon are such as one might expect from a man of Smith's peculiar nature and surroundings. He possessed a powerful, though prosaic, imagination, and a retentive memory; but his knowledge was slight and his judgment weak. From beginning to end the book exhibits these traits. The author—perhaps unconsciously—derived what he said from various and in part mutually opposed sources. Hence the confusion in his theology, which is wanting in consistency. Doctrines of the most various origin are illogically thrown together. Calvinism, Universalism, Methodism, chiliasm, Catholicism, deism, and freemasonry are discussed—though not by name—and this in a manner that strikingly corresponds to Smith's relations to these systems. The book is in a measure a mirror of the time, but in a still greater measure a sort of (unconscious) autobiography. At the same time there is no necessity to disallow evidence that the general idea—and even the framework—of the book was derived from an external source. The main contention is that what is really characteristic and personal in the book is from Smith himself.

6. The Founder's Character; Opportunism. Was Joseph Smith a deliberate falsifier and conscious impostor? Most non-Mormon writers answer this question with an emphatic affirmative. Some of the most careful investigators, however (especially Stenhouse and Riley), believe that he was in a large measure the victim of his own hallucinations—that he really believed himself an inspired prophet. That he also practised wilful deception in order to carry out his purposes can hardly be questioned. Had he been a mere impostor, he must have broken down under the storm of persecution that came upon him. Smith had success as a prophet and as the founder of a new religion because the soil was prepared for it. From the beginning the drawing power of Mormonism lay in its claim to possess the gift of prophecy. And as the burden of the prophecy is the promise of material advantage and sensuous enjoyment and glory in the " latter day " and eternally—and withal offered easy conditions as to repentance and inward renewal—it is not hard to see how the enthusiasm that first drew followers to Joseph Smith has continued to be the great animating force of Mormonism. Smith began his career as " Peep-stone Joe " and developed into the " prophet, seer, and revealer " of the Latter-day Saints. After attaining to this dignity he was ever ready with a fresh revelation to meet each new emergency. Smith and his successors have been the ideal opportunists. In his prophesyings, however, Smith practised self-restraint: " We never inquire at the hand of God for special revelation only in case of there being no previous revelation to suit the case " (*Times and Seasons*, V., 753). Revelations were uttered pertaining to almost every conceivable concern except, perhaps, religion proper.

7. The New Church; Various Centers.

The formal founding of the new sect took place Apr. 6, 1830, in Fayette, N. Y. At that time it numbered some seventy adherents. Its official name was fixed somewhat later. By revelation Smith took the title of " seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ, and elder of the church." He began a vigorous propaganda. Every convert was baptized—no previous baptism was recognized. Among the first notable converts were Pratt (author of *The Voice of Warning*) and Sidney Rigdon, the chief figure in early Mormon history after Smith himself. As he found too little faith in the neighborhood of his home, Smith in 1831 removed with many of the " Saints " to Kirtland, O., whither Rigdon had already preceded him. The object in view was to find the land of promise, to establish therein a theocracy with the prophet as God's mouthpiece and vicegerent, and to build up a new city of Zion in preparation for the glory of the latter day. To realize this object four successive attempts were made in as many places: at Kirtland, O.; Far West (now Independence), Mo.; Nauvoo, Ill., and finally in Utah. In the first three places extraordinary temporary success was followed by so fierce and determined opposition on the part of the surrounding " Gentiles " that the saints could make no effectual resistance. That in Utah they have been able not only to hold their ground, but also to prosper greatly is to be ascribed to prior possession and isolation, together with an improved organization and a saner leadership. The successive settlements of the Mormons represent, in general, stages not only of outward progress but also of inner development. At Kirtland the new sect met with immediate and striking success: its missionaries displayed immense zeal and churches were founded in Ohio, Pennsylv[illegible] ana, and Illinois. With removal to Kirtland the number of the Mormons grew to at least 1,200 souls. Here Sidney Rigdon became prominent. He had assimilated some of the ideas of Fourier, the French collectivist. Following a special revelation of February, in 1831, the Kirtland saints began to organize communal business ventures, in which, for a time, they met with success.

8. Industrial Development; Opposition.

The opposition, however, of the " unbelievers " about them caused Smith to turn his eyes toward the Western bounds of civilization, in order to find there a place where he might without hindrance fully carry out his views. In the autumn of 1831 he founded a colony in Jackson County, Mo. A revelation had declared that here was the promised land and the place for the city of Zion. Large tracts of land were bought; the town of Far West, or Zion, was founded, where the city of Independence now lies; a monthly and a weekly paper for the propagation of the new faith were established; and all the affairs of the colony were carried on with admirable zeal and vigor. Nevertheless, although continuing to regard Far West as the destined site for the city of Zion, Smith made Kirtland for an indefinite time the chief seat of the saints. Thither he returned in 1832. He now thrust the communion into various perilous business ventures, all under the control of the church and without adequate financial foundation. In the summer of 1833 a temple was built at the cost of $40,000, and although most of the Saints gave one-seventh of their time to its construction, a debt of from $15,000 to $20,000 was left upon it. Very early the non-Mormons in the region about Kirtland began to show a bitter hostility toward the new sect. Their opposition had its root partly in religious differences and partly in their indignation at Smith's domination in financial affairs that concerned the public at large. In May, 1832, a mob broke into the prophet's house, brought him into a neighboring field and tarred and feathered him. Rigdon suffered the same disgrace. Nothing daunted, however, Smith on the following day preached and baptized three converts, and afterward continued to prosecute his various undertakings with energy.

9. Developing Organization; Missionary Operations.

In 1834 Smith organized the first high council of the church with himself, Rigdon, and Williams as the first presidency. In associating these men with himself in the highest office Smith did not make them in any sense equal with himself. They were his counselors, but both in prophesying and in ruling he was to be unconditionally supreme. In 1835 a further step in the development of the hierarchy was taken in the founding of the body of the twelve apostles. One of the twelve was Brigham Young, who became Smith's successor in the presidency. Young had become a Mormon about the end of 1832 and had already rendered important service in the church by suppressing dissensions due to the prophet's growing profligacy. In 1836 the constitution [illegible]as further developed by the establishment of a [illegible]al council for each district of the church (at that time Kirtland and Zion), called the "quorum of seventy." The various councils came to be called "quorums"—the first presidency, the twelve, the seventy. In 1837 the apostles Hyde and Kimball were sent as missionaries to England and South Wales, where they worked with remarkable success, especially among the laboring classes. After three years' labor they could count 4,019 Mormons in England alone. The report for June, 1851, gave a total of 30,747 adherents in the United Kingdom and further declared: "Within the last fourteen years more than 50,000 have been baptized in England, of whom nearly 17,000 have emigrated to Zion."

10. History, 1836–38.

The year 1836 was marked by the apostasy of some of the pillars of the church at Kirtland. The "three witnesses" (Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris) to the Book of Mormon were excommunicated along with other "dissenters." There is evidence that while the Saints were yet in Kirtland polygamy began to be practised by some of the leaders. Whether Smith privately sanctioned or condoned these practises is not quite certain. His ostensible efforts at their suppression lacked the vigor that generally characterized his actions. In the *Book of Doctrine and Covenants* (1835) he declared: "Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication, and polygamy: we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife; and one woman but one husband." In obedience to a revelation Smith in 1836 established a bank at Kirtland, which about the beginning of 1838 became insolvent. Judicial procedure against the prophet and others was begun. At this moment, however, Smith and Rigdon in obedience to a revelation went to Missouri. The colony there had been having troublous times since 1834, when the prophet had removed various difficulties. Now, however, internal dissensions became serious, while the Gentiles' opposition grew increasingly fierce. From the beginning the people of Missouri had resented the attitude of the Mormons as expressed (for example) in a passage in the *Book of Commandments* (1833) calling that state the "land of your inheritance, which is now the land of your enemies." Already border-ruffianism had been manifested against the Mormons. A popular demand for the removal of the Mormons was met with temporizing on their part, and, as the governor's attempt to call out the militia to protect them was futile, a mob drove at least 1,500 of them northward across the Missouri River. These settled chiefly in Clay, Caldwell, and Daviess counties. Negotiations for pecuniary redress proved fruitless; for conviction for violence committed against a Mormon could not be had in Jackson county. While the Mormons had been guilty of various offenses, non-Mormons were disposed to lay upon them the blame for any depredations when the authors were unknown, and so the Mormons suffered beyond their deserts. Notwithstanding, the town of Far West itself was, until 1838, materially prosperous and on fairly good terms with the neighboring Gentiles. About this time, however, the presidency was charged with misappropriating trust funds, and several prominent leaders forsook the church. About the same time there was formed an organization later called the Danite Band or the "Avenging Angels." Its members were bound by blood oaths to obey any behest of the church against property or life. In the same year also the tithing system was established, which ever since has been so important for Mormonism.

11. Nauvoo Period; Polygamy; Smith's Death.

The climax of the civil strife in Missouri seems to have been occasioned largely by a sermon of Rigdon's on July 4, 1838, which predicted a war of extermination between Saints and Gentiles. Upon complaint to the governor that the Mormons in Caldwell and Daviess counties resisted the execution of justice, a regiment of militia was called out; but the soldiery for the most part disbanded. Nevertheless there were serious conflicts between the Mormons and the Gentiles, which culminated in the massacre of twenty Mormons at Hawn's Mill. In the autumn the state authorities demanded the expulsion of the Mormons, except the leaders, who were to be held for trial. Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum were imprisoned at Liberty, but on the way to trial effected their escape, probably by bribery. The two brothers rode to Quincy, Ill. To this state most of the Mormons, to the number of about 15,000, had already fled. The prophet bought large tracts of land in Hancock County and beyond the Mississippi in Iowa. On the eastern bank of the river the Mormons began to build a city to which by revelation the name Nauvoo was given. The Mormon propaganda was meanwhile vigorously at work in the United States and abroad, and (1840–43) converts flocked to Nauvoo to the estimated number of 3,758. Smith procured from the state legislature a charter for the city which made it almost independent of state control. The prophet now organized a military body under the name of the Nauvoo legion, himself assuming the command with the title of general. In Apr., 1841, the foundation of a new temple was laid; it was dedicated May 1, 1846. Smith began now to take interest in state and national politics. He appealed to President Van Buren for help to recover losses of property in Missouri; but as neither the president nor Congress would take action, and as Clay and Calhoun, presidential aspirants, gave non-committal answers to his inquiries concerning their attitude toward the Mormons' claims, he announced himself in the organ of the church a candidate for the presidency of the United States. As Smith's power increased, his profligacy also grew. In order to quiet the indignation of his wife the prophet in 1843 imparted to a select few a revelation which permitted himself and (with his sanction) others to have more than one wife. This revelation was openly promulgated first in 1852 by Brigham Young. In Nauvoo the polygamous practises occasioned serious dissensions. A Dr. Foster and two others started an independent newspaper, called the *Expositor*. Its first—and only—number condemned various church practises and doctrines including that of the plurality of wives. At Smith's behest the press and property of the *Expositor* were destroyed and Foster was expelled from the city. Aroused to indignation by the revelation of the state of things in Nauvoo and perhaps no less by various mysterious depredations in the surrounding country, the people of bordering counties raised forces for a proposed war against the Mormons. The prophet with several others planned to flee, but upon Governor Ford's promise of protection he surrendered himself at Carthage June 24, 1844, but on the night of June 27 a band of disguised ruffians broke into the jail and shot to death the prophet and his brother Hyrum.

12. Brigham Young; Removal to Utah.

The tragic end of the prophet turned to the advantage of the Mormons. It placed on him the halo of martyrdom, while the leadership fell into the hands of a man who was his superior as an organizer and ruler, though inferior to him as prophet and religious enthusiast. There were several rival candidates for the office of first prophet and president. Rigdon was easily disposed of and even excommunicated. Other candidates, besides Young, were Strang and the prophet's son, Joseph Smith, 3d. Strang loudly proclaimed that he had received a revelation that he should be Smith's successor. Upon Young's election he withdrew with his followers and settled in Wisconsin, where in 1856 he was shot as the result of a quarrel with two members of his sect. The "Young Josephites," largely holding aloof from Brigham Young, founded in 1852—in a more definite way in 1860—the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints with Joseph Smith, 3d, at the head (see below, III.). Brigham Young (b. in Whitingham, Vt., June 1, 1801; d. in Salt Lake City Aug. 29, 1877) was the logical successor of Smith. Although originally only an ordinary carpenter he proved himself to be a man of very extraordinary talents. His leadership was cordially accepted by the great majority of the Saints. In 1845 the legislature of Illinois found it necessary to withdraw the charter of the city of Nauvoo. This condition, coupled with the unabated hostility of the surrounding non-Mormons, led the Saints to the determination to emigrate far beyond the borders of civilization. The Valley of the Great Salt Lake was finally fixed upon. The exodus began in 1846 and before the close of 1848 the whole body of Young's adherents had crossed the plains except a few left at the Missouri as forwarding agents for Mormon emigrants. In Sept., 1846, the Mormons that had not already departed were forcibly expelled from Illinois by a general uprising. The migration to Utah was a stupendous undertaking, affording Young a supreme opportunity for the development and display of his talents as organizer and leader, so that he entered upon his administration in Utah with the prestige of a signal triumph. He reached his destination July 24, 1847. Immediately the founding of Salt Lake City was begun. A fund was established for the assistance of Mormon emigrants, who, coming from Great Britain, Sweden, and Norway, and in less numbers from Germany, Switzerland, and Frar
the years 1848–51 reached the numb

and in the years 1852–55 from Great Britain alone 9,925.

13. Defiance of the United States.

The design of Brigham Young was to build up a state which, both economically and politically, should be as nearly independent as possible. The economic success of the Mormon community was due in part to his skilful, though despotic, management, but also in no small measure to the inflow of money brought by the California gold-seekers and, at a later period, to the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad. In their political designs the Mormons were less fortunate. When, in 1848, the region within which their settlements lay became United States territory, Young quickly decided that he wanted statehood for his colony, not territorial rule by the federal authorities. A "provisional" government was set up for the "State of Deseret," whose boundaries were set so wide as to include most of the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. In 1849 a constitution was prepared and a delegate sent to Washington with a petition for admission into the Union. Congress, however, refused to recognize the new state and ignored the name Deseret. In 1850 it organized a territorial government for the smaller region occupied by the Mormon settlements and gave the new territory the name Utah. The president appointed Brigham Young governor; also district judges were appointed by the federal government. But Young's tactics were so aggressive that the federal officers were soon compelled to withdraw. As Young's term of office drew to a close President Pierce purposed to appoint a non-Mormon in his stead. He offered the place to Lieutenant-Colonel Steptoe, then in Utah with a small military force. But Young's attitude was so threatening that Steptoe dared not accept the office. In a message to Congress in 1857 Buchanan declared that "there no longer remained any government in Utah but the despotism of Brigham Young." "To restore the supremacy of the constitution and laws within its limits" the president appointed a new governor (Alfred Cumming) and other federal officers, and sent them to their posts accompanied by a military force of 2,500 men "for their protection and to aid as a posse comitatus in case of need in the execution of the laws." That a collision was imminent between Mormondom and the federal government was clear to all who understood the state of affairs in Utah and the principles and policy of Young. Polygamy flourished as an avowed doctrine of the church. Young had acquired an almost incredible power as dictator. He was a mighty force for order according to his system, but the means which he employed were often atrocious. In order to accomplish a much-needed "reformation" he instituted a veritable reign of terror, and there were not a few "church-inspired murders." It was natural, therefore, that when Young heard of the coming of the federal officers and troops, his attitude should be boldly defiant. He publicly announced the news of the coming "invasion," and declared he would
or the devil." He called
harassed the federal

troops in various ways, and by cutting off their base of supplies effectually crippled them, compelling them to retire into winter quarters. The year 1857 witnessed the most frightful act of violence in the history of the Mormons—the massacre of 150 non-Mormon emigrants at Mountain Meadows by a band of Mormons and Indians under the lead of Bishop John D. Lee. Not until twenty years later could Lee be seized for his crime, tried, condemned, and executed. Early in 1858 Young procured from President Buchanan a free pardon for all the Mormon leaders, and peace was declared. The last of the federal troops were withdrawn in 1860. It is certain, however, that Young never intended real submission to the federal government. The more or less open Mormon defiance continued until in 1890 the church reluctantly " traded polygamy for Statehood."

14. Suppression of Polygamy; Statehood.

The fight of the United States government against polygamy in the territories began with the Morrill bill of 1860 (enacted 1862). The measure was ineffective because the conviction of a polygamist could not be had from Mormon juries. The Cullom bill of 1869 (which failed of passage in the Senate) was opposed by Delegate Hooper of Utah on the ground that the Mormons' doctrine of marriage, being an essential part of their religious faith, was entitled to full protection under the constitution. Presidents, one after another, recommended to Congress a more vigorous procedure against the Mormons. In a message in 1880 President Hayes declared: " Polygamy can only be suppressed by taking away the political power of the sect which encourages and sustains it." Recommendations of Garfield and of Arthur in 1881 led to the enactment in 1882 of the " Edmunds Law," improved 1887 (" Edmunds-Tucker Law "), which provided that no polygamist might vote in any territory or hold office under the United States. The attitude of the Mormon church toward the law is manifest from *An Epistle of the First Presidency to the officers and members of the church*, Oct. 6, 1885:

> "The war is openly and undisguisedly made upon our religion. To induce men to repudiate that, to violate its precepts, and break its solemn covenants, every inducement is given. . . . We did not reveal celestial marriage. We can not withdraw or renounce it. God revealed it, and he has promised to maintain it and to bless those who obey it."

Prosecutions under the Edmunds Law began in 1884; convictions for polygamy or unlawful cohabitation (mostly the latter) numbered 3 in 1884, 39 in 1885, 112 in 1886, 214 in 1887, and 100 in 1888. Among the provisions of the act of 1887 was one that dissolved the corporation of the Mormon church. In 1890 the United States supreme court affirmed a decision of a lower court confiscating the property of the Mormon church, and declaring that church to be an organized rebellion. In the same year Congress passed an act disposing of the church lands for the benefit of the school fund. After the admission of Utah as a state Congress restored the property. Perceiving the futility of further resistance President Woodruff, Sept. 25, 1890, issued a proclamation (not a revelation!) in which he declared that his " advice to the Latter-Day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land." It was no recession from the principle of polygamy, only a necessary concession to the force of public law. By the concession in the matter of polygamy the chief obstacle to statehood for Utah was removed. Its admission finally took place in Jan., 1906. The political difficulties of the Mormons have led the church so far to modify its political creed as to declare that the Saints " form not a rival power as against the Union, but an apostolic ministry to it, and their political gospel is state rights and self-government."

15. Late History; Present Status.

Brigham Young died leaving an estate of $2,000,000 to be divided among his seventeen wives —he had had twenty-five wives all told—and fifty-six children. After his death the twelve apostles with John Taylor at their head exercised the chief authority until Taylor's election to the presidency in 1880 with George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith as counselors. In like manner after Taylor's death in 1887 the twelve again ruled until the election of Wilford Woodruff to the presidency in 1889. Upon his death in 1898 Lorenzo Snow was made president. All of these were acknowledged polygamists. As successor to Snow (d. 1901) Joseph F. Smith, son of the martyr patriarch, Hyrum Smith, was chosen president. Though these were all able men, no one of his successors has been comparable to Brigham Young. Although rough and uncultured, he possessed enormous physical and mental energy and all the qualifications of a great popular leader. To him even more than to Joseph Smith Mormondom owes its coherence and persistence. He received revelations when he needed them—and many of the most offensive doctrines of Mormonism were promulgated by him—yet he was far more an organizer than a prophet. The " Utah " Mormons numbered in 1909 about 350,000 members (baptized believers) in the United States. Considerably more than one-half of these are found in Utah, though there is probably not a state or territory in the Union without some of them, while in all the states and territories bordering on Utah, especially in Idaho and Arizona, they have gained a firm foothold and make themselves felt politically. There are at least 15,000 Mormons in Europe (chiefly in Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and Belgium). A considerable number is in Canada and a few are to be found in each of a score of other countries in various quarters of the globe. Their propaganda, which suffered a check by the promulgation of the doctrine of polygamy in 1852, has been vigorous and fairly successful since Woodruff's manifesto advising the Saints to contract no marriage forbidden by law.

16. Doctrinal System.

The first principle of Mormonism is belief in a present and progressive revelation. According to their official statement, their religion " consists of doctrines, commandments, ordinances, and rites revealed from God to the present age." The conception of revelation is apocalyptic. From time to time noteworthy changes have taken place in their doctrine, and others can come at any time. It is true only in the vaguest sense that the church's creed, belief, aims, and purposes have remained the same. The Mormons, acknowledge as the word of God the Bible " in so far as it is correctly translated," the Book of Mormon, and the revelations contained in *Doctrine and Covenants* and in later publications. So far as the Bible is concerned, Joseph Smith and his successors have taken such liberties with its meaning, and even with its text, that it can not be said to have any authority for a Mormon. The Book of Mormon, so important historically, is not comparable, in doctrinal significance, with the *Book of Doctrine and Covenants* and the *Pearl of Great Price*. In the year 1842 Joseph Smith published a short outline of Mormon belief. In it the doctrine of the Trinity was acknowledged, while punishment of the race for Adam's fall was denied. Through Christ's propitiatory sacrifice salvation is possible for all men, on condition of obedience to the ordinances of the Gospel. These are: faith, repentance, baptism for the remission of sins; the laying on of hands for the receiving of the Holy Ghost. The true church must have the same institutions and the same spiritual gifts as the Apostolic Church. There is taught further the gathering together of Israel and the restoration of the ten tribes. Zion will be built somewhere on the American continent and Christ will rule in person upon the earth, which will be renewed to paradisiacal glory. All men should be in possession of religious liberty. Obedience and reverence should be accorded to kings and all in authority. A pure, honest, chaste, and beneficent life is a holy duty. This, however, affords only a faint notion of what Mormonism was then, to say nothing of its later manifestations. Its doctrine of God, for example, is widely different from that of the Christian Church. The Mormon conception of deity rather resembles that of Buddhism. From it a system of anthropomorphisms has been developed, which far exceeds that of any Christian sect in any age. The Mormons teach that nothing is created, everything is begotten. The supreme God (himself brought forth in some way by eternal, self-moving, and intelligent matter) begot other gods. All have bodies, parts, and passions, for " man is made in the image of God." A chief occupation of these gods is to produce souls for the bodies begotten in this and other worlds. The sex idea runs through the whole Mormon conception of the universe. Each world has its own god; ours is none other than Adam—who gradually attained his present glory. " He is the only God with whom we have to do." All gods are in a progressive development, and all Saints will advance to the dignity of gods. Justification by faith as taught by Evangelical churches is a " destructive doctrine." Submission and obedience to the commandments of the church is the essential thing in faith. Baptism, through which sins are washed away, is unconditionally necessary to salvation. Infant baptism is a " solemn mockery," for little children have no sins to repent of and are not under the curse of Adam. An essential feature of the Mormon system is the doctrine and practise of baptism for the dead. As the true Church was extinct upon shortly after the days of the apostles until Joseph Smith, no baptism in all that time was valid. Saints, however, may be baptized for the dead and thus insure the salvation of the latter. The most notorious of the Mormon doctrines is that of celestial marriage, or marriage unto eternity. All marriages entered into without divine sanction, such as is given only to the Saints, are dissolved by death. Those, on the other hand, who wed in accordance with the true Gospel are married for eternity. If a wife thus sealed precedes her husband in death, he may in like manner marry another, and, if the second should die, a third, and so on. In the resurrection all are to be his. Moreover, inasmuch as in eternity a man may have many wives, so may he even in this world, and at one time, if God and his Church sanction it. As many women as God thus gives a man are his and his alone, and cohabitation with them is right and holy. In its behalf the Mormons claim that this doctrine strongly tends to exclude adultery and prostitution.

17. Ordinances in Theory and Practise.

In close relation to the doctrinal system stand the church commandments, ordinances, and public worship. Only believers are baptized, and that by immersion, and it is followed immediately by the laying-on of hands. The celebration of the Lord's Supper takes place every Sunday. By special revelation the use of fermented wine was forbidden; now even the unfermented juice of the grape gives place to water. The Saints have certain secret rites or mysteries, the most important of which are those connected with the marriage ceremony, known as going through the Endowment House. In Salt Lake City all secret rites are now performed in the temple. No non-Mormon may enter the temple, whereas access to the great tabernacle is free to all. Public worship consists of song, prayer, sermon, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and sometimes the dispensing of blessings by a patriarch. In the tabernacle at Salt Lake the music is excellent and impressive. Generally two persons preach in a single service. The sermons are for the most part mere harangues, usually without a text, and a mixture of the religious and the secular. Everything, however, is manifestly adapted to the end in view. Regarded as an organism Mormonism strives to realize the ideal of a pure theocracy based on prophetism and mediated by a hierarchy. In its beginnings a free prophetism ruled; but as it was perceived what confusion must arise if every man were his own prophet, there early developed a great hierarchical system. While every member of the church may enjoy the blessings of divine communion and revelations for his own comfort and guidance, revelations affecting the whole church are given only through the president, although his counselors may share illumination with him. The priesthood is of two orders: the Aaronic (charged with secular affairs) and the Melchisedec (charged with spiritual affairs). The latter is the higher and may overrule the former. Every worthy adult male member has a place in one or the other of these orders. There is no salaried preaching class. It is expected of each member that he will ve in any work to which he may be assigned, at home or abroad. About 2,000 missionaries are constantly at work, the personnel being largely changed every two or four years. Each mission is under the presidency of an elder and has the necessary minor officers. The missionaries travel and labor by twos or in larger groups. In the making of proselytes the more offensive (esoteric) doctrines of Mormonism are passed over without mention; stress is laid on the doctrine of a progressive, present-day revelation and the (materialistic) glories promised to the Saints.

18. Priesthood and Government.

The ranks of the Melchisedec priesthood are the following: (1) The council of the first presidency, consisting of three men, in office and dignity equal to Peter, James, and John. One of these is church president, chosen in a general assembly, and the others are his counselors. These may be against him in counsels but never in final decisions. For the whole church the president is prophet, seer, and revelator, and his authority is absolute. (2) The twelve apostles, or extraordinary witnesses of the name of Christ in the whole world. In the interval between the death of a president and the election of his successor the twelve exercise the highest authority in the church. (3) Presidents of the quorums of seventy; (4) patriarchs; (5) high priests. The Aaronic priesthood includes: (1) bishops, who have charge of the gathering of the tithes and the care of the poor; (2) priests; (3) teachers; (4) deacons. Territorially the church is divided into "stakes of Zion" and the stakes again into wards. The stakes of Zion are so called in distinction from Zion proper, which is in Jackson County, Mo., whither also the Saints are to assemble themselves at last to receive the returning Christ. In North America there are some fifty of these stakes, twenty-one of them in Utah. Each stake has an organization which copies that of the entire church. For each stake also there is a presiding bishop and for each ward a bishop. The bishops are assisted by under officers. By means of this elaborate yet well-balanced system the church maintains a most effective oversight of its affairs. The social and economic aspects of Mormonism have ever been interesting and are in part worthy of praise. The rigorous system has been successful in restraining many vices and in producing a high general state of material well-being, while the lawless subjectivism of its prophetism, which opened the gate to polygamy and other vicious doctrines and practises, has wrought untold harm to its people. Separating itself from the Christian Church and (as far as practicable) from the larger civil and social community, Mormonism is necessarily deficient in many of the best elements of modern culture. It has, however, combined into one the religious and the social element more successfully than any other movement of modern times.

J. R. Van Pelt.

III. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints: This body claims to be the church of that name that was organized by Joseph Smith in Fayette, N. Y., Apr. 6, 1830, and subsequently located at Kirtland, O. This contention is by the Utah body of Latter-day Saints. The disruption occurred in 1844, the main body having meantime removed from Kirtland to Missouri, thence to Nauvoo, Ill. (see I.–II., above); the smaller body was reorganized near Beloit, Wis. At the first conference of the latter, in 1852, the leadership of Brigham Young was disowned. The Reorganized Church has never favored polygamy, but has borne testimony against it. It accepts three books as of divine origin: the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Book of Covenants—the last as a guide in church government, the Book of Mormon as a history of the inhabitants of America for 2,400 years, closing 400 A.D., and the Bible as the word of God, so far as it is translated correctly. The faith of the church is that of the epitome, made by Joseph Smith in 1842 (ut sup.) and enlarged somewhat since. Articles were inserted after polygamy became a tenet of the faith of the Utah branch, declaring for monogamy and against the doctrine of plural wives.

The system of polity is similar to that of the Utah branch, consisting of the presidency, embracing when full, three men, the apostolate, the quorums of seventy, and priests or pastors, teachers, deacons, and bishops—the last-named conducting the business affairs of the church.

The headquarters of the church, which were in Plano, Ill., for nearly twenty years, were removed in 1881 to Lamoni, Ia., where they now are. There are in Lamoni a publishing house, a college, and two homes for the aged. The church carries on missionary work in the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, Germany, Scandinavia, Mexico, and the Sandwich and Society Islands. It reports in the United States alone 49,500 members, 560 churches, and 1,200 ministers. It is slowly increasing in membership.

The president of the church is Joseph Smith, son of the first president. He has held this office since 1860. He lives in Independence, Mo.; his associates are Frederick M. Smith, Independence, Mo., and Richard Evans, Toronto, Canada. The president of the quorum of the twelve apostles is William H. Kelley, Lamoni, Ia.; and Heman C. Smith, of the same place, is second in order of appointment, and is also historian of the church.

H. K. Carroll.

1. To 1869.

IV. Anti-Mormon Movements: Joseph Smith once said with emphasis and apparent pride: "Mormonism is at war with every craft and creed of Christendom." That statement has had abundant verification in every period of Mormon history. But in Nauvoo and afterward in Utah there were many but futile attempts to reform Mormonism from within. The advent of the United States army into Utah, the opening of mines, and the inflow of "Gentiles" afforded protection and gave promise of help from without. Three powerful forces of Christian civilization were invoked: the press, the pulpit, and the school. The first paper published was *The Valley Tan*, issued in 1858 from the camp. *The Salt Lake Vedette* followed, then *The Utah Magazine*, afterward *The Tribune*, and others in subsequent years. Some young men of literary tastes organized a "literary and musical society," which maintained a struggling existence. In 1865 they invited the Rev. Norman McLeod, an army chaplain and Congregational minister, to the city. He instituted services in a hall in Main Street. A Sunday-school was organized in the city and another at the camp, and Dr. John King Robinson, surgeon in the army, became superintendent. The literary society, with help from California, erected Independence Hall, a commodious adobe building for religious and literary purposes. The next year McLeod went east to solicit funds. In his absence Dr. Robinson was treacherously murdered. McLeod was advised by friends not to return to Utah, as his life was in danger. But Major Charles H. Hempsted, United States district attorney, maintained the Sunday-school. Early in 1867 Warren Hussey and two Episcopalian ladies, Mrs. Dr. Hamilton and Mrs. Oliver Durant, requested Bishop Tuttle of Montana to send a clergyman. He sent Rev. Messrs. Thomas W. Haskins and George W. Foote. In May they instituted the first permanent Christian service in Salt Lake City. Major Hempsted gave into their hands the Sunday-school with an enrolment of fifty. Responding to a crying need for school facilities, they, in July, opened St. Mark's grammar-school. An Episcopal church of fifteen communicants was constituted that summer. A much-needed hospital was provided, the first in Utah. In years following this denomination established churches and schools in five other towns, and a second church, St. Paul's, in Salt Lake City. On the removal of Bishop Tuttle to Salt Lake City in 1869, St. Mark's became the cathedral. Subsequently Rowland Hall, a boarding and day-school for girls, was opened. The Episcopalians now have property in Utah worth about $400,000.

2. From 1869 to the Present.

In 1869 two Presbyterian ministers, Sheldon Jackson (q.v.) and Melanchthon Hughes, held the first religious service in Corinne and instituted regular work. A church of nine members was organized July 14, 1870. In 1864 the Rev. Henry Kendall, secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, while *en route* to California, preached in the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City. He found in the city Presbyterians eager for church privileges, but not until 1871 was their request granted. Rev. Josiah Welch arrived in July of that year, and instituted regular services in a room above a livery stable. Out of this beginning grew the First Presbyterian Church of Salt Lake City. In 1875 Rev. D. J. McMillan arrived and instituted an aggressive policy. Within six years he established 40 missions and schools, from St. George in the extreme south of Utah, to Malad, Idaho, the northern part of the Mormon realm. At present the Presbyterians have 27 ministers, 27 churches, 1,819 communicants, 1 college, 4 academies (boarding and day-schools), 13 day-schools, 1,402 scholars, and property amounting to $650,000. Since the establishment of a public-school system in Utah the denominations have discontinued many of their parochial and mission schools. In 1870 the Rev. G. M. Peirce, a Methodist minister, arrived in Salt Lake City, at once began work, and soon established a church. In 1876 he launched *The Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate*, the first Protestant religious paper in Utah. This denomination extended its church and school work into many parts of Utah. It now has 23 ministers in charge of 27 churches, with 1,550 members, 35 Sunday-schools with 2,530 scholars, and church and manse property worth $222,100.

In 1873 Rev. Father Scanlan of the Roman Catholic Church was sent to Salt Lake City. Three years previously Rev. Father Kelley from Nevada visited the city and purchased a plot of land for church purposes, but held no service. Father Scanlan established St. Mary's Church, and in course of time twelve other parishes and forty missions, in 1875 St. Mary's Academy, in 1881 Holy Cross Hospital, in 1886 All Hallows College, and later Kearns St. Ann's Orphanage. Schools were opened in five other towns. Father Scanlan is now bishop, and St. Mary's is his cathedral, with a new building costing $350,000. In 1874 the Congregationalists returned and organized a church in Independence Hall, with Rev. Walter M. Barrows as pastor. In 1878 Hammond Hall and later two other academies and five mission schools in other parts were opened. At present the Congregationalists have 10 churches with 1,327 members and 10 Sunday-schools with an enrolment of 1,260.

In 1881 Rev. Dwight Spencer, superintendent of Baptist missions, reached Salt Lake City, and organized a church which has grown and multiplied. That denomination has now 10 ministers and 10 churches, with 1,000 members. In 1882 the Lutheran Church entered Utah. They have pursued a conservative policy and accomplished substantial results. The Josephites (non-polygamous Mormons) established several churches and have quietly served those Mormons who repudiate polygamy and the divine right of Brigham Young and his followers. The Jews from the first have done their part well. They have helped all the Christian churches and maintained several synagogues. The Y. M. C. A. has acquired property worth $240,000; it has 1,365 members, 1,013 of whom are members of Protestant churches; 585 are in educational classes, and 311 in Bible classes. D. J. McMillan.

Bibliography: From the Mormon standpoint: *Book of Mormon*, 1st ed., Palmyra, N. Y., 1839, current publication in revised form at Salt Lake City; Joseph Smith, *Book of Doctrine and Covenants*, Kirtland, Ohio, 1835; *The Pearl of Great Price*, Salt Lake City, 1891 and current (selections from Joseph Smith's writings); various works of B. H. Roberts, currently published at Salt Lake City, e. g., *The Gospel*, *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History*, *New Witness for God*, *Defence of the Faith and of the Saints;* P. P. Pratt, *A Voice of Warning to All Nations*, Kirtland, 1838; Thompson, *Evidences in Proof of the "Book of Mormon,"* Batavia, 1841; Lucy Smith, *Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith and his Progenitors*, Liverpool, 1853, Plano, Ill., 1880 (by the prophet's mother); E. W. Tullidge, *Life of Joseph the Prophet*, Plano, 1880; idem, *Hist. of Salt Lake City*, Salt Lake City, 1886; J. E. Talmage, *Articles of Faith*, ib. 1899; Joseph Smith 3d, and H. C. Smith, *Hist. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*, Lamoni, Ia., 1901; B. H. Roberts, *Mormon Doctrine of Deity*, Salt Lake City, 1903; L. A. Wilson, *Outlines of Mormon Philosophy*, ib. 1905; J. H. Evans, *One Hundred Years of Mormonism, 1805–1905*, ib. 1906.

From the historical, critical, or anti-Mormon point of view: W. A. Linn, *Story of the Mormons, from the Date of their Origin to . . . 1901*, New York, 1902 (detailed); H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, vol

xxi., *Utah*, San Francisco, 1889; E. D. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled*, Painesville, Ohio, 1834; D. P. Kidder, *Mormonism and Mormons; historical View of the Rise and Progress of the . . . Latter-Day Saints*, New York, 1853; B. G. Ferris, *Utah and the Mormons*, ib. 1854; J. W. Gunnison, *The Mormons*, Philadelphia, 1856; J. Hyde, Jr., *Mormonism; its Leaders and Designs*, New York, 1857 (by an ex-Mormon); P. Tucker, *Origin, Rise, and Progress of Mormonism*, ib. 1867; J. H. Beadle, *Life in Utah; or, the Mysteries and Crimes of Mormonism*, Philadelphia, 1870; idem, *Polygamy; or, the Mysteries . . . of Mormonism*, Fulton, Ky., 1904; M. Busch, *Geschichte der Mormonen nebst Darstellung ihres Glaubens*, Leipsic, 1870; F. H. Ludlow, *Heart of the Continent; with an Examination of the Mormon Principle*, New York, 1870; T. B. H. Stenhouse, *The Rocky Mountain Saints*, ib. 1873; R. von Schlagintweit, *Die Mormonen . . . von ihrer Entstehung bis auf die Gegenwart*, Cologne, 1878; J. H. Kennedy, *Early Days of Mormonism*, New York, 1888; T. Gregg, *The Prophet of Palmyra, Mormonism; together with a complete Hist. of the Mormon Era*, ib. 1890; W. H. Thomas, *Mormon Saints*, London, 1890; M. T. Lamb, *The Mormons and their Bible*, Philadelphia, 1901; I. W. Riley, *The Founder of Mormonism*, New York, 1902; N. L. Nelson, *Scientific Aspects of Mormonism*, ib. 1904; Mrs. J. F. Willing, *On American Soil; or, Mormonism the Mohammedanism of the West*, Louisville, 1906; E. V. Fohlin, *Salt Lake City, Past and Present. A Narrative of its History and Romance, its People and Cultures, its Industry and Commerce*, Salt Lake City, 1909. A considerable body of magazine literature is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, pp. 748–749.

MORNING LECTURES: The name usually given to a series of sermons published under the title *Morning Exercises at Cripplegate, St.-Giles-in-the-Fields and in Southwark, being divers Sermons preached A.D. 1659–1689, by several Ministers of the Gospel in or near London*, 8 vols., London; republished, ed. J. Nichols, 6 vols., London, 1844. The occasion is thus given by D. Neal (*Hist. of the Puritans*, i. 424, New York, 1863): "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, and the other in a suitable exhortation to the people." These services were held in various churches consecutively, and, after the end of the war, were continued, until the Revolution, in a modified form, the sermons taking up points of practical divinity. The collection of sermons is regarded as "one of the best compends of theology in the English language."

MORONE, mō-rō′nê, **GIOVANNI DE:** Italian cardinal; b. at Milan Jan. 25, 1509; d. in Rome Dec. 1, 1580. He studied law at Padua, but entered the ecclesiastical life, and as early as 1529, for services rendered by his father, he was appointed by Clement VII. to the bishopric of Modena. Paul III., on ascending the papal throne in 1535, despatched the young bishop as nuncio to the duke of Milan, then to Germany, whence Vergerio had just returned. His chief task and commission was to promote, both with King Ferdinand and also in Hungary and elsewhere, the cause of the proposed council at Mantua; to dissipate the opposition that had been roused against the choice of that place; and to inform the Curia concerning everything that bore upon ecclesiastical questions (the records of this nunciature were published with annotations by W. Friedensburg, Gotha, 1892). Morone was once more sent across the Alps (1540), this time to the conference in session at Spires. Though he was likewise present at Regensburg in 1541, yet the controlling part there fell to Cardinal Gasparo Contarini (q.v.). Morone, who in the mean time had become a cardinal, returned to Modena in 1542, where he now found serious heresies at work, especially among the members of the local Academy of the Grillenzoni. It had become habitual to read *Sommario della Sacra Scrittura* ("Summary of Sacred Scripture"), while Protestant views obtained on various doctrines. After somewhat protracted proceedings, those under examination signed certain articles whereby they signified their orthodoxy. Morone himself belonged to the circle of people who valued highly the little book, "Of the Benefit of Christ's Death" (see ITALY, THE REFORMATION IN, § 7), a point subsequently brought forward in the trial that was instituted against him on the charge of heresy. For neither the important services which Morone had rendered the Curia during his nunciatures nor those which he had rendered as one of the legates at the Council of Trent could shield him from the mistrust of the fanatical Paul IV. (q.v.). The pope included Morone, along with two other bishops and Cardinal Pole (q.v.), under a writ of indictment (June, 1557); and, once committed to prison in the Castle of San Angelo, Morone was obliged to linger there till after the pope's death (1559). Pius IV., in whose election the cardinal, liberated after the pope's death, had taken part, declared him innocent and quashed the trial, and when the Council of Trent reopened, the pope designated Cardinal Morone as one of its presidents. This experienced diplomat was employed also by Gregory XIII., who despatched him to Genoa, and in 1576 to Regensburg as envoy to Maximilian II. Morone spent his closing years at Rome, where he had been appointed dean of the College of Cardinals. He rests in the Church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* by N. Bernabei, Modena, 1885; C. Cantù, in *Atti dell' Istituto Lombardo*, 1866; F. Sclopis, in *Séances et travaux de l'académie des sciences morales et politiques, compte-rendu*, xc. 29–48, 321–359, xci. 49–82, Paris, 1869–70; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 106, 122, 256–265, iii., nos. 22, 23, 39; *KL*, viii. 1929–30; and J. G. Schellhorn, *Amænitates literariæ*, xii. 537–586, 14 vols., Leipsic, 1725–1731.

MORONITES. See CELESTINES.

MORRIS, EDWARD DAFYDD: Presbyterian; b. at Utica, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1825. He was graduated from Yale College (A.B., 1849) and Auburn Theological Seminary (1852). He was pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Auburn, N. Y. (1852–55), and of the Second Presbyterian Church, Columbus, O. (1855–67); professor of church history in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati (1867–74), and of theology in the same institution (1874–97). He was moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly at Cleveland, O., in 1875, and in theology is "evangelistic, in a broad sense Calvinistic, but catholic and irenic." He has written: *Outlines of Christian Doctrines* (Cincinnati, 1880); *Ecclesiology* (New York, 1885); *Is there Salvation after Death?* (New York, 1887); *Thirty Years in Lane* (Cincinnati, 1897); *Theology of the Westminster Symbols* (Philadelphia, 1900); and *The Presbyterian Church, New School* (1904).

MORRIS, JOHN GOTTLIEB: Lutheran; b. at York, Pa., Nov. 14, 1803; d. at Lutherville, Md., Oct. 10, 1895. He graduated from Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1823; studied at Princeton, N. J., Theological Seminary, 1826, then at Gettysburg Theological Seminary; was the founder of the First English Lutheran (Trinity) Church, Baltimore, Md., and its pastor, 1827–60; became librarian of the Peabody Institute, Baltimore, 1860–64; was stated supply of the Third Lutheran Church of the same city, 1861–67; from 1834 he was lecturer on biology in Pennsylvania College; from 1874 he was pastor at Lutherville, Md.; and also lecturer on pulpit elocution and Biblical science in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. With his brother he founded Lutherville Ladies' Seminary, and in 1846 he aided in establishing the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.). He distinguished himself in natural history, and belonged to numerous American and European scientific societies. He was the founder of the *Lutheran Observer* in 1831, editor till 1833, then a contributor. He was the author of *Catharine De Bora* (Philadelphia, 1856); *Catalogue of the Described Lepidoptera of North America*, and *Synopsis of the Described Lepidoptera of North America*, part I. (both Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1860–62); *The Lords Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874); *Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry* (1874); *Quaint Sayings and Doings of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia, 1876); *Bibliotheca Lutherana: List of Publications of Lutheran Ministers in the United States* (1876); *Journeys of Luther: their Relation to the Work of the Reformation* (1880); *Luther at Wartburg and Coburg* (1882); *Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (1884); *Life Reminiscences of an Old Lutheran Minister* (1896; pp. 355 sqq., contains a list of his writings). He edited a translation of Köstlin's "Life of Martin Luther" (1883); and assisted in editing the *Evangelical Review* (Gettysburg, 1849–62).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Life Reminiscences* (ut sup.), consult: H. E. Jacobs, in *American Church History Series*, iv. 389–390 et passim, New York, 1893; H. E. Jacobs and J. A. W. Haas, *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, p. 329, ib. 1899.

MORRISON, HENRY CLAY: Methodist Episcopal (South) bishop; b. near Clarksville, Tenn., May 30, 1842. He was educated in the public schools, and received his classical and Hebrew training privately. After teaching school from 1860 to 1863, he was licensed to preach, and in 1864 was chaplain of the Eighth Kentucky Mounted Infantry, C. S. A. In 1865 he was appointed to the Middletown Circuit, and later held pastorates at Bardstown, Ky. (1866–68), Elizabethtown, Ky. (1868–69), Middletown, Ky. (1869–72); Shelby Street, Louisville, Ky. (1872–76); Broadway Church, Louisville (1876–80); Chestnut Street, Louisville (1880–84); Russelville, Ky. (1884–86), and the First Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga. (1886–90). From 1890 to 1898 he was a missionary secretary of his denomination, and in this capacity raised large funds and paid off the debt of the Board of Missions. In 1898 he was elected bishop with headquarters at New Orleans.

MORRISON, JAMES DOW: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Duluth; b. at Waddington, N. Y., Oct. 16, 1844. He was educated at McGill University, Montreal (A.B., 1865), and after studying under the canons of Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, was ordered deacon in 1869, and ordained priest in the following year, after which he held parishes at Hemmingford, P. Q. (1869–71), Herkimer, N. Y. (1871–75), and Ogdensburg, N. Y. (1875–97), being also archdeacon of Ogdensburg from 1881 to 1897. In 1897 he was consecrated first missionary bishop of Duluth. In 1898 he was Paddock lecturer at the General Theological Seminary, New York City. He has written *Fundamental Church Principles* (Milwaukee, 1898).

MORRISON, ROBERT: The father of Protestant missions in China; b. at Buller's Green, Morpeth (15 m. n.n.w. of Newcastle), England, Jan. 5, 1782; d. at Canton, China, Aug. 1, 1834. He had a decided inclination for study, took up Latin, Hebrew, and theology under Rev. W. Laidler, and afterward attended Hoxton Academy in England, 1803–04. In 1804 he offered himself to the London Missionary Society, and was appointed the first missionary to China; entering their training institute at Gosport, he took up the study of Chinese under a Chinaman resident there; was ordained Jan., 1807, and then sailed for Canton. He became interpreter for the East India Company (see CHINA, II., 3, § 1) and assiduously engaged in the translation of the Bible into Chinese, and in the preparation of Chinese tracts and a dictionary. He revised and published a Chinese version of the Acts in 1811; issued an original Chinese catechism, and in 1815 a Chinese grammar which was printed by the Serampore press in India. In 1813 he completed, with the assistance of William Milne (q.v.), the translation of the entire New Testament, the Gospels, the closing epistles from Hebrews and Revelation being the work of Morrison. He and Milne also made a version of the Old Testament, so that the entire Bible was printed in 1819. He also made a translation of the morning and evening prayers of the Church of England. His most laborious literary work was his Chinese Dictionary, published by the East India Company at an expense of £12,000 (3 parts, Macao, 1815–23), a work of remarkable industry and scholarship. He also founded the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca, which, however, was never very successful, and was removed in 1845 to Hongkong. In 1824 he paid a visit to England, returning to China in 1826. His interest in educational work is shown by his gift of a large Chinese library to University College, London, England, and he had a share in the establishment of the Bartlett's Buildings Language Institution, at London. After his death The Morrison Education Society was founded in his honor by merchants interested in the

Chinese for supporting a school for Chinese youth. The school was located at Macao, 1838, and removed to Hongkong in 1842 (see BROWN, SAMUEL ROBBINS). He was also the author of *Horæ Sinicæ: Translations from the Popular Literature of the Chinese* (London, 1812); *A View of China for Philological Purposes, Containing a Sketch of Chinese Chronology, Geography, Government and Customs* (1817); *Vocabulary of the Canton Dialect* (3 parts, Macao, 1828); *Memoirs of Rev. William Milne, D.D., Late Missionary to China . . . Compiled from Documents Written by the Deceased; to which are added Occasional Remarks* (Malacca, 1824). Mr. Morrison added to his literary and civil labors private efforts to spread the Gospel, the public proclamation of the Gospel being forbidden. After his death his remains were taken to Macao, where they still rest, the site being marked by an appropriate inscription testifying to his devotion as a missionary and his eminence as a Chinese scholar. Although his dictionary has been superseded by that of Samuel Wells Williams, his name will always have an honorable place beside the names of Martyn, Judson, Carey, Williams, and other workers in the heroic age of modern missions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lives are by Mrs. E. Morrison, 2 vols., London, 1839 (by his widow); S. W. Williams, in F. Piper, *Lives of Leaders of the Church Universal*, ed. H. M. McCracken, pp. 819–837, Philadelphia, 1879; W. J. Townsend, London, 1888. Consult also W. W. Moseley, *The Origin of the First Mission to China*, London, 1842; and the literature on missions to China.

MORRISON, THEODORE NEVIN: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Iowa; b. at Ottawa, Ill., Feb. 18, 1850. He was graduated from Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. (A.B., 1870), and the General Theological Seminary (1873). He was ordered deacon in 1873 and was advanced to the priesthood in the following year. He was then rector of St. Paul's, Pekin, Ill. (1874–76) and of the Church of the Epiphany, Chicago (1876–99), and in 1899 was consecrated bishop of Iowa.

MORSE, RICHARD CARY: Presbyterian; b. at Hudson, N. Y., Sept. 19, 1841. He was educated at Yale (A.B., 1862), Union Theological Seminary (1865–66; graduated, 1867), and Princeton Theological Seminary (1866–67). After being assistant editor of the *New York Observer* from 1867 to 1869, he was ordained to the ministry in 1869, and since that year has been general secretary of the international committee of the Y. M. C. A. He has taken an active part in the extension of that organization both in the United States and Canada, and in other parts of the world, and is honorary American secretary of the World's Committee of the Y. M. C. A. He has written *Robert M. McBurney, a Memorial* (New York, 1899); *Polity of Young Men's Christian Associations* (1904); and *Fifty Years of Federation* (1905).

MORTMAIN, mōrt'mên″: In law, the state of lands and tenements held by perpetual tenure. Since the alienation of church property is forbidden by ecclesiastical canons, and members of ecclesiastical bodies were reckoned as dead persons in law, the phrase *mortua manus*, "the dead hand," was used to express this aspect of the church as a holder of property, and the term statutes of mortmain came to signify the secular laws which attempted to impose limitations upon the church's power of acquiring property. Such laws are found as early as the Carolingian period, and numerous civil enactments of the Middle Ages limit the amount of real property which may be held by churches or monasteries, largely for the reason that such property was exempted from feudal dues and services. The indifferent success of such legislation may be seen from various statements of the very large proportion of the land which was in ecclesiastical possession. In England the Magna Charta as revised and confirmed by Henry III. forbade the transfer of land to church corporations by a tenant without the consent of his lord. The statute *de religiosis* of Edward I., enacted in 1279, forbade the acquisition of land by clerics or others in such wise that it should come into mortmain. The aim of this and subsequent laws of the same king was to prevent the impoverishment of the nation by endowments which deprived the State of its due services under the feudal system, and were based on the theory that the national church should share in the nation's burdens. The laws of mortmain were retained in the United States only in Pennsylvania, owing to the fact that there were no great religious corporations, and because the feudal system never existed here. The growing desire to limit the rights and privileges of corporations has led to the enactment of laws in the United States and in other countries which more or less directly affect ecclesiastical bodies. A treatment of them, however, belongs rather to works on law and jurisprudence than to one devoted to religion or theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. D. Tudor, *Law of Charities and Mortmain*, London, 1889; J. Rawlinson, *Notes on the Mortmain Acts*, ib. 1877. The statute of 1279 is in Henderson, *Documents*, pp. 148–149.

MORTON, NATHANIEL: Colonial historian; b. in Leyden, Holland, 1612; d. in Plymouth, Mass., June 28, 1685. He came to America in 1623; became Governor Bradford's assistant at Plymouth in the management of public affairs, and in 1645 was appointed secretary of the Plymouth Colony. He was well read, and noted carefully the facts and events of the early days of the colony; nearly all its records were written by him. He wrote the valued *New-England's Memoriall: or a Brief Relation of the most Memorable and Remarkable Passages of the Providence of God, Manifested to the Planters of New-England in America; with Special Reference to the First Colony thereof, Called New-Plymouth, as also a Nomination of Divers of the most Eminent Instruments Deceased, both of Church and Commonwealth, Improved in the First Beginning and After-progress of Sundry of the Respective Jurisdictions in those Parts; in Reference unto Sundry Exemplary Passages of their Lives, and the Time of their Death. Published for the Use and Benefit of Present and Future Generations* (Cambridge, 1669; 2d ed., Boston, 1721; 6th ed., Boston, 1855). He wrote also in 1680 a *Synopsis of the Church History of Plymouth*, which appeared in Ebenezer Hazard's *Historical Collections* and in Alexander Young's *Chron-*

icles of the Pilgrim Settlers of Massachusetts (2 vols., Boston, 1841–46).

Bibliography: J. B. Felt, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of New England*, 2 vols., Boston, 1855–62; *Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography*, iv. 429–430, New York, 1898; W. Walker, *Ten New England Leaders*, pp. 17, 36, 38, 44, ib. 1901.

MORUS, SAMUEL FRIEDRICH NATHANAEL: German Protestant exegete; b. at Lauban (75 m. e. of Breslau) Nov. 30, 1736; d. at Leipsic Nov. 11, 1792. He received his primary education at home, his father being an instructor in the Lauban Latin school. At the University of Leipsic he came under the influence of J. A. Ernesti (q.v.), and was regarded as that teacher's best pupil. Some years were spent in private tutoring, during which at the house of Professor Ludwig, one of his patrons, he met Goethe. In 1761 he began giving lectures on Greek and Latin writers at Leipsic. He became professor extraordinary in 1768 and full professor in 1771. After 1780 he lectured on New-Testament exegesis, and on the death of Ernesti was transferred to the theological faculty. He afterward became rector and was four times dean between 1774 and 1785. In 1787 he became a member of the consistory of Meissen.

In his exegetical work Morus developed the methods of his teacher Ernesti. His *De descrimine sensus et significationis in interpretando, De causis, quibus nititur interpretatio allegoriarum*, and his *De nexu significationum eiusdem verbi* (in his *Dissertationes theologicæ et philologicæ*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1787, vol. ii., ed. C. A. T. Keil, Leipsic, 1794) are of lasting worth.

The *Prælectiones* (2 vols., 1794–1810), collected from his students' notebooks, has historical value only. His *Epitome theologiæ Christianæ* (1789) is unsystematic, but free from the dogmatism of the period. A collection of his sermons was published at Leipsic, 1786. Morus also edited a number of Greek and Latin texts. He was of frail physique, unostentatious in his piety, modest, and a lover of peace. (G. Müller.)

Bibliography: The autobiography of Morus appeared in *Magazin für Prediger*, vol. v., 12 vols., Züllichau, 1781–1791. Studies of his life and services are by D. Beck, Leipsic, 1792; Voigt, ib. 1792; J. G. C. Höpfner, ib. 1793; and *ADB*, xxii. 342–344.

MOSCHUS, mos'cus: Greek theologian of the 6th century; d. at Rome about 619. The place and date of his birth are unknown and the details of his life are scanty. His name, according to the manuscripts, was Johannes, son of Moschus, but he is also known as "The Continent" or "The Monk." Photius records that he entered the monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem, that he then dwelt for a time among the hermits of the Jordan valley, after which he joined the monks in the new monastery of Great Sabas, near the Dead Sea. He journeyed to Egypt and the Great Oasis, accompanied by Sophronius, in the reign of Tiberius II. (578–587). Later still he went to Cyprus and thence to Rome where he died.

The fame of Moschus rests upon his "Meadow," written at Rome and dedicated to Sophronius, probably his companion and later patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 638; see Sophronius, 2.), who has indeed been declared (as by Nicephorus, John of Damascus, and the second Nicene Council) to be the author of the "Meadow." This work, in its present form, is a mass of disconnected stories, based on older sources, including a "Paradise," perhaps identical with the "Old Folks' Book," doubtless a collection of apothegms. In its original form, however, the "Meadow" seems to have been somewhat on the plan of the *Collationes* of Cassian or of the *Historia monachorum* of Timotheus, recounting Moschus' personal experience with famous ascetics or giving edifying stories told by them. The numerous tract-like stories are probably interpolations. The object of the work was a contribution to ascetic life, but its style, as compared with older writings of similar character, is vulgar and uncouth, though the chaotic condition of the manuscripts render even the original extent of the work uncertain. Nevertheless the "Meadow" is a work of distinct importance, containing valuable information on monastic life both in Palestine and in the other countries visited by the author, and also describing the liturgy, the political relations of the day as disturbed by the invasions of Persians and Arabs, and giving hints of such phases of culture history as the development of the cult of Mary. The work long remained popular in the monasteries and exercised an influence on later literature of similar character, filled as it was with the marvelous and assailing heresy in a manner which renders it not without importance for the history of dogma. (E. Preuschen.)

Bibliography: A good edition of the work of Moschus is still a desideratum; it is printed with Latin transl. in *MPG*, lxxxvii., reproduced from F. du Duc, in *Bibliotheca Græco-Latina*, pp. 1057–1159, preceded by a life, pp. 1054–57, Paris, 1624. Consult further: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 124 sqq., Hamburg, 1807; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 187–188, et passim.

MOSES.

Name, Birth, and Childhood (§ 1).
Youth and Early Manhood; the Divine Call (§ 2).
The Plagues of Egypt (§ 3).
The Exodus (§ 4).
The March to Sinai (§ 5).
From Sinai to Kadesh (§ 6).
From Kadesh to Nebo (§ 7).
Character (§ 8).
Moses as Lawgiver (§ 9).
As Historian and Religious Founder (§ 10).

1. Name, Birth, and Childhood.

The liberator of Israel from the Egyptian bondage, to whom tradition unanimously refers the establishment of Israel's nationality, bears in the Bible the name *Mosheh*, which Ex. ii. 10 explains as a memento of his wonderful preservation in earliest childhood. The name is probably of Egyptian origin, not from the Egyptian-Coptic *mo*, "water" and *uje*, "saved," or *mou*, "water," and *shi*, "take," the latter accepted by the Septuagint which has *Mōūsēs*, but rather from *mes*, *mesu*, "child," often used in proper names, as, e.g., *Tautmes*, Thothmes. In Ex. vi. 20 and Num. xxvi. 59, Amram and Jochebed, both of the tribe of Levi, are called the parents of Moses. Jochebed is mentioned as a daughter of Levi (Ex. ii. 1; Num. xxvi. 59) and Amram as a grandson; this neither accords with the Mosaic marriage-laws (Lev. xvii. 12) nor with the duration of the stay in Egypt. Indeed, according to Num. iii. 27 sqq., Amram can scarcely have been Moses' father. Ex. vii. 7 states that Aaron was older than Moses, as was also a sister (Ex. ii. 4), perhaps Miriam. The future liberator was born at the time of the severest oppression of his people. The Pharaoh, apprehensive because of the spread of the Semitic population in the northeast of the kingdom, had just commanded that the newly born male children of the Israelites should be cast into the Nile. Disregarding this stern command, the mother of Moses dared to keep her child, who was "exceeding fair" (Acts vii. 20), for three months; then she entrusted him to the care of the Almighty (Heb. xi. 23). The child, placed in an ark of bulrushes and watched by his sister, was discovered by the Pharaoh's daughter who wished to bathe in the river. It therefore seems that Moses saw the light in a royal capital on the lower Nile. Some think of Tanis (the Zoan of Num. xiii. 22, etc.), but Bubastis is more probable, as the Hyksos rulers often resided there. The Pharaoh in question is not Rameses II., but a ruler of the eighteenth dynasty. A tradition (Eusebius, *Præparatio evangelica*, ix. 27; Eng. transl., i. 462 sqq., Oxford, 1903) names the savior of Moses Merris; the Rabbis give Bityah, derived from the Bithiah of I Chron. iv. 18; Josephus, however (*Ant.* II., ix. 5) calls her Thermuthis. The adoption of foreign children was not unusual at the royal court. Similar legends regarding the preservation of celebrated men in their childhood prove nothing against the historical character of this event, only the undoubtedly older recital concerning Sargon I. could be considered a prototype (see BABYLONIA, VI., 3, § 1).

2. Youth and Early Manhood; the Divine Call.

At the Egyptian court Moses was instructed in "all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and it is quite probable that he came into close touch with the Egyptian priesthood, who were the guardians of wisdom and culture. Manetho (Josephus, *Apion*, i. 26, 28) even asserts that he was a priest of Osiris in Heliopolis and bore the name of Osarsiph, which he later changed to Moses. The Bible relates only one event of Moses' youth, the slaying of an Egyptian slave-driver (Ex. ii. 11 sqq.). He was obliged to flee from Pharaoh's wrath to the land of Midian, in the southeastern part of the Sinaitic peninsula. A courteous service rendered at a well, recalling Jacob's adventure, brought him into the house of the priest of Midian, who took him into his service and gave him his daughter Zipporah in marriage. This priest of Midian is called Reuel in Ex. ii. 18 (J), but Jethro in Ex. iii. 1 (E), etc.; the name Jethro may be an appellative (*yithro-yithron*, "superiority," "excellency"). Zipporah is hardly identical with the Ethiopian woman of Num. xii. 1, this text seeming to refer to a later event. Two sons, Gershom and Eliezer, were born to Moses during his exile in Midian (Ex. ii. 22, xviii. 4). Tradition (Acts vii. 30) marks an interval of forty years between the flight to Midian and the revelation from God; according to P (Ex. vii. 7), Moses was eighty years old when he appeared before Pharaoh. The vision at which he was entrusted with his office was vouchsafed him at Mt. Horeb or Sinai (see SINAI). Here the angel of the Lord, or, according to the further recital, the Lord himself appeared to him unexpectedly. This appearance was not in human form but elemental, a flame of fire rising from a bush. Its supernatural quality was shown by the bush remaining unconsumed. The divine voice heard by Moses announced itself to be that of the God of the covenant with the fathers, and commanded Moses to free his people and lead them, in the name of Yahweh, from the Egyptian bondage to Canaan (cf. Ex. iii. 14 with vi. 3). Moses was to demand of Pharaoh that the Israelites should be allowed to go three days' journey into the desert to sacrifice to their God, whom they could not serve in Egypt. In spite of his hesitation, Moses was forced to accept, and his power consisted in the fact that not his own will but that of God prevailed. Moses feared that he did not possess the requisite eloquence for his task and was told that Aaron should speak for him. He was therefore forced to conform to the will of God and depart for Egypt. On his way back, during a halt, an incident occurred, the account of which is obscure (Ex. iv. 24–26). He had failed to circumcise his son (the narrator seems to know of only one), although this usage had been made a law for Abraham and his descendants, and the text says that Yahweh attacked him, probably by an illness which roused his conscience. As the father was incapacitated by illness, Zipporah cut off her son's foreskin and, casting it at Moses' feet, exclaimed: "A bloody husband art thou to me." These enigmatical words may signify that by her act she had saved her husband's life. Another king now sat on the Egyptian throne, but the position of the Israelites was not improved. Moses was coldly received by his people, and found little appreciation for his mission. At first, indeed, they were grateful for the prospect of liberation, but when the Pharaoh received ungraciously the demand for the festival in the desert and redoubled his exactions, the Israelites reproached Moses and Aaron with being mischief-makers.

3. The Plagues of Egypt.

Before the plagues fell upon Egypt, Pharaoh was shown the change of the rod into a serpent, which was merely a symbol of what was to follow; it accorded with Egyptian usage, just as the plagues conformed to the natural conditions of the land. Egyptian magic was to be conquered in the domain of its national gods, so that all might see that Yahweh was the real Lord of the land (Ex. viii. 19). On the traditional names of the Egyptian magicians, see JANNES AND JAMBRES. At the present day Egyptian snake-charmers are able to reduce these creatures to complete insensibility, so that they appear like rods. Since Pharaoh paid no heed to this sign, it was followed by the plagues, ten in number, which gradually forced the Egyptians to recognize the full power of the Lord. They are principally related by JE, partly by P or by both sources in combination. The plagues succeeded one another in the course of a few months, with short intervals to give the Pharaoh time for reflection. Firstly, at the command of the prophet, the Nile water was turned to blood; this signifies a reddish hue of the water, accompanying its corruption, the latter a fearful blow for the Egyptians as this element was for them so invaluable. The water sometimes becomes corrupt when the Nile is low, but the fact that it now grew exceptionally foul at the command of Moses was evident proof of Yahweh's agency. Seven days after the first (combine Ex. vii. 25 and viii. 1) followed the second plague, an invasion of frogs, especially favored by the stagnant water. These were the small *rana Nilotica* and *Mosaica*, indigenous in Egypt; by their unusual number and obtrusiveness they became a national calamity. The magicians also succeeded in producing both these plagues but could not remove them, and the king had to seek help from Moses. As, however, the king relented only for the moment, the third plague ensued, that of gnats. These insects are always annoying in Egypt, but perhaps through the drying-up of the stagnant water, they now became a veritable scourge. Here the power of the magicians failed and they were obliged to acknowledge a divine agency. Since the ruler was still obdurate, the fourth, the plague of lice (Septuagint, *kunomuia*, " dog-flies ") followed. This infliction was so severe that Pharaoh was moved to consent that the Israelites should sacrifice to God in Egypt; Moses wisely refused. The promise then given by Pharaoh in his extremity, that the Israelites should be permitted to make the three days' journey into the desert, was not kept when this plague was removed and so a fifth was sent, a terrible murrain. The plague of boils was the sixth and this afflicted even the magicians. All these visitations were on a gradually ascending scale; three others were of exceptional severity. Firstly, as the seventh plague, a destructive and even deadly hailstorm which, according to Ex. ix. 31, took place at the end of January or the beginning of February. The plague of grasshoppers, the eighth, completed the misfortune, since they appeared in unprecedented numbers (Ex. x. 14). The king now consented to the departure of the adults, provided the children and the cattle remained, but no compromise was accepted and the ninth plague, of three days' darkness, ensued. This may be connected with the khamsin, which sometimes, usually in March, brings clouds of dust and obscures the sun. Pharaoh was now ready to let the children go also, only wishing to keep the cattle as a pledge. When this was refused, he again opposed his will to that of God and the tenth plague was inflicted, destined to break down his obstinate resistance. As the Egyptians would not recognize Yahweh's paternal authority over Israel, his first-born, he avenged himself by taking away the cherished first-born of the land. Preparations were made to protect Israel from the plague and also for a speedy departure. The visitation fell upon the homes of the Egyptians, and while the sound of mourning was heard in every house, the Israelites marched forth, urged thereto by the terrified Egyptians, who showered gifts upon them so as to be rid of them the sooner.

The feast of the Passover was from this time a memorial of the preservation from the destroying angel and of the hasty departure. The sanctification of the first-born is referred to the sparing of the first-born of Israel in Egypt (Ex. xiii. 2, 11–16).

4. The Exodus.

The Exodus took place (P) on the fifteenth of the month Abib which from that time was to be counted the first month (Num. xxxiii. 3; Ex. xii. 2). The city of Raamses is mentioned as the point of departure, doubtless the city which the Israelites were forced to build (Ex. i. 11). The site is not determined; from Ex. xii. 31, it seems that the Pharaoh resided there. It was probably in Goshen, a little to the west or north of the first station Succoth, Egyptian *Thuket* or *Thuku*, originally the name of a district and then of its chief city, Pithom-Hieropolis, the Tell Mashuta of to-day (cf. E. Naville, *The Store City*, in the *Memoirs* of the Egypt Exploration Fund; q.v.). The present Wadi Tumilat was traversed, where the mass of the Israelites joined the march. Etham was the second station (Egyptian, *Khetem*, " fortification "), a bulwark for protection against attacks from the east; it was at " the edge of the desert." Here the route was deflected from the natural course in a southerly and then in a northeasterly direction, so that the gulf lay between the Israelites and the desert. This gulf, which was afterward traversed, the " Reedy Sea," is the Gulf of Suez, an arm of the Red Sea (q.v.). Its characteristics corroborate the statements of the narrative, especially its sudden and strong tides, particularly when favored by the wind during the vernal equinox. If, as assumed above, the march was through the Wadi Tumilat, the passage was probably by the Bitter Lakes, south of the present Ismailiya. Led by God's Pillar of Fire and Cloud (q.v.), the Israelites had moved southward from Etham. When the Pharaoh was informed of this, he realized from the continuance of their march that there was no hope of their return; at the same time, the direction taken led him to think that the leaders had no certain plan and that, hemmed in by the trackless desert, the throng could be easily overtaken and brought back. Already repenting of his consent, he started in pursuit with his chariots. He encountered the Israelites encamped on the seashore to the west of the gulf; their position seemed hopeless. At the prayer of Moses, however, God showed a miraculous way of escape through the sea, the waters of which divided, allowing the Israelites to pass dry-shod. Eager to secure their prey, the Egyptians hastened after them the same night; in their passage, a panic arose among their chariots, caused by the fiery reflection from the pillar, and, to complete the catastrophe, the waters returned and overwhelmed the Egyptians. As a natural cause, a strong northeast wind may be conjectured which left the ford dry at ebb-tide while a shift of the wind to the contrary direction swelled the returning flood-tide. The sublimest monument to this event was raised by Moses, in his magnificent song (Ex. xv. 1 sqq.), the authenticity of which can not rightly be disputed, although some additions may have been made to it. The rescue of the Israelites at the Red Sea marks the birth-hour of the people of Yahweh; the later prophetic and poetic literature looked back to this event as the climax of the deliverance and it became a type of salvation (Isa. xi. 15, lxiii. 11 sqq.; Ps. lxxviii., cv., cvi.).

5. The March to Sinai.

The "mount of God" formed the goal of Israel's further journey. This mountain has been found in the land of Edom, or on the western coast of Arabia. It is, however, more probable that the traditional view which places it in the southern part of the Sinaitic peninsula is correct; in this case, the Israelites went eastward towards the Gulf of Akaba. Between the passage of the Red Sea and Sinai, a number of stations are mentioned where a halt was possibly made for a longer or shorter period. Tradition places the scene of the triumph over Pharaoh at Ayun Musa, whence the journey may have been pursued for three days through the desert of Shur until Mara was reached (perhaps Hawara, sixteen hours south of Ayun Musa). According to the ancient list of stations (Num. xxxiii.) the Israelites encamped again at the Red Sea between Elim and the desert of Sin, perhaps in the beautiful Wadi Tayibe; Rephidim is generally thought to be the fruitful Wadi Feiran, at the foot of Mount Serbal. The desert was a fit place for Israel's education, since the people was here dependent upon its God for guidance and nourishment. Nevertheless, suspicion and want of faith prevailed, held in check only by overpowering signs of God's fatherly care; the pillar of cloud; the gift of manna, of water from the rock and of quails; the victory over the Amalekites through the prayers of Moses; and finally the sublime manifestation of God on Sinai. As with the wonders performed in Egypt and in the passage of the Red Sea, a connection with local phenomena can be found for these happenings. Manna is a common vegetable product on the western side of the Sinaitic peninsula, and flocks of quails frequently alight here in the spring; both Jebel Musa and Serbal tower in imposing majesty, especially during a storm. All this, the well-authenticated battle with the Amalekites, and allusions in early lyrics serve to confirm belief in the historical quality of these narratives.

6. From Sinai to Kadesh.

On Sinai, where the Lord permitted the people to gaze upon his glory and hear his voice, the Law was given through the mediation of Moses. After nearly a year's sojourn at this place (cf. Num. x. 11 with Ex. xix. 1), the Israelites resumed their march, led by Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (Num. x. 29 sqq.), and moved northward into the desert of Paran. On this long journey the people often murmured and were sternly punished; when, finally, they refused to advance toward Canaan, intimidated by the reports of spies sent thither, not even the appeals of Moses to God's mercy could shield them from the judgment that that generation should not see the land of promise. A wilful attempt to invade Canaan failed, and the Israelites were forced to turn back to the Red Sea. Much obscurity covers the forty years' wanderings in the desert; naturally, the people were not continually changing their abode. A longer residence in Kadesh (see Negeb, The) is shown by Deut. i. 46; Judges xi. 17; cf. Num. xx. 1, 14; this place may have been the religious and civil center, while the people wandered in the neighboring regions. Among the events of these years was the rebellion of Korah (Num. xvi.).

7. From Kadesh to Nebo.

In the first month of the fortieth year, the Israelites were still in Kadesh. Although the time had come for entrance into the promised land, because of the opposition of the Edomites and Amalekites they did not follow the most direct course thither but made a wide détour and proceeded by Mt. Seir to the country west of the Jordan. As at this time even Moses and Aaron lost faith (Num. xx. 2–12), they were not permitted to live to see the realization of their hopes. On one occasion, the murmurings of the people were punished by venomous serpents; Moses then saved the Israelites by setting up a brazen serpent on a pole (see Serpent, Brazen). This image was later used as an idol (II Kings xviii. 4). Arrived at the Arnon, the Israelites encountered the Amorites, led by Sihon and Og, and defeated them twice; by these victories the country west of the Jordan was won. Though the Moabites were well pleased with the downfall of their enemies the Amorites, they sought to thwart the plans of the Israelites without risking open opposition, and called the famous magician Balaam (q.v.) to their aid, but his magic was unavailing. They and the Midianites had better success with the sensual temptations of their Baal-worship, and Israel's licentiousness was punished by a pestilence. Moses died at the end of the forty years, after resigning his command to Joshua and dividing the conquered territory among the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh on the condition that they should aid their brethren in the conquest of the land beyond the Jordan. In a prophetic song, he foretold the future of his people (Deut. xxxii.) and blessed the different tribes as Jacob had done (Deut. xxxiii.); he was permitted to gaze from Mt. Nebo over the promised land and then died, at the age of 120 (Deut. xxxiv. 7; P), and the children of Israel mourned for him thirty days.

8. Character.

The character of Moses, as presented by the Bible, shows that from his youth he was endowed with a high sense of righteousness and with a warm love for his people. The fact that he was able, without material power, to lead his people for forty years, proves not only his mental vigor, but also his patience and kindness; and yet he earned but little gratitude. Even his brother proved untrustworthy (Ex. xxxii.) and, with Miriam, intrigued against him (Num. xii.); but he was never embittered and is rightly called "meek above all men which were upon the face of the earth" (Num. xii. 3). This did not, however, imply any weakness, for he could be stern and inflexible where the honor of his God was at stake (Ex. xxxii. 27). He was a prophet great alike in word and deed (Hos. xii. 13), one who saw God not merely in dreams and visions but "face to face" (Num. xii. 6 sqq.). The glory of God was reflected on his countenance so that he was forced to veil it (Ex. xxxiv. 29 sqq.; *Keren*, "horn, ray," cf. R. V. margin, is incorrectly rendered *cornuta facies*, "horned appearance," in the Vulgate, hence the pictorial representations of Moses with horns). His historical importance can not be too highly estimated; not only did he liberate Israel and thus help it to a national existence, but he was, according to a unanimous tradition which no criticism can overthrow, the human author of theocracy in its national form.

9. Moses as Lawgiver.

To what extent the law as existent in the Pentateuch is of Mosaic origin can not be satisfactorily determined, but Moses may safely be regarded as the originator of the divine ordinances contained therein. It is certain that he was better qualified for this work, both by education and by divine guidance, than any other Israelite. As a legislator educated in Egypt, it may be assumed that he wrote down the divinely inspired laws from the very beginning, or at least the essential portions. Reminiscences of Egypt abound in the law (Ex. xx. 2; Lev. xix. 34; Num. xv. 41; Deut. v. 15). The legislation does not imply a complex civilization, but is adapted to a people devoted to agriculture and cattle-raising (cf. Ex. xxi., xxii.) and so rude as to require the sternest repressive laws (cf. Ex. xxi. 24–25); at the same time it breathes a simple and childlike faith. Nevertheless, the law, in its present form, was as little written at one time as were the historical parts of the Pentateuch. There were additions and supplementary laws which may belong to post-Mosaic times (see Hexateuch). For example, it is clear that the royal laws did not exist in Samuel's time (I Sam. viii.), indeed, they seem to have been composed by him (cf. P. Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker*, Bielefeld, 1872). The conclusion is legitimate that not only was the oral tradition from Moses' time written down and edited later, but that prophets who proclaimed laws in the spirit of God incorporated these in the code of Moses. Still the foundation of the Torah is Mosaic, above all, its simplest form, the Decalogue (q.v.); this, however, heads the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.–xxiii.), which is especially archaic and is arranged on the same numerical scheme. This section is now generally regarded as the oldest part of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy is in clearer accord with it than are the remaining laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and although in its present form it must be assigned to a later period, we do not doubt that Mosaic tradition told of a parenetic repetition of the law in the fields of Moab; in thought and spirit this body of laws is thoroughly Mosaic. The remaining Elohistic legislation, more priestly than prophetic in its character, may have been edited, as the modern theory assumes, at a late period.

10. As Historian and Religious Founder.

Moses may also be regarded as the first Hebrew historian. Naturally, the story of his life and work as given in the Pentateuch can not be by him, but the recital of the battle with the Amalekites (cf. Ex. xvii. 14) and the list of stations (Num. xxxiii. 2 sqq.) are stated to be from his hand. These ancient texts make it probable that Moses recorded historical events, more especially since, besides Moses' song, there are three songs in Num. xxi. unquestionabl
longing to this time. The tablets of T
(see Amarna Tablets) prove that were written down in the outlying provinces of Egypt in this period. The blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii.), despite critical attacks, is probably authentic (verses 1–5 show a later hand) and the Song of Moses seems to be by him and is unmistakably related to Ps. xc. As the mediator of the Old Covenant, Moses occupies an exceptional place in the New Testament also, not simply as the highest authority for the Jews (e.g., John v. 45, viii. 5, etc.), but also for Christ and the apostles. The essential fact was not his authorship of the Pentateuch (Luke xxiv. 44; Mark xii. 26), but his theological significance as the founder of the divine rule under the law of which he was the mediator. The Old Testament is personified in Moses in its positive and prophetic significance (John. v. 45–46) and in its temporary and incomplete quality (cf. Matt. xix. 8; II Cor. iii. 7; Gal. iii. 19). "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17). C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: The subject is, of course, treated in the works on the history of Israel named under Ahab; and Israel, History of. Further discussion will be found in the commentaries on Exodus to Deuteronomy, and in the works on O. T. theology; and his relation to the laws and narrative of the Hexateuch is set forth in the works on Biblical Introduction (q.v.) and on the Hexateuch (q.v.). Further light may be gained in this connection from the literature given under Hammurabi and His Code. Consult further: J. Reiner, *Moses und sein Werk*, Berlin, 1907; B. Beer, *Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipsic, 1863; A. P. Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i. 86–173, London, 1863; G. Rawlinson, *Moses, his Life and Times*, ib. 1887; F. Vigouroux, *La Bible et découvertes modernes*, ii. 280-592, Paris, 1896; K. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, New York, 1899; D. G. Hogarth, *Authority and Archæology*, pp. 54–79, London, 1899; J. W. Rothstein, *Moses als Mensch und Prophet*, Erlangen, 1901; H. P. Smith, *O. T. History*, pp. 55-65, New York, 1903; E. Stucken, *Astralmythen der Hebräer*, part v., *Mose*, Leipsic, 1907; C. F. Kent, *Student's O. T.*, vol. i., iv. 1–48, New York, 1907; P. Volz, *Mose. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion*, Tübingen, 1907. For Mohammedan views: G. Weil, *The Bible, Koran and the Talmud*, London, 1846. For the Assumption of Moses see Pseudepigrapha, III., 6, and cf. Charles' ed. of that work, pp. xiv.–xvii., London, 1897. Consult further: *DB*, iii. 438–448; *EB*, iii. 3203–19; *JE*, ix. 44–57; F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, xxvii. 1190–1215, Paris, 1906.

MOSES OF CHORENE (MOSES CHORENENSIS). See Armenia, II., § 3.

MOSHEIM, mos′haim, **JOHANN LORENTZ VON:** German Lutheran church historian; b. at Lübeck Oct. 9, 1694 or 1695; d. at Göttingen Sept. 9, 1755. He attended the gymnasium at Lübeck 1707–12, where interest in his mother tongue and a fondness for poetry seems to have been awakened, and in 1716 he entered the University of Kiel, and as a student attracted the attention not only of his professors, but also of men like Leibnitz, Buddeus, and Lacroze. In 1719 he became a member of the faculty of philosophy, and in 1723 accepted a call as professor to Helmstädt. In 1726 he became abbot of Marienthal, 1727 of Michaelstein. In 1729 he was entrusted with the leadership of all school affairs and obtained a decisive influence over the state church. In 1726 he was induced to promise
without the consent of the
and more the main
, the influence

of which was rapidly waning before the newly established institution at Göttingen. Although he could not go to Göttingen, he was very active in the organization of the theological faculty there, drew up its statutes and assisted in the appointment of its professors. It was only in 1747 that he was enabled to accept a call to the new university as its first and only chancellor. But in spite of his high position, he did not enjoy the same authority and freedom at Göttingen as at Helmstädt.

Mosheim was not only the most learned theologian in the Lutheran Church of his day, he was also one of the first German authors and scholars of his age. His style was pure, elegant, fluent, and felicitous, whether in German or Latin. This esthetic quality was fostered by his early acquaintance with the literature of England, France, and Italy, to which was chiefly due the breadth of view which enabled him so to further the theological science of his day, especially in church history. As a theologian, he occupied an intermediate position between the extremes of pietism and deism. He was opposed to the confessional orthodoxy on the ground that theology was thus excluded from scientific culture. But on the other hand, he was one of the first in Germany to attack the deists and the authority of the reason. Although Mosheim's importance lies largely in his many-sidedness by which he fructified the whole field of theology, his historical works display best the range of his learning and his large horizon, as well as the minuteness of his observation and his attention to detail, his terse delineation, and his faithful representation of lights and shadows. He collected his earlier treatises on church history such as *Vindiciæ antiquæ Christianorum disciplinæ* (Kiel, 1720) in his *Observationes sacræ et historico-criticæ* (Amsterdam, 1721), and in his *Dissertationes ad historiam ecclesiasticam pertinentes* (1732–43). He investigated comprehensively the history of religion and of the Church in his Latin translation (with notes, Jena, 1733) of Cudworth's *Intellectual System*. He treated questions of the history of the early Church such as the date of the apologies of Tertullian and Athenagoras, and the influence of Platonism upon the Church, and touched other spheres of church history as may be seen from *Historia Tartarorum ecclesiastica* (Helmstädt, 1741) and *Erzählung der neuesten chinesischen Kirchengeschichte* (Rostock, 1748). He sought to popularize church history by his translation of the eight books of Origen against Celsus (Hamburg, 1745). He wrote also histories of heresies, under the titles, *Versuch einer unparteiischen Ketzergeschichte* (Helmstädt, 1746); and *Anderweitiger Versuch einer vollständigen und unparteiischen Ketzergeschichte* (ib. 1748). As early as 1726 he had written a comprehensive exposition of church history under the title, *Institutiones historiæ ecclesiasticæ Novi Testamenti*. The edition of 1737 was in 1741 enlarged by the remaining portion of the history of the later Church. His *Institutiones historiæ Christianæ maiores* (Helmstädt, 1739) was intended to be more detailed, but Mosheim finished only the first century. The want was supplied to a certain extent by his *Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum* (Helmstädt, 1753; Eng. transl. by R. S. Vidal, *Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians before . . . Constantine the Great*, 3 vols., London, 1813–15) which is his most mature accomplishment in church history. Almost immediately before his death there appeared his *Institutiones historiæ ecclesiasticæ antiquæ et recentioris* (ib. 1755; Eng. transl. by A. Maclaine, *An Ecclesiastical History*, 2 vols., London, 1765, 2d ed., 5 vols., 1768; and by J. Murdoch, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, 3 vols., 1832, ed. by W. Stubbs, 3 vols., London, 1863). Mosheim's importance as a church historian rests upon the fact that he set a higher mark for the church historian and tried to reach it.

Mosheim made contributions to nearly every branch of theological science. He left commentaries on the New Testament and works on theological encyclopedia, dogmatics, polemics, church polity, and homiletics. His most important work in the department of systematic theology was his *Sittenlehre der heiligen Schrift* (5 vols., Helmstädt, 1735–53; vols. vi.–ix. added by J. P. Miller). As a preacher he was much admired, and his sermons, published in 7 vols. (1725 and often) were esteemed as models. (N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A list of his writings was left by himself in his *Notitia scriptorum . . . a Moshemio*, Helmstädt, 1731, cf. the preface to the Helmstädt, 1764, ed. of his *Institutiones*, and to the Eng. ed. of his *Institutes* by Stubbs, London, 1863. Accounts of his life and writings are in J. M. Gesner, *Biographia academica Gottingensis*, ed. J. N. Eyring, vol. i., Halle, 1868; J. G. Meusel, *Lexicon der vom 1750 bis 1800 verstorbenen teutschen Schriftsteller*, ix. 348–364, 15 vols., Leipsic, 1802–16; E. Rössler, Die *Gründung der Universität Göttingen*, Göttingen, 1855; *ADB*, xxii. 395 sqq.; F. A. E. Ehrenfeuchter, in *Göttinger Professoren*, Gotha, 1872; K. Heussi, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung J. L. von Mosheim*, Gotha, 1904; idem, *J. L. Mosheim*, Tübingen, 1906.

MOSQUE (Arab. *masjid*, "a house of prayer"): A Mohammedan place of worship. The first one was built by Mohammed at Medina, in a graveyard opposite the spot where his camel knelt on his public entrance into that city. The most famous mosques are *Masjid al Nebi* ("Mosque of the Prophet") at Medina, replacing the original one; *Al-Hamram* at Mecca, enclosing the Kaaba (q.v.); *Santa Sophia* in Constantinople, originally a Greek basilica; the Mosque of Achmed, in the same city; that of Omar, in the Ḥaram enclosure at Jerusalem; the Great Mosque, at Damascus; the mosque at Hebron; and the alabaster mosque of Mehemet Ali, at Cairo; the most elaborate is the Great Mosque at Delhi, built by Shah Jehan (1631–37). Mosques are found in every Mohammedan settlement, and vary in cost and beauty as do 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, 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 *miḥrab* (a niche surmounted by a vaulted arch), placed in the direction of Mecca; and the *minbar*, or platform pulpit, upon which the ministers stand during service. The mosque is a composite building, in that its dome is Byzantine, its minaret is the Christian campanile, without its bell, while the court is like a khann. In connection with mosques are schools where the Koran is taught. In the Mosque Al-Azhar at Cairo is the great university of the Mohammedans, whither students come from all parts of their world, and whence they are sent to propagate their faith. Other establishments, benevolent in character, are also connected with mosques.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the general works given under ARCHITECTURE, consult: J. Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, London, 1876; idem, *Hist. of Architecture*, ib. 1893; G. de Prengly, *L'Architecture des Arabes*, Paris, 1842; Franz-Pasha, *Die Baukunst des Islam*, Darmstadt, 1896; R. Borrmann, *Die Baukunst des Altertums und des Islams im Mittelalter*, Leipsic, 1904; R. P. Spiers, *Architecture East and West*, London, 1904.

MOTET. See SACRED MUSIC, II., 2, § 3.

MOTT, JOHN RALEIGH: Methodist layman, leader in the Young Men's Christian Association movement; b. at Livingstone Manor, N. Y., May 25, 1865. He studied at Upper Iowa University, but was graduated from Cornell University, 1888; the same year he became student secretary of the international committee of the Y. M. C. A. and chairman of the executive committee of the Student Volunteer Movement; since 1895 he has also been general secretary of the World's Christian Federation, since 1898 secretary of the foreign department of the international committee of the Y. M. C. A., and since 1901 associate general secretary of the same. He has been most efficient in promoting the foreign mission enthusiasm among young people, and organizes missionary conferences in all parts of the world with marked skill. He enjoys a commanding position among the leaders of modern evangelization. He has written: *Strategic Points in the World's Conquest* (New York, 1897); *The Evangelization of the World in this Generation* (1900); *Christians of Reality* (Shanghai, 1902); *The Pastor and Modern Missions* (New York, 1904); and *The Future Leadership of the Church* (1909).

MOULE, GEORGE EVANS: Anglican bishop in Central China; b. at Gillingham (24 m. n.e. of Dorchester), Dorsetshire, England, Jan. 28, 1828. He was educated at Corpus Christi College (B.A., 1850), and was ordered deacon in 1851 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate at Fordington, Dorset (1851–55); chaplain of the Dorset County Hospital (1855–57); a missionary, under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society, at Ning-po and Hangchow, China, from 1857 to 1878; and curate of West Stafford (1878–80). In 1880 he was consecrated missionary bishop in Central China, his diocese covering the provinces of Keang-su, Chehkiang, An-hwi, Huipeh, and parts of Keang-si and Hunan, holding this position till 1907, when he became missionary for the Church Missionary Society at Hangchow, China. He has published *Faith and Duty* (sermons; Shanghai, 1902).

MOULE, HANDLEY CARR GLYN: Church of England, bishop of Durham; b. at Dorchester, Dorsetshire, Dec. 23, 1841. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1864), where he was fellow from 1865 to 1881. He was assistant maste at Marlborough College (1865–67), assistant cura of Fordington, Dorset (1867–73, 1877–80), dean of Trinity College (1873–77), first principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge (1881–99), and Norrisian professor of divinity at Cambridge (1899–1901). In 1901 he was consecrated bishop of Durham. He was also select preacher at Cambridge in 1880, 1882, 1891, 1894, 1896, 1899, and 1900, and at Oxford in 1895, as well as honorary chaplain to the queen in 1898–1901 and to the king since the latter year. In theology he is " deeply attached to the main positions and traditions of the English Reformation, a humble believer in the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and in later years greatly influenced by the Keswick movement."

Among his numerous works are: *Apollo at Pheræ* (Cambridge, 1865); *Poems from Subjects Connected with the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1869); *Fordington Sermons* (1882); *Christianus, a Story of Antioch, and Other Poems* (1883); *Justifying Righteousness* (1885); *Thoughts on Union with Christ* (1885); *Thoughts on the Spiritual Life* (1887); *The Christian's Victory over Sin* (1887); *The New Birth* (1888); *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (1889); *Secret Prayer* (1889); *The Net and the Deliverance* (1889); *Veni Creator* (1890); *The Cup of the Covenant* (1890); *Daniel: or, the Secret of Continuance* (1890); *Life in Christ and for Christ* (1890); *The Oak of Ephrah* (1891); *At the Holy Communion* (1892); *Jesus and the Resurrection* (1893); *Charles Simeon* (1895); *Grace and Godliness* (1895); *In the House of the Pilgrimage* (1896); *The Sacrament of Baptism* (1896); *Prayers and Promises* (1896); *Philippian Studies* (1897); *Colossian Studies* (1898); *Our Prayer-Book* (1898); *Confession* (1899); *On the Holy Communion* (1899); *Our Great High Priest*, (1899); *Ephesian Studies* (1900); *The Secret of the Presence, and other Sermons* (1900); *The Evangelical School in the Church of England* (1901); *From Sunday to Sunday* (1903); *Justification by Faith* (1903); *Temptation and Escape* (1903); *Imitations and Translations* (1904); *The School of Suffering* (1905); *My Brethren and Companions, and other Sermons* (1905); *Second Epistle to Timothy* (1905); *Holiness by Faith* (1906); *Scenes in the Life of our Lord* (1907); *The High Priestly Prayer: a devotional Commentary on the* 17*th Chapter of St. John* (1907); *Christ's Witness to the Life to Come, and Other Sermons* (1908); *Faith, its Nature and Work* (1909); and *Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1909). He likewise prepared for *The Cambridge Bible* the volumes on Romans (Cambridge, 1879), Ephesians (1886), Philippians (1889), and Colossians and Philemon (1893); for *The Expositor's Bible* the volume on Romans (London, 1894); and for the *Cambridge Greek Testament* the volume on Philippians (Cambridge, 1897).

MOULTON, WILLIAM FIDDIAN: Wesleyan; b. at Leek (42 m. n. of Birmingham, Eng.) Mar. 14, 1835; d. at Cambridge Feb. 5, 1898. The son and grandson of Wesleyan preachers, he was educated at Wesleyan schools, at Woodhouse Grove School, near Leeds, until he was fifteen, when he entered Wesley College, Sheffield. In 1851 he matriculated in London University. In 1853 he became a master in a private school in Davonport; he graduated with honors in London University (B.A., 1854; M.A., 1856). From 1854 till 1858 he was mathematical master at Queen's College, Taunton. In 1858 he entered the Wesleyan ministry, but, as in the judgment of the Conference he was better fitted for teaching than for preaching, he became at once assistant tutor at Richmond College, Surrey, and so remained for ten years, when he became classical tutor in the same [illegible]. In [illegible] he was called to be [illegible] School.

C

franchises of his ministerial brethren to a high degree. He was elected into the Legal Hundred in 1872, which was a singular honor for so comparatively young a man, and in 1890 he was elected president of the Wesleyan Conference. His scholarly labors were incessant and well directed. Mathematics had been his early choice, but it was as the best Greek scholar among English Wesleyans of his day that he will be remembered. He was not prolific as an author mainly for the reason that he had always so much teaching to do and because he took infinite pains with his literary work, and by preference did work requiring infinite pains if it were to be well done. He made his mark first by a fine translation of Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh, 1870) which superseded that by Edward Masson (1859). In 1870 he was selected as representative of the Wesleyans on the Bible Revision Committee and served very zealously in the New Testament Company. His interest in the general subject of Bible revision led to his preparing a brief but excellent *History of the English Bible* (London, 1878). His critical and exegetical studies were also well displayed in the commentary on Hebrews which he contributed to Bishop Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary for English Readers* (1879), and that on John, in cooperation with William Milligan, in Philip Schaff's *Popular Illustrated Commentary on the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1880). Shortly before his death he appeared as editor with Alfred S. Geden of *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers* (1897), but in his prefatory note he disclaimed more than a consultative position. So, though his separate publications were few, their quality was high and he will not quickly be forgotten. His versatility, his accomplishments, and his spirituality endeared him to his contemporaries.

Bibliography: W. F. Moulton, *William F. Moulton: a Memoir, with a Chapter on (his) Biblical Work and Opinions by James Hope Moulton*, New York, 1899.

MOUNT OF OLIVES. See Jerusalem, I.

MOURNING CUSTOMS, HEBREW.

Signs of Mourning (§ 1).
Explanations of Schwally, Frey, and Lagrange (§ 2).
Grüneisen's Views (§ 3).
Views of Baentsch (§ 4).

1. Signs of Mourning.

Expressions of grief among the Hebrews varied with the occasion. Childless Rachel grieved through envy (Gen. xxx. 1). Examples appear of the grief of the vanquished (I Kings xx. 31; Jer. xlix. 3); of the destitute (Jer. xvi. 5); of those under the wrath of God (Amos viii. 8); of those in trouble (Isa. lxi. 3); of those who receive evil tidings (Num. xiv. 39). Such grief shows itself by outward manifestations, the most striking of which are seen in the case of death and bereavement. Grief makes a man fall to the ground (II Sam. xii. 20); cover his face (II Sam. xix. 4); neglect his person (II Sam. xii. 20); seek solitude in the upper chamber (II Sam. xviii. 33) or on the very roof (Isa. xv. 3); while the weeping mourners assemble in the street (Isa. xv. 3) or in the house of mourning (Matt. ix. 23). They have their heads shorn to baldness (Jer. xlviii. 37). The law, however, forbade this practise as heathenish (Deut. xiv. 1), but the Moabites observed it (Isa. xv. 2). Mourners even tore out their hair by the roots (Ezra ix. 3), sat in ashes (Jonah iii. 6), and put earth on their heads (I Sam. iv. 12). The wringing of the hands (Lam. i. 17) and the beating of the breast (Isa. xxxii. 12) are also signs of grief. The signs of mourning were carried also in the clothing. The mourner put off his adornment (Ex. xxxiii. 4), went barefoot (II Sam. xv. 30), rent his clothing (not so the high priest, however, Lev. xxi. 10), and assumed special signs of mourning such as sackcloth (Heb. *saḳ*, cf. Dress and Ornament, Hebrew, § 1; and II Sam. xxi. 10; Isa. l. 3 ; Joel i. 8), or raiment of dark color (Mal. iii. 14, A. V. margin). He also fasted (Dan. x. 3) even for seven days (I Sam. xxxi. 13). The neighbors would offer food to the mourner (II Sam. xii. 16–17), which may have been a specific " bread of mourners," baked of coarse meal (Hos. ix. 4). An important part was played in the mourning for the dead by the dirge or elegy, the most notable instances of which are David's lament over Jonathan (II Sam. i. 17 sqq.), and Jeremiah's over Josiah (II Chron. xxxv. 25). This was later accompanied with musical instruments (Matt. ix. 23). While such lamentations, like the fast mentioned (I Sam. xxxi. 13), usually lasted for seven days, Aaron and Moses were mourned for thirty days (Num. xx. 29). The anniversary of a death was also celebrated (Judges xi. 40) for four days. The Law forbade mourning celebrations over the criminal, the suicide, or the outlaw.

2. Explanations of Schwally, Frey, and Lagrange.

Modern critics have sometimes traced the mourning customs of the Hebrews to a natural religion which existed previously to the Mosaic dispensation and an animistic belief which was independent of the divine revelation of the Hebrew Bible (cf. F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, Giessen, 1892). Tonsure of the head and cutting off of the beard were by Schwally considered to be offerings of the hair; tearing or gashing of the flesh was a blood offering for the dead. Sackcloth was originally the clothing of slaves, and the wearing of it was a token of submission to the dead, who still had power to help or hurt the living. To win the favor of the dead the mourner ate with him the bread of mourning, and drank with him the cup of sorrow. The treasures laid in the graves of kings, as Josephus relates, were so many offerings to the dead. On the contrary J. Frey and Lagrange rightly maintain that all these mourning rites are celebrated as under the eye of Yahweh, who is, as it were, brought nearer to the mourners by the death of those they love or honor. Sackcloth is the religious material indicative of humiliation. The veiling of the head, or the hiding of the face with the hands is a sign of shrinking awe in the presence of Yahweh (Ex. iii. 6; I Kings xix. 13). The wearing of mourning garments was intended to call down the mercy and tenderness of God. The bread of mourning and the cup of sorrow were not meant to propitiate the dead. For whatever elements of religious observance the Israelites derived from the non-Hebraic nations they at once incorporated in their worship of Yahweh, at least up to the times of Amos, Hosea, and Jeroboam II. This is apparent from Jer. xli. 5. Later legislation did not forbid such mourning observances except so far as they were heathenish and ignored Yahweh. That the cutting of the hair was not a substitute for a human sacrifice but was merely intended to be a disfigurement of the mourner is proved by the fact that the Egyptians usually had their heads shaven, but in time of sorrow allowed their hair to grow. Frey looks upon all these mourning customs as so many signs of self-humiliation before the sender of so great a calamity, and of a desire to form some sort of connection or relation with the soul who has vanished into the land of shadows.

3. Grüneisen's Views.

Grüneisen rightly takes the position that Frey's interpretation is one-sided. In the time of affliction men are suddenly made conscious, he says, of the nearness of God, who has in his hand the power of death. They seem to be brought in peril of death. They disguise themselves in sackcloth and disfigure themselves in various ways so as to conceal their identity from God and escape this peril. They would also conceal themselves from the spirit of the dead, for the dread of ghosts is universal. The spirit of the dead is looked upon by them as no superhuman being, worthy of worship, but as a gloomy specter less than human. The disfigurement is intended to make the living unrecognizable by the spirits of the dead, and the dirge or elegy is merely a means of driving them away. Lagrange, on the contrary, thinks that there is nothing mysterious or animistic to be found in most of these mourning customs. To weep, to cry aloud, to sigh, to kiss the dead are merely signs of natural sorrow. Lagrange also gives a plausible explanation of the custom of sitting in ashes. Ashes are a sign of desolation. When a city has been sacked, ruined, and burnt, the hillocks and mounds that remain are the sole refuge of the inhabitants. They sit in the dust (Isa. xlvii. 1) or in the ashes (Jonah iii. 6), wallow in ashes (Jer. vi. 26; Mic. i. 10), and cast up dust on their heads (Ezek. xxvii. 30). In all these usages are symbolized the ashes of the tomb or of the corpse consumed on a funeral pyre.

4. Views of Baentsch.

All these expositions seem to fail in breadth and comprehensiveness. Baentsch, however, seems to have pointed out the only way to a profitable handling of such questions. From a wide acquaintance with ancient oriental thought he has come to the conclusion that the Hebrew Scriptures are to be accepted as authentic, but with due regard to the results of modern criticism. They are to be interpreted on a broader basis. Accordingly all the mourning customs of the Hebrews are to be taken as part and parcel of the universal tradition of the ancient oriental peoples. It is evident that all Semitic peoples, whether Babylonian, Arabian, Syrian, or Canaanite, had similar conceptions of the soul of the dead wandering about as a shade. Death was a misfortune which men sought to avoid. These two ideas took various forms. Some peoples thought that the soul could be conjured back to earth; others that it wandered without rest in the under world until it obtained relief. It was in man's power to protect himself from the spirit and to procure rest for it. But such beliefs by no means imply worship of the dead. It is now known from many sources that these ancient oriental ideas were deeply rooted in the mind of Israel, though opposed to the religion of Yahweh. This religion was forced to apply in a new sense the words expressive of the old terms of ancient astral religion which alone were intelligible to the people. Thus there flowed an upper and an under current of religious life in Israel. The greater number of the mourning customs originated in the under stream, therefore the people tenaciously adhered to them. There are scholars who maintain that the under stream is the direct outcome of the religion of Yahweh, except in cases where they find a Semitic parallel usage of higher antiquity. But the main object of this religion was to teach the people monotheism, though it made itself felt in every department of human life. But there did not cease to be some subjects on which the religion of Israel never mounted much above the level of the ancient oriental speculations, and these subjects were death, the grave, the soul, mourning, and Sheol. But to declare that every detail in the beliefs held on such subjects continued to conform to ancient oriental systems would not express the truth, for such ideas in many instances had become completely transformed by the influence of the religion of Yahweh. See BURIAL; CEMETERIES. (R. ZEHNPFUND.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Early investigations which have still very considerable value are collected in Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xxxiii. Recent discussions, besides the book of Schwally mentioned in the text, are: J. Frey, *Die altisraelitische Totentrauer*, Dorpat, 1894; idem, *Tod, Seelenglaube und Seelenkult im alten Israel*, Leipsic, 1898; Jastrow, in *JAOS*, xx (1899), 130–150; idem, in *ZATW*, xxii (1902), 117–120; C. Grüneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels*, Halle, 1900; Büchler, in *ZATW*, xxi (1901), 81–92; M. Klotz, *Krankenbesuch und Trauerbrauch nach Bibel und Talmud*, Frankfort, 1901; M. J. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, Paris, 1903; B. Baentsch, *Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus*, Tübingen, 1906; Wellhausen, *Heidentum*, pp. 177 sqq.; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 163 sqq.; Nowack, *Archäologie*, i. 193 sqq.; *DB*, iii. 453–455; *EB*, iii. 3220–3222; *DCG*, ii. 208–209, 496; *JE*, ix. 101–102.

Illustrative matter is found in: I. Goldziher, *Le Sacrifice de la chevelure*, Paris, 1881; J. Lippert, *Der Seelenkult in seinen Beziehungen zur althebräischen Religion*, Berlin, 1881; A. Jeremias, *Hölle und Paradies bei den Babyloniern*, Leipsic, 1903; idem, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orient*, ib. 1907; A. Bertholet, *Die israelitische Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode*, Tübingen, 1899; S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*, New York, 1902; P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Religionsgeschichte*, i. 328 sqq., Tübingen, 1905.

MOUSE, THE: An animal mentioned in Scripture only in Lev. xi. 29; I Sam. vi. 4, 5, 11, 18; and Isa. lxvi. 17. The Hebrew is *'akhbar*, a word which probably covers not only the several species of mice found in Palestine, but also rats and the jerboa or leaping mouse, a marsupial. H. B. Tristram (*Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, pp. 122 sqq., London, 1884) suspects that the word does duty for twenty-three kinds of small rodents. Though this extended use can not be absolutely proved for the Old Testament, it is rendered nearly certain by the usage of the Talmud and that in cognate languages.

While the mention in Scripture is rare, in two cases the circumstances are of unusual interest. The passage in Leviticus is of less importance, as it simply registers the mouse among the animals over which a food taboo extends. The chapter in I Samuel deals with the plague on the Philistines (q.v.) attending the presence among them of the ark, and a significant part of the history is existence among the propitiatory offerings of golden mice (rats?) which the sufferers evidently associated with the pestilence. The connection of the rat with the bubonic plague so recently discovered illumines this narrative (see Diseases and the Healing Art, § 4). Indirectly confirmatory of this is the disaster referred to in II Kings ix. 35, by which the great army of Sennacherib was almost wholly destroyed on the borders of Egypt. The Egyptian account introduces the mouse, though in a different way (see Assyria, VI., 3, 12), and the real cause of the catastrophe to the Assyrians may well have been the bubonic plague.

The passage in Isa. lxvi. 17 is even more striking, referring as it does to the eating of the mouse in connection with the eating of the swine " and the abomination." The explanation here is doubtless to be found in the mystic sacrificial eating of a totem animal (see Comparative Religion, VI., 1, d. § 1). The evidence that the mouse was once a totem animal is quite convincing. This animal was in the Troad held sacred to Apollo, was fed in his temple, and images of it were also kept there (Aelian, *Historia*, xii. 5), sometimes appearing beside the deity's tripod and sometimes beneath his feet. In the region the name for the mouse was sminthos, and one of the epithets of Apollo was Smintheus (e.g., *Iliad*, i. 39), the phrase " Sminthean Apollo " was equivalent to " Apollo of the mouse " (cf. Strabo, *Geographica*, xiii. 604), and Sminthiac feasts were celebrated at Rhodes, Gela, Lesbos, and in Crete. In the Troad a number of places were named from the mouse, in Ceos and Tenedos there were Sminthean temples, and the animal appears on coins and heraldic designs (Strabo, x. 486). The connection of the deity with the animal is explained in a twofold manner quite in accordance with the method accompanying the vestiges of totemistic practises—Apollo was the protector and also the destroyer of the mouse. Both explanations may have a historical basis. The immunity offered a totem animal sometimes results in the animal becoming a pest; the removal of the nuisance by any means is then ascribed to the god who formerly protected it and his relation to it is reversed in the myth. It is known also that in Egypt the rat was a totem animal sacred to Ra (J. G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, new ed., London, 1883), while the inhabitants of Crocodilopolis worshiped the shrew-mouse, which was sacred to Horus, and examples of porcelain models of the animal are extant. In India the mouse was sacred to Rudra and to Ganesha, and the image of the latter often has a mouse under its foot. If Isa. lxvi. be as late as the moderate critics place it (in the Greek period), it was composed in a time when religious syncretism was entering Palestine in force, and with the evidences of mouse worship about—in the Mediterranean basin, in Egypt, and in Crete—the reference is best explained as a totemistic observance adopted by renegade Jews and denounced by the prophet. A like reference is probably to be seen in Ezek. viii. 10.

Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: Besides the commentaries on the passages, consult: Smith, *Semites*, 2d ed., p. 293; A. Lang, *Custom and Myth*, pp. 103–120, London, 1885; idem, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, p. 201, ib. 1887; idem, *Modern Mythology*, pp. 80–82, ib. 1897; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 129–132, London, 1890. Material illustrative but not closely pertinent may be found in J. Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, i. 523, Edinburgh and New York, 1908.

MOVEMENT, LAYMEN'S MISSIONARY: A movement organized in the chapel of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, Nov. 15, 1906, at a layman's meeting held in connection with the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the " Haystack prayer-meeting " (see Mills, Samuel John) out of which grew the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (see Congregationalists, I., 4, § 11). Only about seventy-five laymen were present at the initial meeting. From three to six in the afternoon, a large part of the time was spent in prayer. During the evening session, one address was given, followed by discussion concerning the necessity of enlisting the laymen of all the churches more fully in the work of foreign missions. A series of resolutions was passed, calling into existence a committee of twenty-five or more representative laymen, to consult with the secretaries of the various foreign missionary boards, with reference, first, to the conduct of a campaign of education among laymen, to interest them more largely in missions; second, to the devising of a comprehensive plan for the evangelization of the world in this generation; third, to endeavor to send a commission of fifty or more laymen to visit the mission fields and report their findings to the Church at home. The chairman of this committee, Samuel B. Capen of Boston, presented these proposals on behalf of the committee to the annual conference of foreign mission boards of the United States and Canada at Philadelphia, Jan. 9, 1907. The movement was heartily and unanimously endorsed by this conference, including all Protestant churches in North America. In the formal resolutions of the conference these paragraphs occur: " We recognize this movement as providential, having been born of prayer and of the Spirit. In its spontaneity and timeliness it gives evidence of the hand of God, and we are profoundly convinced that this is but another step in advance toward the completion of his great purpose in the redemption of mankind. . . . We recognize the imperative necessity for this new movement, in view of the tremendous demands of a world field white for the harvest, which requires that the churches of Christendom should lay plans and put forth effort adequate to meet the demands that are upon us."

The plan of the movement is not to send out missionaries nor to administer missionary funds, but only to cooperate in the enlargement of the foreign missionary work carried on by the various churches through their own regular agencies.

In the summer of 1907, at the invitation of leaders of missionary work in Great Britain, a commission of six laymen from the United States and Canada visited London, Edinburgh, Liverpool, and other cities in England and Scotland, presenting the methods and plans of the Laymen's Missionary Movement. Committees were appointed both in England and Scotland to extend the work. The Scottish national committee employs a secretary to devote his time to the movement. In 1907–08, over sixty laymen visited various mission fields to investigate religious conditions, needs, and results. Since their return, many of them have been engaged largely in giving their testimony to the churches and have been successful in stimulating greatly increased interest in missionary work. During the winter of 1908–09 a national missionary campaign was conducted by the Laymen's Missionary Movement in Canada, conventions being held in a large number of the leading cities of the Dominion. On Mar. 31 to Apr. 4, 1909, there was held in Toronto a Canadian missionary congress, attended by over 4,000 commissioners, representing all Protestant churches. This congress adopted a notable national missionary policy, the first of its kind ever adopted by the representatives of all the churches of a nation. It has since been ratified by all the church courts of the various communions in Canada. The complete proceedings of the congress have been published in *Canada's Missionary Congress* (Toronto, 1909). A Canadian council has direct supervision of the work in Canada.

A similar national missionary campaign was conducted throughout the United States during the winter of 1909–10, including conventions at seventy-five of the leading cities, culminating in a national missionary congress at Chicago, May 3–6, 1910. Twelve of the denominations in the United States and Canada have organized their own denominational committees of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, to promote its spirit and methods more thoroughly in their own communions. About twenty secretaries are now employed by different committees to give their whole time to the supervision and extension of the movement. It is worthy of note that the offerings to foreign missions by the churches of the United States and Canada increased during the fiscal year 1907–08 by $602,000 over the contributions of the previous year. The gain in the fiscal year 1908–09 over the previous year was $1,256,000.

The Laymen's Missionary Movement has no membership and no organization, apart from a series of committees. There is a general committee of over 100 laymen, which meets semiannually, giving general direction to the movement. There is an executive committee of twenty-one members, which meets each month in New York City, giving closer supervision to the work. The chief executive officer is the general secretary, J. Campbell White, who was called to this office soon after the movement began and has continued in this position ever since. The offices are in the Metropolitan Building, 1 Madison Avenue, New York City. The chief features of a standard missionary church, as emphasized by the Laymen's Missionary Movement, are as follows:

(1) a missionary pastor;
(2) a missionary committee;
(3) systematic missionary education, through
    regular meetings,
    literature, and
    mission study;
(4) canvass of entire membership for subscription;
(5) a weekly missionary offering;
(6) all plans, prayers, efforts, and offerings are related to the world as a field.

By these methods whole cities have more than doubled their entire previous missionary offerings and at least one whole denomination has experienced a similar result. It is the hope and purpose of the movement to enlist the men of all churches in the steady support of a missionary policy, adequate to the presentation of the Gospel of Christ to every creature. J. CAMPBELL WHITE.

MOXOM, PHILIP STAFFORD: Congregationalist; b. at Markham, Ontario, Aug. 10, 1848. After serving in the northern army throughout the Civil War, he was educated at Kalamazoo College, Mich. (1866–68), Shurtleff College, Ill. (1868–70), the University of Rochester (A.B., 1879), and Rochester Theological Seminary (1878). He was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1871 and from 1872 to 1875 was pastor of the Baptist church at Albion, Mich. He was then pastor at Mt. Morris, N. Y., and at the same time pursued his theological studies at Rochester, until 1878, after which he held successive pastorates at the First Baptist Church, Cleveland, O. (1879–85), and the First Baptist Church, Boston (1885–93), and since 1894 has been pastor of the South Congregational Church, Springfield, Mass. He was university preacher at Harvard in 1894–97 and Lowell lecturer in 1895. He has written *The Aim of Life* (Boston, 1894); *From Jerusalem to Nicæa: The Church in the First Three Centuries* (1895); and *The Religion of Hope* (1896).

MOYER LECTURE: A lectureship founded by Lady Rebecca Moyer (widow of Sir Samuel Moyer; d. in London about 1722). The amount left was twenty pounds annually, chargeable against her house in Bedford Row, London; the sermons, eight in number, were to be delivered annually in St. Paul's, London, if permitted, on the first Thursday of each month from November to June, and were to defend the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. The lectureship terminated about 1774 by reason of expiration of the lease of the house. A list of the lectures is given in J. Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, cols. 2129–2130, London, 1854.

MOZARABIC LITURGY: An ancient Spanish liturgy, called also Gothic because it developed during the Gothic dominion in Spain. The name "Mozarabic," from a participial form of the Arabic verb *'Araba* and signifying "arabized," came into use in the eighth century as a general designation for the Christians who remained in Spain after the Mohammedan conquest. Opinions have differed as to the origin of the Spanish liturgy. In view of its marked divergence from the Roman ritual and its great resemblance to the Gallican, some have thought that the Spanish and Gallican liturgies both developed from the Asiatic (Lesley, Mabillon, Bickell, and others) and that the former was substantially the same as that brought into the country by the Goths. Others (Gams, Probst, Pinius) maintain that the oldest Spanish liturgy was the Roman and that the Gothic importation was influenced by it and worked over especially by Bishops Leander and Isidore of Seville. The question is solved if it be admitted that originally Rome had the same liturgy as the East (see MASS, II, 2, § 1). In the latter half of the eleventh century under Popes Alexander II. and Gregory VII. efforts were made to introduce the Roman ritual. In 1088 a synodal decree ordered the suppression of the Mozarabic Liturgy in Toledo, and when opposition arose the decision, according to the custom of the time, was left to the ordeal (the two liturgies being exposed to fire); the Mozarabic rite coming through unscathed was regarded as having vindicated its right to exist. King Alfonso VI. determined to allow both liturgies side by side. At the end of the sixteenth century the Mozarabic rite had been supplanted everywhere except in six churches in Toledo. Cardinal Ximenes exerted himself to preserve it and had prepared new and careful editions of both the missal and breviary (published at Toledo 1500 and 1502); he also obtained papal permission for the six churches in Toledo to use the liturgy and built a chapel which he provided with a foundation for thirteen chaplains who should perform the office and mass daily according to the liturgy. Similar foundations were made in Salamanca and Valladolid (see MASS, II, 3, § 1, and cf. J. Pinius in *ASB*, July, vi., 66–67; C. J. Hefele,, *Cardinal Ximenes*, Tübingen, 1844, pp. 161 sqq.).

The order of festivals in the Mozarabic liturgy differs somewhat from that in the Roman; e.g., there are six Sundays in Advent and two festivals of the Annunciation (Mar. 24 and Dec. 18). The three lections (prophecy, epistle, gospel) are retained, and prominence is given to homiletical matter. After each of the readings there is a short discourse to the people, in which the hortatory element predominates. Certain usages, as the breaking of the host into nine parts, each of which has a special name and meaning, are reminiscent of the Greek Church. The chant is more melodious than the Gregorian; it is named "Eugenian" from a certain Eugenius, archbishop of Toledo.

The Mozarabic mass begins with the prayer of the priest as he ascends the altar-steps. Then follow the introit, the Gloria in excelsis (but not always), the prayer of the day, the prophecy, the psallendum (gradual), the epistle, and the gospel. After this comes the preparation and presentation of the offerings, which are not yet regarded as a proper sacrifice and which the catechumens were allowed to see. The order of the mass of the faithful is as follows: a prayer called *missa*, which varies according to time and festival; another prayer, the commemoration of saints and the dead; the *oratio post nomina*, the *oratio ad pacem*, with the kiss of peace; the preface under the name *illatio*, ending with the Trisagion; the prayer *post sanctus;* the consecration and elevation and, during the latter, the *post pridie*, a prayer not unlike the final prayer of the Roman canon; the creed, the breaking of the bread into nine parts, of which each receives the name of a mystery of the faith; memento of the living, especially of those present; the Lord's prayer; mixing of the nine fragments with the holy blood; blessing of the people; communion, with music and prayer, thanksgiving; dismissal and solemn blessing with the words *in unitate Sancti Spiritus benedicat vos Pater et Filius, amen.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Editions are: by A. Ortiz at the instance of Cardinal Ximenes, missal, Toledo, 1500, breviary, 1502; in H. Florez, *España sagrada*, vol. iii., Madrid, 1748; by A. Lesley, Rome, 1755; the missal by F. A. Lorenzana and F. Fabian y Fuero, Angelopolis, 1770, and the breviary by Lorenzana, Madrid, 1775; by F. Arevalus, Rome, 1804; Lesley's ed. of the missal with his preface and Lorenzana's, in *MPL*, lxxxv., and Lorenzana's ed. of the breviary, ib. lxxxvi.; another ed., Toledo, 1873; *Liber comicus*, ed. G. Morin, in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, i (1893), 1–388.

Consult: F. Probst, in *ZHT*, 1888, pp. 1 sqq.; idem, *Die abendländische Messe vom 5–8 Jahrhunderte*, pp. 367 sqq., Münster, 1896; J. Pinius, in *ASB*, July, vi. 1–112, idem, *Liturgia Mozarabica*, Rome, 1740; J. M. Neale; *Tetralogia liturgica*, London, 1849; idem, *Essays in Liturgiology and Church Hist.*, ib. 1863; C. R. Hale, *The Mozarabic Liturgy and the Mexican Branch of the Catholic Church*, New York, 1876; idem, *Mozarabic Collects*, ib. 1881; G. Rietschel, *Liturgik*, i. 316 sqq., Berlin, 1900; E. J. y Moraleda, *El Rito Mozárabe*, Toledo, 1904.

MOZARABIC PERICOPES. See PERICOPES.

MOZETTA. See VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

MOZLEY, JAMES BOWLING: Church of England theologian; b. at Gainsborough (15 m. n.w. of Lincoln), England, Sept. 15, 1813; d. at Oxford Jan. 4, 1878. He studied at Grantham, and subsequently at Oriel College, Oxford (A.B., 1834; M.A., 1838; B.D., 1846; D.D., 1871); was elected to a fellowship at Magdalen College in 1840, where he resided until 1856, when he accepted the living of Old Shoreham, Sussex. Through Mr. Gladstone he was made canon of Worcester in 1869; and, in 1871, regius professor of divinity, an office which he held, in conjunction with his vicarage, until his death. He was appointed Bampton lecturer for 1865, and select university preacher in 1869. While Mozley was a student at Oxford, the influence of Newman and Pusey was strong, and he was an enthusiastic though independent follower of those early leaders in the Tractarian movement. Yet when Newman entered the Church of Rome, Mozley kept firm in his allegiance to the Anglican Church. Thus he found himself separated from the party with which he had been originally identified. Agreeing with the predestinarianism of St. Augustine, and at odds with the doctrine of his party, he labored to reconcile the Christian tradition about baptism with the theology of Calvinism. Accordingly he stood almost quite alone as a theologian; he never quite sympathized with the Evangelicals in their general spirit and tone, and he never ceased to be a Churchman, and in fact a High-churchman; but the developments of that party were not to his taste and he found no other that he could join. Mozley was at his best in argument, and may indeed be called the "Butler of his generation." He was also recognized as one of the best theological thinkers of his day, and his sermons were of a superior quality. For a long period he was known only as a contributor to *The Critic* and *The Christian Remembrancer*, while his writings in general covered subjects critical, dogmatic, and apologetic. His productions embrace: *The Influence of Ancient Oracles in Public and Private Life* (vol. v. of *Oxford English Prize Essays*, Oxford, 1836); *A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination* (London, 1855); *The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration* (1856); *A Review of the Baptismal Controversy* (1862); *Eight Lectures on Miracles Preached before the University of Oxford in . . . 1865* (Bampton lectures, 1865; latest ed., 1895); *Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford, and on Various Occasions* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1876; latest ed., 1895); *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages and their Relation to Old Testament Faith; Lectures* (London, 1877; latest ed., New York, 1908); *Essays, Historical and Theological* (2 vols., 1878); *The Theory of Development. A Criticism of Dr. Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1878); *Sermons, Parochial and Occasional* (1879); and *Lectures and Other Theological Papers* (1883; reissue, 1907).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *The Letters of J. B. Mozley. . . . Edited by his Sister* [Anne Mozley], London, 1884; the Introduction to the *Essays*, ut sup., by his sister, and a biographical notice by R. W. Church, in the same; R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, London, 1891; *DNB*, xxxix. 249–251.

MUEHLAU, mü′lau, **HEINRICH FERDINAND:** German Lutheran; b. at Dresden June 20, 1839. He was educated at the universities of Leipsic and Erlangen from 1857 to 1862 (Ph.D., Leipsic, 1861), and in 1869 became privat-docent for Old-Testament exegesis at the former university. In the following year he was called to Dorpat as professor of the same subject, remaining there until 1895, when he became professor of New-Testament exegesis at the University of Kiel, resigning in 1909. He has edited J. F. Böttcher's *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testament* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1863–65) and *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (2 vols., 1866–68); *Liber Genesis sine punctis excriptus* (in collaboration with E. F. Kautzsch; 1868); and the eighth to the eleventh editions of W. Gesenius's *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch* (in collaboration with W. Volck, 1878–90); and has written *De proverbiorum quæ dicuntur Aguri et Lemuelis origine et indole* (Leipsic, 1869); *Die biblische Lehre vom Gewissen* (Dorpat, 1889); *Zur paulinischen Ethik* (Kiel, 1898); *Martinus Seusenius' Reise ins heilige Land* (1902); and *Die Ostseeprovinzen Russlands und ihre deutsche Kultur* (1906).

MUEHLENBERG, mü′len-berg, **HENRY MELCHIOR:** The patriarch of the Lutheran Church in North America; b. at Eimbeck (39 m. s.e. of Hanover, Germany) Sept. 6, 1711; d. at New Providence (Trappe), Pa., Oct. 7, 1787. In the Latin school of his native town the foundation was laid for his excellent classical training. From 1735 to 1738 he studied theology at Göttingen, and then served as teacher in the Francke institutions at Halle. Having been ordained at Leipsic in 1739 he was called to Grosshennersdorf through the influence of Baroness von Gersdorf, the patroness of that charge. In the year 1741 August Hermann Francke (q.v.) urged him to accept a call from the three Lutheran congregations in Pennsylvania (New Providence, New Hanover, and Philadelphia), which had been transmitted by the Rev. Fiedriech Michael Ziegenhagen in London. In April, 1742, he arrived in London and in June of the same year embarked for Georgia, where he was to visit the Salzburg colonists under pastors Bolzius and Gronau, near Savannah. He arrived in Philadelphia, Nov. 25, 1742.

At the time of his entrance into the new world Muehlenberg was in the prime of his young manhood. Having enjoyed a fine classical education he spoke Latin fluently. He was also able to use the Dutch and English tongues in preaching, besides his native German. He was a scholarly theologian, firmly rooted in the Lutheran Confession. The slight touch of Halle Pietism which he had received proved a wholesome feature in his pastoral dealings with individuals. He was dignified and magnetic in his personal appearance, well balanced in his judgment of men and affairs, pleasant and cordial in his intercourse with men of high or low degree, and gifted with remarkable powers of organization and administration. Thus he was particularly well equipped for bringing order into the chaotic condition of the scattered Lutherans in America, and for laying the foundation for a solid organization. Among the German emigrants in the Province of Pennsylvania up to the middle of the eighteenth century the Mennonites, Schwenckfelders, and other sects were strongly represented. The German Reformed were also quite numerous. But the majority belonged to the Lutheran confession. Yet there was hardly any provision made for their spiritual needs. Men who had never been called to the ministry, or who had been disciplined and deposed as unworthy of the office in the old country, like Valentin Kraft, pressed into the folds which were without shepherds and assumed the pastoral office. Nearly ten years before Muehlenberg's arrival the above-mentioned Pennsylvania congregations had applied to Drs. Ziegenhagen in London and Francke in Halle for worthy Lutheran pastors. Their patience had been severely tried by tiresome negotiations. Just one year before Muehlenberg's arrival Nicholas Ludwig Zinzendorf (q.v.) appeared in Pennsylvania under the name of Count von Thuernstein and sought to gather around his person a sort of union of the best elements of German Christians. He proved to be particularly aggressive toward the Lutherans. In Philadelphia Zinzendorf subjected Muehlenberg to an *Examen rigorosum*, which he endured in a dignified manner. Having been required by the mayor of the city to give up the church records of the Lutherans, Zinzendorf left the city Jan. 1, 1743, and returned to Europe.

Now the field was clear for Muehlenberg to take up the work of organizing the Lutheran Church in this western continent, and this proved to be his life-work. The service of the three congregations which had called him, was very exacting, as they were 36 miles distant from each other, without roads to connect them. He devoted himself to the instruction of the young, insisted on scriptural discipline for the communicants, installed elders and deacons, and built school-houses and churches. Other congregations also asked for his advice and services; for example, the Lutherans on the Raritan River, New Jersey; in southwestern Pennsylvania (Frederick); and even the churches on the upper Hudson, founded by the Palatinate immigrants, and the Dutch Lutherans in New York whom he served as pastor for two successive summers. Thus his influence gradually extended over all the Lutherans in the provinces of North America.

At his urgent request the fathers in Halle sent additional laborers into the American field, Peter Brunnholz, Nicolas Kurtz, Johann Helfrich Schaum, Johann Friedrich Handschuh, Johann Friedrich Schmidt, Justus Heinrich Christian Helmuth, and Johann Christopher Kunze, the most prominent and scholarly among them, who afterward became Muehlenberg's son-in-law. In 1748, on the occasion of the dedication of St. Michael's Church in Philadelphia, Muehlenberg organized the first Lutheran synod on this western continent, the ministerium of Pennsylvania. The Swedish Lutherans in Pennsylvania and Delaware were in full sympathy with him in his labors, Provost Johann Sandin taking part in the opening of the synod and Provost Magnus Wrangel de Saga being his intimate friend and safe counselor in all important church questions. In 1761 Muehlenberg took up his residence in Philadelphia and prepared the first draft of a constitution for the congregation, which was at once signed by 500 heads of families and became the model for many Lutheran churches in Pennsylvania. In 1766 he undertook the erection of the large Zion's Church, at the corner of Fourth and Cherry streets, Philadelphia, which could accommodate 2,000 persons and was long considered the largest and most beautiful church edifice in North America. In this church congress held the memorial service for Washington in 1799. In 1776 Muehlenberg returned again to Providence, but his resignation from the Philadelphia congregation was accepted only in 1779. From Aug., 1774, to Feb., 1775, he had undertaken another journey to the South, in order to settle certain difficulties which had arisen among the Salzburg colonists in Georgia. There he succeeded in establishing peace between the contending parties and prevailed on the congregation to adopt a constitution prepared by himself. The last decade of his life was spent among his country congregations, which he continued to serve with the Word and sacraments as far as his failing strength would allow. In those years he prepared the draft of the first Pennsylvania hymn-book (1786) which to this day is known as the "Muehlenberg Hymn Book." While it showed here and there the influences of the Halle Pietism, it was the best Lutheran hymn-book in eastern North America until it was replaced by the church-book of the General Council in 1877.

Muehlenberg bore the full burden of "a church in the planting" under the most difficult and distressing circumstances. He found among his people a state of utter disintegration and demoralization. The various elements, coming from different regions of the fatherland and inclined to abuse their unaccustomed liberty, were hard to unite under a sound church discipline. And even the opposition of worldly-minded pastors, who resisted his work of organization at every step, had to be met and overcome in all patience and wisdom. His own coworkers in the synod not infrequently annoyed him by their lack of tact and of pastoral wisdom.

He died with the closing stanza of Paul Gerhardt's hymn "Commit thou all thy griefs" on his lips. The Philadelphia congregation desired to have him buried under the pulpit of Zion's Church, but the family decided in favor of the churchyard of the Augustus-Church in New Providence (Trappe) as the place of his interment. His tombstone bears the prophetical inscription (which may be translated; "Had he no monument, future ages still would know how great a man he was"):

Qualis et quantus fuerit,
Non ignorabunt sine lapide
Futura sæcula.

Dr. Muehlenberg was married to Anna Weiser, the daughter of the famous Conrad Weiser, Jr., who, as an Indian commissioner and interpreter, held a very prominent position in the provincial government. Three of his sons who were educated at Halle and were destined to enter the service of the Lutheran Church as ministers became quite illustrious in American history. **John Peter Gabriel,** born at Trappe, Pa., Oct. 1, 1746, ordained in 1768, was pastor in New Jersey and afterward in Woodstock, Va. In Jan., 1776, he exchanged the ministerial gown for a colonel's uniform, and, at the head of his regiment, took part in the war against England. He became a general in the American army and enjoyed the intimate friendship of Washington. After the war he was vice-governor of Pennsylvania, member of congress, and senator. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 1, 1807. The second son, **Frederik August Conrad,** b. at Trappe, Pa., Jan. 1, 1750, ordained 1770, was pastor of Christ Church, New York City, and founded the New York ministerium of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Afterward he followed a political career, becoming a member of congress, speaker of the legislature of Pennsylvania, and president of the convention which ratified the constitution of the United States. He also presided over the first and the third congress as speaker. He died in Lancaster June 4, 1801. The youngest son, **Gotthilf Heinrich Ernst,** born at Trappe, Pa., Nov. 17, 1753, is the only one who continued in the ministry. He was ordained in 1770, assisted his father in the ministry, and became third pastor of the Philadelphia congregation. From 1780 to 1815 he served the Evangelical Lutheran Trinity Church in Lancaster, Pa., and died there May 23, 1815. He achieved a reputation as a scholarly botanist. ADOLPH SPAETH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are the *Hallesche Nachrichten*, 2 vols., Halle, 1750–87, republished with notes by W. J. Mann, B. M. Schmücker, and W. Germann, Allentown,

Pa., vol. i., 1886, Eng. transl., begun by C. W. Schaeffer, part i., Reading, Pa., 1882; the *Selbstbiographie*, going as far as 1743, ed. W. Germann, Allentown, Pa., 1881; and J. W. Richard's translation of Muehlenberg's diary, in *Evangelical Review*, vols. i.–iv. Lives are by J. G. C. Helmuth, Philadelphia, 1788; M. L. Stoever, ib. 1856; W. J. Mann, in English, ib. 1887, in German, 1891; W. K. Frick, ib., 1902. Consult further: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Lutheran Pulpit*, New York, 1869; H. E. Jacobs, in *American Church History Series*, vol. iv., chaps. xii.–xviii., ib. 1893; T. E. Schmauk, *Hist. of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania (1638–1820)*, vol. i., Philadelphia, 1903; and in general literature under LUTHERANS.

MUEHLHAEUSSER, mül-hei′ser, **KARL AUGUST:** German theologian; b. at Kleinkems (28 m. s.w. of Freiburg), Baden, Feb. 26, 1825; d. at Wilferdingen (8 m. s.e. of Carlsruhe) Jan. 21, 1881. He was educated at Heidelberg; became vicar at Eppelheim (1847), afterward vicar in Carlsruhe, and minister at Sulzfeld (1854). At the suggestion of Ullmann, who esteemed him highly, he was called to Carlsruhe in 1857 as assessor of the high consistory. When Ullmann resigned in 1860 on account of the controversy over the liturgy, Mühlhäusser, who became a regular member of the high consistory, remained in that body, but openly expressed his divergence from its views. In 1864 he frankly opposed it in favor of the protest signed by 119 clergymen of Baden against Schenkel's *Charakterbild Jesu*. By degrees his position became untenable, and in this same year he accepted a call to the country parish of Wilferdingen. There he developed an extensive activity relating to ecclesiastical policy. As an acknowledged leader of the " positive " party, he assembled his friends in the " Evangelical Conference," and represented the conservative minority with ability and success in many general synods of Baden. As a member of the Baden diet he proved an experienced and ready parliamentarian. By word and pen he advocated the principles of the German Conservatives. After 1876 he collaborated with Geffken in the publication of the *Zeitfragen des christlichen Volkslebens*, the first part of which, *Christentum und Presse*, was prepared by Mühlhäusser himself, and emphasized the necessity of defending the Christian view of life by means of the press. He was an enthusiastic advocate of home missions in south Germany, and was for many years the president of the southwestern conference which he had attended since its establishment in 1864. JULIUS NEY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Reinmuth, *Karl August Mühlhäusser*, Heilbronn, 1882.

MUELLENSIEFEN, mü″len-sî′fen, **JULIUS:** German Lutheran preacher; b. at Iserlohn (45 m. n.e. of Cologne), Apr. 28, 1811; d. at Wernigerode (22 m. s.s.e. of Brunswick) Apr. 28, 1893. After studying at Halle and Berlin, he became private tutor in the home of General von Diest; pastor in Cöthen, Brandenburg, 1836, and in 1852 chief pastor of the Marienkirche in Berlin, in which position he was active for thirty-three years, being made pastor emeritus in 1890. Müllensiefen's especial gift was the care of souls; he had a peculiarly clear insight into the most complicated conditions of the inner and outer life and a great faculty of discerning the possible solution of the problems presented. His high ethical standard and the uncompromising sternness of his moral judgment were united with a paternal sympathy for the needs of a burdened or troubled conscience. It was for this reason that he exerted a more wide-spread pastoral influence than almost any other clergyman in Berlin, as well by personal communication as through correspondence. His pastoral and pedagogical gift was unfolded more especially in catechetical instruction, to which he usually devoted sixteen hours each week during the entire year. His sermons also, of which three major collections have appeared (*Der Weg des Friedens*, Berlin, 1871; *Zeugnisse von Christo*, 4 vols., 15th ed., Halle, 1894; *Das Wort des Lebens*, 4 vols., 8th ed., 1888) bear the same pastoral character. The most widely read are *Tägliche Andachten zur häuslichen Erbauung* (19th ed., 1905).

G. RIETSCHEL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Müllensiefen, in *Deutsche evangelische Blätter*, xix (1894), 158 sqq.

MUELLER, mül′er, **DAVID HEINRICH:** Austrian Jewish Orientalist; b. at Buczacz (85 m. s.e. of Lemberg), Galicia, July 6, 1846. He was educated at the universities of Vienna, Leipsic, Strasburg, and Berlin, and in 1875 became privat-docent at the first-named institution, becoming associate professor of Oriental languages in 1881 and full professor in 1885. He is also professor of Hebrew and the philosophy of religion at the Vienna Israelitisch-theologische Lehranstalt. He is noted for his services in developing knowledge of the strophical structure of poetry in the Old Testament, and this criterion of structure he has begun to apply to the New Testament. He has been since 1887 one of the editorial board of the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, and besides his work as editor of al-Samma'i's *Kitab-al-Farq* (Vienna, 1876); al-Hamadani's " Geography of the Arabian Peninsula " (2 vols., Leyden, 1884–91); and a portion of the " Annals " of al-Ṭabari (1888–89), has written *Himjarische Inschriften* (Vienna, 1875); *Himjarische Studien* (1876); *Südarabische Studien* (1877); *Bericht über eine Reise nach Konstantinople* (1878); *Burgen und Schlösser Südarabiens* (2 parts, 1879–1881); *Sabäische Denkmäler* (in collaboration with J. H. Mordtmann; 1883); *Siegfried Langer's Reiseberichte aus Syrien und Arabien und die von ihm entdeckten und gesammelten Inschriften* (Leipsic, 1883); *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien nach Abklatschen und Copien des Herrn J. Euting* (1889); *Rezensionen und Versionen des Eldad ha-Dani* (1892); *Die altsemitischen Inschriften von Sendschirli in den königlichen Museen zu Berlin* (1893); *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien nach Abklatschen von J. Theodore Bent* (1894); *Ezechiel-Studien* (Berlin, 1895); *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (2 vols., Vienna, 1895); *Die Haggadah von Sarajevo* (in collaboration with J. von Schlosser; 1898); *Südarabische Altertümer in kunsthistorischen Hofmuseum* (1899); *Die Mehri- und Soqoṭri-Sprache* (2 vols., 1902–05); *Die Gesetze Hammurabi's und ihr Verhältnis zur mosaischen Gesetzgebung sowie zu den Zwölf Tafeln* (1903); *Das syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch und Hammurabi* (1905); *Semitica*, contributed to the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy (1906); a series of *Biblische Studien*, reproduced from various periodicals (5 parts, *ing the Death of Mr. Müller*, ib. 1909. For minute and detailed accounts of the institution consult the *Annual Reports*.

MUELLER, HEINRICH: German Lutheran; b. at Lübeck Oct. 18, 1631; d. at Rostock (44 m. n.e. of Schwerin) Sept. 17, 1675. He studied at Greifswald and Rostock; entered the ministry at Rostock, 1652; became archidiakonus there, 1653; professor of Greek in the university, 1659, and of theology, 1662. Doctrinally, Müller occupied a middle ground in Lutheran theology, and his orthodoxy was pervaded with the warm glow of an intimate personal faith, so that he stood out as one of the most eminent figures in the era preceding Pietism. And as such he was called to cooperate in the renewal of ecclesiastical life in the Evangelical church of Germany. In his sermons and devotional writings, Müller often reveals a masterful and "popular" eloquence. As a devotional writer, Müller was exceedingly prolific. Among his works are: *Der himmlische Liebeskuss* (1659; new ed. by Fiedler, 1831, Hamburg, 1848); *Kreuz Buss und Betschule* (1661); *Betrachtungen über den 143. Psalm* (new ed., Hamburg, 1853; Leipsic, 1872); "collected Sermons" (2 vols., 1663–72); *Schlusskette und Kraftkern* (1663; reissue, Halle, 1853, 1855); *Evangelische Schlusskette* (1672; reissued, Halle, 1855); *Festevangelische Schlusskette* (1673; new ed., Halle, 1855); *Die geistlichen Erquickstunden* (1664; later editions, Leipsic, 1872; Hamburg, 1889; Eng. transl., *Hours of Spiritual Refreshment*, London, 1840); *Der geistliche Dankaltar* (1668); *Die ungeratene Ehe* (1668); *Thränen- und Trostquelle oder der Heiland und der Sünder* (Frankfort, 1676; new ed., Halle, 1855). After Müller's death there appeared *Der evangelische Herzensspiegel* (1679), briefer homilies on the Evangelical pericopes (new edition, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1882, 1884); *Das evangelische Præservativ wider den Schaden Josephs in allen dreien Ständen* (1681); and his funeral discourses, *Gräber der Heiligen* (1685). Müller also composed a number of spiritual hymns, of which several have been adopted in the Church hymnals. HERMANN BECK.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Biographies have been written by C. O. F. Aichel, Hamburg, 1854, and by O. C. Krabbe, Rostock, 1866. Consult further: E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iv. 67 sqq., Stuttgart, 1868; C. G. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Predigt*, pp. 106-110, Gotha, 1872; K. Palmer, *Lebensbilder von Erbauungsschriftsteller*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1870, A. F. W. Fischer, *Kirchenlieder Lexikon*, p. 158, Gotha, 1878, H. Beck, *Die religiöse Volkslitteratur der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Gotha, 1891.

MUELLER, JOHANN GEORG: The name of two theologians.

1. Swiss Reformed teacher and educator; b. at Schaffhausen (23 m. n.n.e. of Zurich, Switzerland), Sept. 3, 1759; d. there Sept. 20, 1819. Being of a religious turn of mind and under the influence of Lavater's "Glimpses into Eternity" and Young's *Night Thoughts*, he determined to study theology, which he did first at Zurich and later in Dessau, Bremen, and Bernburg. But Müller had not
begun to build on a sure basis, and while
tingen his religious perplexities so incr
he turned to Herder for assistance.
Weimar, he was taken by Herder in

for six months, and the attachment thus formed was a lasting one. Under Herder's influence Müller became freer, more full of life, and was spurred on to further research. On his return home, Müller found his foundation alarmingly weak in spite of the many theologies with which his head was filled. He became bewildered in endeavoring to read the Bible with understanding; accordingly he concluded to put aside all theological books, even the Bible, and to devote himself for two years to classical literature. On resuming his Bible study he attained the conviction he sought, based on the eternal truth of divine revelation. Not being able to fill a pastorate because of ill health, he accepted a professorship in the College of Humanity, Schaffhausen, and devoted his time to science and writing. His works were addressed in particular to the young, his endeavor being to make the Bible in its magnificence and humanity once more of practical value. He agreed fully with the Augsburg and Helvetian Confessions and his theology differed rather in form, than materially, from the older system. He sought to simplify theology, to banish scholasticism, to free the religion of Jesus from its Jewish garb, to present it pure and practicable, in short, to humanize theology; although its first principle—positive revelation—would have to remain the same. At first lecturer, in 1794 he became professor of Greek and Hebrew, and later of encyclopedia and methodology in the College of Humanity. He was thrown out of his clerical position by the Revolution, and cheerfully accepted the situation, believing that he could in that way best serve his city. Through the confidence of his fellow citizens he was appointed first representative of the people, then a member of the city council, and last deputy mayor.

Müller's chief works are *Philosophische Aufsätze* (Breslau, 1789); *Unterhaltungen mit Serena* (2 parts, Wintherthur, 1793–1802; 3d ed., 3 parts, part iii. ed. Kirchhofer, 1834–35); *Bekenntnisse Merkwürdiger Männer von sich selbst* (16 vols., 1792–1809); *Briefe über das Studium der Wissenschaften, besonders der Geschichte* (Füssli, 1798); *Ueber ein Wort, das Franz I. von den Folgen der Reformation gesagt haben soll* (1800); *Reliquien alter Zeiten, Sitten und Meinungen* (4 parts, Leipsic, 1803–06); *Von Glauben der Christen. Vorlesungen* (2d ed., 2 vols., Winterthur, 1823); and *Ueber christlichen Religionsunterricht* (1809). (G. KIRCHHOFER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: The autobiography, produced in *Protestantische Monatsblättern*, xviii (1861), 35 sqq.; the *Briefwechsel* between himself and his brother, the historian Johann von Müller, ed. E. Haug, Frauenfeld, 1893. Consult further: The biography by K. Stokar, Basel, 1885; three lectures by J. Kirchhofer, in *Unoth, Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertum des Standes Schaffhausen*, i. 65 sqq., Schaffhausen, 1864; and *Aufzeichnungen von Johann Georg Müller*, ed. J. Bächtold, Berlin, 1881.

2. German Reformed teacher and comparative religionist; b. in Basel, Switzerland, May 8, 1800; d. there Aug. 31, 1875. From 1818 to 1825 he
ied philosophy and theology at the Hochschule
tte as his teacher in theol-
attending lectures by
g his examinations
le became teacher

of Latin in the Pädagogium in Basel, 1828; in 1831, after taking his degree of licentiate, was appointed assistant teacher in the theological faculty; and in 1835 became professor.

He studied the works of Philo, of Josephus, and of the apostolic Fathers, as auxiliaries for his specialty, New-Testament exegesis and introduction; he published an edition of Philo's "Creation" (Berlin, 1841), and later *Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes* (Leipsic, 1869). In 1870 appeared a *Program* on Philo's messianic prophesies. His edition of Josephus' *Apion* was published by two of his colleagues, Riggenbach and Orelli (Basel, 1877). His most valued labor was done in his lectures on introduction to the New Testament. His other field was comparative religion. In his early study of the philosophy of religion, he was strongly opposed to a priori reasoning, sought solid historical foundation for his belief, and studied carefully the ethnic religions. Although there was no chair of comparative religion, Müller continued to give lectures on the history of polytheistic religions, of which little was known at that time. His *Geschichte der amerikanischen Urreligionen* (Basel, 1855) is a product of this period. He also studied the ethnographical problem of the relation between the Semites and Hamites, and published a *program* in 1860, in which he asks: "Who are the Semites, and on what authority do we say, 'Semitic languages'?"; a second program, of 1864, treats of the nationality of the Hyksos and the Philistines; and in another at Gotha in 1872, *Die Semiten in ihrem Verhältniss zu Chamiten und Japhetiten*, he tried to prove that "Semite" was the designation of a group of related peoples, and not a proper name for a class of languages, and that the so-called "Semitic" languages should be called "Hamitic." Müller published an autobiographical sketch before his death. (Jacob Kündig.)

MUELLER, JULIUS: German Lutheran theologian; b. at Brieg (28 m. s.e. of Breslau) Apr. 10, 1801; d. at Halle Sept. 27, 1878. He studied jurisprudence and theology at the universities of Breslau (1819–20), Göttingen (1822–23), and Berlin (1823–24), gradually coming to feel more and more that his interests lay in theology rather than in law. In 1825 he was called to the pastorate of Schönbrunn. Here, however, he became involved in controversy, denying the right of the government to interfere in church affairs and refusing to use either the agenda or the union ritual. He was saved from deposition by a call to become university preacher at Göttingen in 1830. In the following year he became privat-docent, and in 1834 was appointed associate professor, and in the same year he was called to Marburg as professor of dogmatics. Here he was called to defend the point of view of a truly scientific and believing theology against the ever-increasing onslaught of the anti-Christian philosophy of the times; and here, too, he wrote his chief theological work, his *Christliche Lehre von der Sünde* (2 vols., Breslau, 1839–44; Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1877). The point of view is the Protestant tenet of unrestricted scientific investigation which recognizes no other authority than the immutable basis of the Bible. At the same time Müller sought to avoid all conflict between scientific thought and Christian feeling, insisting especially that reflection on sin must not lead to the annihilation of "religious awe." According to Müller not only did the doctrine of sin hitherto in vogue rest on an antiquated metaphysics, but sin was neither adequately expressed nor sufficiently explained; nor could the antinomy, resulting from the view that sin could be committed only by free will, while no factor in the empirical development of the individual could bear the weight of such voluntary decision, be solved by the ecclesiastical doctrine of original sin. His solution was the assumption of an intelligible self-decision. But if the resolve to maintain the deepest truths justified seeking a better scientific foundation, nevertheless a theology truly revised on the basis of belief could be established only on a purer and profounder concept and foundation of Christian truth than was afforded by the teachings of the Church. In so far as a theology thus established on the great principles of general Protestant belief thrust into the background denominational differences, it necessarily implied the tendency to union which is clearly evident as a fundamental tenet of Müller's system of thought.

Müller's doctrine of sin not only conditioned his entire attitude toward theology and the Church, but also determined his subsequent career. His importance became ever more evident, and in 1839 he was called from Marburg to Halle. Seven years later he was a deputy of the faculty of Halle to the General Synod, where he earnestly advocated union, his early opposition to this movement being removed by the change in the policy of church government. Entirely disapproving the course hitherto taken for union of the Lutheran and Reformed, Müller held that if uniformity in worship and in church government were to have any value, both must rest on uniformity of belief; and an adequate expression of this consensus he held was expressed in the new formula of ordination proposed by Nitzsch. Here his idea was to preserve the denominational characteristics of each congregation, for if ordination thus became the expression of the unionistic standpoint of the entire church, nevertheless denominational rights were expressly recognized in the calling of pastors. It is easy to see that Müller's peculiar attitude was not understood, even though he defended it in *Die erste Generalsynode der evangelischen Landeskirche Preussens und die kirchlichen Bekenntnisse* (Breslau, 1847). The confirmation and execution of the decisions of the synod dragged on until ended by the revolution of 1848; but the ensuing reaction in Church and State compelled him to resume the struggle. He now felt that he must defend the actual existence of the union, and besides a series of papers bearing on the problem he published an irenic statement of his views, designed to reconcile the moderate Lutherans, in *Die evangelische Union, ihr Wesen und ihr göttliches Recht* (Berlin, 1854). While the results of Müller's struggle for the union was successful in so far as the Reformed were placed on an equal footing with the Lutherans in Prussia (and more he had not hoped for), he was deeply pained by having to combat those with whom he felt himself one in faith. Loneliness and illness now beset him, and in 1856 he suffered a stroke of apoplexy. A year later, however, he was able to resume his lectures, which he continued for twenty-two years. But further extensive literary work was impossible, though he collected his *Gesammelte Dogmatische Abhandlungen* (Bremen, 1870), originally published in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben*, which he had founded in 1850 with Neander and Nitzsch. In 1878, a few months before his death, he retired from active life.

(David Hupfeld.)

Bibliography: M. Kähler, *Dr. Julius Müller, der hallische Dogmatiker*, Halle, 1898; L. Schultze, *Dr. Julius Müller, Mittheilungen aus seinem Leben*, Bremen, 1879.

MUELLER, KARL FERDINAND FRIEDRICH: German Protestant; b. at Langenburg (46 m. n.e. of Stuttgart) Sept. 3, 1852. He was educated at the universities of Tübingen (1870–74; Ph.D., 1876; lic. theol., 1878) and Göttingen (1876–77), interrupting his studies in 1875–76 to serve as curate at Ludwigsburg. He was a lecturer at the Tübingen theological seminary (1878–80), became privatdocent for theology at Berlin (1880), and associate professor (1882). In 1884 he went in a similar capacity to Halle; to Giessen as full professor (1886); to Breslau, as professor of church history (1891); and to the University of Tübingen (1903). He has written: *Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern mit der römischen Kirche* (2 vols., Tübingen, 1879–80); *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften* (Freiburg, 1885); *Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen bis zum Anfang des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Gotha, 1886); *Kirchengeschichte* (2 parts, Freiburg, 1892–1902); *Luther und Karlstadt* (Tübingen, 1907); and *Die Esslinger Pfarrkirche im Mittelalter*, in *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte für Landesgeschichte*, xvi (1907).

MUELLER, WILHELM MAX: Lutheran; b. at Gleissenberg (a village near Waldmünchen (38 m. n.e. of Regensburg), Bavaria, May 15, 1862. He was educated at the universities of Erlangen, Leipsic (Ph.D., 1893), Berlin, and Munich. In 1888 he left Germany for the United States, and after two years' residence in New York City was appointed in 1890 to his present position of professor of Old- and New-Testament exegesis at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia. He has written *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern* (Leipsic, 1893); *Die Liebespoesie der alten Aegypter* (1899); and *Egyptological Researches* (Washington, 1906).

MUEMPELGART, müm'pĕl'gărt, **COLLOQUY OF:** A disputation between Lutherans and Reformed at the castle of Mümpelgart (a town better known to English readers under its French name Montbéliard, near the French border, 37 m. w. of Basel), Mar. 21–26, 1586. This was occasioned by the incorporation of the county of Mümpelgart into the duchy of Württemberg by inheritance. As early as 1526 Farel had preached the Gospel in Mümpelgart, but soon had to flee. In 1535, however, a Calvinistic type of the Reformation was established by Tossanus, a Reformed Frenchman; then the duke of Württemberg attempted to reorganize the church on the Lutheran model. Many Calvinists had found a refuge in Mümpelgart from French persecution, but were not easily admitted to the Lord's Supper. In order to create more friendly relations with the Lutherans, the disputation was arranged. On the Lutheran side, Jacob Andreas and Lucas Osiander of Tübingen were commissioned, together with two political councilors, Hans Wolf von Anweil and Friedrich Schütz. On the Reformed side there were present Beza, Abraham Musculus, preacher at Bern; Anton Fajus, deacon at Geneva; Peter Hybner, professor of Greek in Bern; Claudius Alberius, professor of philosophy in Lausanne, and the two councilors, Samuel Meyer of Bern and Anton Marisius of Geneva. The points of controversy were (1) the Lord's Supper, (2) the person of Christ, (3) pictures and ceremonies, (4) baptism, and (5) election. The proceedings were not taken down in writing, but both parties in the beginning handed in written copies of their theses. Both parties claimed the victory. Against the agreement there was later published a protocol in the interest of the Lutherans. Beza disputed the correctness of the *Acta* of Tübingen and defended himself in Latin and German. A deputation from Württemberg requested at Bern satisfaction for the allegation of forgery which had been repeated by Musculus, but the deputation made no impression upon the Reformed. The only result of the disputation was a deepening of the differences between the two parties.

(A. Schweizer†.)

Bibliography: Sources are: *Acta colloquii Montis Belligartensis*, Tübingen, 1594; *Ad acta colloquii Montisbeligardensis, T. Beza responsio*, Geneva, 1587–88. Consult: H. J. J. Heppe, *T. Beza, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, pp. 267 sqq., Elberfeld, 1861.

MUENCHMEYER, münh'mai-er, **AUGUST FRIEDRICH OTTO:** German divine; b. at Hanover Dec. 8, 1807; d. at Buer (10 m. n. of Essen), district of Münster, Nov. 7, 1882; studied at Lüneburg, Holzminden, Göttingen, Berlin, and at the preachers' seminary at Hanover. In 1840 he was appointed pastor at Lamspringe, near Hildesheim; in 1851, superintendent at Catlenburg; and in 1855, consistorial councilor and superintendent at Buer, and member of the ecclesiastical court of Osnabrück. He was a zealous advocate of the complete separation of State and Church, which he supported in the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, and in the *Göttinger Monatsschrift* (1846–1847). He engaged in a controversy with Höfling over the latter's *Grundsätze evangelisch-lutherischer Kirchenverfassung*, to refute which he published *Das Amt des Neuen Testaments nach Lehre der Schrift und der lutherischen Bekenntnisse* (Osterode, n.d.). He was the author also of *Das Dogma von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche* (Göttingen, 1854). (J. G. W. Uhlhorn†.)

MUENSCHER, WILHELM: German theologian; b. at Hersfeld (32 m. s.s.e. of Cassel) Mar. 15, 1766; d. at Marburg July 28, 1814. He studied at the gymnasium of his native town and at the University of Marburg; officiated for some time as assistant to his father, pastor at Hersfeld; became in 1789 pastor of the collegiate church there; was three years later called to the chair of theology at the University of Marburg. Although his activity embraced all branches of theology except Old-Testament exegesis, he is known chiefly through his writings on doctrinal theology and church history. His theological standpoint was that of a moderate rationalist, and for him the mission of doctrinal theology was to answer the question "How and why has the doctrine of Christianity gradually assumed its present form?" This question he endeavored to answer in a series of essays in various periodicals. He was the author also of *Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (4 vols., Marburg, 1797); *Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (Marburg, 1804); and a *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Marburg, 1811).

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: His life and writings were edited by L. Wachler, Frankfort, 1817. Consult also the *Versuch einer Geschichte der hessisch-reformierten Kirche* by his son, W. Münscher, Cassel, 1850.

MUENSTER, ANABAPTISTS IN.

Humanistic, Social, and Religious Ferment (§ 1).
Bernhard Rothmann; the Sixteen Articles (§ 2).
Entrance of Radical Elements (§ 3).
Anabaptist Radicalism in Control (§ 4).
Anabaptist Theocracy; Siege of the City (§ 5).
Capture of the City; Punishment of the Leaders (§ 6).

1. Humanistic, Social, and Religious Ferment.

The Anabaptist movement in Münster grew out of the Reformation in that city, and this again stood in closest relation to revolutionary tendencies within the city. The opposing parties were the town as represented by the council and the bishop or cathedral chapter, as well as the patricians, as opposed to the gilds and common people. It was during the struggle among these different parties for leadership that the spark of the Reformation was kindled in Münster. Merchants, especially from Frankfurt, seem to have brought the first message; Evangelical influences proceeding mostly from Augustine friars in neighboring cities had their effect, while Humanism prepared the way. At the instigation of Rudolph von Langen, the cathedral school in Münster had since 1500 through the instruction it furnished in Latin and Greek extended widely its influence. Among the first who began in Münster to confess deviating religious opinions were the Humanists Johann Glandorp and Adolf Clarenbach, teacher at the school of St. Martin. Peter Gymnich of Aix-la-Chapelle, a distinguished scholar and canon of St. Martin's, had been on terms of friendship with Luther since 1520; Arnold Bellholt, a patrician, had similar relations with Carlstadt. In 1524 the Reformation seems to have been publicly proclaimed and advocated by the preachers of the different churches in Münster. In 1525 occurred the first outbreak of the suppressed ferment, a significant element of which was the union between social and religious interests. The impetus was given by the revolt of the peasants which moved down the Rhine into the neighborhood of Münster. At the instigation of the gilds the populace on May 22, 1525, attacked unsuccessfully the rich monastery of Niesing; in spite of this failure the gilds demanded the abolition of the economical competition of the monastery. The movement spread further, the gilds and common people adopted and presented to the council the so-called Articles of Frankfurt which expressed their demands for far-reaching social and religious reforms, such as the abolition of spiritual jurisdiction over citizens and of the immunity of the clergy. Under pressure from the council, the chapter signed some articles, but immediately left the city and presented to the bishop a writ of complaint, while the council abolished the economical competition between the gilds and the monastery of Niesing by confiscating the looms and withdrawing the annuities.

2. Bernhard Rothmann; the Sixteen Articles.

A reaction occurred, however, after the insurrection of the peasants had been suppressed. Under the pressure of the archbishop of Cologne the council felt itself compelled to sacrifice the articles of 1525 and to restore to the monasteries their former privileges. After the restoration of the *status quo ante*, the cathedral chapter returned to the city and the Evangelical preachers were banished. But with these repressive measures the anti-clerical movement was in no way conquered; discord between Bishop Friedrich von Wied and the cathedral chapter gave occasion to a new Evangelical movement under the leadership of Bernhard Rothmann, not in Münster itself but before the gates of the city, on the territory of the bishop, at St. Mauritz (1531). Rothmann was born about 1495 at Stadtlohn in the bishopric of Münster, educated in his native city, in Münster and Deventer, was for a time a teacher and then studied at the University of Mainz. In 1529 he became preacher of St. Mauritz, but he soon joined the Evangelical party and became its leader. He increased the excitement among the people when the character of his sermons became known throughout the city; on the night of Good Friday, 1531, a mob went into his church, defiled the altars, and erected in the churchyard a pulpit for Rothmann, who defied all prohibitory injunctions of the chapter. As the movement spread further, the Protestant party endeavored to unite with the Evangelicals throughout the empire. For this purpose Rothmann visited Wittenberg (where he became acquainted with Melanchthon), Speier, Strasburg (where he met Capito and Schwenckfeld), perhaps also Marburg. After his return he preached openly the Lutheran doctrine. Disagreements between the cathedral chapter and the bishop were favorable to Rothmann's actions, but in 1532 he was compelled to flee. The confession of Rothmann, which was printed and everywhere distributed, betrays in form and contents the influence of Melanchthon, of the Augsburg Confession, but also of Zwingli and not less of the Anabaptists. In Feb., 1532, the adherents of Rothmann stormed the church of St. Lambert, and an Evangelical congregation was constituted. The opposing Roman party, unable to take any effective measures against the gilds and common people, felt greatly relieved at the resignation of Friedrich von Wied as bishop on Mar. 24, 1532. His successor, Duke Erich of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen, bishop of Paderborn and

Osnabrück, had sharply suppressed the Evangelical movement in his territories, but his sudden death on May 14 frustrated all hopes of the Catholics and furnished the occasion for a new Evangelical advance. The newly elected Bishop Franz of Waldeck, at the same time bishop of Minden and Osnabrück, demanded the removal of the Evangelical preachers and the restoration of Roman Catholic worship (June 28), but the citizens formed a league for the protection of Rothmann and elected a committee of thirty-six men for the purpose of obtaining not only permission to preach the Gospel freely, but also its sole recognition in the city. In a formal agreement the council pledged itself to protect the Gospel and requested the Roman clergy to refute Rothmann from Scripture. As these refused a disputation, the offices of all churches in the city, with the exception of the cathedral, were filled with Evangelical preachers (Aug. 10) while the populace destroyed pictures and altars. The Evangelicals had already sought the protection of Landgrave Philip of Hesse (q.v.), who, in the neighborhood of Münster, had asserted his influence in favor of the Gospel. In two letters of July 30, addressed to the council and the bishop, Philip had endeavored to reconcile the opponents by permitting Evangelical preaching, at the same time continuing the revenues of the Roman clergy. At a request of Rothmann, dating from July 16, two Evangelical preachers, Gottfried Stralen and Peter Wertheim, had been sent to Münster. Nevertheless, the bishop required the return of the city to Catholicism, appealing to the edict of Worms and the result of the Augsburg diet, while the Evangelicals relied upon the Interim of the Diet of Nuremberg (1532) and the imperial mandate of Regensburg (Aug. 3, 1532). An attempt of the city to induce the interference of the Schmalkald league failed. On Aug. 16 Rothmann and the other Evangelical preachers presented sixteen articles on the "abuses" of the Roman Church, and these showed an inclination toward Zwinglianism, especially in the conception of the Lord's Supper. In spite of the warnings of Luther and Melanchthon, Rothmann administered the Lord's Supper with wine and wheat bread which was to be broken by the communicants. There was nothing left to the council but to yield and to request Roman Catholics not to officiate in the cathedral at Christmas and not to administer baptism. A successful attack of the neighboring town Telgt in the night of the twenty-sixth of December delivered almost the entire episcopal aristocracy and some patricians of Münster into the hands of the Evangelicals. Owing to the intervention of Landgrave Philip, a treaty of peace between the town and the bishop was obtained on Feb. 14, 1533. Until the decision of a general free Christian council the six churches of Münster with their revenues and the right of filling vacancies were given over to the citizens for Evangelical church service while the bishop, the cathedral chapter, and the other colleges were allowed to adhere unconditionally to their religion. But at the very time when the Evangelicals had obtained sufficient concessions upon which to build up their work of reform on a solid basis, discord arose within their own ranks. Radical elements, hitherto in the background, gained control and won over even the influential personality of Rothmann.

3. Entrance of Radical Elements.

The beginnings of radicalism in Münster are veiled in obscurity. Undoubtedly the movements of the enthusiasts in the neighborhood wielded some influence, but the decisive moment arrived at the end of 1532 when in consequence of measures taken by the government of Jülich the so-called Wassenberg preachers went over to Münster, men who, like Heinrich Roll, Dionysius Vinne, and others who were influenced more or less by Melchior Hoffmann (q.v.), held a spiritualistic conception of the Lord's Supper and had a low estimate of infant baptism. [Far greater than that of Hoffmann was the influence of Erasmus, Carlstadt, and Gerhard Westerburg on the Wassenberg preachers. There is evidence that Hüllmaier's writings were also known in these circles. There is no evidence that any of the Wassenberg preachers had adopted distinctively Hoffmannite views until after the arrival in Münster of the emissaries of Matthys. The views and methods of Matthys should be distinguished from those of Hoffmann. While Hoffmann was chiliastic and predicted the setting up of the kingdom of Christ in Strasburg, he did not reach the point of declaring that the time had actually come for the forcible setting up of the kingdom and the slaughter of the ungodly. For much valuable information about the Wassenberg preachers cf. Karl Rembert's *Die "Wiedertäufer" in Herzogtum Jülich*, Berlin, 1899. A. H. N.] They found support among the gilds, and Rothmann, although in the beginning an opponent of the enthusiasts, had met their views in the sixteen articles. Thus there was on the one side a conservative Lutheran party, relying upon the council as the Evangelical authority, led by Johann von der Wieck, and striving after a union with the Schmalkald league, on the other side the enthusiasts, relying upon the democracy and led by Rothmann. Philip of Hesse acted as mediator, at the same time being the go-between of town and bishop. Under the influence of Roll, Rothmann began to preach against the Lord's Supper and baptism, while Hermann Staprade, one of the Wassenberg preachers, became second preacher of the church of St. Lambert, and under their influence the people were carried away to iconoclasm. A disputation was held on Aug. 7 and 8, 1533, in order to settle the differences among the Evangelicals. The conservative side was represented by Professor Hermann von dem Busche of Marburg, while Rothmann, Vinne, Klopriss, and others represented the enthusiasts. The result was unfavorable to the conservatives; Rothmann defended his view that the baptism of children is unscriptural, Busch desisted from a reply, and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was not discussed at all. Consequently the ordinance of the council against innovations remained without effect since Rothmann and his adherents openly defied it (Sept. 17). Thereupon the council closed the churches and deposed Rothmann from his ministerial office, but the gilds and commoners gained for him liberty to preach. In this distress the Lutherans united with the Roman

Catholics and the bishop; in consequence Roll, Staprade, Vinne, and Stralen were banished, while Rothmann was forbidden to preach. Thus the situation which obtained after the conclusion of peace in Feb., 1533, seemed to be restored, and the council concluded to establish Evangelical church institutions with the aid of preachers sent by the Landgrave of Hesse. A church order was called into life, and the pulpits were occupied by Evangelical preachers.

4. Anabaptist Radicalism in Control.

In Jan., 1534, there followed a change by reason of the adoption in Münster of the ideas of Melchior Hoffmann (q.v.). Hitherto the Wassenberg tendency, mitigated by Evangelical conservative precedents, had dominated the adherents of Rothmann, i.e., the Lord's Supper had been celebrated as a Passover meal and the necessity of the baptism of children energetically refuted, without, however, drawing any antitrinitarian or Anabaptist inferences. But after the summer of 1533 Melchiorites flocked into the city and amalgamated with the Wassenberg people. In Dec., 1533, the banished preachers returned to the city, and the appearance of two disciples of Jan Matthys in Jan., 1534, gained the victory for Melchioritism. Jan Matthys, a baker of Haarlem, who regarded himself as the promised Enoch, was penetrated by Hoffmann's idea of the expansion of the Gospel of the covenant. Rothmann, Klopriss, Vinne, Roll, Stralen, and Staprade were baptized, while within eight days the number of baptized persons increased to 1,400. An attempt of the council to expel the preachers again failed. A covenant of the baptized was formed after the arrival of Johann Bockhold or Jan Bockelson (generally known by his assumed name John of Leyden, q.v.) and Gert tom Kloster at the invitation of Matthys (Jan. 13). The Dutchmen found the ready support of the democracy, especially of Knipperdolling, the fanatical champion of government by the people, and gained the support also of the preachers. Their adherents were pledged to certain articles of faith, the so-called Articles of Münster, which in the refusal of obedience to "pagan" authority followed the Dutch type, and in Feb., 1534, John of Leyden and Knipperdolling began to proclaim the segregation of the communion of the just before the divine judgment of wrath. On Feb. 11 they obtained by force the guaranty of entire freedom of faith, completing thereby the victory of Anabaptism over the party of order. The adherents of the latter left the city, while the Anabaptists in unbridled fanaticism successfully carried on a most active propaganda. Jan Matthys now entered Münster; Knipperdolling became burgermaster; the populace spoiled and devastated the monasteries and the cathedral; while all the "godless" were expelled. Appealing to Acts ii., Jan Matthys began with the introduction of the community of goods, for the administration of which seven "deacons" were installed. On Mar. 15, all books in the city were burnt, with the exception of the Bible which became the law book of the "New Jerusalem." A bloody defeat subdued the opposition of the citizens.

5. Anabaptist Theocracy; Siege of the City.

In the mean time the bishop had prepared a regular siege which was strengthened by the aid of Cleve, Cologne, and Hesse. The radicalism and fatalism which characterized Hoffmann's principles induced the besieged for the time being to desist from attempts at organization, and the same defects led Jan Matthys on Apr. 5, on the basis of a supposed revelation, to make a sally in which he found his death. John of Leyden became his successor. He completed the organization of the "New Jerusalem" by overthrowing the old municipal constitution and replacing it with a divinely revealed constitution of Israel. "Twelve elders of the twelve tribes of Israel" assumed all worldly and spiritual power in Münster. John of Leyden was appointed speaker of the elders and at the same time had charge of the military forces. These were now organized so excellently that the besieged gained continual victories over the besieging forces of the bishop. Following the example of the patriarchs, on the basis of Gen. i. 28 and an inference from I Tim. iii. 2 to the effect that the common man had more than one wife, induced also by the social anomaly of a great surplus of women, John of Leyden introduced polygamy; Rothmann even took nine wives. These conditions led the more considerate citizens to a final attempt to overcome the movement. With about two hundred adherents Heinrich Mollenhecke, a blacksmith, succeeded in capturing John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, Rothmann, and other leaders, but the energy of the Anabaptists prevented the opening of the gates and surrender of the town into the hands of the bishop, released the captured leaders, and took bloody vengeance on the opponents so that the control of the prophets became absolute. On Aug. 31 John of Leyden was proclaimed king over the chosen people and ruler of the world (Jer. xxiii. 2–6; Ezek. xxxvii. 21 sqq.). The new king immediately constructed his court; Knipperdolling became viceroy, Rothmann court preacher, and other officers such as chancellor, butler, court tailor, were added, in spite of the community of goods. Divara, the beautiful widow of Matthys, became queen. Special coins were struck with the inscription John i. 14, iii. 5. In accordance with Matt. x. the mission of twenty-seven apostles was proclaimed, but they were soon captured and put to death. To further the cause, Rothmann published about this time his book, *Restitution rechter und gesunder christlicher Lehre*, according to which the restoration began with Luther, but was completed by Melchior Hoffmann, Matthys and John of Leyden. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only authority, the incarnation of Christ is to be conceived in a Melchioritic sense, free will plays a part in the work of redemption of Christ, baptism is of instructed adults only, the communion of persons baptized in this way forms the church, Christ's kingdom is earthly. Another work, *Büchlein von der Rache*, called forth by the fate of the Anabaptist apostles, attempted to prove from passages of the Bible that the day of the destruction of the godless as the harbinger of the kingdom of peace (Jer. xxxi.) had arrived. But owing to the vigilance of the besieging forces, the invasion of outside converts was inconsiderable, the sectarians could neither break the siege nor avoid a famine, while the bishop continually received reinforcements on terms agreed upon in Coblenz on Dec. 13, 1534, to the effect that after the capture of the city a new government should be instituted only with the consent of the princes. Prophecies of the king, awakened by repeated expectations of reinforcement from Holland, did not confirm the wavering trust of the citizens in their ruler. Increasingly the citizens responded to the promises of the bishop by deserting, and attempts at mediation failed. Rothmann's publication, *Von Verborgenheit der Schrift des Reiches Christi und dem Tage des Herrn*, could not conceal the fact that the "day of the Lord" was not imminent. At a diet in Worms (Apr. 4, 1535) the bishop succeeded in winning the imperial cities to the aid of the besieging army so that now almost the entire empire was represented before Münster, while John of Leyden was compelled to dismiss the old men, women, and children from the city on account of the famine; about 1,600 armed men were left.

6. Capture of the City; Punishment of the Leaders.

By the aid of treason, about 400 of the besiegers succeeded in entering the city on the night of June 24–25, 1535, and on the following day it was captured. The soldiers were merciless. The king and queen, Knipperdolling and Krechting were captured, while Rothmann seems to have sought and met death. On June 29, the bishop himself entered the town and the dream of the "New Jerusalem" was at an end. The possessions of the Anabaptists were offered for sale; half the spoil and all munitions were left to the bishop. On July 13 a solemn service of thanksgiving was held in the cathedral. But the most difficult problem now arose of regulating religious affairs in Münster, because of the opposition between Roman Catholics and Protestants. The Protestant party under the leadership of Philip of Hesse demanded the restoration of the treaty of Feb. 14, 1533, while the Roman Catholics with the cathedral chapter, the nobility, and the cities of the bishopric agreed upon the form of religion "which was approved by the emperor and the empire," with the removal of some abuses (July 19). A diet of Worms on Nov. 1 decreed the restoration of Catholicism and of the old municipal constitution. The bishop, however, resented these decrees as forced upon him against his will, and set up a new "order" which brought the rule of the city almost entirely under his influence, thus depriving the Protestants of all opportunity to regain their former privileges. John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, and Krechting were imprisoned. A final offer of the king to give him his life on condition that the Anabaptists keep silence was refused. The captives were led to Münster, tried, and cruelly tortured to death at the early dawn of Jan. 22, 1536; their corpses were hung up in iron baskets on the tower of the church of St. Lambert. The fall of Münster was catastrophic for the entire Anabaptist movement. Theologians like Luther, Melanchthon, Menius, Corvinus, and Cochlæus vied with each other in attacking the writings of Rothmann and of Anabaptists in general. Hand in hand with the fall of Anabaptism went the destruction of democratic tendencies, and the fall of Münster confirmed the power of the sovereign. Even in Moravia and Hesse toleration of Anabaptism ceased. On the other hand, the doctrine itself underwent a process of purification, in so far as Menno Simons (see SIMONS, MENNO), its regenerator, began with combating the idea of the earthly kingdom of John of Leyden. [It should be borne in mind that only a fraction of the so-called "Anabaptists" were involved in this effort to set up the kingdom of Christ by force, acting under the influence of chiliastic and theocratic ideas induced largely by terrible persecution and despair. A. H. N.] For the general background of the movement, see ANABAPTISTS, II.

(W. KÖHLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: U. Rhegius, *Widderlegung der münsterischen newen Valentinianer und Donatisten Bekentnus*, Wittenberg, 1535; C. Erhard, *Gründlich Historia der münsterischen Wiedertäufer*, Munich, 1589; H. Dorpius, *Warhafftige Historia wie das Evangelium zu Münster angefangen, und darnach durch die Widerthuffer verstört, wider auffgehört*, ed. Merschmann, Magdeburg, 1847; H. von Kerssenbroch, *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer zu Münster*, ed. H. Detmer, 2 vols., Münster, 1899–1900 (Kerssenbroch's *Leben und Schriften*, critically edited with indexes, containing much important information concerning religious, social, and literary conditions in Münster). For the English reader two discussions from different points of view are accessible in A. H. Newman, *Hist. of Anti-Pedobaptism*, chaps. xxi., xxii., Philadelphia, 1897; and J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, vol. v., chap. vii., St. Louis, 1903. Consult further: C. A. Cornelius, *Die münsterische Humanisten*, Münster, 1851; idem, *Berichte der Augenzeugen über das münsterische Wiedertäuferreich*, n.p., 1853; idem, *Geschichte des münsterischen Aufruhrs*, Leipsic, 1855–60; idem, *Die nederländischen Wiedertäufer während der Belagerung Münsters*, Münster, 1869; H. W. Erbkam, *Geschichte der protestantischen Sekten*, Gotha, 1848; T. de Bussière, *Des Anabaptistes . . . et du regne de Jean Bockelsohn à Münster*, Paris, 1853; K. Hase, *Das Reich der Wiedertäufer*, Leipsic, 1860; idem, *Neue Propheten*, 3d ed., ib. 1893; K. W. Bouterwek, *Zur Literatur und Geschichte der Wiedertäufer*, Bonn, 1864; L. Keller, *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer und ihres Reichs zu Münster*, Münster, 1880; K. Pearson, in the *Modern Review*, Jan.–Apr., 1884; T. Kielstra, *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, Leyden, 1888; L. Schauenberg, *Die Täuferbewegung in . . . Oldenberg-Delmenhorst*, Oldenberg, 1888; K. Kautsky, *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*, London, 1897 (pp. 216–293 contain the most favorable account yet given of the Münster kingdom); E. Tumbült, *Die Wiedertäufer*, Bielefeld, 1899; B. Bax, *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists*, London, 1903; H. Detmer, *Bilder aus den religiösen und socialen Unruhen in Münster*, i.–iii., Münster, 1903–04; idem and R. Krumbholtz, *B. Rothmann, Die münsterschen Wiedertäufers, 2 Schriften*, Dortmund, 1904. On the individual leaders so far as not treated in this work, consult *ADB* under their names.

MUENSTER, BISHOPRIC OF: An ancient bishopric in Westphalia, originally comprising the Saxon territory between the Lippe and the Ems, bounded on the south by the diocese of Cologne and on the west by that of Utrecht. It is probable that the first missionary work here was done by clerics from the latter diocese, for when it was organized as a separate bishopric Charlemagne appointed a Frisian priest, Liudger (q.v.), as its first bishop. The exact date can not be determined; Liudger (q.v.) was still an abbot on Jan. 13, 802, and is designated as a bishop on Apr. 23, 805. The fact of his Frisian origin brought about the inclusion in his jurisdiction of five Frisian districts to the north of the Lippe, extending down to the mouth of the Ems. (A. Hauck.)

For the first two centuries after the foundation of the see, the population of Westphalia was scanty and exclusively agricultural. Towns grew up first around the monasteries which Liudger founded in connection with the episcopal sees, as is witnessed by the name of Münster, which supplanted the old name Mimigernæford, Mimigardevord. The high position assigned by Charlemagne to the Saxon bishoprics placed temporal jurisdiction in the bishops' hands from the beginning. In the twelfth century this was increased by rich donations, and after the death of Duke Henry the Lion in 1180 Bishop Hermann II., Count of Katzenelnbogen (1174–1203), assumed the ducal powers in his diocese. His successors exercised similar rights, recognizing only the emperor as their overlord in temporal matters. These rights were stubbornly contested in the Frisian part of the diocese, and not fully acknowledged until 1276. In the thirteenth century the chapter held the position of first estate of the diocese, the nobility taking the second, and the towns, under the leadership of Münster, the third. But the two latter strove incessantly to increase their power, even by force of arms. Otto IV., Count of Hoya (1392–1404), established firmly the power which the bishopric long enjoyed in Westphalia. The introduction of the Reformation teachings in 1524 was supported by the independent spirit of the populace, and the town became a center of Anabaptist disturbances (see Münster, Anabaptists in). But with the election of Ernest, elector of Bavaria and archbishop of Cologne (1585–1612), the conflict was decided in favor of the predominance of the Roman Catholic religion, although the extent of the diocese was notably diminished during the sixteenth century. The ecclesiastical boundaries of the diocese were enlarged by the bull *De salute animarum* in 1821, and it now consists of 366 parishes, with a Roman Catholic population of nearly a million. For a list of the bishops 809–1522 cf. Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiii. 538–539.

Bibliography: Sources are: R. Wilmans and F. Philippi, *Kaiserurkunden der . . . Westfalen*, 2 vols., Münster, 1867–81; *Regesta historiæ Westfaliæ*, ed. H. A. Erhard, 2 vols., ib. 1847–51; *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, vol. iii., ed. R. Wilmans, ib. 1871; *Die Geschichtsquellen des Bistums Münster*, ib. 1851 sqq., Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 424; A. Tibus, *Gründungsgeschichte der Stifter . . . des alten Bistums Münster*, ib. 1867; A. Calmet, *Hist. de l'abbaye de Münster*, Colimar, 1882; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 406–407; R. Stapfer, *Die älteste Agende des Bistums Münster*, Münster, 1905.

MUENTER, münʹter, **FRIEDRICH CHRISTIAN KARL HEINRICH:** Danish bishop; b. at Gotha, Saxe-Coburg, Germany, Oct. 14, 1761; d. at Copenhagen Apr. 9, 1830. He studied philology and theology at the University of Copenhagen, and church history at Göttingen. He was appointed professor of theology at the University of Copenhagen, 1787, in 1808 succeeding to the bishopric of Zealand. Münter was a prolific writer, and several of his works pertaining to church history are still of value. His principal works are a handbook on the history of the doctrinal theology of the oldest Christian church (2 vols., Copenhagen, 1801–4); a history of the Danish Reformation (2 vols., 1802); an exposition of the religion of the Carthaginians (1816; 2d ed., 1821); and a church history of Denmark and Norway (3 vols., 1823–33). Of great importance were also his "Symbols and Art-Notions of the Ancient Christians" (2 vols., 1825); and *Primordia ecclesiæ Africanæ* (1829), which for a long time was the principal guide for students of the oldest history of the African church. As a theologian Münter was distinctly a historian, not a systematist. He had no firm theological or philosophical standpoint, but was always an ardent advocate of peace. He believed in the "divinity of Christianity," but his theology was leavened with rationalism. As a teacher he was successful only with those who shared his interest for archeology. (F. Nielsen†.)

Bibliography: J. P. Mynster, in *TSK*, vi (1833); B. Münter, *Familien Münters Stamtavle*, Copenhagen, 1901.

MUENZER, müntʹser, THOMAS.

His Youth (§ 1).
Activities at Zwickau (§ 2).
In Bohemia. Works upon the Liturgy (§ 3).
Revolutionary Teaching in Alstedt (§ 4).
Expulsion from Alstedt and Mühlhausen (§ 5).
Events Leading to the Peasants' War (§ 6).

1. His Youth.

Thomas Muenzer, a prominent enthusiast of the time of the Reformation and a leader in the Peasants' War (q.v.), was born at Stolberg in the Harz Mountains (50 m. s.e. of Brunswick), before 1490; beheaded at Mühlhausen in Saxony (29 m. n.w. of Erfurt) May 27, 1525. Of his youth only a few incidents are known. In 1506 he entered the University of Leipsic, and in 1512 he was a student in the University of Frankfort. In the first half of 1513 he was engaged in Halle in a league against Archbishop Ernst of Magdeburg; in 1515 he was provost in Frohse near Aschersleben, after which he seems to have led a wandering life for several years. In the beginning of 1519 he was at Leipsic, where he still lived at the time of the disputation. He seems to have made a good impression upon Luther, as the latter recommended him to Johann Silvanus of Eger (Egranus), at that time preacher in Zwickau. At the end of 1519 he was confessor of the Bernardine nuns in the monastery of Beutitz near Weissenfels. But he found it impossible to stay in one place for any length of time, and at Beutitz was soon involved in difficulties. He evidently had no serious conception of his duties, as appears from a statement of Luther to the effect that he often omitted the formula for the transformation of the elements in the administration of the Lord's Supper. It is hardly to be assumed that he ever acknowledged the authority of the Wittenberg circle, considering his independent nature; but the new movement had seized him, as appears from his study of Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, and of the acts of the Councils of Constance and Basel. The study of the *Theologia Germanica* (q.v.) recommended by Luther, and of the works of Tauler and other mystics exercised a not inconsiderable influence upon him.

With the approval of Luther he followed in 1520 a call to Zwickau where Egranus had introduced

2. Activities at Zwickau.

the Reformation and had become involved in disputes with the monks. During a temporary absence of Egranus, Münzer became his substitute as first preacher of the principal church in Zwickau. His first sermons betrayed his radical tendencies through his vehement attacks on the pastoral activity of the monks, whom he accused of avarice and deceitfulness, securing thereby the favor of the citizens who disliked the mendicant friars because of their wealth. The town council did not listen to the complaints of the Roman Catholics, but requested Duke John to prohibit any molestation of the preachers of the Gospel. Münzer became more and more aggressive especially after his removal to the church of St. Catharine, on the return of Egranus. He reviled all who contradicted him, and caused them to be suspected as opponents of the Gospel. Two principles from this time directed his actions; first, the appeal to the immediate inspiration of the Spirit as guiding speech and action; secondly, the tendency to organize a communion of saints filled with the spirit. He aroused the laymen against his spiritual colleagues, gathered the elect into conventicles, and asked them to appoint twelve apostles and seventy-two disciples out of their number. "The laymen must become our prelates and pastors," he announced, and it was especially Nikolaus Storch, a cloth-weaver, whom he praised as one versed in the Bible, to whom he gave the testimony of possessing the spirit. In this way he naturally came into difficulties with his colleagues in the city, especially with Egranus, and he incited the people to their removal by force. On Apr. 16 he was deposed, and with Marcus Thomae turned to Prague in order to establish his spiritual church among the Utraquists.

3. In Bohemia. Works upon the Liturgy.

Here he preached in different churches in German and Latin and found adherents among the nobility, but his wild invectives against the clergy made it impossible for him to stay. He wandered from place to place, always announcing his spiritual gospel by pointing to the near advent of the Antichrist. In spite of his later denial, he must have had in 1522 a conversation with Luther in which vehement words were exchanged. From Nordhausen, where he sojourned at least at the end of that year, he came immediately before Easter, 1523, to Alstedt and was accepted by the council on trial as preacher of the Church of St. John. Here he began immediately those reforms of the church service known chiefly from his three liturgical works: *Deutsch kirchen ampt. Vorordnet, aufzuheben den hinterlistigen Deckel, unter welchem das liecht der Welt vorhalten war* . . . (Alstedt, n.d.); *Deutsch evangelisch Messe, etwann durch die bepstischen pfaffen im latein zu grossem nachteil des christenglaubens vor ein opfer gehandelt* (Alstedt, 1524); *Ordnung und berechnunge des teutschen ampts zu Alstadt durch Tomam Müntzer, seelwarters in vorgangen osteren aufgericht* (Alstedt, 1524). Although in comparison with other utterances these works show a certain moderation, they nevertheless betray his characteristic tendency. In the first two works he laid especial stress upon the song service; the whole liturgy, with the exception of the collects and lessons, according to him, should be sung. His third work gives an account of the arrangement of the church service as it still existed in 1523 and explains in an interesting and original manner the individual parts of the church service. All three works reveal his artistic sense, ecclesiastical taste, high endowments, and comprehensive knowledge, and they possess a high degree of originality; they reveal also the purpose to build up and not to tear down. Nevertheless the increasing disfavor of Luther may be easily explained. He was offended by the strong emphasis laid upon the Spirit, still more by the low estimate placed on the sermon and by the polemical attitude against the Wittenberg circle and the formality of the church service. Münzer's inflammatory speeches induced Count Ernst of Mansfeld to prohibit attendance upon Münzer's services. Münzer violently attacked and reviled the count, and in a letter addressed to the elector on Oct. 4, 1523, he offered himself to be tried according to divine right, but the elector was satisfied with the promise of Münzer to desist in the future from utterances in the pulpit which were not profitable for the instruction of the people. Thus Münzer had gained his point, and without hindrance continued his insurrectionary sermons.

4. Revolutionary Teaching in Alstedt.

In the beginning of 1524 he issued *Protestation oder empictung Tome Müntzers von Stolberg am Hartzs seelwarters zu Alstedt seine leren betreffende vnnd tzum anfang von dem rechten Christen glawben, vnnd der Tawffe*, which was soon followed by *Von dem getichten glawben auff nechst Protestation aussgangen Tome Müntzers Selwerters zu Alstedt*. The former publication, in which he assumed the manner of an apostle or prophet, was an attack on the doctrine of the Wittenberg theologians, although Luther himself is not mentioned. It aims to refute the doctrine of infant baptism on the ground that Christ did not baptize children, and that there is no evidence of the baptism of Mary or of the disciples. He concludes that baptism is not properly understood, and that its use in Christianity has become a "bestial apish play." The principal point, according to him, centers in immediate inspiration by the Spirit of God. He declares also against the authority of the Scripture. The doctors of the Bible, he says, have no other faith or spirit than that which they have stolen from Scripture; but that is not the right kind of faith; this must be taught immediately by God, man must wait until he attains it by the work of God, otherwise it is worth nothing. In spite of its obscurity, Münzer's doctrine found great acclamation. From all sides people flocked to hear the sermons of the great prophet. He gathered his "elect" into leagues, appealing to II Chron. xxiii. 16; strangers were also welcomed, and in one day he received about 300 converts. His evident purpose was the violent suppression of everything that according to his opinion contradicted the Gospel. In the spring of 1524 citizens of Alstedt stormed the near-by chapel of Mallerbach to which pilgrims used to resort, and carried away its treasures, since Münzer preached open rebellion against the princes. It is evident that Münzer had been seized by the idea, then dominating wide circles, of a great revolution to come in the year 1524, and he felt himself called upon to assist in its fulfilment. When a member of the council was arrested on account of his participation in the attack at the chapel, he ordered the alarm-bell to be rung, and immediately an armed mob arose; even women seized pitchforks in order to protect their council and preachers against possible attack. Nevertheless, the princes found no way to intervene. At the same time Münzer's invectives against the Wittenberg Reformers became more violent, especially against Luther's doctrine of Scripture. When the people of Sangerhausen were forbidden by the authorities to attend his sermons, he preached rebellion against the tyrants, and in fearful threatenings denounced the princes. On July 13, 1524, Elector Friedrich and Duke Johann came to Alstedt and permitted Münzer to deliver before them a sermon in which in vehement terms he demanded the use of force against the godless and those that practised idolatry: "The vicious lazy Christians must be eradicated if the princes are not willing to do it" (*Ausslegung des andern vnterschyds Danielis*, etc., Alstedt, 1524). Duke Johann on this occasion pledged him to subject his writings to the censor, but the other proposal to be tried before the Wittenberg circle Münzer indignantly rejected and yet remained unmolested. The excitement increased on hearing that people who had fled from Sangerhausen for the sake of the Gospel and others who had attended the sermons of Münzer and were captured were to be delivered to the authorities. Thereupon Münzer preached on July 24 that sword must be met by sword, and his following was convinced that no harm could come to them if a struggle should result.

5. Expulsion from Alstedt and Mühlhausen.

In the mean time Luther had seen the sermon preached before the princes and at the end of July wrote his famous *Sendbrief an den Fürsten zu Sachsen vom aufrührerischen Geist* in which he instructed the authorities in their duties in regard to the rebellion. Consequently Münzer was tried on Aug. 1 before Duke Johann and his councilors at Weimar. Although he denied many things, he was convicted of rebellious actions and dismissed until the elector should dispose of him further. Münzer then offered himself to be tried for the purpose of defending his doctrine against the "mendacious Luther" before the Christianity of all nations. He did not wait for the elector's answer, but after his return to Alstedt the council opposed him, and he secretly left the city on Aug. 7. Shortly before that he had written a new work, *Aussgetrückte emplössung des falschen Glaubens der vngetrewen welt, durchs gezeugnis des Euangelions Luce, etc.*, which offers the best insight into his doctrine. From Alstedt Münzer went to Mühlhausen. In this small but industrious imperial city Evangelical preachers had been active for some time, among them Heinrich Pfeiffer, a native of Mühlhausen and formerly a monk in the monastery of Reiffenstein in the Eichsfeld, a man gifted with great energy and stirring eloquence. His sermons and those of his associates, being directed more against the hated priests and monks than toward the preaching of the Gospel, fell upon fertile soil, since the people were dissatisfied with the avaricious and immoral life of the clergy and the autocratic and arbitrary rule of the council. The priests' houses were despoiled, and after an insurrection the council was compelled to admit participation in the government by the citizens. Nevertheless, toward the end of Aug., 1523, Pfeiffer and his associates were banished from the city. Toward the end of the year Pfeiffer was again in Mühlhausen and found many adherents, and although these entered the church about Easter, 1524, and broke the images, the council did not dare to interfere and was satisfied with the prohibition to shelter the preacher. In this town Münzer expected to find what he sought. A warning letter from Luther, dated Aug. 21, 1524, and addressed to the council, arrived too late. At first people hesitated to allow Münzer to preach, but finally they consented. He entered into the closest connection with Pfeiffer, and more and more the opponents of the old government of the city united with the religious innovators. Churches and monasteries were ravaged, pictures removed, relics torn out and disfigured. The preachers surrounded themselves with armed mobs. Münzer instructed the people that they were not obliged to obey the authorities and without compromise announced the duty to persecute and expel all not following the spiritual life. The tumult increased in such a way that a number of councilors escaped their responsibility by flight. For the radicals the time seemed to have arrived to obtain their demands. Münzer and Pfeiffer issued twelve articles in which was urged the deposition of the old council and the installation of a new council that should order and judge according to the Word of God. The articles were distributed in the neighboring villages, but did not find a favorable reception, and the council once more succeeded in gaining the upper hand, whereupon Münzer and Pfeiffer were expelled on Sept. 28, 1524.

6. Events Leading to the Peasants' War.

Both turned to the South and reappeared in Nuremberg, where Münzer found a printer for his lampoon on Luther with which he intended to avenge himself for his expulsion from Saxony, *Hoch verursachte Schutzrede und Antwort wider das geistlose, sanftlebende Fleisch zu Wittenberg welches mit verkehrter Weise durch den Diebstahl der heiligen Schrift die erbärmliche Christenheit also ganz jämmerlich besudelt hat.* Before the council of Nuremberg was aware, he had disappeared. He traveled south, and his works on baptism and faith as well as his inimical attitude to Luther had directed the attention to him even in Zürich in the circle of the Anabaptists. In Griessen, a little village between Waldshut and Schaffhausen, he became personally acquainted with the Zürich Friends; and their communistic tendencies have not without reason been traced to Münzer's influence. In places like Klettgau and Hegau, where all was already in a state of ferment, he delivered inflammatory speeches, and by them as well as by his writings he unsettled the conditions more and more. Münzer longed to be back at Mühlhausen, where his wife had remained, but did not return at the earliest before the beginning of 1525. Pfeiffer had meanwhile returned and had renewed his inflammatory course of action. They both preached openly on the necessity of rebellion, Pfeiffer taking the leading part, since he was the very man to transform Münzer's theories into actuality. The communistic element became more prominent and the number of radicals increased. At the same time warlike preparations were made and men were drilled as soldiers. On Mar. 16 the council was deposed under the leadership of Pfeiffer, and a new council was instituted upon the principles established by the preachers. Münzer held the great mass of the people, but his influence was still greater in Thuringia and in the Harz Mountains, where he incited the people by letters and by the formation of leagues. The inevitable consequences of Münzer's agitation now appeared. From the South the peasants' movement approached and spread over the whole of Thuringia, the Eichsfeld and the Harz regions. The spiritual center was Mühlhausen with its preachers, though Münzer did not appear as the real leader. People were not willing to follow him blindly, and there were also disagreements with Pfeiffer which hindered a uniform advance. While Pfeiffer's marauding expeditions into the Eichsfeld occupied a part of the insurgent forces and carried everywhere devastation and destruction, Philipp of Hesse approached after defeating the peasants around Hersfeld and Fulda, and at the same time the peasants who had gathered in the neighborhood of Frankenhausen were threatened by Duke Georg and especially by Count Ernst of Mansfeld. On May 10 Münzer came to their assistance, and immediately broke off the negotiations that had been entered upon with Count Albrecht of Mansfeld. In the face of the superior power of the princes the peasants again entered upon new negotiations, but by false news of victories from outside, by his eloquence and trust in victory, and by his reference to signs supposed to be given him by God, the prophet once more succeeded in deluding the hesitating people. The bloody battle of Frankenhausen on May 15 decided the issue. On the following day Münzer was captured and delivered into the hands of Count Ernst of Mansfeld at Heldrungen, was placed under torture, and Georg of Saxony and Philipp of Hesse took pains to convert him. After the surrender of Mühlhausen Münzer was led there and put to death together with Pfeiffer. (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: A "History of Münzer" printed at Hagenau, 1525, and reproduced in Walch's ed. of Luther's Works, xvi. 159 sqq., is ascribed to Melanchthon. Consult: G. T. Strobel, *Leben, Schriften und Lehren Thomä Müntzers*, Nuremberg, 1791; J. K. Seidemann, *Thomas Münzer*, Dresden, 1842; K. E. Förstemann, *Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenreformation*, i. 228, Hamburg, 1842; O. Merx, *Thomas Münzer und Heinrich Pfeiffer 1523–25*, Göttingen, 1889; A. H. Newman, *Hist. of Anti-Pedobaptism*, pp. 67–86, Philadelphia, 1897; K. Kautsky, *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*, pp. 90–154, London, 1897 (sympathetic and apologetic); H. E. Jacobs, *Martin Luther*, pp. 253 sqq. et passim, New York, 1898; R. Jordan, *Chronik der Stadt Mülhausen*, vol. i., Mühlhausen, 1900; idem, *Zur Geschichte der Stadt Mühlhausen*, parts i.–ii., ib. 1901–02; E. Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts*, i. 470 sqq., Leipsic, 1902; H. C. Vedder, *Balthasar Hübmaier*, pp. 97, 105–107, 160, 162, New York, 1905; H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1905; Moeller, *Christian Church*, iii. 36, 62, 88, 93.

MUEZZIN, mū-ez'zin (**MUEDDIN**): The official attached to a Mohammedan mosque, whose business it is to chant the *azan* (from which the word muezzin is formed with the aid of the preformative), or call of the faithful to prayer, five times each day. The call is sounded from the minaret, if the mosque has one, otherwise from the side of the mosque. The words of the call are: "Allah is most great (four times); I testify that there is no God but Allah (twice); I testify that Mohammed is the apostle of Allah (twice); come to prayer (twice); come to salvation (twice); Allah is most great (twice); there is no god but Allah." In the early morning call, after the words "Come to salvation," the Muezzin adds "Prayer is better than sleep" (twice).

MUFTI: The title of an official in Mohammedan, particularly Turkish, countries, whose duty it is to assist the judge or cadi by expounding the law. He must be familiar with the Koran, with the body of Mohammedan tradition, as well as with the works on law, as it is part of his work to cite decisions already made in similar cases.

Bibliography: D. B. Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory*, pp. 115, 184, 276, 277, New York, 1903.

MUGGLETON, LODOWICK, MUGGLETONIANS: English sectarian and the followers of him and John Reeve (1608–58); b. in Walnut Tree Yard, off Bishopsgate Street Without, London, July, 1609; d. at London Mar. 14, 1698. Apprenticed as a tailor, he went as a journeyman to his cousin John Reeve (1608–58) in 1631, who converted him to Puritanism, and in 1647 he withdrew from all worship, adopting an agnostic position. In 1650 he was attracted by the declaration of the two so-called prophets, John Robins, a "ranter," and Thomas Taney, a predecessor of the Anglo-Israelites, whose crude pantheism took hold of him; at the same time he read Jacob Boehme (q.v.). He drew also Reeve to his views. The latter in 1652 professed personal communications, appointing him messenger and Muggleton mouthpiece of a new dispensation; and as the two witnesses (Rev. xi. 3) they set forth as prophets of a new system of faith. They gathered a large following and the sect continued till the last century, Joseph Gauder (d. 1868) being reported as the last adherent.

The element of spirituality was contributed by Reeve. He distinguished between faith and reason as respectively the divine and demoniac elements in man (the doctrine of two-seeds), and shared with the Socinians a frank anthropomorphism and a belief that the mortality of the soul is to be remedied by a physical resurrection. The harder outlines, including the rejection of prayer, came from Muggleton. His philosophy is epicurean, holding that after the divine being had fixed the machinery of the world and placed a conscience in man, he took no further notice of the world until the revelation to Reeve. The devil is a human being, narratives of miracles are mostly parables, the sun travels around the earth, and heaven is calculated to be six miles off. " Earth and water were not created, but self-originated; the evil one became incarnate in Eve; the Father was the sufferer on the cross, having left Elijah to govern heaven while he came on earth to die " (J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies*, p. 355, Philadelphia, 1874). In 1853–54 Muggleton and Reeve were tried and imprisoned for denying the Trinity.

Bibliography: Consult the *Works* of Reeve and Muggleton, ed. J. and I. Frost, London, 1832; idem, *A List of Books and General Index to Reeve and Muggleton's Works*, ib. 1846; *A Modest Account of the Wicked Life of . . . L. M.*, in *Harleian Miscellany*, vols. i., viii., London, 1808–13; *Transactions of the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society*, 1868–70. Muggleton's autobiography is prefixed to his own *Acts of the Witnesses*, 1699.

MUHLENBERG, WILLIAM AUGUST: Protestant Episcopalian clergyman, poet, and philanthropist; b. in Philadelphia Sept. 16, 1796; d. in New York Apr. 8, 1877. His great-grandfather was Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, his grandfather Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, and his father Henry William Muhlenberg, and he was baptized in the Lutheran communion, but while a little boy made choice of the Episcopal Church. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1814, and at once entered on his theological studies under Bishop White, by whom he was ordained deacon in 1817, and whose assistant he became in Christ Church. On his ordination as priest, 1820, he accepted a call to the rectorship of St. James', Lancaster, Pa., where he remained six years, and where he did much toward the advancement of public education. He occupied himself also at this time in church hymnody; wrote a *Plea for Christian Hymns*, that was circulated at the special General Convention of 1821, and which, with other measures, resulted in 1826 in the adoption of a collection of hymns prepared by a committee of which he was the chief worker. His own well-known hymn, " I would not live alway," was written in Lancaster in 1824, and first printed in the Philadelphia *Episcopal Recorder*, in 1826. He declared that a myth had grown up about his famous hymn and that it was not written under the depression of a ruptured engagement of marriage. But, convinced that it was too gloomy, he worked it over and thus enlarged and " evangelized " it (cf. the publication mentioned below).

He championed the Christianizing of education, the union, in some practical form, of the Evangelical bodies of Christendom, and Christian brotherhood as exemplifying itself in institutions of charity and beneficence for the poor and oppressed. On leaving Lancaster in 1826, he became rector of St. George's, Flushing, L. I., N. Y., and there opened a school in 1828, when he relinquished his charge. In 1838 he joined the school to St. Paul's College, of which he was rector till 1846, when he entered on the pastorate of the Free Church of the Holy Communion, New York, the building of which was erected by his sister, Mrs. Mary A. Rogers. He was the originator of numerous important movements in the Episcopal Church (see Deaconess, III., 2, d. § 2), and the methods he employed in his schools became most popular, being widely applied in other institutions. It was during his ministry in this church that he enunciated most emphatically those " Evangelical Catholic " principles which he believed to be the true theory of the Christian Church, and which are signally expressed in *The Muhlenberg Memorial* (cf. *Evangelical Catholic Papers*, New York, 1875). His grandest exemplifications of Christian brotherhood are the institutions of St. Luke's Hospital, New York, opened in 1859, with himself as its first pastor and superintendent; and the Church Village of St. Johnland on Long Island, incorporated in 1870. " The incarnation was the central idea of his theology and the inspiration of his Christian life —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. His works embrace *I would not live alway, and Other Pieces* (New York, 1859; reissued with *The Story of the Hymn, and a Brief Account of St. Johnland*, 1871); *Evangelical Sisterhoods; in Two Letters to a Friend* (1867); *Christ and the Bible; not the Bible and Christ* (1869); and his *Evangelical Catholic Papers; Compiled by Anne Ayres* (1875).

Bibliography: Biographies have been written by E. Harwood and G. D. Wildes, New York, 1877; A. Ayres, ib. 1880, new ed., 1884 (the standard); and W. W. Newton, Boston, 1890. Consult also E. A. Washburn, *Sermons in Memorial of W. A. Muhlenberg*, New York, 1877.

MUIR, PEARSON M'ADAM: Church of Scotland; b. at Creetown (32 m. s.w. of Dumfries), Kirkcudbrightshire, Jan. 26, 1846. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, after which he was minister at Catrine, Ayrshire (1870–72), Polmont, Stirlingshire (1872–80), Morningside, Edinburgh (1880–96), and Glasgow Cathedral (since 1896); also secretary of the Church Service Society (1888–1907). By appointment of the General Assembly he was lecturer on pastoral theology in the universities of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Edinburgh in 1895–97 and 1902–06. He has written *Samuel Rutherford* (St. Giles Lectures on Scottish Divines; Edinburgh, 1882); *The Church of Scotland: A Sketch of its History* (1890); *Religious Writers of England* (1901); and *Modern Substitutes for Christianity* (Baird lecture; 1909); and contributed the section on the monuments and inscriptions in Glasgow Cathedral to G. E. Todd's *Book of Glasgow Cathedral*, 1898).

MULBERG, JOHANNES: Dominican monk and anticipator of the Reformation; b. at Klein-Basel in the middle of the fourteenth century; d. in Maulbronn in 1414. He was the son of a cobbler and devoted himself up to his twentieth year to his father's handicraft. He then first attended school and soon afterward entered the Dominican order. With fervent zeal he participated in the efforts for the reformation of his order and won many cloisters for the reform movement, especially in South Germany. He soon became one of the most successful and esteemed public speakers. From 1400 he began, in Basel, the struggle against the Beghards and Beguines (q.v.), who found earnest defenders in the Franciscans. From 1405 to 1411, he sojourned in Italy, and remained, after the Council of Pisa, under the obedience of Gregory XII. When he returned to Basel in 1411, he sharply assailed the moral shortcomings of the clergy in his sermons and, in a prophetic vein, announced to them a great judgment. Driven from Basel as a schismatic and heretic, he died, widely revered as a god-sent prophet. Among his works, the controversial writings against the Beguines are noteworthy; these have been published in part by Haupt (*ZKG*, x. 511 sqq., 1896; cf. J. L. von Mosheim, *De Beghardis*, pp. 554 sqq., Leipsic, 1790). H. HAUPT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Wurstisen, *Bassler Chronick*, pp. 201–220, Basel, 1580; P. Ochs, *Geschichte der Stadt . . . Basel*, iii. 26–35, ib. 1819; J. F. Hautz, *Geschichte der Universität Heidelberg*, i. 240–241, ii. 364 sqq., Mannheim, 1862–1864; K. Schieler, *Magister Johannes Nider*, pp. 13, 164 sqq., Mainz, 1885; Reichert, in *Römische Quartalschrift für Altertumskunde*, xiv (1900), 84, 95, xv (1901), 128–129, 139, 148.

MULE: The hybrid of the ass and the mare, in contrast with the hinny, the offspring of the stallion and the she-ass. The mule, on account of its sure-footedness, is more serviceable than the horse in mountainous regions, though inferior both in size and strength. Mules are mentioned in the Egyptian and Assyrian records, as well as in Homer. According to the latter, they were derived principally from Mysia and Paphlagonia (Iliad, xxiv.). The Hebrews obtained these animals from Togarmah (Armenia), which was rich in horses, through the Phenicians (Ezek. xxvii. 14). They were also imported into Assyria. Among the Hebrews they are first named in David's time as saddle animals of the kings and princes (II Sam. xiii. 29; I Kings i. 33), and as beasts of burden (I Chron. xii. 40). It is evident that at this period they were somewhat rare; only later did their use become more general (I Kings xviii. 5; Zech. xiv. 15). They were sent to Solomon as tribute from conquered peoples (I Kings x. 25; II Chron. ix. 24). Whether the Hebrews themselves raised these animals in ancient times is not known; in the later legislation (Lev. xix. 19) this is forbidden. The law was, however, evaded by breeding the animals outside the land. Sennacherib carried off a great number of mules, asses, and horses as booty (according to the inscription on the famous cylinder of this king, iii. 18 sqq.); the returning exiles brought back a considerable number of mules with them, although the number of horses was three times as great (Ezra ii. 66; Neh. vii. 68). I. BENZINGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere*, ed. O. Schrader, Berlin, 1902; F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1336–1338, Paris, 1906; *DB*, iii. 456; *EB*, iii. 3224–25; *JE*, ix. 105.

MULFORD, ELISHA: Episcopalian; b. at Montrose, Susquehanna County, Pa., Nov. 19, 1833; d. at Cambridge, Mass., Dec. 9, 1885. He graduated from Yale College 1855; studied theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York, at Andover, Mass., and in Halle and Heidelberg, Germany; was ordained deacon 1859, and priest 1862; had charges at Darien, Conn., 1861; South Orange, N. J., 1861–64; Friendsville, Penn., 1877–81. From 1864 to 1877 he resided without charge at Montrose, Pa.; after 1881 he lived at Cambridge, where he lectured on apologetics in the Episcopal Divinity School. Dr. Mulford was in sympathy with the theological sentiments expressed by the school of Coleridge and Frederick Denison Maurice, and stood for the union of the utmost liberty of philosophic thought in the treatment of Christian dogmas. He was also under the influence of Richard Rothe, and was in accord with the realism of Hegel. He wrote *The Nation, the Foundation of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States* (New York, 1870, and often); and *The Republic of God, an Institute of Theology* (Boston, 1881, and often).

MULLENS, JOSEPH: English Congregationalist missionary; b. in London Sept. 2, 1820; d. at Chacombe, near Mpwapwa (200 m. w. of Zanzibar), German East Africa, July 10, 1879. He graduated from London University in 1841; in 1842 he offered himself to the London Missionary Society, and, after being ordained, sailed for India, where he began work at Bhowanipore, and was pastor of the native church there, 1846–58. While there he gathered statistics of the missions in India and Ceylon. Returning to England in 1858, he was prominent as secretary of the Liverpool Missionary Conference in 1860; in 1865 he became joint foreign secretary and in 1868 sole foreign secretary of the London Missionary Society; in 1870 he was present at the annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; and he spent the year of 1873 in a visit to Madagascar in the interest of missionary work. He was active in securing the convention of the Mildmay Conference, London, 1878. His last great desire was to establish on a permanent basis the missions of the London Society in Ujiji, Africa, and in this interest he accompanied several missionaries to Africa. Starting from Zanzibar he got no farther than Mpwapwa. His statesmanlike and administrative abilities enabled him to perform wonders for the efficiency of the London Missionary Society. His writings embrace *Vedantism, Brahminism, and Christianity Examined and Compared. A Prize Essay* (Calcutta, 1852); *Missions in South India Visited and Described* (London, 1854); *The Religious Aspects of Hindu Philosophy Stated and Discussed. A Prize Essay* (1860); *A Brief Review of Ten Years' Missionary Labor in India between 1852 and 1861. Prepared from Local Reports and Original Letters* (1863); *London and Calcutta Compared in their Heathenism, their Privileges and their Prospects* (1868); and *Twelve Months in Madagascar* (1875).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xxxix. 276–277; *London Missionary Society Chronicle*, Oct., 1879.

MULLINS, EDGAR YOUNG: Baptist; b. in Franklin Co., Miss., Jan. 5, 1860. He received his education at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas (1876–79), the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (graduated 1885), and at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; was pastor at Harrodsburg, Ky. (1885–88), of the Lee Street Baptist Church, Baltimore (1888–95); corresponding secretary of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention (1895–96); pastor of the First Church, Newton, Mass. (1896–99); has been president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and professor of theology since 1899; and is president of the Baptist Young People's Union of America. He is the author of *Why is Christianity True?* (Chicago, 1905); and *Axioms of Religion: a New Interpretation of the Baptist Faith* (Philadelphia, 1908).

MULOT, mü″lō′, **RENÉ, MULOTISTS.** See Holy Ghost, Orders and Congregations of the, II, 2.

MUNGER, THEODORE THORNTON: Congregationalist; b. at Bainbridge, N. Y., Mar. 5, 1830; d. at New Haven Jan. 11, 1910. He was graduated from Yale College (A.B., 1851) and Yale Divinity School (1855), after which he held pastorates at Dorchester, Mass. (1856–60), Haverhill, Mass. (1862–70), Lawrence, Mass. (1870–75), San José, Cal. (1875–76), North Adams, Mass. (1876–1885), and the United Church, New Haven, Conn. (after 1885; after 1891 pastor emeritus). He wrote: *On the Threshold* (Boston, 1881); *The Freedom of Faith* (1883); *Lamps and Paths* (1885); *The Appeal to Life* (1887); *Character through Inspiration* (New York, 1897); *Horace Bushnell, Preacher and Theologian* (Boston, 1899); and *Essays for the Day* (1904).

MUNGO, SAINT. See Kentigern, Saint.

MUNNU, SAINT. See Fintan, Saint.

MURATORI, mū″rā″tō′rî, **LUDOVICO ANTONIO:** Italian Roman Catholic historian; b. at Vignola (50 m. n.n.w. of Florence) Oct. 21, 1672; d. at Modena Jan. 23, 1750. He studied theology, philosophy, and law at Modena, and in 1695 was attached to the Ambrosian Library at Milan. In 1700 he was recalled to Modena as archivist and librarian, where he spent the remainder of his life, being also provost of Santa Maria della Pomposa. The results of his activity at Milan were his *Anecdota ex Ambrosianæ bibliothecæ codicibus* (4 vols., Milan and Padua, 1697–1713) and *Anecdota Græca* (Padua, 1709). Here he discovered the famous Muratorian Canon (q.v.). The controversy which broke out in 1708 between the emperor and the pope over the state and territory of Comacchio, in which Muratori was called to defend the house of Este against the papal claims, led to his first great historical work, the *Antichità Estensi ed Italiane* (2 vols., Modena, 1717–40). He then proceeded to an exhaustive collection of material for a history of Italy from the fifth to the sixteenth century. The results were his *Rerum Italicarum scriptores ab anno 500–1500* (28 vols., Milan, 1723–51), supplemented by his *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi* (6 vols., 1738–42; Italian transl. by the author, *Dissertazioni sopra le antichità italiane*, 3 vols., 1751) and his *Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum* (4 vols., 1739–43). The material thus obtained was summarized in a simple description of facts in rigid chronological order from the beginning of the Christian era to 1749, the work being entitled *Annali d'Italia* (12 vols., 1744–49). Here, too, belongs his *Liturgia Romana vetus tria sacramentaria complectens* (1748). The remaining works of Muratori, many of them under pseudonyms, were devoted either to literature, philosophy, jurisprudence, or theology. To the first class belong his *Della perfetta poesia italiana* (2 vols., 1706) and *Reflessioni sopra il buon gusto intorno le scienze e le arti* (1708); to the second his *Della Carità cristiana* (1723), *Filosofia morale esposta* (1735), *Delle forze dell'intendimento umano* (1745), and *Della forza della fantasia* (1745); and to the third his *Governo della peste politico, medico ed ecclesiastico* (1714), *Defetti della giurisprudenza* (1741), and *Della pubblica felicità* (1749). His theological writings roused much controversy, especially by his attacks on the Jesuit favoring of vows in Sicily to defend the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception even at the risk of life, and by his criticisms of certain ecclesiastical proceedings, particularly the excessive honor of the saints and the great number of holidays. To this class belong his *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio* (Paris, 1714; under the pseudonym of Lamindo Pritanio); *De superstitione vitanda sive censura voti sanguinarii* (1740; under the pseudonym of Antonius Lampridius); the pseudonymous *Ferdinandi Valdesii epistolæ* (1743), and *Della regolata divozione de' cristiani* (1747; under the pseudonym of Lamindo Pritanio). The latter class of writings exposed Muratori to the attacks of his enemies and rivals. Muratori's voluminous correspondence, hitherto either scattered in various publications or still only in manuscript, was edited by M. Campori in his *Epistolario di L. A. Muratori* (Modena, 1901 sqq.). (G. Laubmann†.)

Bibliography: Accounts of his life were written by G. F. Soli Muratori, Naples, 1758; and by A. Fabronius, in *Vitæ Italorum*, x. 89–391, 18 vols., Pisa, 1778–99. Consult further: A. von Reumont, *Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte*, iii. 215–270, 6 vols., Berlin, 1853–57; M. Landau, *Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur*, Berlin, 1899.

MURATORIAN, mū′rā′to′rî-an, CANON.

I. Description.
II. Place, Date, and Authorship.
III. Contents.
    Gospels and Acts (§ 1).
    Pauline Epistles (§ 2).
    Other Writings (§ 3).
IV. Ruling Ideas.

I. Description: The Muratorian Canon is an early manuscript fragment of importance for the history of the New-Testament canon. The manuscript upon which until lately knowledge of the contents of this canon rested entirely and still rests almost wholly is a miscellany carelessly put together, beginning with an excerpt from Eucherius. [This was discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and published by him in *Antiquitates Italicæ*, Milan, 1740.] What immediately preceded the Canon is unknown, as seven quaternions just before its abrupt opening are lost. After it comes, on the same leaf, a part of Ambrose on Abraham, which is immediately repeated. This proceeding, together with the notable variations between the two copies, sufficiently indicates the carelessness of the copyist, and shows that the frequent orthographical mistakes are his and not those of the original author. This is shown even more clearly by the recent discovery of some bits of the Muratorian Canon in four eleventh- or twelfth-century Latin manuscripts of Paul's epistles at Monte Cassino. The compiler of the prologue in which these occur can not have used the Milan manuscript, as is shown by many details; and the fact that he worked from an independent source not only demonstrates that the poor Latin of the Milan text is not that of the original author, but increases confidence in the substantial fidelity of the text as we have it. But even after a collation of the newly found extracts, there are still questions which can be solved only by conjecture. The most important of the hypotheses naturally formed is that the fragment is a translation of a Greek original. This was early suggested by Muratori and S. de Magistris, both of whom assigned its original composition to a Greek-writing author—the former to Caius of Rome and the latter to Papias; and the theory, supported in recent days by Hofmann, Tregelles, Westcott, Salmon, and Kuhn, is now the prevalent though not the universal one.

II. Place, Date, and Authorship: The designation of Rome not only as *urbs Roma* in l. 76 but as *urbs* alone in l. 38 indicates a western origin; and so (assuming the substantial completeness of the text) does the fact that James and Hebrews are not even mentioned. The circumstantial solemnity with which the position of Pius at the time of the writing of the Shepherd of Hermas is described is intelligible only if the author was writing, not indeed in Rome for Romans, but in or for a western church in some way connected with Rome. The date rests largely on the sentence already referred to (73 sqq.): "The Pastor [i.e. Shepherd], moreover, did Hermas write very recently in our times in the city of Rome, while his brother bishop Pius sat in the chair of the church of Rome" (*ANF*, v. 604). If the words "very recently," by contrast with the epoch of the prophets and apostles, would allow the lapse of a considerable time between the writing of the Shepherd and that of this document, "in our times" is conclusive for the birth of the author before the death of Pius (not later than Easter, 154). The author took a lively personal interest in the position of the Shepherd in public worship; and this was not a question of the fourth and fifth centuries, but one vigorously discussed in the west about 200. The earlier date assigned by some, about 170 or 180, is improbable, if only because the writer speaks as a member of the Catholic Church which has definitely cast out not merely the parties of Valentinus, Basilides, and Marcion, but Montanism as well; and this was first true in Rome about 195, in Carthage not till after 203. The apologetic tone in which he speaks of John's Gospel and epistles implies that he was aware of the attacks made upon the Johannine writings by the Alogi, while he seems to know nothing of that of Caius, directed against the Apocalypse alone. This question and that of the relation of the Shepherd of Hermas to the canon were closely connected with the Montanist movement and the discussion stirred up by it in regard to discipline and to the place of prophecy in the Church. If the document was written within the region of Roman influence, it can scarcely have been written before 200–210. This excludes several suggested names for the author, such as Papias and Hegesippus. Caius is excluded by the fact that he was a bitter opponent of the Apocalypse, which is mentioned with reverence in the Fragment as a work of the apostle. More plausible than this is Lightfoot's suggestion of Hippolytus; but against it are (1) the author's total silence as to Hebrews, in which Hippolytus was much interested; (2) the opinion that the Apocalypse was written before the Pauline epistles, while Hippolytus apparently held, as did Irenæus, that it was written under Domitian; and (3) the education possessed by the author, which is not that of Hippolytus. For the present, then, all that can be said is that a member of the Roman church, or of some Catholic community not far from Rome, wrote in Greek about 200–210 a synopsis of the writings recognized as belonging to the New Testament in his part of the Church. As the beginning of the Milan manuscript is missing, it is not known what sort of a work that was from which the compiler took what exists, or whether a similar survey of the Old Testament preceded it. To judge from internal evidence, the Latin version can hardly have been made before 350, possibly not till the fourth century.

III. Contents: This document is not a canon in the original sense of the word, a mere catalogue of titles, but is a survey of the entire New Testament, with historical information and theological reflections appended.

1. Gospels and Acts.

Although the description of only the third and fourth Gospels is complete and only a line of what went before has been preserved, it is generally admitted that Matthew and Mark had been discussed. Of uncanonical gospels, such as were mentioned by Irenæus and Origen in similar contexts, nothing is heard. The exclusive validity of our four Gospels for the author and his environment is perfectly apparent. The apologetic way, however, in which he speaks of the agreement of these four in all essentials, and the fact that this comes immediately after the account of the origin of the fourth and is followed at once by a defense of John's assertion of his own credibility in I John i. 1–4, show that this whole passage is a reply to the position of the Alogi toward the Johannine writings. Both here and in what is said about Mark and Luke, the relation of the evangelist to the facts he relates is emphasized. If the word beginning the first line is completed in the most probable way, the author says that Mark was not an eye-witness of all to which he testifies, but wrote his Gospel on the testimony of one or more who were, though some of the facts had come within his own experience. Of Luke it is said without qualification that he was not an eye-witness but dependent like any other historical writer on his investigations. Outside of his designation as a physician from Col. iv. 14, all that is said of him seems to be taken from the introduction to his Gospel. A brief but graphic description of the origin of the Fourth Gospel is given in lines 9–16, intelligible only as an excerpt from a longer account, and probably to be traced back to the Gnostic Leucius. In lines 34–39 the author goes on to the Acts, mentioning for the first time the address to Theophilus, but quoting it from Luke, not from Acts. The inference that Luke meant to assert his own personal knowledge of the facts recalls that the version of the Acts prevalent in the west until the time of Jerome had the first personal pronoun from xi. 27 on, instead of from xvi. 10; this favored the exaggerated idea, met in Irenæus and elsewhere, that Luke narrated in the Acts only what he had himself been concerned in. This would explain the now generally accepted reading of lines 37, 38, according to which Luke accounts for closing his narrative before the martyrdom of Peter and the departure of Paul from Rome on his Spanish journey, both of which events occurred, according to the author, before the writing of the Acts.

2. Pauline Epistles.

The Pauline epistles are treated (lines 39–68) in the following order of those addressed to churches: I and II Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., Gal., I and II Thess., Rom. This order the author considers to represent that of their composition; its beginning and end are nearly those of Tertullian's list, and there may be indications of the same order both in Clement of Rome and in the East. After discussing these epistles, addressed (like John's admonitions in Revelation) to seven churches, as typifying or symbolizing the universal Church, he proceeds to the letters addressed to individuals, asserting their reception by the Catholic Church. Then he mentions two epistles written in the name of Paul after the rise of the heresy of Marcion, those to the Laodiceans and the Alexandrians. The existence of the former, which is found in many Latin scriptural manuscripts, is attested by Priscillian, Philaster, and Jerome, by a *Liber de divinis scripturis*, wrongly ascribed to Augustine, yet of the fourth century, and by some ancient prologues to the Pauline epistles; in the East the evidence for it runs from 370 to 800. That its composition can not be dated as late as the period covered by these authors and dates is clear enough; it is out of the question that about 380, when the proceeedings for a definite settlement of the canon had gone far both in East and West, a new Pauline epistle should have found its way into the Bible. At this very time Jerome says it was "rejected by all"; and that this is not hyperbole is shown by the fact that in his discussion of the canon Eusebius never once mentions it. Its inclusion in some western Bibles of the end of the fourth century can only be the belated influence of a far-distant past; and to such a past belongs the protest of the Fragment. It is also now generally believed that an apocryphal epistle of John which is first cited about 370 by Optatus was included in the "Acts of John" of Leucius, written 160–70. It is quite possible that like this and III Cor. the epistle to the Laodiceans and that to the Alexandrians (not now extant) formed part of widely circulated legends of the apostles in the second century.

Under the head of other writings recognized in the Catholic Church (lines 68–73) there is first an assertion of the canonicity of Jude and two epistles of John. There has been much discussion as to whether this means the first and second or the second and third. It is probable, according to the modern reading of the text, that the author mentions two letters designated as those of John in their traditional titles, without deciding the question whether John really wrote them.

3. Other Writings.

These can only be the second and third, whose writer calls himself merely "the elder." Having already treated the first, though only incidentally, in connection with the Fourth Gospel, and there declared his unquestioning belief in its Johannine origin (lines 26–34), the author felt able here to confine himself to the two smaller letters. Next follows a remarkable mention of the "Wisdom written by the friends of Solomon in his honor," which is rendered more intelligible by the conjecture of Tregelles that the translator had before him a Greek phrase which attributed the book of Wisdom to Philo, according to a wide-spread western tradition, and made *hypo philōn* out of *hypo Philōnos*. The book was naturally mentioned next to the epistles of John, because like them it was read in the Church in spite of the incorrectness or doubtfulness of its usual title. The words which close this section are not susceptible of a rational explanation as they stand, "We receive also the Apocalypse of John and that of Peter only, although some of us will not have [them, or, the latter] read in church" [*ANF.* v. 604]. Even the mention and still more the recognition of an Apocalypse of Peter in the West is inconceivable in the light of the fact that not a single quotation from the oldest western writers can be adduced to show their knowledge of it; and it is equally difficult to account for the failure to mention at least I Peter in a work of this kind. The most probable hypothesis is that of the loss of a few words, perhaps of a line, in which I Peter and the Apocalypse of John were named as received, and II Peter as objected to by some members of the church. The Shepherd of Hermas is discussed in lines 73–80, with the assertion that it should never be read in divine service on a footing with the prophets and apostles, while the duty of reading it elsewhere (presumably in small, informal gatherings or in catechetical instruction) is insisted on. The subsequent history of the Shepherd corresponds to the position of compromise here adopted. The Fragment closes with the rejection of certain writings which are in use among heretical parties (lines 81–85). In these lines the corruption of the text and perhaps the defects of the translation reach their height, so that the establishment of a satisfactory text is almost hopeless. The mention of Valentinus is intelligible, for his school had a special "True Gospel" besides the canonical ones; Basilides also gave out a gospel of his own, and used all sorts of Apocryphal writings. The most obscure point is the connection of the name of Marcion with "a new book of psalms."

IV. Ruling Ideas: The tone of the whole treatise is not that of legislation but of explanatory statement of an established condition of things, with only a single instance of difference of opinion among members of the Catholic Church. There is no difference in authority between the Old Testament ("the prophets") and the New ("the apostles"). The only distinction is that the number of the former class is fixed, while that of the latter is still to some extent open. II Peter is still discussed; there are apparently some in the church who regarded the epistles to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians as on a footing with the others; and the proceedings in regard to the Shepherd had shown that some had been inclined shortly before to admit it into the category of Scripture. Apart from these points, however, the New Testament is regarded as definitely made up of the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen epistles of Paul, the Apocalypse of John, probably three epistles of his, Jude, and probably I Peter, while the opposition to another of Peter's writings was not yet silenced. The decision in regard to the Shepherd is the first clearly proved step in the differentiation between the Holy Scriptures and a class of books which did not stand on the same plane, though they were commended as edifying. When, how, and by whom the canon as he received it was established the author does not say, nor does he display any historical knowledge of the process and the grounds on which the decision was made. (T. ZAHN.)

TRANSLATION OF THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT.

. . . at which nevertheless he was present, and so he placed it [in his narrative]. The third book of the Gospel is that according to Luke. Luke, the well-known physician, wrote it in his own name, according to [the general] belief, after the ascension of Christ, when Paul had associated him [with himself?] as one zealous for correctness [i.e., one who took pains to find out the facts]. It is true that he had not seen the Lord in the flesh, yet having ascertained the facts he was able to begin his narrative with the nativity of John. The fourth book of the Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples. In response to the exhortation of his fellow disciples and bishops he said: "fast ye with me for three days, and then let us tell each other whatever shall be revealed to each one." The same night it was revealed to Andrew (who was one of the apostles) that John it was who should relate in his own name what they collectively remembered [or, that John was to relate in his own name, they all acting as correctors]. And so to the faith of believers there is no discord, even although different selections are given from the facts in the individual books of the Gospels, because in all [of them] under the one guiding Spirit all the things relative to his nativity, passion, resurrection, conversation with his disciples, and his twofold advent, the first in the humiliation arising from contempt, which took place, and the second in the glory of kingly power, which is yet to come, have been declared. What marvel is it, then, if John adduces so consistently in his epistles these several things, saying in person: "what we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, those things we have written." For thus he professes to be not only an eye-witness but also a bearer and narrator of all the wonderful things of the Lord, in their order.

Moreover, the acts of all the apostles are written in one book. Luke [so] comprised them for the most excellent Theophilus, because the individual events took place in his presence—as he clearly shows [by] omitting the passion of Peter as well as the departure of Paul when the latter went from the city [of Rome] to Spain.

Now the epistles of Paul, what they are, whence or for what reason they were sent, they themselves make clear to him who will understand. First of all he wrote at length to the Corinthians to prohibit the schism of heresy, then to the Galatians [against] circumcision, and to the Romans on the order of the Scriptures, intimating also that Christ is the chief matter in them—each of which it is necessary for us to discuss, seeing that the blessed Apostle Paul himself, following the example of his predecessor John, writes to no more than seven churches by name in the following order: to the Corinthians (first), to the Ephesians (second), to the Philippians (third), to the Colossians (fourth), to the Galatians (fifth), to the Thessalonians (sixth), to the Romans (seventh). But though he writes twice for the sake of correction to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, that there is one church diffused throughout the whole earth is shown (? i.e., by this sevenfold writing]; and John also in the Apocalypse, though he writes to seven churches, yet speaks to all. But [he wrote] out of affection and love one to Philemon, and one to Titus, and two to Timothy; [and these] are held sacred in the honorable esteem of the Church catholic in the regulation of ecclesiastical discipline. There are adduced also (one) to the Laodiceans, another to the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul for (i.e., against) the heresy of Marcion, and many others which can not be received into the Church catholic, for it is not fitting that gall be mingled with honey.

Further, an epistle of Jude and two bearing the name of John are counted among the Catholic [Epistles] [*]; and Wisdom, written by the friends of Solomon in his honor.

We receive the apocalypses of John and Peter only, which [latter] some of us do not wish to be read in church. But Hermas wrote the Shepherd in the city of Rome most recently in our own times while his brother bishop, Pius, was occupying the chair of the church of Rome; and so indeed it ought to be read; but that it be made public to the people in the church or [placed] among the prophets (whose number is complete) or among the apostles is not possible to the end of time.

Of Arsinous (or Valentinus) or Miltiades we receive nothing at all. Those also who wrote the new book of psalms for Marcion, together with Basilides who founded the Asian Cataphrygians (?) . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the edition of Muratori named in the text, collations are to be found in: M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, i. 389–434, Oxford, 1846; in *TSK*, 1847, pp. 818–829; C. K. Bunsen, *Analecta antenicæna*, i. 137–141, London, 1854; S. B. Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus*, London, 1868; A. Reifferscheid, in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, historisch-philosophische Klasse*, lxvii (1871), 496 sqq.; B. F. Westcott, *General Survey of the Hist. of the Canon*, pp. 521 sqq., London, 1889; A. Harnack, in *ZKG*, iii. 595–599; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 1007, Leipsic, 1891; E. Preuschen, *Analecta*, pp. ix., 129–137, Freiburg, 1893. An Eng. transl. is given in *ANF*, v. 603–604. The subject is treated in all the most important treatises on the canon of the New Testament, in the works on N. T. introduction (G. Salmon gives also the text, pp. 43–44 of 6th ed. of his *Historical Introduction to . . . the N. T.*, London, 1892), and in many of the treatises on the early Church. Specially worthy of mention are: C. A. Credner, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ed. Volkmar, pp. 141–170, 341–363, Berlin, 1860; F. H. Hesse, *Das muratorische Fragment*, Giessen, 1873; Hilgenfeld in *ZWT*, 1872, pp. 560–582, 1874, pp. 214–231, 1880, pp. 114–121, 1881, pp. 129–170; Harnack, in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1874, pp. 274–288, 445–464, idem in *ZKG*, iii (1879), 358–408; idem, *Litteratur*, i. 646–647, ii. 1, pp. 330–333 et passim; T. Zahn, ut sup., ii. 1, pp. 1–156; G. Kuhn, *Das muratorische Fragment*, Zurich, 1892; H. Lietzmann, *Das muratorische Fragment und die monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien*, Bonn, 1908.

MURDOCK, JAMES: American scholar; 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; was 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 Münscher's *Elements of Dogmatic History* (New Haven, 1830); a translation from the Latin of Mosheim's *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* (New Haven, 1832); a translation of Mosheim's *Commentaries on*

---

[*] The Latinity of this sentence makes it untranslatable; the translation given is an approximation only.

the Affairs of the Christians before the Time of Constantine the Great (2 vols., New York, 1851–52); *The New Testament: a literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito Version* (1852). He also edited, with preface and notes, Milman's *History of Christianity* (1841), and wrote *The Nature of the Atonement* (Andover, 1823); and *Sketches of Modern Philosophy, especially among the Germans* (Hartford, 1842).

MURNER, THOMAS: German Catholic priest and poet; b. at Oberehnheim (15 m. s.w. of Strasburg) probably Dec. 24, 1475; d. there Aug. 23, 1537. He entered the Franciscan order at Strasburg 1490; was ordained priest in 1494; studied theology at Paris, law at Freiburg, and philosophy, philology, and mathematics at Cracow, 1495–1500, taking his doctorate some time before 1509. About 1500 or 1501 Murner is said to have lived at Solothurn in order to become familiar with the Swiss monasteries. In 1502 he returned to Strasburg. He attempted at Cracow and other places to teach logic and even jurisprudence by means of charts, *Chartiludium Logicæ* (Cracow, 1507) and *Chartiludium Institute Summarie* (1518). In 1508 he was at Strasburg, where he was attacked by Ulrich Zasius on account of his humanistic leanings. Murner, on the other hand, maintained that the study of ancient literature was not incompatible with a pious and chaste life and that contact with the world necessitated classical education even for clergymen. In his *Ludus Studentum Freiburgensium* (Frankfort, 1511) he taught even prosody in a figurative manner. His greatest renown was won by his satires, in which he was thoroughly at home. In 1512 appeared his *Narrenbeschwörung* and *Schelmenzunft*, the former at Strasburg, the latter at Frankfort. The *Narrenbeschwörung* was influenced by the *Narrenschiff* of Sebastian Brant, but its originality has not suffered from that fact. The *Schelmenzunft* is the *Narrenbeschwörung* abbreviated. In both poems Murner attacked the deficiencies and frailties of all classes, the gluttony and rebellious turn of the peasants, the arrogance, egoism, and niggardliness of citizens, the vanity of women, the rapacity, debauchery, and brutality of the nobility, the insubordination and egoism of the imperial princes, but especially the ignorance, levity, unchastity, avarice, and unscrupulousness of the clergy. But in criticism of the Church, Murner never went beyond abuses in the Church; its constitution and doctrines he did not assail. He attacked not personalities but principles, or rather, the lack of them. In 1514 appeared his poem, *Ein andechtig geistliche Badenfahrt* and in 1515 *Die Mülle von Schwyndelssheym und Gredt Müllerin Jahrzeit. Die geuchmat zu Straf allen wybschen mannen* (Basel, 1519) is directed against foolish lovers and ladies' men and forms a rich source for the history of manners, customs, and fashions. In 1519 appeared his translation of the *Institutionen* which in 1521 was renewed under the title, *Der keyserlichen Statrechten ein Ingang und wares Fundament.* The popularizing of legal science was a need of the time. But, though Murner discerned the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church, he was decidedly hostile to the Reformation. Against Luther Murner wrote no less than thirty-two pamphlets of which only five or six have been printed: *Ein christliche und briederliche Ermanung zu dem hochgelerten Doctor Martino Luter* (1520); *Von Doctor Martinus Luters leren und predigen, das sie arg wenig seint* (1520); *Von dem babstenthum . . . wyder Doctor Martinum Luther* (1520); *Ain new lied von dem undergang des Christlichen Glaubens in Bruder Veiten thon* (1521); *Ob der Künig uss engelland ein lügner sey oder der Luther* (1522). But in spite of his zeal, he gained little acknowledgment even among Roman Catholics, and his attacks had not the least effect upon his opponents. His satires lacked religious enthusiasm and sincerity. His best satire is *Von dem grossen lutherischen Narren wie j'n Doctor Murner beschworen hat* (1522). But the poem was immediately suppressed by the council of Strasburg, and Murner was forbidden to print anything else. In 1523 Murner visited in England with Henry VIII., whose treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther he had translated in the preceding year. After his return the Reformation had victoriously entered Strasburg, and Murner removed to Oberehnheim, but driven away by the Peasants' War, he 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, after Lucerne was defeated in the first war of Kappel, Murner had to flee once more. He escaped to Wallis and then took refuge with Elector Frederic II. in the Palatinate. In 1530 he returned to Oberehnheim where he spent the rest of his life. (F. LIST†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. E. Waldau, *Nachrichten von Thomas Murners Leben und Schriften*, Nuremberg, 1775; J. Scheible, *Das Kloster*, vol. iv., Stuttgart, 1846; J. Hub, *Die komische und humoristische Literatur . . . des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Nuremberg, 1856; W. Kawerau, *Thomas Murner und die Kirche des Mittelalters*, Halle, 1890; idem, *Thomas Murner und die deutsche Reformation*, ib. 1891; K. Ott, in *Alamannia*, xxiii. 144–188, 231–288.

MURPHY, FRANCIS: Apostle of total abstinence and evangelist; b. at Wexford (64 m. s.w. of Dublin), Ireland, Apr. 24, 1836; d. at Los Angeles, Cal., June 30, 1907. He emigrated to the United States while a young man; served as a private during the Civil War; began work in Portland, Me., as an advocate of total abstinence in 1870, and led the campaign in that state for several years; his success there led to the extension of the movement over the entire country, until it was estimated that over 10,000,000 had signed the pledge, which involved not only abstinence from intoxicating drinks but earnest effort to induce others to the same. The great results of his work in the United States led, in 1881, to his being called to England and the continent, where his successes were continued for four years. On his return he made his home for some years in Pittsburg, Pa., but continued his work on the platform. In 1900 he went to Hawaii to present his cause, then to Australia, returning in 1901 and making his home in Los Angeles, Cal., but continuing his work till failing eyesight compelled his retirement in 1906.

MURPHY, JAMES GRACEY: Irish Presbyterian, exegete; b. at Ballyaltikilikan in the parish of

Comber (8 m. s.e. of Belfast), Ireland, Jan. 12, 1808; d. at Belfast Apr. 19, 1896. He graduated from Trinity College, Dublin (A.B., 1833); became minister at Ballyshannon, 1836; classical head master at the Royal Belfast Academical Institution, 1841; and professor of Hebrew, Presbyterian College, Belfast, 1847. He was the author of *A Latin Grammar* (London, 1847); *A Hebrew Grammar* (1857); *Nineteen Impossibilities of Part First of Colenso on the Pentateuch Shown to be Possible; with a Critique on Part Two* (Belfast, 1863); *The Human Mind; A System of Human Philosophy* (London, 1873); the volume on Chronicles in *Handbooks for Bible Classes* (Edinburgh, 1879); *Sacrifice as set forth in Scripture; The Carey Lectures for 1888* (London, 1889). He was also the author of commentaries on Genesis (Edinburgh, 1864); Exodus (1866); Leviticus (1872); Psalms (1875); Revelation (London, 1882); and Daniel (1884); he translated C. F. Keil's commentary on Kings (Edinburgh, 1857); and assisted in the translation of E. W. Hengstenberg's commentary on Ezekiel (1869); he also translated, enlarged, and edited O. Zöckler's commentary on Chronicles (1880).

MURRAY, JOHN: Founder of the Universalist denomination in America; b. in Alton (15 m. n.e. of Winchester), Hampshire, Eng., Dec. 10, 1741; d. in Boston, Mass., Sept. 3, 1815. His father was an Anglican and his mother a Presbyterian, both strict Calvinists, and his home life was attended by religious severity. In 1751 the family settled near Cork, Ireland. In 1760 Murray returned to England and joined Whitefield's congregation; but embracing, somewhat later, the Universalistic teachings of James Relly (q.v.) he was excommunicated. In 1770 he emigrated to America, and preached, as a Universalist minister, his first sermon in Good Luck, N. J., Sept. 30, 1770, which place he made his home till 1774, itinerating from Virginia to New Hampshire. In 1774 he settled at Gloucester, Mass., and established a congregation there. He was suspected of being a British spy, but in 1775 was chaplain of the Rhode Island Brigade before Boston. He participated in the first general Universalist Convention at Oxford, Mass., September, 1785. On Oct. 23, 1793, he became pastor of the Universalist society of Boston, and faithfully served it until Oct. 19, 1809, when paralysis compelled him to give up preaching. He was a man of great courage and eloquence, and in the defense of his views endured much detestation and abuse. In regard to Christ, he taught that in him God became the Son; for "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, are no more than different exhibitions of the selfsame existent, omnipresent Being." He taught that all men would ultimately be saved through the sacrifice of Christ, the basis for this being the union of all men in Christ, just as they were united with Adam, and therefore partaking of the benefits of his sacrifice. He was also a writer of hymns and a compiler of hymnals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are his own *Letters and Sketches of Sermons*, 3 vols., Boston, 1812; *Autobiography*, continued by his wife, ib. 1816, centenary ed., 1870. Consult: R. Eddy, in *American Church History Series*, x. 388 sqq., New York, 1894.

MURRAY, NICHOLAS: Presbyterian controversialist; b. at Ballynaskeagh (26 m. s.w. of Belfast), Ireland, Dec. 25, 1803; d. at Elizabethtown, N. J., Feb. 4, 1861. He emigrated to America 1818; was employed as printer by Harper & Brothers. Brought up a Roman Catholic, he was in 1820 converted to Protestantism, and, after graduation at Williams College (1826) and at Princeton Theological Seminary (1829) became a Presbyterian pastor, first at Wilkesbarre, Pa., 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 *Letters to the Right Rev. John Hughes, Roman-Catholic Bishop of New York* (3 series, New York, 1847–48, revised ed., 1855), a keen exposure of certain abuses in the Church of Rome abroad. These letters appeared in the *New-York Observer*, over the signature of "Kirwan," since he, like Kirwan (q.v.) was a convert. They attracted wide notice at the time, and made his name a household word. They have been translated into several languages. He addressed another series to Chief Justice Taney, published in 1852 under the title *Romanism at Home* (1852). He also wrote *Notes, Historical and Biographical, concerning Elizabethtown* (Elizabethtown, 1844); *Men and Things as I saw them in Europe* (1853); *Parish and Other Pencillings* (1854); *Preachers and Preaching* (1860); and a volume of sermons, *A Dying Legacy to the People of my Beloved Charge* (1861).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. I. Prime, *Memoirs of the Rev. Nicholas Murray*, New York, 1862.

MURRHONITES. See CELESTINES.

MUSAEUS, mū-sē'us, JOHANN: Lutheran theologian and controversialist; b. at Langewiesen (27 m. s.e. of Gotha), Thuringia, Feb. 7, 1613; d. at Jena May 4, 1681. He studied philosophy and the humanities at Erfurt and Jena, but afterward devoted himself to theology at the latter university, where he became professor of history in 1643 and of theology in 1646. Equipped with a thorough philosophical training, he speedily vindicated the application of philosophy to theology against the disciples of rigid Lutheran orthodoxy and advocated a careful distinction between creed and theology, maintaining that theological investigation should be unrestricted. His philosophical training and energy enabled him to enter into disputes with opponents not only of Lutheranism, but also of Christianity and religion. Thus he wrote against Lord Herbert of Cherbury his *De luminis naturæ insufficientia ad salutem* (Jena, 1668), based upon the thesis that natural theology is insufficient for the sinner because it knows nothing of atonement for sins; and attacked Matthias Knutzen in his *Ablehnung der ausgesprengten abscheulichen Verleumdung, ob wäre in . . . Jena eine neue Secte der sogenannten Gewissener entstanden* (1674). He also polemized against the Jesuits, first against Veit Erbermann concerning the Bible of Duke Ernest the Pious in his *Biblia Lutheri auspiciis Ernesti ducis . . . glossis ac interpretationibus illustrata—*

a Viti Erbermanni, iterata maledicentia vindicata (1663) and concerning the Church in his *Tractatus de ecclesia* (1671); then against Jodocus Kedde in his *Verteidigung des unbeweglichen Grundes, dessen der Augsburgischen Konfession verwandte Lehrer zum Beweis ihrer Kirchen sich gebrauchen* (1654), and finally against Jakob Masenius in two theological disputations, of which the more important is entitled *De ecclesia*. Another treatise of the same category is his *Tractatus theologicus de conversione hominis peccatoris ad Deum* (1661). He likewise entered into a controversy with the Arminians regarding the salvation of the heathen, opposed the Socinians, and also devoted much labor to the critique of Reformed doctrines and traditions. In his *De usu principiorum rationis et philosophiæ in controversiis theologicis* (1644) he attacked the excessive use of philosophy in theology among the Reformed theologians, and opposed M. F. Wendelin and the doctrine of predestination in his *De æterno electionis decreto an ejus aliqua extra Deum causa impulsiva detur necne* (1668) and his *De sacra cœna sintne corpus et sanguis Christi in ea realiter præsentia?* (1664). After various doubts and struggles he publicly attacked the syncretism of Calixtus in his *Quæstiones theologicæ inter nostrates hactenus agitatæ de Syncretismo et Scriptura sacra* (1679). His conception of theology as an object of heart as well as of head led him to emphasize the importance of good works and of the sanctity of the will to such a degree that he has been characterized as a precursor of Spener, and these same convictions obliged him to oppose the rigid definitions then prevalent in orthodox Lutheran dogmatics. Like the other theologians of Jena, Musaeus refused to sign the *Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranæ*, drawn up by Calovius (q.v.) in 1655, remaining true to this decision even after Duke Ernest the Pious tried to negotiate peace (1670–72). A long and bitter controversy ensued. After the death of the duke in 1675 Johan Reinhard published in Wittenberg his *Theologorum Jenensium errores*, in which he listed no less than ninety-three heresies, chiefly from the lectures of Musaeus. In accordance with the unanimous resolution of the faculty of Jena, Musaeus, then their dean, replied in his *Der jenischen Theologen ausführliche Erklärung über 93 vermeinte Religionsfragen oder Kontroversien* (1677), whereupon Calovius attacked him in the continuation of his *Systema locorum*. In 1679, however, a formal visitation of the university of Jena was instituted, and all the professors, nineteen in number, were forced to subscribe to a new formula and to renounce their syncretism. The *Prælectiones in epitomen Formulæ Concordiæ* (1701) and the *Compendium theologiæ positivæ* appeared posthumously. One of the chief merits of Musaeus was his completion of the system of natural theology by giving due consideration to the religious and ethical capacity of the natural man, thus seeking to determine the process of conversion. He taught that the natural will could turn effectually to righteousness, though only in an obscure way (Rom. ix. 30 seq., x. 2.). Despite the attacks of his opponents, Musaeus was orthodox, although he was less easily satisfied with the various statements of the orthodox system than the Wittenberg theologians, his scientific conscience compelling him to search for proofs and to base his doctrines upon safe principles. The most important service, however, which Musaeus rendered the Lutheran Church was his check to the exclusive rule of the Wittenberg orthodoxy without denying or perverting the true tenets of Lutheranism. (JOHANNES KUNZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For early sources consult: Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiii. 572. Consult: F. W. Buck, *De Joanne Musæo*, Jena, 1862; A. Calovius, *Historia syncretistica*, 1682; J. G. Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten von der Reformation an*, parts i.–iii., Jena, 1733 sqq.; idem, *Religionsstreitigkeiten der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, parts iv.–v., ib. 1739; H. Schmid, *Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten*, pp. 400–420, Erlangen, 1846; E. L. T. Henke, *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit*, vol. ii., Halle, 1860; G. Frank, *Die jenaische Theologie*, Leipsic, 1856; A. Tholuck, *Vorgeschichte des Rationalismus*, vols. i.–ii., Halle, 1853–1862; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, ii. 202–212, Berlin, 1857.

MUSAEUS, PETER: Lutheran theologian—brother of Johann Musaeus; b. at Langewiesen (27 m. s.e. of Gotha), Thuringia, Feb. 7, 1620; d. at Kiel Dec. 20, 1674 He obtained his education at Jena and Helmstedt; through the influence of Georg Calixtus, he received a position at Rinteln, first as professor of philosophy in 1648 and five years later as professor of theology. In the latter capacity he took part in the colloquy of Cassel (1661), but incurred the displeasure of the orthodox by the concessions which he favored. Musaeus himself is said to have been offended later by the encroachments of the Reformed and to have left Rinteln. From 1663 to 1665 he was professor in Helmstedt, and in 1665 was called to the new university of Kiel, where he opposed syncretism and union, especially in his *Liber de fugiendo syncretismo jussu Christiani Alberti Ducis Holsatiæ scriptus* (Kiel, 1670), but satisfied neither the Lutherans nor the Reformed. His versatile training in philosophy and his scholarship were considered even superior to his brother's, but their theological tendencies were the same. (JOHANNES KUNZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Möller, *Cimbria literata*, ii. 565–573, Copenhagen, 1744; C. A. Dolle, *Lebensbeschreibung aller Professorum Theologiæ zu Rinteln*, i. 275–296, Hanover, 1752; F. W. Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrtengeschichte*, ix. 321–328, Cassel, 1794.

MUSCULUS (MEUSEL), ANDREAS: Lutheran theologian; b. at Schneeberg (21 m. s.w. of Chemnitz), Saxony, 1514; d. at Frankfort-on-the-Oder Sept. 29, 1581. He was educated at the Latin school of his native city, and at the University of Leipsic. In 1538, after acting as a tutor for several years, he resumed his studies, this time at Wittenberg, where he became an enthusiastic disciple of Luther. At the instance of Johann Agricola, whose brother-in-law he seems to have been, he was appointed to a position at the University of Frankfort and also as preacher of the Franciscan Church in 1541. As an orthodox Lutheran, however, he became involved in disputes with his colleague Ludecus, whom he attacked in several theses (directed at the same time against Melanchthon and the entire Wittenberg school). Melanchthon was much displeased at the attitude of his former pupil, and in a letter of 1546 endeavored to instruct and appease him. Musculus succeeded Ludecus, on the latter's removal to Stendal, both as pastor and professor, was also made rector, and was for a long time the only theological teacher of the institution. After the death of Agricola he became general superintendent of the entire March of Brandenburg.

The life of Musculus was a continual battle, especially as he was polemic by nature. At first he assailed the Interim, then Osiander's doctrine of justification, and when Stancari (q.v.) came to Frankfort, the pair speedily became involved in controversy. In 1552 Elector Joachim ordered both to discuss at Berlin the mediatorial office of Christ, and Agricola, as arbitrator, decided in favor of Musculus. In 1558 Friedrich Staphylus, a Roman Catholic convert, who had studied with Musculus at Wittenberg, published his *Theologiæ M. Lutheri trimembris epitome* (Cologne, 1558), in which he accused Musculus of teaching that Christ suffered according to his divine as well as according to his human nature. Musculus immediately replied in his *Responsio ad virolentum et maledicum scriptum Friderici Staphyli* (1558), which was answered, in its turn, by Staphylus in his *Defensio pro trimembri theologia M. Lutheri* (Dillingen, 1559), in which he clearly proved the truth of his charge. Musculus was accordingly defeated, and retained his position only on account of the general resentment against Staphylus.

As Melanchthon had only half approved the position of Musculus in his dispute with Stancari, and had declined the office of arbitrator in their controversy, he had rendered himself unpopular in the March, and thus helped to prepare the way for the long struggle of Agricola and Musculus against Philippism (see PHILIPPISTS) in that territory. Agricola attacked his colleague, Provost Buchholzer of Berlin, and Musculus assailed Abdias Prætorius, the enthusiastic Philippist in Frankfort who injoyed the favor of Elector Joachim. The moot point was the formula of the Frankfort convention concerning the necessity of good works, and in 1558 Musculus began the controversy from his pulpit. The mandate of peace issued by the elector in 1560 had little effect, but in Feb., 1562, Prætorius considered his cause lost and fled from the country. Buchholzer, however, opposed Agricola so successfully that Philippism was victorious, and Prætorius was able to return two months later. In the following year the elector entirely changed his mind and Philippism was definitely defeated. After the death of Agricola in 1566, Musculus bore the responsibility of sole leadership in the defense of a pronounced anti-Melanchthonian and anti-Calvinistic Lutheranism, and in 1574–75 he published three treatises on the Lord's Supper to controvert the Crypto-Calvinists, while in 1577 his *Widerlegung der Calvinisten* appeared. Musculus increased the bitterness of the controversies in which he was involved by his vehemence and his habit of making his accusations in the presence of his congregation. He availed himself of the confidence of his sovereign to erect charitable institutions and to found scholarships and other aids for students, while he gave generous assistance to the poor. He performed faithfully the duties of his office, preached twice a week, and undertook frequent tours of inspection. In his sermons he criticized the fads and abuses of his time, and in this spirit published pamphlets such as *Wider den Hosenteufel* (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1555); *Vom Gotteslästern* (1556), *Wider den Eheteufel* (1556); *Vom jüngsten Tage* (1557); *Vom Himmel und der Hellen* (1559); *Von des Teufels Tyrannei in den letzten Tagen* (Worms, 1561); *Vom itzt regierenden Epicuro* (1569); *Bedenke das Ende* (1572); and *Vom Wucher und Geiz* (1579). He also wrote a Latin book of prayers (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1553), which included meditations on the passion and on the proper use of the Lord's Supper, etc. Among his doctrinal works mention may be made of his *Enchiridion sententiarum ac dictorum* (1552), citations from the works of the ancients in defense of the Lutheran doctrine; and *Catechismus . . . der heiligen alten Lehrer nach Ordnung der Hauptstücke des Katechismus* (1555), in which he tried to prove that Luther's doctrine was older than Roman Catholic teaching. Joachim II. commissioned him to compile a doctrinal confession from Luther's works for a Brandenburg *Corpus doctrinæ*. This work appeared in 1572, containing the doctrinal system of Musculus, in addition to the Augsburg Confession and the Smaller Catechism. Musculus also published an epitome from Luther's writings, entitled *Thesaurus; Hochnützlicher teurer Schatz und gülden Kleinod . . . aus den Büchern . . . Lutheri zusammengebracht* (1577). In 1576 he helped frame the Book of Torgau (see FORMULA OF CONCORD, § 3), and in 1577 aided in the final redaction of the Formula of Concord. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. W. Spieker, *Lebensgeschichte des Andreas Musculus*, Frankfort, 1858; L. Grote, in *ZHT*, 1869, pp. 377 sqq.; G. Kawerau, *J. Agricola*, Berlin, 1881; M. Osborn, *Die Teufelslitteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts*, ib. 1893.

MUSCULUS, mʊs′kiu-lʊs (**MUESSLIN, MEUSSLIN**), **WOLFGANG**: Reformed theologian; b. at Dienze (9 m. e. of Salzburg), Lorraine, Sept. 8, 1497; d. at Bern Aug. 30, 1563. He received a thorough education in his native town and in the best schools of the neighborhood. He remained for a time in Rappoltsweiler, Colmar, and Schlettstadt, being powerfully influenced by German humanism in the latter city. At the age of fifteen he entered the Benedictine monastery near Lixheim, and there found an opportunity to plunge into the classics, especially Ovid. At the age of twenty he began to study theology, and as he showed a talent for eloquence, he was entrusted with preaching in the monastery and in its parochial churches. In 1518 he became acquainted with Luther's works, and immediately became a decided advocate of the new doctrine, so that he fled from the monastery nine years later and married the niece of his former prior. He was then compelled to struggle for existence by working as a weaver, but at last secured a position as assistant preacher in the village of Dorlitzheim, and in 1529 became deacon in the cathedral church of Strasburg. There he learned Hebrew and completed his theological education by attending lec-

Early Life and Education.

tures at the university, forming the acquaintance of Capito and Butzer.

Work as a Reformer.

In 1531, through the mediation of the council of Strasburg, Musculus was appointed preacher of the Church of the Holy Cross in Augsburg, and such was his activity there that after six years the cathedral church was transferred to the Protestants, and he himself was made first preacher. Exceedingly important was his participation in the efforts for union and his share in the negotiations between the theologians of Wittenberg and Upper Germany. Butzer had been the most zealous advocate of a reconciliation between the factions, but had been unable to secure any permanent results, while Luther's distrust of Zwingli led him to suspect everything that proceeded from this direction. Despite these obstacles, Butzer and Capito continued their efforts for union. On the basis of the Helvetic Confession of 1536, Butzer proposed that a convention be held at Eisenach for the discussion of the controverted points, but the cities of Switzerland declined at the last moment, although the towns of Upper Germany sent their delegates, Musculus being present as the representative of Augsburg. Instead of Eisenach, Wittenberg was chosen as the place of meeting, and the result of the conference was the Wittenberg Concordia. Musculus avoided everything which might impede harmony, and for the sake of peace retracted his Tetrapolitan views concerning the Lord's Supper. After his return to Augsburg he easily succeeded in bringing about the acceptation of the Concordia, but the compromise satisfied no one. Zwingli's adherents would not accept it, and when Musculus saw it rejected by all, he returned to his former position, which he later expounded in his *Confessio de sacramento corporis et sanguinis dominici*. Equally fruitless was his participation in the religious conference of Evangelical and Roman theologians begun at Worms in 1541 and continued at Regensburg in the following year. In 1544 he introduced the Reformation in Donauwörth and wrote a Latin catechism in connection with it. He found time to study Greek and Arabic and to publish translations of the Greek patristic works, thus unconsciously laying the foundation for his later versatility. His successful activity at Augsburg was unexpectedly ended by the Augsburg Interim of 1548, which was forced upon the town by the emperor. The opposition of the council was soon broken, and Musculus was compelled to leave the city, and to seek refuge among strangers. He turned to Switzerland where he was kindly received by Bullinger and Johann Haller, and at last in 1549 he received a position as professor of theology in Bern.

Activities at Bern.

Musculus may be reckoned among the number of those who aided in the reconciliation of the two hostile factions then existing at Bern. Although he could not be compared with the older Reformers in creative originality, his extensive linguistic and theological knowledge, as well as his clear and thorough exegesis, made him an admirable teacher, while through his numerous commentaries he exerted a lasting influence upon his contemporaries. He was by no means a partizan, and was inclined to regard the differences between the Reformers as unessential. As he had once consented to the Wittenberg Concordia in his love of peace, so he mediated successfully between the extreme tendencies in Bern. His theological standpoint was always that of the Reformed Church, as may be seen in his chief dogmatical work, the *Loci communes* (Basel, 1554; Eng. transl. by J. Man, London, 1563). His works attracted the attention of the isolated Protestants in Poland and Hungary, and the correspondence which ensued occasioned his *Vom Auffgang des Worts Gottes unter den Christen in Ungarn, die den Türcken unterworffen.* (W. Hadorn.)

Bibliography: His diary, with other documents, is printed in T. Kolde, *Analecta Lutherana*, Gotha, 1883. His life by his son A. Musculus was edited by the latter's son in *Synopsis festalium concionum*, Basel, 1595. Later treatments are to be found in P. Bayle, *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, iv. 285–288, London, 1737; in the lives by L. Grote, Hamburg, 1853; and W. T. Streuber, in *Berner Taschenbuch* for 1860; also in *ADB*, xxiii. 95–96; and in Beza's *Icones. Contemporary Portraits of Reformers . . .*, with *Introduction* by C. G. McCrie, pp. 90–94, London, 1906. Further information is given in S. Fischer, *Geschichte der Reformation und Disputation in Bern*, Bern, 1828; S. Hess, *Lebensgeschichte M. H. Bullinger*, 2 vols., Zurich, 1828–29; C. B. Bundeshagen, *Konflikte des Zwinglianismus, Luthertum und Calvinismus in der Berner Landeskirche 1532–88*, Bern, 1842; Fluri, in *Berner Taschenbuch* for 1897, pp. 239 sqq.

MUSIC, SACRED. See Sacred Music.

MUSIL, mū'sîl, **ALOIS:** Austrian Roman Catholic; b. at Rychtářov (a village near Wischau, 22 m. n.e. of Brünn), Moravia, June 30, 1868. He studied at the universities of Berlin and Vienna, at Olmütz, Moravia (D.D., 1895), in Palestine (especially at the École biblique, Jerusalem), Egypt, Syria (particularly at St. Joseph's College, Beirut), in Arabia during 1895–98, and at the British Museum, Cambridge, Constantinople, and Arabia in 1899–1902. From 1891 to 1895 he was instructor in religion in Mährisch-Ostrau and in 1898–99 held a similar position in Olmütz. Since 1902 he has been professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Semitic languages in the theological faculty at Olmütz. He has written: *Die syrischen Kirchen* (Brünn, 1899); *Bibel oder Babel* (1903); *Von der Erschaffung bis zur Sindflut* (Prague, 1905); *Topographisches zur alttestamentlichen Geschichte* (Ivantschitz, 1906); *Ḳuṣeir 'Amra* (2 vols., Vienna, 1906); *Karte von Arabia Petræa* (1906); and *Arabia Petræa* (3 vols., 1907–08).

MUSTON, ALEXIS: Reformed Church of France; b. at La Tour de Peiltz (12 m. e.s.e. of Lausanne), Switzerland, Feb. 11, 1810; d. at Bordeaux, France, Apr. 6, 1888. He studied at Lausanne, and at Strasburg (B.D., Lic. Theol., and D.D., 1834); was ordained, 1833; exiled from Piedmont, 1835; went to Nîmes, France, where he was naturalized; lived at Bordeaux first as assistant pastor, 1836–40, then as pastor. His productions of interest and importance are: *Histoire des Vaudois des vallées du Piémont et de leurs colonies depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours* (vol. i., Paris, 1834; put by the Roman Catholic hierarchy upon the Index); *Les Martyrs* *vaudois ou les confesseurs de la vérité dans les vallées du Piémont* . . . (1849); *L'Israël des Alpes. Première histoire complète des Vaudois du Piémont et de leurs colonies* (1851; Eng. transl., *The Israel of the Alps: a Complete History of the Vaudois of Piedmont and their Colonies,* Edinburgh, 1857); *Les Vaudois des Alpes italiennes, de 1686 à 1694, poëme. Les Premiers Chants* (Paris, 1855); *Les Néhémites, ou l'expulsion, l'exil et le retour des Vaudois dans leur patrie, de 1686 à 1690* (1850); *La Gossen opprimée: histoire jusqu'ici inconnue des églises Vaudoises* . . . (1850); *Histoire populaire des Vaudois, enrichie des documents inédits* (1862); *Valdésie, poëme* (1863); *Le Préhistorique dans les pays de Montbéliard et les contrées circonvoisines* (Montbéliard, 1887). He contributed papers on archeological subjects to the journal of the Société Scientifique et Médicale of Montbéliard.

The Legal Status.

MUTILATIONS AND MARKS, CEREMONIAL: In Deut. xiv. 1 the Hebrews are prohibited from practising two customs, cutting the person and "shaving between the eyes" for the dead; the reason assigned for the prohibition in verse 2 is that they are a people holy to Yahweh. Ezekiel, in his legislation for the Hebrew Utopia (xliv. 20), forbids the priests to indulge in either of two extremes, shaving the head and wearing the hair long. The priestly law in Lev. xix. 27–28 goes still further, verse 27 forbidding the rounding of the "corners of the head" and "marring the corners of the beard." An illuminative translation of verse 28 (in *SBOT*) reads: "You (i.e., the Hebrew people) shall not make incisions in your skin for the dead; nor shall you tattoo any marks upon you." Lev. xxi. 5 forbids the priests to shave the head or to shave off the corner of the beard or to make cuttings in the flesh; and the connection (verses 1–5) implies that the practise prohibited is connected with mourning. The passages from Leviticus are from the "Holiness Code," and the reason assigned is the same as in Deuteronomy; the basis of the proscription is religious, which implies that the practises forbidden were also connected with religion.

Biblical Passages Showing Customs.

Other passages, some of earlier date, which either refer to customs similar to those proscribed or use the customs rhetorically, imply that in these as in other items the legislation cited is correcting practises (mostly connected with mourning) which had hitherto been observed but were at the time of the enactments deemed objectionable. The earliest in time of these passages is Hos. vii. 14 (R. V. margin), and apparently the ceremony referred to is one of prayer and petition to deities for the gift of crops. In Amos viii. 10; Isa. iii. 24, xxii. 12; Micah i. 16; Ezek. vii. 18; and Job i. 20 the shaving of the head is either noted without disapproval, or commanded as from Yahweh, or predicted as signs of mourning which will result from certain calamities which are to occur by way of punishment for sin. Jeremiah makes frequent reference to such customs: xvi. 6 declares that the coming affliction will be so severe that the rites of mourning, among them those of mutilation of the person by incisions and shaving of the head, will not be observed; xli. 5 records the fact of certain men coming with offerings from Samaria "to the house of the Lord" with beards shaven and garments rent—both of these customs usual in times of mourning; in the rhetorical passage xlvii. 5 baldness (when artificial, a sign of mourning) is predicted for Gaza (this passage does not involve that the habit was current among Philistines, against *DB*, i. 538); probably a similar explanation holds for xlviii. 37 (cf. Isa. xv. 2), where the same mark is to indicate that Moab will experience calamity (the rhetorical character of these passages prevents their use to prove the existence of the habit among Philistines and Moabites). Ex. xiii. 9, 16 (JE) seems to imply a (former?) custom of tattooing on forehead and hand which had religious significance, with which reference such a tender passage as Isa. xlix. 16 is to be compared. Contrast with this Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18, which represents a later stage when the symbols of religious faith were to be bound upon (not tattooed into) hand and forehead. It is difficult to decide whether the Exodus passage is purely figurative; at any rate it seems to know the custom of tattooing. Ezek. ix. 4–6 is expressive and characteristic, the literal rendering being "carve a Taw (i.e., the Hebrew letter T) upon the foreheads," etc. Some rabbinic commentators, probably erroneously, explain this by the ankh, the Egyptian sign of life, which, however, is quite different in form from the letter Taw. The habit of inscribing a sign of religious affiliation on the hand is referred to in the Old Testament as late as the exile, since the Deutero-Isaiah says (xliv. 5) "Another shall write on his hand 'Yahweh's'" (cf. R. V. margin), the purpose being to designate a man as a servant or worshiper of Yahweh. I Kings xviii. 28 is not to be brought into connection with the phenomena under discussion, but is to be related with those treated under Ecstasy (q.v.). Also of slightly different character is the "mark" of Cain (Gen. iv. 15), which is most probably to be brought into connection with the clan mark common under totemism. The mark of Cain was to serve as a deterrent from murderous assault upon him, which is the way in which the clan mark operates, since the killing of a clansman is likely to cause a blood feud (cf. COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1, c. § 3). The references to the custom of mutilation or tattooing reappear in the Book of Revelation; thus in xiii. 16, 17, xiv. 9, 11, xix. 20, and xx. 4, those who belong to the beast and worship him are said to bear his mark in hand and forehead; while in vii. 3–4 the servants of God are said to be "sealed in their foreheads."

As Connected with Mourning.

The cases cited in the preceding from the Bible fall under two categories, those which arise under circumstances of mourning, and those which presuppose immediate connection with deity. The former class is by an increasing number of commentators related to the cult of the dead. The cutting or tearing of the hair and gashing of the flesh are customs common among diverse peoples of the past and present. Herodotus (ii. 40) speaks of Egyptians beating themselves at the celebration in honor of Isis; in ii. 60 he relates that Carian residents of Egypt cut themselves with knives at the same celebration; according to iv. 71 the Scythian mourner cuts bits from his ear, shaves his head, cuts his arm, his forehead, and his nose, and thrusts an arrow through his left hand. Xenophon (*Cyropædia*, III., i. 13) reports practically the same customs among the Armenians. The Arabs had the custom of scratching the face and shaving the head during the period of mourning (Wellhausen, *Heidentum*, pp. 123–124, 182, 198–199). The legislation of Solon and the Twelve Tables forbade the women of Athens to bring blood by self-flagellation (for the legislation of Solon consult G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. iii., new ed., London, 1872; for that of the Twelve Tables, M. Voigt, *Die XII. Tafeln. Geschichte und System des Civil- und Criminal-Rechtes, wie Processes der XII. Tafeln*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1883–84). The sacrifice of the hair and of blood in honor of the manes of the departed is well attested for the Greeks (cf. *Iliad*, xxiii. 141–151, 135–136); while among primitive peoples it is still believed that the ghost receives strength and new vigor from the blood shed by mourners. The indications of an ancestor cult among the Hebrews are being studied anew, and it is a possibility that the mourning customs indicated or forbidden in the passages cited from the Old Testament are connected by derivation from this (cf. C. Grüneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israel*, Halle, 1900; *JE*, i. 569–571).

As Signs of Worship.

The second class of cases noted in the Bible are those in which the mutilations serve to indicate the connection of the worshiper with a deity. Light on this is thrown by ethnic usages. Herodotus (ii. 13) relates of a temple near the Canopic mouth of the Nile that slaves might find sanctuary there by devoting themselves to the god and receiving upon their bodies sacred stigmata as signs of service; and in iii. 8 he notes that the Arabs used the tonsure in ring shape, leaving the hair on the crown of the head, in honor of their god Orotal. The many varieties of tonsure—a practise which ranges from India to Central America—all connected with religion, will at once occur to the reader. Lucian (*De dea Syria*) shows that Syrian priests were tattooed on neck and wrist, while at Byblus the people shaved their heads at the annual mourning for Adonis, while women had the alternative of sacred prostitution. Philo (*De monarchia*, i.) remarks that idol worshipers were branded. In III Macc. ii. 29 it is stated that Ptolemy IV. Philopator branded Jews with the ivy leaf, the symbol of Dionysus. In Asia Minor the worshipers of Cybele and other deities received a mark in their flesh. For the significance of circumcision see that article. Among the races which are most addicted to tattooing—as Maoris and East Polynesians—the ceremony is often connected with the initiation at puberty into the mysteries, or with marriage, both being related to religion. The same is true of the totem mark, which is produced by scarification, tattooing, or painting. It is incorrect to assume, however, that all tattooing is religious. Much is purely decorative, and other purposes are also served, such as to indicate membership with societies not religious in character. Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: The commentaries on the passages cited are often illuminative, especially those which take into account the ethnic customs. Consult further: T. Waitz; *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, passim, 6 parts, Leipsic, 1859–72; A. Lacassagne, *Les Tatouages*, Paris, 1881; Goldziher, in *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, xiv (1886), 49–51; G. A. Wilken, *Revue coloniale internationale*, iii (1886), 225–279, iv (1887), 345–426; W. Joest, *Tätowieren, Narbenzeichen und Körperbemalen*, Berlin, 1887; R. Pietschmann, *Geschichte der Phönizier*, i. 389–390, Berlin, 1889; J. Batchelor, *Ainu*, pp. 131–132, London, 1892; F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, pp. 16–18, Giessen, 1892; Stade, in *ZATW*, xiv (1894), 250–251; H. G. Robley, *Moko; Maori Tattooing*, London, 1896; Von Luschau, in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxviii. 1896; J. Frey, *Tod, Seelenglaube und Seelenkult im alten Israel*, pp. 127-173, Leipsic, 1898; É. Sergent, *Les Tatouages dans les pays chauds*, Montpellier, 1901; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, London, 1903 (especially valuable for citations of ethnic practises); W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, pp. 212 sqq.; idem, *Rel. of Sem.*, chap. ix.; Nowack, *Archäologie*, i. 194–195, Benzinger, *Archäologie*, p. 219; *DB*, i. 537–539, ii. 283–285; *EB*, i. 971–975.

MYCONIUS, mi-kō'nî-us (**MECUM**), **FRIEDRICH:** German Reformer; b. at Lichtenfels in Upper Franconia (20 m. n.n.e. of Bamberg) Dec. 26, 1490; d. at Gotha Apr. 7, 1546. After graduating from the school of his native city, he was sent in 1504 to the Latin school in Annaberg, where he met Tetzel (1510) who was traveling over Germany as commissary of indulgences. As he was greatly troubled by his spiritual condition he was persuaded in 1510 to enter the Franciscan monastery. From Annaberg he went to the monastery in Leipsic and in 1512 to that in Weimar. He there studied diligently Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, Gabriel Biel, and especially Augustine, whose works made a deep impression upon him. In 1516 he was ordained priest in Weimar and soon received a position as preacher there. With great satisfaction he listened to Luther when he began his fight against indulgences, and Myconius was among the first who followed the new paths. But as the authorities of Weimar maintained a reserved attitude toward the Reformation, it became more and more difficult for him to hold his office. His intercourse and correspondence were closely watched, and he was threatened with life-long confinement in a monastery, being sent to the monasteries of Leipsic and Annaberg. But in 1524 he succeeded in escaping, and received at Zwickau a position as preacher in a hospital. At the instance of Wenzeslaus Link and Gabriel Didymus he was called to the congregation in the small town of Buchholz. In the same year (1524) Duke John called him to Gotha, at the request of the council and the congregation. Though the ground there had been cleared for the Reformation, ecclesiastical affairs as well as secular were still in a hopeless condition. The higher and lower clergy had degenerated and a dead ecclesiastical mechanicalism was all that showed. School affairs were in the hands of ignorant and indolent monks, and in the government of the city and among the members of the council avarice and disorder reigned. Myconius mastered the situation by his wisdom and energy. About 1525 Luther entered into correspondence with him, and encouraged him not to be frightened off by the rebellious peasants, while Melanchthon, who began to correspond with him in 1527, warned him against imprudent interference in non-religious affairs. Myconius reformed the schools of the city and awakened the interest of the citizens in them. In the Augustinian monastery he erected a school whose first rector from 1524 to 1535 was Basilius Monner of Weimar. Myconius exerted great influence both by his sermons and in his practical pastorate and by his exemplary conduct. His influence, moreover, was not confined to Gotha. He accompanied as preacher Prince John Frederick three times to the Lower Rhine, to Cologne, Jülich and Cleves, and in 1534, after the latter had become elector, to Düsseldorf, Brunswick, and Celle. On these journeys, Myconius preached to large concourses. With Melanchthon, Menius, and others he took part in the church visitations of Thuringia in 1527 and 1533, also in many important conventions of the Reformation, in the religious colloquy of Marburg 1529, the Wittenberg Assembly of 1536, the convention of Schmalkald 1537, the negotiations in Frankfort and Nuremberg 1539, and the convention of Hagenau 1540. In 1538 he went to England with Franz Burkhardt and Georg von Boyneburg in order to discuss the articles of the Augsburg Confession with the theologians of Henry VIII. He was successful in introducing the Reformation in Saxony after the death of Duke George in 1539, at first in his beloved Annaberg, then in Leipsic, where he preached the first Evangelical sermon in the Church of St. Nicolai. The princes left him there that he might carry through the work of the Reformation; he remained nine months, meeting an obstinate and violent opposition, but finally mastered the situation. He won the affection of the citizens to such a degree that Elector John Frederick was asked to leave him there two years, but in 1540 he returned to his congregation. His health had always been very delicate and unequal to his arduous tasks. Owing to overexertion on the occasion of the Thuringian visitations, he was compelled after the year 1539 to interrupt his labors from time to time, especially as he developed bronchial troubles.

Few characters of the Reformation appeal to the sympathy as strongly as does Myconius. Like Luther, he had attained the light and truth of the Gospel by personal experience. His character had been firmly fixed early in life and could not be unsettled by the theological disputes and opinions of the time. In Luther he recognized with gladness from the beginning "the chosen man of God and the last Elijah," and his devotion to Melanchthon was not less sincere. The purity of his character was undisputed and secured him the respect of friend and foe. In spite of his efficiency in the Latin and German tongues and his popular gifts, he did not aspire to the fame of a writer or scholar, but exerted his activity in the practical work of the church. Nevertheless, he has left some treatises which are still valuable, as, for instance, *Wie man die einfeltigen und sonderlich die krancken, im Christenthumb vnterrichten soll* (Wittenberg, 1539; new ed., Frankfort, 1598, enlarged by the treatise *Wi- man mit den besessenen Leuten umgehen soll*). Whenever the condition of his throat prevented him from preaching, he busied himself with searching the archives of the church, of monasteries, and the hospital, and published extracts of them under the title *Neues Erbbuch und Kopey der Ministratur 1542* and wrote his *Historia Reformationis* 1517–42, both extant in manuscript in the archducal library at Gotha. This history reflects his experiences and impressions in an unpretentious, but fresh and plastic manner, and is the valuable contribution of a contemporary of the events.

(G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: His *Historia Reformationis* contains many biographical details. Biographies were written by A. Probus, Schmalkalden, 1597; M. Adam, Frankfort, 1705; Juncker, Waltershausen, 1730; J. G. Bosseck, Leipsic, 1739; C. K. G. Lommatzsch, Annaberg, 1825; K. F. Ledderhose, Gotha, 1854; M. Meurer, Leipsic, 1864 (contains an excellent list of literature); G. Kreyenberg, in *Grenzboten*, 1892, i. pp. 114 sqq.; and P. Scherffig, Leipsic. 1900. Consult also: H. E. Jacobs, *Martin Luther*, pp. 65–66, 79, 117, 287, New York, 1898; J. W. Richard, *Philip Melanchthon*, pp. 159, 254, 280, ib. 1898.

MYCONIUS, OSWALD: Swiss reformer; b. at Lucerne 1488; d. at Basel Oct. 14, 1552. His original name was Geisshüsler. After completing his education at Basel, where he became acquainted with Zwingli, Holbein, and Erasmus, he became a teacher at the canons' school at Zurich in 1516. Here he published two pamphlets in one of which (1518) he held that the pope must be obeyed only so long as he required nothing contrary to Christianity. He took a decisive part in the calling of Zwingli to Zurich. Shortly afterward Myconius was called to teach in his native city, but he continued to correspond with his lifelong friend Zwingli. In 1522 his views forced him to retire from his position. After teaching for a time at Einsiedeln he returned to Zurich, primarily as teacher at the school attached to the Fraumünster. Here he held German lectures on the New Testament, besides taking a silent though active part in all the measures of Zwingli. To this period belongs his *Ad sacerdotes Helvetiæ qui Tigurinis male loquuntur suasoria ut male loqui desinant* (1524). In 1531 Myconius was called to the church of St. Albans at Basel and in 1532 he was appointed the successor of Œcolampadius (q.v.). Though he accepted this only on condition that he might resign as soon as one more worthy could be found, he continued to discharge the double office of head of the Basel church and professor of theology until his death. He was involved in many difficulties, however, by Carlstadt (q.v.), who formed a faction in the faculty to subordinate the church to the university, only to be defeated by Myconius; and when the latter sought to carry out the reformatory measures of Œcolampadius, Carlstadt declared to the council that his rival wished to make the civil authorities slaves of the priests, and told the people that Myconius disapproved all their pleasure. Despite this the prestige of Myconius increased everywhere.

In the eucharistic question, while remaining generally in accord with the Zwinglian position, as is clear from his letters and from his commentary on
l. 1538), Myconius approximated Luthe

in certain regards. In the first Helvetic Confession, drawn up in 1536, he accordingly termed the Lord's Supper a mystic meal, and spoke of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ not as perishable physical food but as nourishing eternal life. He sought, moreover, to reconcile Luther and Zwingli in their eucharistic views, and pursued a similar course in the Osiandrian controversies. The most distinguished pupil of Myconius was Theodor Bibliander (q.v.), to whose edition of the letters of Œcolampadius and Zwingli (Basel, 1536) Myconius contributed a first brief life of Zwingli (printed in the *Vitæ quatuor reformatorum*, ed. Neander, Berin, 1841). (EMIL EGLI†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His correspondence with Zwingli is printed in the *Opera* of the latter, vols. vii.–viii. Biographies are by M. Kirchofer, Zurich, 1813; and K. R. Hagenbach, Elberfeld, 1859 (contains also the principal minor writings of Myconius). Further notices will be found in the literature dealing with the Reformation in Switzerland, also in the biographies of Bullinger, Œcolampadius, and Zwingli. Consult: Schaff, *Christian Church*, vii. 215 sqq.; T. and F. Platter, *Sittengeschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, ed. H. Boos, Leipsic, 1878; S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, passim, New York, 1903.

MYNSTER, min'ster, **JAKOB PETER:** Danish bishop; b. at Copenhagen Nov. 8, 1775; d. there Jan. 30, 1854. He studied theology at the university of his native city, and became pastor at Spjellerup, on the island of Zealand, in 1802; first chaplain at the Church of Our Lady in Copenhagen in 1812; privat-docent in psychology in the theological seminary at Copenhagen in 1813, and court preacher in 1826. During his career in the Danish metropolis he published a volume of *Kleine Theologische Schriften* (in German, Copenhagen, 1825), which gives evidence of his knowledge of esthetic and philosophical literature, as well as of church history. In 1834 he was appointed bishop of Zealand, in which capacity he officiated until his death. During his incumbency of the bishopric the religious movement caused by the appearance of Grundtvig (q.v.) agitated the Danish Church, and Mynster, who had no sympathy with the former's ideas of religious liberty, became one of his most ardent opponents. Grundtvig, however, succeeded in preventing the introduction of a revised ritual proposed by Mynster, and as the teachings promulgated by the former found more and more adherents the old bishop found it impossible to stem the tide of liberalism, and he gradually gave up the struggle, devoting himself to literary pursuits. He published numerous collections of sermons, and a work entitled "Thoughts on Christian Dogmas" (2 vols., Germ. transl., Hamburg, 1840), which for a long time remained popular both in Denmark and Germany. A collection of his writings in 6 vols. appeared at Copenhagen in 1852–57; collections of his letters in 1860–66; an autobiography in 1854 (2d ed., 1898); and a volume of sermons, 1875. (F. NIELSEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the autobiography and letters named above, consult: C. L. N. Mynster, "Reminiscences," Copenhagen, 1877. Further literature in Danish is given in Hauck-Hersog, *RE*, xiii. 609.

MYRBERG, OTTO FERDINAND: Swedish theologian; b. in Gothenburg Apr. 26, 1824; d. at Upsala Mar. 22, 1899. He received his education at the University of Upsala (B.A., 1841; Ph.D. and candidate in theology, 1851); was appointed professor of exegesis there 1866, and resigned 1892. He was an able and independent exegete of the Biblical-theological school, being influenced by J. T. Beck and by Sören Kierkegaard (qq.v.). For him faith received its justifying power as the most profound ethical act; justification is gained not by imputation but by man's appropriating it; and he stressed not Christ's suffering and death but his personality, which was perfected through suffering and death. He assailed the Lutheran doctrine of atonement and justification, and took part in the controversy called out by the teaching of Waldenström (q.v.) on the atonement which was diffused throughout Sweden and entered the United States. Among his works are *Den ignellska theologien* (1862); *Bidrag til en bibelsk theologi* (1863); *Inledning til Romarebrefvet* (1868); *Om aposteln Petrus och den äldsta kyrkans falska gnosis* (1865); *Pauli bref til Romarena* (1871); *Den hel. Skrifts lära om försoningen* (1874); *Salomos Ordspråk* (1875); *De paulinska brefven* (2d ed., 1883); *De apostoliska brefven af Jakob, Petrus, Judas och Johannes* (1883); during 1864–69 he edited the periodical *Vittnet*, and after 1884 *Bibelforskaren*, which among other things contains his admirable translation of Isaiah, and his interesting commentary on Revelation.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

MYRRH: The fragrant gum of *Balsamodendron myrrha*, a tree or shrub growing chiefly in Arabia and Ethiopia, but not in Palestine, where its use was a luxury (cf. Matt. ii. 11). The gum, at first oily and then fluid, is primarily a yellowish white; but it hardens into reddish drops or kernels with a peculiar balsam smell and bitter taste. The best kind flows partly of itself. Generally the bark of the tree was incised to obtain the myrrh, which was exported from Arabia to the West especially by Nabatæans and Phenicians, who frequently adulterated it and doubtless sometimes substituted similar gums from other trees. Myrrh was used as incense (Cant. iii. 6), to perfume clothing and beds (Ps. xlv. 8; Prov. vii. 17; Cant. i. 13), as an unguent (Ex. xxx. 23; Esther ii. 12; Cant. v. 5), and in pulverized form for embalming (John xix. 39), whence most of the Church Fathers interpreted the myrrh of Matt. ii. 11 as a symbol of the suffering and death of Christ. Myrrh was also mingled with wine to impart to it an aromatic flavor and to render it less intoxicating; but the "wine mingled with myrrh" of Mark xv. 23 was probably the sour wine of the Roman soldiers mingled with some bitter ingredient to produce stupefaction (cf. Matt. xxvii. 34). (R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: See under MYRTLE.

MYRTLE: A tree about ten feet high, growing in the valleys and on the shores, as well as on heights not altogether devoid of moisture (cf. Neh. viii. 15), in Asia, whence it was transplanted to Greece and Italy. Its perfume and beauty, enhanced by its smooth, evergreen leaves and white flowers, made it a favorite adornment of gardens (cf. Isa. xli. 19, lv. 13), though it also grew wild in Palestine (Neh., ut sup.). Oil and a sort of wine were prepared from its black berries (Vergil, *Georgica*, i. 106; Pliny, *Hist. naturalis*, xv. 35–38, xxiii. 44); and its branches formed decorations of houses and rooms on festal occasions, as at the Feast of Tabernacles (Neh., ut sup.). The classics also show that myrtle branches were strewn in the way, and garlands of myrtle were worn at feasts, especially at marriage feasts since the myrtle was sacred to Aphrodite and the symbol of conjugal love. The name Hadassah, "Myrtle," was thus appropriate as the name of a beautiful girl, and was the original appellation of Esther (Esther ii. 7).

(R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: C. Hart, *Fauna and Flora of Sinai, Petrae*, etc., London, 1901–05; M. Callcott, *Scripture Herbal*, ib. 1842; H. S. Osborn, *Plants of the Holy Land*, Philadelphia, 1860; H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, London, 1884; G. E. Post, *Flora of Syria, Palestine, and Syria*, Beirut, 1896; C. Joret, in *L'Orient classique*, 1897, p. 355; G. Henslow, *Plants of the Bible*, ib. 1906; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxvii., cols. 1363–67.

MYSTAGOGICAL THEOLOGY.

"Mystagogia." Cyril of Jerusalem (§ 1).
Dionysius the Areopagite (§ 2).
Works Antedating Theodore of Andida (§ 3).
Theodore of Andida and Others (§ 4).
Later Eastern and Western Treatises (§ 5).

1. "Mystagogia." Cyril of Jerusalem.

A term "Mystagogical Theology" was used to denote a form of disciplinary theology that was cultivated principally in the Eastern Church in the early Byzantine age, but also in the Middle Ages, and later in Russia. It conveys the sense of the church ceremonial not in the light of historic science but as having a "secret meaning." As used in ancient Greek, *mystagogia* signifies the sacred initiation into the "mysteries," either by actual admission to the sacred solemnities or by theoretical admission through instruction. Whatever introduces to a mystery is a *mystagogia;* the priest who performs or conducts the process is a "mystagogue," as is the theologian who correctly expounds it and embodies its true sense (which is primarily a secret) in the form of "doctrine." The sacred process is itself a *mystagogia,* since it initiates into the region of divine wonders. Above every other ecclesiastical solemnity, the Eucharist is accounted a *mystagogia,* indeed it is termed expressly "the mystagogia." In general, however, mystagogical theology has examined everything pertaining to the divine offices, and has discovered a secret meaning in every part of them. The earliest mystagogical work known is the "Mystagogical Catechetics" by Cyril of Jerusalem (q.v.), dating from about the middle of the fourth century. This is in five sermons, wherein Cyril further explains to the neophytes, to whom he has already delivered the creed in the course of eighteen sermons, who have also been baptized accordingly, the additional sacred operations which they have undergone, together with the holy ceremonies in which they have now shared for the first time. It is presupposed that the catechumens were as yet not rightly aware of what was to come about in them when they received baptism, nor how the Eucharist, to which they were to be admitted for the first time after baptism, was celebrat what this celebration altogether signified. Cyril elucidates only a few details in a really mystagogical sense and in the simplest terms of statement. "Symbolic" and "dogmatic" explanations occur interchangeably. That is to say, Cyril felt no less obliged to set clearly before the newly baptized members the matter in question, the renewal they have undergone, especially to render them conscious of the fact that the bread and wine were the body and the blood of the Lord, than to exhibit the rites and the forms, which they have seen and shared, in their intrinsic significance; in other words, he aimed to present those rites on their objective side, yet as themselves conveying the sense of their process. The main outline of presentation is the idea that the "renewal" involved a gradual progress, and that this was discernible in the rites themselves.

2. Dionysius the Areopagite.

The proper founder of mystagogical theology, broadly considered, was Dionysius the Areopagite (q.v.), a man of whom little is known, save that he probably belonged to the close of the fifth century and was active in Syria. The work of special interest here is "Concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" (*MPG*, iii. 369 sqq.; Eng. transl. by John Parker, London, 1894). What in this is significant in respect to the expository feeling of the early Church is that the whole visible entity and activity of the "hierarchy," that is, the Church in its vital agency, is represented as being filled with mysteries and wonders; and if one be but correctly initiated, these, perchance, can be everywhere seen "shining through." Dionysius made it clear that "dogma" is possessed of a mirrored counterpart in ceremonial worship. In later times, the ceremonial was not infrequently treated as a criterion for a "new" doctrine; the same being discarded unless there appeared to be something congruent in the rites. Conversely, it is a special question just how far the rites and sacramentals became gradually adapted to the dogma already current, with symbols to fit the occasion. As Dionysius will have it, the terrestrial hierarchy is a copy of the celestial. Just as the angels, in graduated circles, throng round about the one only God, even so the clergy on earth encompass the one bishop. The latter is quite peculiarly "a divine and godly man." From him do the priestly persons receive their divine consecrations, whereby they become qualified to "divinify" men. Dionysius treats of the principal ecclesiastical mysteries. A brief description of the given transaction is invariably followed by a survey of the emblematical character of its rites in detail. The object is to elucidate the intrinsic nature of the clergy, to explain its direct significance in connection with the transaction concerned; again, the same as touching the "faithful." For instance, in his "Priestly Ordinances" or acts of consecration for clerical offices, Dionysius shows that both the "unity" of the hierarchy is represented, and the gradation between bishop, priest, and liturgist (deacon). In the case of baptism one may discern illumination for its emblematic import, as one perceives how the by turning westward and being disrobed for the act of renunciation, then by facing eastward and steadfastly gazing in this direction while confessing the faith, is led over from the sphere of the lightless to that of the light.

The next important mystagogue was Maximus Confessor (q.v.), whose interpretation of the Eucharist, found in *MPG*, xci. 657 sqq., supplies what Dionysius omitted, a mystagogical elucidation of the Church as congregation. In so far as the Church embraces all "sorts and conditions of men," it is fairly a "type and image" of God, a copy of his fulness and diversity, though in unity inherent. Maximus furthermore contemplates the Church as a structure; for if one surveys its typical compartments aright, the Church is at once a mysterious depiction of the universe, and an image of man and his constituent parts. In chap. viii. Maximus reaches his distinctive theme, the Eucharist. He reviews the entire course thereof; the priest's entrance into the Church represents Christ's appearing in the flesh, the entrance of the people indicates the separation of the faithful from the unbelieving, the closing of the doors points to the end of the world and the judgment, which only those worthily transformed into the world of divine reason can enter securely.

Next to be considered are the writings which deal particularly with a historical and symbolical construction of the Eucharist; that is, those the rational continuity of which has evolved the theory as to the so-called dramatic character of the liturgy.

3. Works Antedating Theodore of Andida.

But here many literary questions remain to be settled before the development becomes thoroughly clear. It was long believed that Sophronius of Jerusalem was the founder of this theory. But the Russian scholar Krasnoseljcev has shown this to be an error. It is owing to him, again, and to F. E. Brightman, that an important man in the history of mystagogical theology has of late been to some extent newly recovered to knowledge, namely, Theodore of Andida. But in order to keep the literary sequence firmly in mind, one must pause at this point to consider a work entitled "Mystagogical Church Lore." This has been ascribed to many authors, and a really critical edition on the basis of the many manuscripts available is still lacking. Pitra communicated a fragment of a Latin translation prepared by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (q.v.); while from the letter to Emperor Charles the Bald, appended by Anastasius to this document, it appears that in Constantinople at that time, the Patriarch Germanus I. (d. 730) was deemed the author. It is entirely possible that this tradition is correct. The work itself underwent many reconstructions. Whether the shortest form, published by Miller after a *Codex Bodlejanus et Magdalenensis* (in his edition of the works of Cyril of Jerusalem, pp. 325–332, Oxford, 1703), is the earliest, is undecided. The one in *MPG*, xcviii. 384–453, is certainly late and greatly enlarged. In the explanation of the liturgy which this work presents, the thought is dominant that the celebration of the Eucharist reveals the entire life of the Lord. The priest represents Christ himself; indeed his very vestments are so fashioned that Christ is to be discerned therein. Originally the design appears to have been limited to the priestly symbolizing (in visible ritual acts) of Christ in his passion, death, and resurrection. But ultimately the conception so far expands that practically the whole history of Jesus Christ becomes illustrated in the acts and actors of the liturgy. Even the manner in which the priest holds his fingers, while blessing the people at the close, has its symbolism, and announces the event of Christ's coming again, and of the end of the world.

4. Theodore of Andida and Others.

It is Theodore of Andida who turns the construction so as to cover the whole history of Christ. Who Theodore was, is totally uncertain; Andida the place is supposed to be situated in Asia Minor. Theodore may belong to the twelfth, if not to the eleventh, century. He is acquainted with the work just noted, and holds it to be a work of Basil of Cæsarea. His own treatise is entitled "Summary Review of the Symbols and Mysteries Occurrent in the Divine Liturgy" (cf. A. Mai, *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, vi. 2, pp. 547–584, 8 vols., Rome, 1852–71; and *MPG*, cxl. 417–468). Theodore (some codices call him "Nicholas") is a learned man. He remarks that "many priests were aware that the various acts in the liturgy aimed to set forth the Lord's passion, etc., not only according to its effects, but also to depict, as in a figure, the very manner thereof; save that there was no doubt but that those liturgical acts exhibited likewise the entire earthly career of Jesus." The holy table, whereon the sacrifice is prepared, can certainly be regarded as the "grave," but is also expected to recall the "manger." The bread is naturally a "type of the body of Christ, but also of Mary, in so far as she conceives the Word by power of the Holy Ghost," whereas the deacon also "salutes" the bread, even as the angel greeted Mary. Where the deacon withdraws from the "table of preparation" the Lord abides there in the stillness of retirement and seclusion; these being the thirty years of Christ's "obscurity." Then the priest comes actively forward: his first "ingress" into the Church represents the preaching Christ; his second entrance, with the bread and wine, exhibits Jesus on his way to death. The vestments have manifold significance (see Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical). Theodore's entire treatise is full of subtle, often brilliant, phantasy. Its manner of interpretation dominated all the succeeding era; and its theory has come to be officially binding. A treatise to be correctly appraised only upon due acquaintance is the one associated with Sophronius of Jerusalem (d. 638), and formerly held to be genuine: "Account Comprising the Entire Ecclesiastical History" (*MPG*, lxxxvii., pp. iii., 3981 sqq.). This work is a combination of the primitive "Mystagogical Church Lore" and of Theodore's "Summary Review." The various mystagogical writings mentioned above are of moment in that they reveal the development of the liturgy in general. Yet they have not been adequately valued by liturgical scholars either as sources to determine the graduating distinctions or different successive phases in the history of liturgy, or as governing the relative status of the traditional liturgical forms. In fact, the mystagogical theory often affords the possibility of ascertaining what is old and what is new material. Especially are the many quotations from prayers, lections, etc., of value for critically collating the manifold liturgical texts.

5. Later Eastern and Western Treatises. The most renowned mystagogues of the Middle Ages were the two metropolitans of Thessalonica, Nikolaos Kabasilas (q.v.) and Simeon (q.v.). The former is the more ingenious, being comparable for acumen to Theodore of Andida, whose mode of contemplation he specifically continued, particularly the thought that the liturgy visibly presents the entire incarnation of the Logos. But it were leading us too far afield to examine his work in detail. His " Interpretation of the Divine Liturgy " is found in *MPG*, cl. 368 sqq. Simeon is of much slighter compass; for him the external is everywhere the most engaging, the separate pieces of clerical vestments, their form, color, etc. The line of " Dionysius the Areopagite," Maximus Confessor, Theodore of Andida, Nicholas Kabasilas, is the line *par excellence*, that of the real thinkers; the second rank, to which Simeon belongs, is that of the *dilettanti*. Howbeit, Simeon suited the taste of his time, and owes it to this circumstance that he came to be the most popular mystagogue, the one whose name continues thoroughly current. In the form of a dialogue he discussed both dogmas and rites, besides composing tracts of a mystagogical nature (cf. *MPG*, clv. 61–536). In his case, the drama of the liturgy comes to be a mere spectacular exhibition, " performed," in a sense, by puppets. The more modern era has also produced its mystagogues. In the second half of the sixteenth century flourished Johannes Nathanael (in Venice and Constantinople); later, Nicholas Bulgaris (close of the seventeenth century; not to be confused with Eugenius Bulgaris, q.v.), though he published simply what his brother Christodulos (a priest on the island of Corfu) had written. But the Russian literature is more important in this direction than the modern Greek. Among works that have become very well known may be mentioned the " Letters on the Divine Offices of the Eastern Church " by Ludovicus of Muralt (1838); the " Elucidation of the Divine Offices of the Eastern Church in the Light of their Symbolical Meaning," by Philaretus (archbishop of Tchernigov, in his " History of the Church of Russia "; Germ. transl. by Blumenthal, i. 369 sqq., Frankfort, 1872); the " Meditations on the Divine Liturgy," by the illustrious poet Gogol (Germ. transl. in A. V. Maltzew, *Liturgikon*, Berlin, 1902). An inexhaustible wealth of imagination has been educed among the Russians by the liturgy, and the entire round of the Church solemnities. In the Western Church certain attempts are not wanting in the way of construing ceremonial worship in a mystagogical or symbolic sense. Only in the West this matter is hardly taken so seriously as in the East. There is much freer play in the East in this connection than in the West, where the great mystagogues are but paired with the great dogmatists.

F. Kattenbusch.

Bibliography: Besides the literature under the special articles in this work on the individuals named in the text, consult: W. Gass, *Die Mystik des Nikolaus Cabasilas*, pp. 155 sqq., Greifswald, 1849; idem, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 298 sqq., Berlin, 1872; Steitz, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, vols. ix.–xiii (1864–68); E. Le Grand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, Paris, 1885 sqq.; F. Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Konfessionskunde*, i. 335 sqq., 350 sqq., 393 sqq., 491 sqq., Freiburg, 1892; F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. xciii.–xcv., London, 1896; P. Meyer, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1899; Drews, in *TSK*, lxxiii (1900), 480–488; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, consult index under the names of the individuals named in the text.

MYSTERIES, TRIBAL. See Tribal Mysteries; and Comparative Religion, VI., 1, b, § 5.

MYSTICISM.

I. Definition and Description.
  Essential Character (§ 1).
  Relation to Religion (§ 2).
  Attainment of Mystical Conditions (§ 3).
II. History.
  In the East (§ 1).
  Scholastic and Monastic Mysticism (§ 2).
  Early Protestant Mysticism (§ 3).
  Post-Reformation Roman Catholic Mysticism (§ 4).
  Late Protestant Mysticism (§ 5).
  Mysticism in England (§ 6).
  In America (§ 7).

I. Definition and Description: **1. Essential Character.** Like many other psychological concepts, mysticism scarcely admits of rigid definition, since its elements, though rooted in the individual soul, so cross with other elements in the course of the development of each person, and give rise to such complex phenomena, that exact delimitation becomes impossible. To gain even an approximate notion of mysticism, a distinction must first be drawn, a number of elements must be eliminated, particularly all that results from sense-perception, and all that may be deduced from such perception by dialectics in the widest sense of the term. When, on the other hand, from external perceptions feelings arise which can not logically be deduced from such perceptions, but can arise only through the cooperation of the peculiar spiritual organism of man, such feelings may be termed mystical. Mysticism has its real beginning, therefore, when the mystical element becomes ascendent over man in connection with the world that surrounds him, and when his soul seeks to be in harmony with the universe that encompasses it, or, more accurately, with the Supreme, however this Supreme be conceived. The way in which the ends of mysticism are acquired is primarily self-introspection. It is true that there is here an element of human cooperation and will, but since the will is unable of itself to produce the inner experience which it desires, but needs to be met by a divine grace which both purifies and illumines the soul, mysticism involves the concept of revelation, and thus comes into relation with religion.

All religion depends on revelation of some sort, real or assumed, and this revelation, independent of human will yet authoritative for future generations, is transmitted by tradition. When, however, religion depends only on historicity and tradition, it becomes barren, legalistic, and lifeless. It accordingly needs a third element if it is to be-

2. Relation to Religion.

come a living thing to the individual. This is found in personal, inward experience, which is itself a secondary form of revelation, yet is accessible to all who believe the authoritative revelation. This element of personal experience, which is essential to mysticism and without which religion can scarcely exist, forms the bond between mysticism and religion. This union is the closest in Christianity, which from the first has contained a strongly mystical element. From religion mysticism may receive tendencies at variance with its real nature, as the desire of persecution; but, on the other hand, mysticism may oppose aberrations in religion. The latter case is, however, comparatively rare. Mysticism may indeed oppose a purely external religion, yet it seldom attacks vitally what is definitely established by the religious body to which a given mystic belongs. Before such definite principles mysticism bows, in conformity with its individual character as contrasted with the social character of religion. The mystic is essentially concerned with God and his own soul, and if he be undisturbed, he readily conforms to external ordinances.

3. Attainment of Mystical Conditions.

Mystical conditions may be induced by certain agencies. In the lowest stages certain narcotics may be employed, though these are utterly rejected by higher mysticism. Again, bodily movements and postures may be assumed, as the whirling of dervishes or the immobility of Hesychasts (q.v.: and see Ecstasy). The common agencies, however, are solitude, silence, asceticism, and concentration of thought on the divine. Among the agencies shared by both religion and mysticism, prayer is preeminent. In the case of mysticism, such prayer is strictly inward, going so far as to hold prayer expressed in words as of inferior worth, and to maintain that the only prayer which really pleases God and helps man is "mental prayer," which utters no word, but expresses the inmost longing for God; so that later, especially in post-Reformation Roman Catholic mysticism, "prayer" came to connote the mystic state in general. Certain phenomena highly valued by many are mistrusted and deemed of secondary worth by some of the greatest mystics, this category including visions, the hearing of voices, bilocation, levitation, etc., the reality of which can not be affirmed. That on which the great mystics lay stress is far different; it is the release of the soul from finite bonds and its conduct to inward communion with God. This communion may be construed as one of essence, the result being pantheistic mysticism; or it may be regarded as absolute surrender to God; and so slight is the distinction between the two views that it is often impossible to distinguish outwardly whether a given mystic is a pantheist or not. While human will and human endeavor prepare the way for the highest flights of mysticism, man can not of himself produce them. They are a divine gift, which God grants to whom, when, and where he will, nor may all gain them who devote themselves to the mystic life. Nevertheless, they form the goal of the mystic way. The stages in this way are mainly described either as "purgative," "illuminative," and "unitative," or as "meditation," "contemplation," and "mystic union." The former classification requires first the purifying of the soul from sinful wishes and acts; then, when a certain degree of perfection has been gained, illumination from God; and finally, ecstatic and complete union with God. In the second classification "meditation" is regarded as natural and humanly controlled reflection which is already directed toward the supreme goal; "contemplation" bears man beyond the natural sphere through grace to higher and higher perfections, above which lies nothing but "mystic union." A distinct form of mysticism is often thought to be found in quietism, but this, strictly speaking, means simply the complete and permanent negation of the will, as in primitive Buddhism; and it requires a degree of submission which has conquered every impulse of the individual will, whereas true mysticism, despite its submission, by no means excludes struggle against individual nature and against individual will.

II. History: **1. In the East.** Since Christian mysticism has rereceived from the Christian religion many impressions and influences, as well as influences from other sources which have affected it and, through it, the mystical element of the Christian religion, and even the history of that religion, a full history of Christian mysticism would require constant reference to the development of the Church in general, as well as detailed discussion of the origin of each of the various mystical phenomena. Here only a survey of the main elements can be given. It is frequently denied that mysticism was present at the very beginning of Christianity, but such a view is erroneous. Mysticism is present in Paul (cf. Gal. ii. 20; Rom. viii. 22) as well as in John, and is also revealed in such early productions as the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and in the "Shepherd" of Hermas. Meanwhile mysticism had received a peculiar development from without which, in itself alien to Christianity, nevertheless exercised a strong influence upon it. An important factor here was Philo of Alexandria (q.v.), whose teachings included unity with the Godhead (though man may gain it only temporarily and through ecstasy) and the Logos (q.v.); Philo not only modified early Christianity, but also influenced, or at least was nearly akin to, Neo-Platonism (q.v.). These theories deeply impressed not only Origen and his school, but even his opponent, Methodius (q.v.). The fourth century, with its rise of monasticism, was highly important for mysticism, which was fostered by the solitude and meditation on the inner life practised by the higher class of monks, a remnant of this mystic contemplation being contained in the fifty homilies of Macarius (q.v.). All this was further aided by the growth of Symbolism (q.v.) in the liturgy, admirably illustrated by the "Catechetical Lectures" of Cyril of Jerusalem (q.v.); while, on the other hand, individual mysticism finds its influential representative in the "Ladder of Paradise" of Johannes Climacus (q.v.; see also Mystagogical Theology). The period of conflict that racked the Church after the Council of Chalcedon witnessed one of the most remarkable phenomena in the realm of mysticism—the pseudo-Dionysian writings (see Dionysius the Areopagite), which represent Neo-Platonism in Christian guise. The type of thought here set forth found its full development in the strictly orthodox Maximus Confessor (q.v.), who taught symbolic meaning for the entire liturgy and gave the pseudo-Dionysian writings their authorized position in the Eastern Church. In the eleventh century a new element was first clearly introduced by Simeon the New Theologian (q.v.), whose teachings of a mystic light may well have given rise, despite many differences, to the peculiar doctrines of the Hesychasts (q.v.), themselves defended in one of the most important productions of the mysticism of the Eastern Church, the "Discourses of the Life in Christ" of Nikolaos Kabasilas (see Kabasilas).

2. Scholastic and Monastic Mysticism.

In the West, except for the mystical element present in occidental as well as in oriental Christianity from the first, illustrated by passages in Tertullian and Cyprian, it was Augustine who laid the foundations for the mysticism of later ages; although for a time he here lacked followers, so that a long time elapsed before mysticism became an independent phenomenon in the theological literature of the western Church. [Anticipations of the coming intensity of interest in the inner life are frequently to be discovered before the time of full bloom, as in the case of Ekkehard (known also as Eckhart the Younger), a monk of St. Gall (c. 980–1036), who left a treatise on parts of the church service, benediction prayers, and also on the chronicle of St. Gall (in *MGH, Script.*, ii. 75–147).] It was not until the twelfth century that mysticism became a real factor in the western Church. Here, as in the East, mysticism and monasticism were closely related, not only in Anselm and Peter Damian (qq.v.), but preeminently in Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugo of St. Victor (qq.v.). The characteristic element, new to a certain extent, in the mysticism of Bernard was the love of Jesus, particularly as the bridegroom of the soul, set forth in his homilies on Canticles. The position of Hugo of St. Victor, while in great measure the same as that of Bernard, was more scholastic and dialectic; and his positing of a fixed way by which the soul is to gain ultimate union with God forms the basis of that scholastic mysticism which mainly dominated the Middle Ages and was continued in the post-Tridentine Church of Rome. Victor's first distinguished successor was Richard of St. Victor (q.v.), and mention must also be made of Saint Hildegard of Bingen and Elizabeth of Schönau (qq.v.). It is not true, as is often stated, that there was a sharp cleavage between mysticism and scholasticism. Not only were such men as Hugo of St. Victor and Bonaventura equally distinguished in both fields, but even Thomas Aquinas had a strongly mystical vein in his theology. At the same time, a distinction was drawn between mysticism and scholasticism as two branches of theology—the latter essentially intellectual, formal, and philosophical; the former pietistic and teaching how to attain union with the divine, both often treating the same themes. The divergence of their methods and aims, however, rendered it possible for some, like Bernard, to be mystics only, others, like Hugo of St. Victor and Bonaventura, to work both in scholastic and in mystical theology, others, like Abelard and Duns Scotus, to be scholastics only, and yet others, like Thomas Aquinas, to modify scholasticism with mysticism. From the twelfth century to the present day mysticism has retained a formal place in Roman Catholicism, which draws, nevertheless, a sharp distinction between "false" and "true" mysticism, honoring the latter and condemning the former. The mendicant orders essentially furthered mysticism. On the other hand, the Dominicans extruded a type of mysticism which was essentially German in representatives and characteristics, though finding at least a partial analogue in the teachings of the Dutch Jan van Ruysbroeck (q.v.) and his school. Among these men the best-known is Eckhart (q.v.), whose chief scholars and successors were Heinrich Amandus Suso and Johann Tauler (qq.v.), and to this same school belonged the *Theologia Germanica* (q.v.). Unlike the school of Eckhart, the Brethren of the Common Life (see Common Life, Brethren of the) not only maintained orthodoxy, but also stressed the practical ends of mysticism, this school producing the famous "Imitation of Christ," usually ascribed to Thomas à Kempis (q.v.). See also Friends of God. To the scholastic mystics of the fifteenth century belonged Dionysius the Carthusian and Nicholas of Strasburg (qq.v.), while a theosophical and humanistic tendency was manifested by Nicholas of Cusa (see Cusa, Nicholas of), Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (see Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni), Reuchlin (q.v.), and the fantastic Theophrastus Paracelsus and Agrippa von Nettesheim (q.v.).

3. Early Protestant Mysticism.

The Reformation gave to mysticism a new status, varying according to the different communions then formed. Of the Reformers Luther most occupied himself with it, and in his earlier career was most sympathetic with it. He became more and more averse to the pseudo-Dionysius, but throughout his life he highly esteemed Tauler and the *Theologia Germanica* (q.v.), while in his Eucharistic doctrine he preserved a portion of Roman Catholic mysticism, this partially explaining the bitter spirit of his defenders, who felt, half-consciously, that they must defend this fragment of mysticism at any cost. Yet mysticism failed to maintain the recognized position that it had formerly held, and attempts were made to ignore, explain away, or excuse Luther's attitude. Dogmatism gained the supremacy, and although there were occasional manifestations of a mysticism that clung to orthodoxy, Lutheranism gave but scant protection to the movement, which is most obvious in Lutheran hymnody. Neither Valentin Weigel nor Jakob Böhme (qq.v.) can be considered Lutheran mystics, though both maintained a Lutheran position. The former was rather inclined to pantheism, and his writings, posthumously published, were regarded as a type of fanatical heresy and did much to discredit mysticism in the Lutheran Church. Böhme, who exercised considerable influence in England, was a theosophist rather than a mystic, and his concepts were developed on a non-Lutheran foundation. The Reformed Church was far less favorable to mysticism than was Lutheranism; Zwingli had no interest in it, Calvin hated it, and Reformed dogma and forms of worship were alike unfavorable to it. In 1671 Gisbertus Voetius (q.v.) could declare that there was no mysticism in the Reformed Church, yet he himself sought, in his *Exercitia pietatis*, to give a quasi-vindication of mysticism, only to advance no further than the lowest grade of the older system, and to make sound mysticism end where the true mystics made it begin. Nevertheless, a series of Dutch theologians, partly his contemporaries and partly belonging to the following generation, gave increased scope to mysticism, this number including Jan and Willem Teellinck, Jodocus van Lodensteyn, and Willem Schortinghuis (qq.v.), in whom certain basal concepts of Romance mysticism have been traced. Similar ideas may also be found in the writings of the English Puritan Francis Rous (q.v.). In England, moreover, the writings of Böhme inspired a system of theosophy strongly mingled with visionary elements, represented by John Pordage and Jane Lead (qq.v.), as well as by the latter's son-in-law Francis Lee, all of whom inspired the Philadelphian Society which found adherents in many places on the continent. And these writings even influenced the dry school of the Cambridge Platonists (q.v.).

4. Post-Reformation Roman Catholic Mysticism.

While mysticism thus found but scant recognition in Protestantism, its position was far different in the Roman Catholic communion. In Spain just before the Reformation, mysticism had received a fresh impulse, expressed in the *Abecedario espiritual* of the Minorite Francisco de Osuna, and shared by his brother Minorite, Pedro de Alcantara. At the same time, however, there arose the quietistic and antinomian Alombrados (q.v.). While Juan d'Avila and Ignatius Loyola were acquitted, after trial by the Inquisition, of affiliation with this sect, the Jesuit founder was strongly influenced by the new mysticism, which, duly regulated and conformed to doctrine and ordinance, he determined to press into the service of the Church. Nevertheless, he forbade the devotion of the whole life to mysticism, which was restricted to certain times. The masterpiece here is his *Exercitia spiritualia* (q.v.); and mysticism gave the Counterreformation some of its strongest sinews, and has exercised on the development of Romanism a force which is yet scarcely valued as it should be. About this same period there arose, through Franciscan and Jesuit influence, a spirit of mysticism in the new congregation of Discalced Carmelites, the great names here being Theresa (q.v.) and John of the Cross (see CARMELITES); and from Spain, especially from the Carmelites, the new mysticism spread to France. Francis of Sales (q.v.) and Mme. de Chantal also belong here, despite the quietism of the latter. Decision concerning Miguel de Molinos (q.v.) is difficult, the problem being whether he valued mystical experiences so highly as to despise the sacraments of the Church, his condemnation, if such was his attitude, being justifiable from the Roman Catholic point of view. The question of disinterested love of God gave rise in France to the persecution of Mme. de Guyon (q.v.), who exercised an influence over German Protestants, and even over some in Switzerland.

5. Late Protestant Mysticism.

In a certain sense, Pietism (q.v.), the most important movement in the German Church since the Reformation, furthered mysticism. Spener, while not himself a mystic, was not unfavorable to the system, which he aided by commencing to break down dogmatic barriers. Both Johann Wilhelm Petersen and Gottfried Arnold (qq.v.) were closely associated with Pietism, and the latter did valuable service for the history of mysticism in the concluding portions of his great church history. To this same period belongs the Berleburg Bible (see BIBLES, ANNOTATED, I., § 3), and in the second decade of the century there arose, in distant connection with emigrants from the Cevennes, inspiration communities in the Wetterau (see INSPIRED, THE). Mention should also be made, in this connection, of Gerhard Tersteegen (q.v.), who occupies an important position in the mysticism of all ages. The second half of the eighteenth century, with its prevailing Enlightenment (q.v.), which was fanatically hostile to all that was not obvious at first sight, was most unfavorable to mysticism. Nevertheless, even this period had such representatives as Samuel Collenbusch, Jung Stilling, Johann Caspar Lavater (qq.v.). Friedrich Christoph Oetinger and Emanuel Swedenborg (qq.v.) were theosophists rather than mystics, while Philipp Matthäus Hahn and Johann Michael Hahn (qq.v.) occupied a middle ground. On the Roman Catholic side the chief place is due Johann Michael Sailer (q.v.).

It might have been expected that the revolution in thought in the nineteenth century would have given a new impulse to mysticism, especially in view of the romantic movement. It is true that the name of mysticism was again honored; that the memory of such mystics as Eckhart and Jakob Böhme was revived; and that a superstitious and credulous Romish history of mysticism was written by Johann Joseph Görres (q.v.). Both Romanists and Protestants did much for the history of mysticism in this period, and in the former communion the theory of mysticism was still studied in traditional fashion. All this, however, was the history and theory of mysticism, not mysticism itself. A real mystic, i.e., one who devotes himself to the mystic life and influences others mystically, can scarcely be found in the nineteenth century. The mystical spirit has not vanished, it is true, but the mystical life has disappeared. The reason probably lies in the ever-increasing unrest of the time, which, though a consequence of the inevitable progress of development, renders impossible that quietude and unworldly meditation which mysticism demands; yet it is not impossible that the time will come when, perhaps under new forms, mysticism will again arise and assert its rights.

(S. M. DEUTSCH†.)

English mysticism may be traced from Sir Thomas Browne (q.v.; *Religio Medici*) and Thomas Jack-

6. Mysticism in England.

son (q.v. 1; *Being and Attributes of God*), who had been steeped in Plato and the Alexandrian Neoplatonism of Plotinus and Origen. The Cambridge Platonists (q.v.) Ralph Cudworth (q.v.; *True Intellectual System of the Universe*), Henry More (q.v.; *Simple Sayings*), and John Smith (q.v.; " The Way or Method of Attaining Divine Knowledge," and " On the Existence and Nature of God " in *Select Discourses of John Smith*, 4th ed., Cambridge, 1859), especially Smith, owed their mysticism more to Plotinus than to Plato. Alongside of this movement arose another under George Fox (q.v.), subject of many mystical experiences and founder of the Society of Friends (see FRIENDS). In the eighteenth century the questions thrown up by the deistic controversy (see DEISM) laid bare the essential opposition of two modes of thought—one basing religion ultimately on reason, in which the endeavor was made to come to an understanding with the Scriptures, authority, and the rational nature of Christianity, the other allying itself with the Quietists, Fénelon, and Madame Guyon, the Moravians, and the German mystics. The chief representative of the latter was William Law (q.v.; *The Way to Divine Knowledge*) who kindled his torch at the flame of Jacob Boehme (q.v.). In the nineteenth century were Samuel Taylor Coleridge (q.v.) who was saturated with Plato, Schelling, and Jacobi, John Frederick Denison Maurice (q.v.), and among poets, William Wordsworth (q.v.; cf. *Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey*), and Arthur Tennyson (d. 1892; cf. *The Higher Pantheism* and *The Ancient Sage*).

7. In America.

In America mysticism has appeared in Jonathan Edwards the Elder (q.v.). It was induced by his monistic metaphysics—God the only real Being, by his rare sense of the presence and agency of God, by his intuitive esthetic appreciation of the divine excellency and beauty, by his prolonged and exhaustive contemplation on the utter insignificance of man and his absolute dependence upon God, and by an emotional nature of surpassing richness for the most part held in check or suppressed by rigorous self-discipline (cf. " Diary," *Works*, i. 60–62, New York, 1829; sermon entitled " A Divine and Supernatural Light," etc., ib., vi. 171 sqq.; and *A Treatise concerning Religious Affections*, ib., vol. v.). In the last century mysticism was associated with the " Transcendental " movement in New England (see TRANSCENDENTALISM; and cf., e.g., R. W. Emerson, *The Over-Soul* and *The Method of Nature*), due in great measure to the noetic or rational quality involved in it. More recently the psychological phenomena of mysticism are receiving attention, and experiments with various kinds of intoxicants have been made with a view to ascertaining how far these are similar to true mystical states. The suggestion made by Prof. William James that mystical states may be " only sudden and great extensions of the ordinary field of consciousness," where the question is raised whether in this experience tracts of consciousness are actually uncovered or there is a true revelation of reality, is destined to stimulate to more painstaking and exhaustive inquiry on this obscure subject (cf. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*, " A Suggestion About Mysticism," vol. vii., no. 4, pp. 85 sqq.). C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An introduction to eastern mysticism is furnished by: E. H. Palmer, *Oriental Mysticism. A Treatise on the Suffistic and Unitarian Theosophy of the Persians*, London, 1867; W. S. Lilly, in *Religious Systems of the World*, London, 1893; C. H. A. Bjerregaard, *Sufi Interpretations of . . . Omar Khayyam and Fitzgerald*, New York, 1902; F. Hadland Davis, *The Persian Mystics*, London, 1907. Besides the literature under the articles on the mystics named in the text, on western mysticism consult: W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, London, 1899; idem, *Studies of English Mystics*, ib. 1907; idem, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, ib. 1907 (by a specialist); R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, New York, 1893 (a classic); J. D. Dalgairns, *The German Mystics of the Fourteenth Century*, London, 1850; I. A. Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology, particularly in Germany*, Edinburgh, 1871; J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1874; H. L. J. Heppe, *Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik in der katholischen Kirche*, Berlin, 1875; idem, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der reformierten Kirche*, Leyden, 1879; G. Matheson, *Aids to the Study of German Theology*, Edinburgh, 1876; W. Preger, *Geschichte des deutschen Mystic im Mittelalter*, Leipsic, 1881; J. Bigelow, *Molinos the Quietist*, New York, 1882; W. Binder, *J. K. Dippel, Der Freigeist aus dem Pietismus*, Bonn, 1882; M. Ebner, *M. Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen*, Freiburg, 1882; S. E. Herrick, *Some Heretics of Yesterday*, London, 1884; J. Hunt, *History of Religious Thought in England*, 3 vols., ib. 1884; F. Splittgerber, *Aus dem innern Leben. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Mystik*, Leipsic, 1884; G. d'Alviella, *Contemporary Evolution of Religious Thought in England, America and India*, London, 1886; T. M., *Spanish Mystics*, ib. 1886; E. Renan, *Studies of Religious History*, ib. 1886; C. du Prel, *Die Philosophie der Mystik*, Leipsic, 1885, Eng. transl., *The Philosophy of Mysticism*, London, 1888; J. Walker, *Theology and Theologians of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1888; G. Visser, *Hendrik Mande. Bijdrage tot de kennis der Noord-Nederlandsche mystiek*, The Hague, 1880; Thomas à Vallgornera, *Mystica theologia divi Thomæ*, Augustæ, 1890; F. Paulhan, *Le Nouveau Mysticisme*, Paris, 1891; A. Auger, *Étude sur les mystiques des Pays-Bas au moyen âge*, Brussels, 1892; J. L. Adam, *Le Mysticisme à la Renaissance*, Paris, 1893; E. O. A. Merx, *Idee und Grundlinien einer Geschichte der Mystik*, Heidelberg, 1893; H. Schauerte, *Mystik*, Paderhorn, 1894; A. Lillie, *Modern Mystics and Modern Magic*, New York, 1894; C. H. A. Bjerregaard, *Lectures on Mysticism and Talks on Kindred Subjects*, ib., 1896; idem, *Lectures on Mysticism and Nature Worship*, Chicago, 1897; V. Charbonnel, *Les Mystiques dans la littérature présente*, Paris, 1896; C. Seltmann, *Angelus Silesius und seine Mystik*, Breslau, 1896; (cf. *Angelus Silesius; Selection from the Rhymes of a German Mystic; Transl. in the original Meter by Paul Carus*, Chicago, 1909); J. F. Grierson, *Modern Mysticism and Other Essays*, London, 1899; A. Peltzer, *Deutsche Mystik und deutsche Kunst*, Strasburg, 1899; A. L. Thorold, *An Essay in Aid of the Better Appreciation of Catholic Mysticism*, London, 1900; E. C. Gregory, *An Introduction to Christian Mysticism*, ib. 1901; idem, *A Little Book of Heavenly Wisdom; Selections from English Prose Mystics*, ib. 1904; C. Harrison, *Notes on the Margins. An Enquiry into Mysticism*, ib. 1901; R. Steiner, *Die Mystik im Aufgange der neuzeitlichen Geisteslebens*, Berlin, 1901; W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, chap. x., London, 1902 (valuable); R. Langenberg, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*, Bonn, 1902; *Juliana, an Anchorite of Norwich; XVI Revelations of divine Love shewed to Mother Juliana of Norwich, 1373*, London, 1902; J. Batteiger, *Der Pietismus in Bayreuth*, Berlin, 1903; E. A. Kernwart, *Bibliothek berühmter Mystiker*, Leipsic, 1903 sqq.; W. P. Swainson, *Christian Mystics*, London, 1903; W. R. Inge, *Light, Life, and Love; Selections from German mystics of the Middle Ages*, ib. 1904; A. H. Bradford, *The Inward Light*, New York, 1905; W. R. Nicoll, *The Garden of Nuts. With an Essay on Christian Mysticism*, London, 1905; S. H. Gem, *Law and Christian Practice and Christian Mysticism*, Oxford, 1905;

J. B. Shearer, *Modern Mysticism*, New York, 1905; A. Hegler, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mystik in der Reformationszeit*, Berlin, 1906; A. E. Waite, *Studies in Mysticism*, London, 1906; F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker*, Göttingen, 1907 sqq.; E. Recejac, *Essay on the Basis of Mystic Knowledge*, London, 1907; W. M. Scott, *Aspects of Christian Mysticism*, ib. 1907; H. Delacroix, *Études d'histoire et de psychologie du mysticisme*, Paris, 1908; F. Giesecke, *Die Mystik Jo. Baptist van Helmonts (1577–1644)*, Böhmen, 1908; F. von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and her Friends*, Göttingen, 1908; A. W. Hopkinson, *The Mystery of Mysticism*, London, 1909; R. M. Jones, *Studies in mystical Religion*, ib. 1909; J. Pachen, *Psychologie des mystiques chrétiens*, Paris, 1909; *Meister Eckhart's Sermons*, Eng. transl. by C. Field, London, 1910; Schaff, *Christian* Church, v. 1, pp. 636 sqq.

MYTHOLOGY. See Comparative Religion, V., § 3, VI., §§ 7–8.

N

NAASENES. See Ophites.

NAASENIAN HYMN. See Ophites, § 2.

NABATÆANS.

I. Early History.
  Documentary Testimony (§ 1).
  Racial Affinity (§ 2).
II. History from 312 B.C.
  Till the Roman Period (§ 1).
  Under the Romans (§ 2).
  Significance, Language, Religion (§ 3).

1. Documentary Testimony.

I. Early History: The Nabatæans were a Semitic people known at least as early as 312 B.C., inhabiting the region so long identified with the Edomites between the Dead Sea and the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Whether they can be traced to a still earlier time depends upon the interpretation of certain passages which are by most scholars taken as referring to this people. The passages in question are, first, those in the Old Testament which mention Nebajoth (firstborn of Ishmael; Gen. xxv. 13, xxviii. 9, xxxvi. 3; I Chron. i. 29; cf. Isa. lx. 7, where the connection is with Kedar, both peoples being pastoral, while the relationship is wholly congruent with the implications in the Genesis passages). It is to be noted that if the Nabatæans are meant in these passages, Arabic affinity is implied. The second class of passages are from the cuneiform inscriptions. Under the form *Na-ba-ai-te* is mentioned a pastoral people, associated with Kedar, on a cylinder inscription of Asshurbanipal; their "king" Natnu had taken part in an Arabic revolt against Assyrian overlordship, and they had been punished by the Assyrian monarch. The inscription describes them as living in a remote region. Other notices of them appear from the same general period in inscriptions made under Tiglath-Pileser, Sargon, and Sennacherib; but in these cases they are assigned to the Aramean stock. After these references the Nabatæans (if they are the people meant) are lost to sight, so far as reference to them goes, until 312 B.C., after which notices become frequent. Thus Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca*, xix. 94–100, cf. ii. 48–50, iii. 41–43) speaks of them as mostly nomadic Arabs, well-to-do through their command of commerce in myrrh and incense. It is significant that Diodorus, though he calls them Arabs, notes that they use Syriac (Aramaic) characters in writing, and this undoubtedly explains the classification made in the Assyrian inscriptions referred to above. By Strabo ("Geography," xvi. 18–26) Nabatea is described as a populous country not far from the Elamitic Gulf, rich in pasturage. There seems to be a probability, however, that Strabo did not distinguish clearly between Nabatæans and Idumeans. Pliny ("Natural History," v. 12, xii. 17) calls the Nabatæans Arabian neighbors of the Syrians, and connects them with Kedar (cf. Isa. lx. 7). I Macc. v. 25 reports that Judas the Maccabee on a trans-Jordanic expedition when three days beyond the Jordan met the Nabatæans, who were friendly and gave information concerning the situation of the Jews who were in Gilead. According to I Macc. ix. 35, Jonathan, when in flight from Bacchides, left his baggage with the Nabatæans so as not to be encumbered with it, and those Nabatæans were not far from Medeba (q.v.). Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII., i. 2) retells the story of I Macc. ix. 35 in a slightly variant form, and (I., xii. 4) makes the name Nabatene cover the region between the Euphrates and the Red Sea (cf. Strabo, above). Further frequent references are made by Josephus to incidents in their history, as in *Ant.*, XIII., xiii. 5, XIV. v. 1, XX., iv. 1, etc. In *Ant.*, I., xii. 4, Josephus evidently means to connect the Nabatæans with the Nebajoth of Genesis, and so to make the people Arabs.

2. Racial Affinity.

There are two apparent difficulties in this identification. The first is philological, Nebajoth being spelt with a tau (t), while in the inscriptions and on the coins the word is written with teth (ṭ). On this ground Glaser (see Bibliography) refuses the identification. While such a transmutation is rare, it is not without parallel, especially under the influence of Hellenism. The second difficulty is the matter of race affiliation. By Nebajoth in Genesis Arabic connections are clearly implied, and with this agree Diodorus, Strabo, Pliny, and Josephus (inferentially). But the fact that in their writing the Nabatæans used Aramaic seems at first sight to justify those Assyrian inscriptions which speak of them as Arameans. The reconciliation is not difficult, however, since Aramaic was the language of commerce and intercourse in quite early times (cf. II Kings, xviii. 26); the Nabatæans were carriers of commerce and therefore employed that language. It is corroborative of this conclusion that the names in the Nabatæan inscriptions are clearly Arabic, though the language is Aramaic. Still further, while the identification of this people with the Nebajoth of the Old Testament can not be a matter of demonstration, there is justification for the identification. One ground is the well-known tenacity of existence of tribal names in the Arabic sphere. A second ground is that if, as some hold, the Nabatæans represent one of the migrations from Arabia (q.v.), the earlier mention in the Old Testament and the Assyrian monuments would be of the "advance guard" of the migration. The advance of the Edomites into Judea (cf. Mal. i. 1–5) in the early part of the sixth century is explained by the pressure upon them from the rear by the Nabatæan hosts, especially as three centuries later the Nabatæans were in possession of the Edomitic region.

1. Till the Roman Period.

II. History from 312 B.C.: What is practically consecutive history begins with the account by Diodorus Siculus (ut sup.) of the expedition sent against the Nabatæans in 312 B.C. by Antigonus under Athenæus after the former had driven Ptolemy Lagus from Cœle-Syria. This force of 4,000 foot and 600 horse arrived at Petra, then and for centuries the chief city and stronghold, while the males were away, captured and looted it. But on the return march due precautions were not taken and in a night attack the Nabatæans almost annihilated the force. A punitive expedition sent out under Demetrius invested Petra, but had to return content with pledges for good behavior on the part of the inhabitants. The account makes of them a pastoral people engaged also in commerce, and living under tribal or patriarchal government. From this time on information comes in general only through mention of the rulers of the people. The next notice in order of time is in I Macc. v. 8, at which time the ruler was a prince (Gk. *tyrannos;* not a king) known to history as Aretas I., with whom Jason the high priest took refuge. A little later than this (164–160 B.C.; cf. I Macc. v. 25, ix. 35) Nabatæans and leaders of the Maccabean party were friends. A notice by Agatharchides (a Greek historian who flourished c. 140 B.C.) reports that the Nabatæans held the Gulf of Akaba and the port of Elath (cf. C. Müller, *Geographia Græci minores*, i. 178, Paris, 1855). The declension of the Ptolemaic and Seleucidan kingdoms c. 100 B.C. was this people's opportunity, which they improved under a King Aretas II. (possibly 110–96 B.C.; this king is called Erotimus by Justin the historian, *Liber historiarum Philippicarum*, XXXIX., v. 5–6) by greatly extending the area which they controlled. Through this they came into conflict with the ambitious schemes for conquest of Alexander Jannæus, whom under a King Obedas they severely defeated (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., xiii. 5), and a little later defeated and killed Antiochus XII. of Syria (Josephus, *War*, I., iv. 7). Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII., xv. 2; *War*, I., iv. 8) reports that the Nabatæans took possession of Cœle-Syria under Aretas III. (85–60 B.C.; probably the Aretas known as *Philhellenos*, and on his coins as "Harbath king of the Nabatæans"), and again defeated Alexander Jannæus, this time near Adida, and for a time at least controlled Damascus. They also later supported Hyrcanus in his conflict with Aristobulus (see Hasmoneans, § 4; cf. *Josephus, Ant.*, XIV., i. 4–ii. 3). This brought them into touch with the Romans, and Scaurus made an expedition against Petra, ravaged the country, but found the capital difficult of access, and was glad to compound for a sum of 300 talents (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV., v. 1; *War*, I., viii. 1).

2. Under the Romans.

In 55 B.C. Gabinius conducted a successful campaign against them (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV., vi. 4; *War*, I., viii. 7). Between 50 and 28 B.C. a King Malchus (Malichos I.) is known, who in 47 B.C. furnished mounted soldiery for the Romans, and this indicates the practical absorption of Nabatea into the Roman Empire. During the Parthian invasion of Palestine (c. 40 B.C.) Malchus clearly favored the Parthians, declined to support Herod, and later was fined by the Romans for his course in the affair. In 32 B.C. Malchus furnished soldiery to Antony, but later, defaulting in payment of tribute, was defeated. Two important inscriptions relate to this king (*CIS*, i. 2, nos. 158, 174). Under Obodas II. (28–29 B.C.) the Nabatæans furnished soldiery to the Romans in the latter's campaign in South Arabia, 25–24 B.C. He also left his mark on the coinage. Aretas IV. (9 B.C.–40 A.D.) was confirmed in his kingdom by Augustus, though the latter had intended to add the Nabatæan realm to Herod's dominions (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVI., x. 9). It was doubtless this king who assumed the title *raḥem-ammah*, "friend of (his) people," probably as an indication of his patriotic intentions and feeling. He furnished auxiliary troops to Varus for use against the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII., x. 9; *War*, II., v. 1), and came into conflict with Herod Antipas, who had married his daughter and then put her away that he might marry Herodias (see Herod and his Family, II., § 2). He escaped a Roman punitive expedition, the result of this quarrel, only by reason of the death of Tiberius. It was this Aretas whose governor was in control of Damascus when Paul was there (II Cor. xi. 32; cf. Acts ix. 23–25; Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., iv. 1; also see Aretas, where the related questions are discussed); the fact shows a great though short-lived expansion of Nabatæan power, and is negatively corroborated by the non-existence of Damascene coins of the period from Roman mints. A very considerable mass of original material is known from this reign in the shape of numerous coins and twenty inscriptions. It is somewhat doubtful whether the Abias of Josephus (*Ant.*, XX., iv. 1) was a Nabatæan king; if he was, there was probably a change in dynasty. Malchus II. (48–71) furnished troops for the Romans in the Jewish War, is known through a number of inscriptions, and in his time Damascus was lost to the Nabatæans. Rabel (71–106) left a considerable number of coins and inscriptions covering a large area extending from between Damascus and Palmyra to a distance south of Petra. Apparently in the early years of his reign he was a minor under the regency of his mother Sekilath, sister of Malchus. He was the last independent ruler of his people, for in 106 A.D. Arabia Petræa was made a Roman province by Cornelius Palma, governor of Syria, the province including the two most noted cities of the Nabatæans, Bostra in the north and Petra in the south. Of the Nabatæan people as a nation nothing more is heard, and they are merged in "the Arabians."

The Nabatæans are of especial interest histor-

3. Significance, Language, Religion.

ically from their relations to commerce, the merchandise from the East and Southeast having for at least four centuries and perhaps for a longer period to pass through their territory and to pay them tribute. They have, moreover, left very interesting cultural remains, especially at Petra (see SELAH), at El-Hejr, and other places. They should be noted also for their patriotism, which enabled them at times to defeat and at other times to compete on even terms with the Syrian and Roman powers. Their position on the border of the desert and partly in it is registered in the remains of their language, in which a number of Arabisms are taken up, these increasing in number toward the south. In the inscriptions the letters are grouped in words, and the letters are often connected in a way which suggests the Arabic and Syriac as opposed to the ordinary individualism of Hebrew and Aramaic writing. Of their religion little is known; the chief deity seems to have been Dusara (Gk. *Dusares*), according to Arabic etymology meaning "god of (the mountain district of) Sara," i.e., the mountain region between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akaba. He is sometimes identified with Tammuz (q.v.), and appears to have been born of the virgin goddess Allat. He was represented under the form of an oblong stone twice as high as it was broad and erected upon a pedestal. He seems to have been worshiped under a number of names into most of which *El*, "God," enters as an element. Allat, a goddess widely known in Arabia, was also worshiped, and her name enters frequently into the composition of proper names. Two deities known as Manutu and Ḳaishah were adored at Hegra. The monuments indicate that some at least of the kings were deified, possibly not till after death.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. M. Quatrimère, *Melangès d'histoire et de philologie orientale*, pp. 58–159, Paris, n.d.; idem, in *Nouveau Journal asiatique*, xv (1835), 5–55, 97–137, 209–240; J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, ii. 2, pp. 55–59, 2d ed., Hamburg, 1836–43; *JBL*, 1862, pp. 103–115; E. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des romischen Reichs*, ii. 165–169, Leipsic, 1865; M. de Vogüé, *Syrie centrale*, pp. 100–124, Paris, 1869; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 147, 152–152 et passim; idem, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 99–116, Giessen, 1878; F. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, pp. 296–301, Leipsic, 1881; C. Huber, *Journal d'un voyage en Arabie*, Paris, 1881; P. Berger, *L'Arabie avant Mahomet d'après les inscriptions*, Paris, 1885; G. Perrot, *Hist. de l'art dans l'antiquité*, iv. 344–346, 389–394, Paris, 1887; F. Lenormant, *Hist. ancienne de l'orient*, vi. 466–470, Paris, 1888; F. Vigouroux, *Mélanges bibliques*, pp. 308–321, Paris, 1889; idem, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxvii., 1444–1455; E. Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, vol. ii. passim, Berlin, 1890; P. Berger, *Hist. de l'écriture*, p. 277, Paris, 1891; B. Miese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, i. 300 sqq., Gotha, 1893; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, i. 39–74, ii. 185–234, 368–377, iv. 191, Paris, 1896–1902; M. J. Lagrange, in *Revue biblique*, 1897, pp. 223–224; idem, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, pp. 70–83, 501–504, Paris, 1905; F. H. Vincent, in *Revue biblique*, 1898, pp. 567–588; R. Dussaud and F. Maclere, *Voyage archéologique au Safa et dans le Djebel ed-Drûz*, Paris, 1901; idem, *Missions dans les regions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne*, ib. 1903; H. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, Philadelphia, 1903; R. E. Brünnow and A. Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, Strasburg, 1904; R. Dussaud, in *JA*, 1904, pp. 189–238; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 726–744 (contains matter not in the Eng. transl., I., i. 345–362); *JE*, ix. 139; and the literature under HASMONEANS and SELEUCIDÆ.

On the coins consult: *Revue numismatique*, 1858, pp. 292–316, 362–385 (by Duc de Luynes), 1868, pp. 153–168 (by M. de Vogüé); III., v (1887), 369–377 (by Sorlin-Dorigny and Babelon); Levy, *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, iii (1871), 445–448; De Saulcy, in *Annuaire de la société française de numismatique*, iv. 1 (1873, 1–35; idem, in *Mélanges de numismatique*, iii (1882), 193–197.

On the inscriptions consult: *CIS*, II., i (1893–1902), 181–489; J. Euting, *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, Berlin, 1885; Dussaud et Macler, in *Voyage*, ut sup., pp. 168, 187; *ZDMG*, 1869, pp. 150–154, 652–654, 1884, 144, 654; E. Renan in *JA*, VII., ii (1873), 366–382; idem, *Documents recueillis dans le nord de l'Arabie*, Paris, 1884; Halévy, in *REJ*, ix (1884), 8–16; P. Berger, in *Comptes rendus de l'académie des inscriptions*, IV., xii (1884), 377–393; C. Doughty, *Documents épigraphiques recueillis dans le nord de l'Arabie*, Paris, 1884; A. Neubauer, in *Studia Biblica*, pp. 209–232, Oxford, 1885; *JA*, IX., xiii (1896), 304–316, 485–497, x (1897), 197–207, 214–217, xi (1898), 129–146 (by M. de Vogüé), x (1897), 518–535, xi (1898), 523–533 (by C. Clermont-Ganneau); G. A. Cooke, *Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 214–262, London, 1903.

NABONIDUS, nab″ō-nai′ [or nî] dus. See BABYLONIA, VI., 1, and VI., 7, § 3.

NADAB: Second king of Israel, son and successor of Jeroboam I. His dates according to the old chronology are 954–952, according to Kamphausen and the modern school 915–914. The Biblical source is I Kings xiv. 20, xv. 25–30. He was evidently aggressive in character and aimed to carry out the policy of his father in the relations with Judah, for his death occurred while he was besieging Gibbethon, a town of the Philistines and therefore appertaining to Judah. He was assassinated by Baasha (q.v.), who exterminated the family of Jeroboam and seized the throne, thus establishing a new dynasty.

NAHUM, nê′hum: One of the minor prophets. The name means "comforter." In i. 1 the prophet is called "the Elkoshite" which, according to Jerome, ad loc., refers to a village in Galilee, probably represented by the modern al-Kauzah in Naphtali; while Epiphanius seeks the site near Bet-Jibrin in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis. Others, without sufficient reason, have seen Elkosh in Capernaum, explained as "village of Nahum"; and the modern Orientals regard the village of al-Ḳush near Mosul as the birthplace of the prophet on the basis of a sixteenth-century tradition. The view of either Jerome or Epiphanius is preferable (cf. Nah. i. 9, 12, 13, ii. 1). The supposition that Nahum wrote in Assyria is purely subjective, for his acquaintance with Assyrian matters is merely what any inhabitant of Palestine could have had from the Assyrian invasion. The Assyrian loan words *minzar*, "prince," and *ṭifsar*, "captain" (iii. 17), may, in like manner, be derived from the sojourn of the Assyrians in Palestine (cf. Jer. li. 27). It is generally held that the book, which was indeed "comforting" to Israel in its prophecy of divine vengeance on Assyria, was written in the reign of Hezekiah. Others make Nahum a contemporary of Manasseh, while Ewald dates him in the reign of Josiah, and Hitzig still later; Cocceius places him in the period of Jehoiachim and Clemens of Alexandria in that of Zedekiah; while Bochart makes him later than Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It is thus evident that the text gives no certain evidence of its date of composition. Such passages as i. 11–12, ii. 3 show that Sennacherib's expedition against Jerusalem was a thing of the past, nor is there any reason to suppose that i. 14 is a prophecy of the assassination of this Assyrian monarch. The most important passage in this connection is iii. 8 sqq., which refers to the destruction of No Amon (Thebes) by Assurbanipal shortly after 664 (see ASSYRIA, VI., 3, § 14). It is accordingly probable that the prophecy of Nahum is to be dated about 660, in the reign of Manasseh. The book is an organic whole, its three chapters corresponding to its three chief themes. The first chapter contains the introduction and subject of the prophecy; the second a description of the judgment of Nineveh by an army sent by Yahweh; and the third the blood-guiltiness of Nineveh which brought destruction on her. [The date of the book is more probably not long after the death of the last great king of Assyria, Asshurbanipal, 626 B.C., when the decay of the empire began. J.F.M.] (W. VOLCK†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best commentary is in G. A. Smith's *Book of the Twelve*, vol. ii., London, 1898. Among the many other commentaries may be named: H. A. Grimm, Düsseldorf, 1790; E. J. Greve, Amsterdam, 1793; M. Neumann, Breslau, 1808; H. Ewald, *Propheten*, ii. 349–360, Stuttgart, 1840; O. Strauss, Berlin, 1853; M. Breiteneicher, Munich, 1861; L. Reinke, Münster, 1867; P. Kleinert, Bielefeld, 1868; C. F. Keil, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1868; J. A. Lindgren, Stockholm, 1872; R. Gandell, in *Bible Commentary*, vol. vi., London, 1876; F. Hitsig, 4th ed., Leipsic, 1881; E. B. Pusey, in his *Minor Prophets*, new ed., vol. v., London, 1907; C. von Orelli, in his *Minor Prophets*, Edinburgh, 1893; A. B. Davidson, Cambridge, 1896; W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, pp. 226–246, Göttingen, 1897; O. Happel, Würzburg, 1902; C. Marti, *Dodekapropheton*, pp. 303–325, Tübingen, 1904. Consult further the works on O. T. introduction: H. Gunkel, in *ZATW*, xiii. (1893), 233–244; A. Billerbeck and A. Jeremias, in *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, iii. (1895), 1 sqq.; P. Haupt, in *JBL*, xxvi. 1 (1907); idem, *The Book of Nahum: a new metrical Translation*, Baltimore, 1908; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxvii., cols. 1462–69.

NAIRNE, nêrn, **ALEXANDER**: Church of England; b. at Hunsdon, Hertfordshire, Jan. 17, 1863. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge (B.A., 1884; M.A., 1887; fellow, 1887–92), and was ordered deacon in 1887 and ordained priest in 1888. He was curate of Great St. Mary's, Cambridge (1887–1889), vice-principal of the Cambridge Clergy Training School (1887–91), assistant master of Harrow School (1891–92), and curate of Hadleigh (1892–1894). He has been rector of Tewin since 1894, examining chaplain to the bishop of St. Albans since 1899, and professor of Hebrew and Old-Testament exegesis in King's College, London, since 1900. He collaborated with H. C. Besching in *The Bible Doctrine of the Atonement* (London, 1907); and contributed to *The One Volume Commentary* (1909).

NAMES.

I. Primitive and Ethnic Names.
  Significance and Power of the Name (§ 1).
  Use in Taboo and Magic (§ 2).
II. Hebrew Names.
  Names as Significant (§ 1).
  Religious Influence upon Names (§ 2).
  Personality Expressed (§ 3).
  The Divine Name (§ 4).
  The Name Jesus Christ (§ 5).

I. Primitive and Ethnic Names: Among primitive peoples and in the ethnic religions the functions and ideas attached to the name are exceedingly important. It often represents and stands for the sum total and potency of the owner. "No being could exist without a name" (Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 294).

1. Significance and Power of the Name.

Thus "the name of a god was the god himself" (Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, p. 162); hence utterance of it was among many peoples avoided, since merely pronouncing it might summon its possessor who would take summary vengeance on discovering that he had been lightly invoked. Hindus believe that when Kali calls a person by name, that person dies. To know the secret name of a deity or a devil was, in the eyes of the Egyptians, equivalent to such control over that being as to compel him to do man's will. In the Mandæan system it is taught that Hibil Ziwa descended to the lowest hell, wrested from its king the secret name of darkness, and so gained power over all hells (see MANDÆANS). The legend of Mar Ebedishu states that an evil female spirit sought to seduce him from the path of rectitude, but that he bound her and compelled her to reveal her twelve names, by which her power for evil was nullified for those who knew them (*Folk-lore*, xi., 1900, pp. 151–152). Similarly, according to Egyptian belief, the name of a human being was as much a part of him as his ka or his body. Indeed, a man's totality of being is in the books and in the inscriptions often summed up by the mention of these constituents. Man's perpetuity is dependent upon that of his name, and the blotting-out of the latter is equivalent to his destruction (cf. Ps. cix. 13; and especially Rev. iii. 5). Creation, according to the same people, was accomplished by the creator's utterance of his own potent name. The power given by the name led to the conception of the secret name (cf. Rev. xix. 12). It was particularly knowledge of this which gave power to him possessing the secret. Thus Isis gained control over the great god Ra by making a serpent bite him and inducing him in his agony to divulge his secret name (Budge, ut sup., p. 137). Yet when the name was engraved on a sacred object, as a scarab, the sanctity of the object protected it from misuse (Wiedemann, ut sup., p. 294). Out of the conception of the power of the name grew the bravado of the Egyptians in which they pretended to know the secret names of their deities and attempted to browbeat the gods into doing the will of man. The deceased, entering the hall of judgment, could pass the ordeal only by knowing the secret names of the judges, of the parts of the hall, even of his own members. Part of the catechism which was supposed to pass him through the trial consisted of these secret designations.

In taboo and magic (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1, b, c) the name comes much into consideration. Since the name is a part of the person, it can be used as can the hair or clothing or any other of a man's belongings to work him ill. Here again enters a motive to keep the name secret.

2. Use in Taboo and Magic.

Christian mothers of Abyssinia often keep a child's baptismal name secret, the object being to protect the child from witchcraft, since a wizard or witch can not act against a person whose name is not known. With this idea a Malay of Borneo changes his name after a serious illness so that the spirit which caused the attack may not find him to afflict him a second time. Names are changed under other circumstances also, as at the crises of life, at puberty, at initiation into the secrets or tribal mysteries. Occasionally the ultimate proof of friendship is exchange of names—each of the friends is thus thoroughly in the power of the other, or, according to another interpretation, each protects the other by assuming his name. Some Polynesian parents change their names at the birth of the first child, others at each addition to the family, all of this to avoid recognition by the spirits and the use of the name to do harm to them or their progeny. Malays of some tribes will not utter their own names aloud, and the same is true of the Banks Islanders; yet to them a nameless person is unthinkable, a nonentity. Similarly Australian blacks believe that their lives may be taken by the use of their name, and with other peoples to write a name is to use sorcery. Among many tribes of India, of Mongolia, and of Africa, the wife never utters the husband's name, while the males of the Solomon and Pelew Islands will not pronounce the women's names, and the husbands in some Indian tribes of California never call their wives by name or divulge their own names. Australians never impart to others the name given an initiate in the tribal mysteries. Indeed, the taboos of the name are almost numberless. The case of the divine name Yahweh, which later Jews came to avoid in the reading of the Old Testament (see JEHOVAH; YAHWEH), is a case of reentrance of the idea of taboo. Among some Australian tribes the name of Damaralun, a chief deity, is either utterly avoided or spoken only in a whisper, is often a secret known only to initiates in the mysteries. On the other hand, many peoples regarded the name of a god, used as an element in a man's name, in the light of a blessing. So the Hebrews sometimes employed the name of God (see below), and other Semites did the same. In particular Phenician names were compounded with the names of deities —Abibaal, Baaleazer, Abdastart, Deleastart, Methusastart, Ithobaal (cf. Hebr. Ishbaal), Baalezor, Baalator, Merbaal are a few examples (Menander of Ephesus, in Josephus, *Apion*, i. 18, 21), with which may be compared Adoni-bezek (Judges i. 4–7), Adonizedek (Josh. x. 1 sqq.), compounded with *Adon*, cf. *Adonai*, one of the titles by which God was addressed. With something of the same thought, still reminiscent of the fact that the name is also an expression of the power of the person, the divine name was variously used on seals, charms, and rings (see ABRASAX, and cf. the medieval legend of Solomon's ring which bore the divine name Yahweh). The power of deity was thus magically employed and the results desired were confidently expected.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

1. Names as Significant.

II. Hebrew Names: The early Hebrews were not wont to name a child without considering the significance of the name; even when this was a family possession, its meaning did not escape the attention. But new names were continually formed to express special characteristics of the person, and the formation of the language owes much to the creation of personal names. Indeed, in the giving of the name, one of the aims was to express some outstanding and particularly marked individuality. This principle was extended even to the naming of places, the nomenclature often carrying with it the reminiscence of some occurrence (cf. Mizpeh, Ramah, Shechem, and note Gen. xxvi. 20, 33, and many passages). Many places bore a name derived either from the pre-Hebraic deity worshiped there or from some appearance of the God of Israel (Beth-shemesh, Beth Dagon, Bethel, Penuel). Personal names sometimes expressed the circumstances of the family when the child was born (Ex. xviii. 3 sqq.). Prophets gave to their children names which were living testimonies to the content of their utterances (Isa. vii. 3, viii. 3). But the general principle was to characterize the child's own individuality by the name bestowed. So in earliest times and among the neighbors of Israel the names of animals were given, as Jael, " mountain goat," Shaphan, " coney," Rachel, " ewe," Deborah, " bee," Huldah, " weasel." The explanation of such names on the basis of totemism (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1 b) is not satisfactory; it is better to think of them as indicating a detection of the characteristic quality of the animal in the person—cf. the animal symbolism in the blessing of Jacob, Gen. xlix. Oreb (" raven ") and Zeeb (" wolf ") resembled in characteristics the bird and beast of prey the names of which they bore. Names of the exilic period like Parosh, " flea," are easily understood if passages like I Sam. xxiv. 14–15 are recalled, while such a name as Tolah (" worm ") may have had its origin in actual events. The names of plants were given also, such as Tamar (" date palm "), Eshcol (" cluster "), and Coz (" thorn "). Still other suggestive appellations are Barak (" lightning "), David (" darling ").

2. Religious Influence upon Names.

But among the Hebrews religious affairs and circumstances influenced much the formation of names, though the creation of names having as an element a divine name is by no means confined to them, such formations being common among Arabs, and similar early Canaanitic and Hebrew names are found, such as Abimelech, Abiezer. Such formations may throw light upon religious conditions and conceptions, as when the names given by Ahab to Ahaziah and Joram show that Ahab did not purpose to renounce Yahweh. In the numerous cases in which a definite attribute of deity or some close relationship is expressed in the name, the idea intended is that of invocation of a blessing, and it is generally found that the mother has the most influence in the choice of the name (Gen. xxix.–xxx.). These theophoric personal names are of high value in the history of religion. They indicate what deity was especially honored at a given period, what divine names were in most common use, and not seldom they show what were the relations between a deity and his people. In the earliest period the divine name in most common use was the simple El—cf. Israel, Ishmael—and this is true as well of the Arabs as of the Hebrews. Frequently the idea expressed is that of relationship, as when words indicating fatherhood, brotherhood, and the like are employed—the Semitic *ab*, " father," *aḥi*, " brother," *ammi,* "uncle," and the like. From the time of Moses with increasing frequency names were compounded with forms derived from the divine name Yahweh. The formation of new names continued until postexilic times—a proof that the significance of these names remained a living factor in their application, though it is a fact that family names were often chosen which carried with them historic reminiscences. Among the later Jews choice was often made of forms which had come down from earliest times, such as Jacob, Joseph, Mary, and the like; alongside these were others which came from Aramaic sources, such as Martha, Tabitha, Caiaphas, and also those which had Greek or Roman origin, such as Alexander, Andrew, Mark, and those which embodied the names of heathen deities, such as Bacchides. This last tendency is shown in another direction, namely, the Grecizing of Hebrew names, as Jason from Joshua, as well as in making translations of Hebrew names, such as Dositheus and Theodotus for Nathanael and Elnathan. Many Jews added to their Hebrew names others from a Greek or Roman source.

3. Personality Expressed.

Among the Hebrews then was especially true the maxim *nomina sunt omina,* since to the Israelite the name was the expression of personality; were there disagreement between name and character, it was fitting to change the former (Ruth i. 20–21). Indeed a change of name under new circumstances was no novelty (Gen. xli. 45; II Kings xxiii. 34). Sometimes teachers gave to their disciples appellations which expressed the latters' spiritual peculiarities (II Sam. xii. 25; Mark iii. 17). Inasmuch as between the person and the name a living connection existed, it was regarded as of great importance that the name be transmitted to posterity (Gen. xlviii. 16; Deut. xxv. 6–7). With a purpose similar to this, yet at the same time marking distinctions, was the practise of adding the father's name to the child's, connecting the two with the words "son of." Later such names were formed simply from the father's, preceded by the word for son, e.g., Bartholomew, from *Bar Talmay,* Barabbas from *Bar Abba.* A related custom is that of Arabs, who sometimes take the name of the son with the prefix "father of." Going back to the fact that the name expressed the individuality is the frequent statement that God calls men by name (Ex. xxxi. 2, xxxiii. 12; Isa. xlv. 3–4); while sometimes "name" stands for "person" (Rev. iii. 4, xi. 13 margin).

4. The Divine Name.

From the foregoing it would be expected that the name of deity would be of especially high significance. This is brought out in the urgent request of Moses that he be told the name of God in order that with authority he might appear before the people with the message he was charged to deliver. It is not to be inferred from this that every new name meant a new deity; but just as a new name for a man might imply new environment or new relationships, a new phase of knowledge of deity may be marked by a new form of address. While it is true that the name of God was sacred, this sanctity did not take the form of taboo of pronunciation in the early Hebrew religion; such ideas came only in late Judaism. It is true that there were appearances of heavenly beings at times whose names it was forbidden to know, but this was that their essential nature should remain hidden (Gen. xxxii. 30; Judges xiii. 18). But the most holy name of the covenant God was in most constant use, not only in prayer but even in oaths. On the other hand, grave indeed was his sin who used the name lightly or in a false oath. And the divine name was employed not only in prayer but in giving a blessing. When this name was spoken over a land, it indicated that the land had become his, had come into close intimate relations with him (Deut. xxviii. 10; Amos ix. 12); it is equivalent to the human proclamation of a proprietor or regent. It follows that such a relation is not of human but of divine initiative, and this is especially true when the spot is a sanctuary (cf. Ex. xx. 24). So the ark bore Yahweh's name, and his name abode in the temple (II Sam. vi. 2; I Kings ix. 3); indeed the significance of a sanctuary was that it was built in his name, which name was a revelation of himself. Hence the altars built to mark some special manifestation of deity bore an appellation which carried with it the memory of the fact. It was because of the special presence of Yahweh's name at Jerusalem that at the temple was concentrated worship of him, and Levi became the holy tribe for a like reason. The name of God is not a thing arbitrarily thought out, it is of the essence of deity, a revelation of himself and so self-expressive; it imparts knowledge of him and guides in the way of his service (Mic. iv. 5). Abuse of it or of his rights or disregard of the holiness of his belongings is a sin against the name which partakes of his own attributes as being "glorious and fearful" (Deut. xxviii. 58). Israel's greatest guilt was that it forgot his name. Regard for his name was one of the motives God had in protecting his people (Ezek. xx. 9, 14). His name is said to dwell in the angel of the presence sent to guide Israel, who became therefore a manifestation of the divine self. Hence the face of God and his name are applied to manifestations of his presence even in heathen religions, as when in a Sidonian temple Astarte is called "the name of Baal," by which was meant that the goddess was a manifestation of the Baal himself, and similarly in Carthage Taanit was called the "face of Baal."

5. The Name of Jesus Christ.

The New Testament shows the same emphasis upon and usage of the word name. The name Jesus Christ embodies the whole content of his person and sums up the knowledge of him and his work. The apostles spread this name throughout the earth; believers rely upon it (John i. 12) and in it are blessed (Acts iv. 12); by it miracles were wrought (Acts xvi. 18), though not as by a formula of magic (cf. John xiv. 13); but in order to accomplish this an inner connection with him is needful (Acts xix. 13). Baptism is in his name or in the triune name (Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 38) —a usage, however, which goes back to Jewish custom of baptizing "in the name." All of these customs bespeak an inner community with Christ of which baptism is but the external expression.

(C. von Orelli.)

Bibliography: For the use of the name among primitive peoples consult: J. G. Fraser, *Golden Bough*, vol. i., London, 1900; R. H. Codrington, *Melanesian Studies*, pp. 43 sqq., ib. 1891; F. F. von Andrian, *Ueber Wortaberglauben*, Munich, 1896; A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, pp. 155–158, 241, 294–295, New York, 1897; E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, pp. 157 sqq., London, 1899; J. Batchelor, *The Ainu*, pp. 142, ib. 1901; W. H. Furness, *Borneo Headhunters*, pp. 16–17, ib. 1902; E. Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, passim, ib. 1902 (very full); idem, *Tree of Life*, pp. 56–57, 75, 162, 177, 213, 221, ib. 1905; and the journal *Folk-Lore* is particularly rich in material.

For the Biblical facts two excellent and, in the latter case, elaborate articles are to be noted in *DB*, iii. 478–485, and *EB*, iii. 3291–3331. Consult further: L. Löw, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, iii. 92–110, Leipsic, 1871; E. Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, Haarlem, 1876; E. Renan, in *REJ*, 1882, pp. 161–177; J. Jacobs, *Studies in Biblical Archæology*, London, 1894; M. Jastrow, in *JBL*, 1894, pp. 19 sqq., 101–127; M. Grundwald, *Die Eigennamen des A. T.s in ihrer Bedeutung für die Kenntnis des hebräischen Volksglaubens*, Breslau, 1895; G. B. Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, London, 1896; idem, in *Expositor*, 1897, pp. 173–190; idem, in *Expository Times*, Sept., 1897, pp. 555–558, 1899, pp. 232–234; G. Kerber, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der hebräischen Eigennamen*, Tübingen, 1897; J. Böhmer, *Das biblische "Im Namen,"* Giessen, 1898; A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 181–186, Marburg, 1895, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1901; F. Giesebrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnames*, Königsberg, 1891; F. Ulmer, *Die semitischen Eigennamen im A. T.*, Leipsic, 1901; R. P. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, passim, Paris, 1905; A. R. Habershon, *The New Testament Names and Titles of the Lord of Glory*, London, 1910; F. C. Conybeare, in *JQR*, viii. 576–608, ix. 59–114, 447–470, 481–603; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii. 1669–77; and works on O. T. theology, e.g., Schultz, chap. xxviii.

NAMING: A means of discipline formerly in use in the German Lutheran churches. It took place publicly before the congregation, at the close of the sermon, and consisted in a personal address to the offending member. Several Lutheran directories contain a provision for its application, as a stage of discipline intermediate between the ordinary private pastoral admonition and entire excommunication. It was ordered to be applied only in case of open and notorious sin, and after the fact of notoriety had been established in the consistory. Apart from this process, the preacher was directed to abstain from any naming or identification of individual sinners. With the rest of the provisions for public penance it gradually disappeared, and is now nowhere used. See Church Discipline, III., § 1.

(O. Mejer†.)

NANA, NANÆA.

Documentary Basis (§ 1).
Nana of Erech (§ 2).
Elam, Armenia, and India (§ 3).
Syria, Phrygia, and Greece (§ 4).

1. Documentary Basis.

Nanæa is the name of a goddess mentioned in II Macc. i. 13, 15. The mention occurs in what purports to be a letter dated 125–124 b.c. from Jews of Palestine to Jews in Egypt commending to the latter the feast of dedication of the Temple. According to the context Antiochus (by whom Antiochus Epiphanes is almost certainly meant) when in Persia entered the temple of Nanæa with the purpose of marrying the goddess and taking a great part of the treasures of the temple as dowry, this being a device sometimes employed by conquerors, thus to obtain control of the wealth in the temples and yet avoid the charge of sacrilege. The priests of the temple, however, trapped him and his company in the temple, stoned them and cut them to pieces. The parallel passage, I Macc. vi. 1–4, does not name the goddess, but locates the temple in a city in Elymais in Persia (Elymais was a province in Susiana, north of the Zagros, therefore "in Persia"); nor does it place his death there but simply records his repulse. II Macc. ix. records that Antiochus essayed to rob a temple in Persepolis (whose is not reported), and was beaten back and died after his return from Persia. According to Appian (*Historia*, xi. 66) there was a temple of Aphrodite in Elymais, while Polybius (*Historia*, xxxi. 11) tells of a temple of Artemis in the same region. Greek and Roman writers were in the habit of identifying foreign deities with their own, and not in all cases is it possible to make out the exact god to which reference is made by them. In the present case the reference to Aphrodite and Artemis may shed light. On the other hand, II Macc. i. and ix. are irreconcilable, since Persepolis was not in Elymais.

2. Nana of Erech.

The identification of the deity mentioned in I Macc. i. 13, 15, leads back with considerable assurance to the very early Sumerian war goddess Nana, patroness of Erech, enshrined in the temple E-ana (see Babylonia, IV., § 5, VII., 2, § 7; and cf. Schrader, *KAT*, p. 422), named in the Babylonian litanies and elsewhere in the inscriptions. Her image was carried away to Elam c. 2280 b.c. by Kudur-nan-ḫundi, where it remained till Asshurbanipal recovered it about sixteen hundred years later (see Babylonia, VI., 1, § 1); meanwhile the deity's place in the city seems to have been assumed by Ishtar in her own temple in Erech known as E-ulmash. Coalescing at times with Ishtar (an illustration of the confusion that resulted from this is furnished by the fact that Ashtar in Mandæan and Nani in modern Syriac denote the planet Venus), at other times recognized as an independent deity, she remained in one form or the other one of the great deities of Babylonia, and Tiglath-Pileser III. sacrificed to her as "Lady of Babylonia," and at one time she appears in connection with Nebo. She seems to have been adopted in various regions, and her history is instructive as an illustration of the very common process in the history of religion of coalescence of the form of one deity with those of others (see Comparative Religion, VI., 2, d). In that way she seems to have borne many names and to have been known as Nani, Nanai, Nanaya, Anæa, Anitis, Anaitis, Tanata, Tanath, Tanais, and Anta.

The existence of the cult of Nana-Nanæa in Elam is not proved. Apart from the passages cited above (§ 1), the evidence is somewhat elusive, the most weighty being the inference that her cult is likely to have developed there owing to the long residence of her image in the region. Moreover, that the deity referred to by Appian and Polybius as Aphrodite

3. Elam, Armenia, and India.

or Artemis was Nanæa is made exceedingly probable by the fact that Nanæa's attributes and cults were appropriated by, assimilated to, or identified with those of Aphrodite in Asia Minor and Greece, as also in part by those of Artemis. This evidence is not made more weighty by the testimony of the Pseudo-Melito, sometimes cited, who reports that Nanai was worshiped in Elam, her worship having been instituted by her royal father after she had been captured by the enemy (in *Corpus apologetarum*, ed. J. C. T. de Otto, ix. 426, 476–477, 505, Jena, 1872). Pseudo-Melito is simply a composite dependent upon the sources already noted. For Armenia it is reported by Agathangelos (supposed to have been a secretary of Tiridates II. of Armenia in the fourth Christian century, to whom is attributed a life of Gregory the Illuminator) in the Armenian text that his people destroyed a temple of " Nanea, daughter of Ormuzd " in Thil (ed. of Venice, 1835, pp. 108, 587); the Greek text declares that they destroyed the " altar of Athena, daughter of Zeus " (it is to be noted that Athena's attributes repeat some of Nana's). This follows a statement to the effect that the golden image of Anahita had been destroyed. The importance of these two statements does not rest alone in the mention of Nanea, but in the fact that the two deities are discriminated. This discrimination does not always occur, since it is quite clear that Anahita and Nanæa were amalgamated or identified in many places, just as were Nana and Ishtar in Assyria-Babylonia. Mihr and Nanea occur in Armenia as names of the deities of sun and moon. In Afghanistan many places still bear the name Bibi Nani, " the Lady Nana " (Venus). Indo-Scythian coins of the first and second centuries A.D. bear the name of Nana with the epithet queen, also the forms Nanæa and Nanaia, the figure of the goddess sometimes having a crescent on the head, which shows that the deity bore there the same general characteristics she had further west in her relations with Ishtar and Aphrodite (cf. P. Gardiner, *Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India*, London, 1884). Apart from these cases, India does not know a deity Nana or Nanæa, which speaks strongly for the importation from the west. The connection was probably established through the Syrian Nanai, but may have come by way of Elam and Armenia. The fact that Nanæa in Indo-Scythic environment represents the moon, while the earlier affiliations of Nana of Erech and Syria were with Venus is offset by the later affiliations which in the West connect Ishtar with the moon. Parallel influences are at work. A possible way of transit for the goddess was through the Parthians and Scythians from the second century B.C. to the first Christian century. There is no difficulty in accounting for the spread of the cult eastward.

Isho bar-Bahlul, one of the most important of Syrian lexicographers, living in the tenth century, gives Nanai as the name of the planet Venus (which again agrees with the coalescence of Nana in Aphrodite in the West). Isho reports that the inhabitants of the region between Nisibis and the Tigris worshiped this deity (P. de Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 16, Leipsic, 1866). Granius Licinianus (*Annales*, p. 9, Leipsic, 1858) asserts that Antiochus Epiphanes went to Hierapolis (in Syria) to marry Diana (=Artemis) and received the temple treasure as dowry, just as I Macc. states that he intended to marry Nanæa. While it is known that Nanæa was worshiped in Syria, the possibility is not excluded that by Diana Licinianus means Anahita. The known deity of Hierapolis, however, was Atargatis (q.v.), whom Lucian describes (*De dea Syria*, xxxii.). Reports of the origin of Attis in Phrygia ascribes his birth to Nana, a virgin, who was impregnated by putting a pomegranate (or almond) in her bosom (Pausanius, VII., xvii. 11; Arnobius, *Adv. nationes*, v. 6, in *ANF*, vi. 491). A connection here with Ishtar and the East is found in the fact that the pomegranate was sacred to Ishtar, and was, from the complexity of its fruit, a symbol of fertility. It was in Phrygia, probably, that the transition was made by which Artemis and Nana, as also Aphrodite and Nana, were conjoined, a proof of the former conjunction being found in an inscription from the Piræus, probably dating from the third century B.C., on a tablet which " Axios and Cleo " devoted to " Artemis Nana " (*Corpus inscriptionum Atticarum*, iii. 131). While the cult of Nana was at times distinguished (as by Arnobius, ut sup.) from that of Cybele, there was confusion between these two cults also, and it is noteworthy that a cult of " the mother of the gods " (Cybele) existed at the Piræus. The association of Artemis with the moon is another connecting link which aids in the assurance that Nana traveled as far west as the Piræus, the Syrian Nana being also connected with the moon. Jerome and Pliny call the goddess of Elam Diana.

4. Syria, Phrygia, and Greece.

Thus the worship of the Sumerian goddess Nana of Erech is traced with probability in Elam, with certainty in Syria, Bactrian-India, Asia Minor, and Greece. She had affiliations with Ishtar in Assyria-Babylonia, with Anahita in Persia, Armenia, and possibly in Bactria, with Ashtoreth (Astarte) in Phenicia, and went to the making of Artemis or Diana, of Aphrodite or Venus, and of Athena in the Greek world. GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, iii (1834), 172 (by C. Masson), 449–451 (by J. Prinsep), v (1836), 266–268 (by J. Avdall; all on Indo-Scythic coins bearing the name of Nanæa); H. H. Wilson, *Ariana antiqua*, pp. 362–363, London, 1841 (also on the coins); Bernstein, in *ZDMG*, x (1856), 549; Windischmann, in *AMA*, viii (1858), 87 sqq.; J. B. Emim, in *Revue del orient de l'Algérie*, 1864, pp. 198 sqq.; Rawlinson's Herodotus, i. 624 sqq., 658 sqq., New York, 1875; F. Lenormant, in *Gazette archéologique*, ii (1876), 10–18, 58–68; P. Scholz, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen*, pp. 355–364, Regensburg, 1877; E. Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 107–109, Giessen, 1878; idem, *KAT*, passim; A. Stein, in *Indian Antiquary*, xvii (1888), 89 sqq.; J. Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, ii. 363–366, Paris, 1892; L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, ii. 484 sqq., 590, 627 sqq., Oxford, 1896; H. Gelzer, in the *Berichte* of the Royal Saxon Academy of Sciences, xlviii (1896), 99 sqq.; R. P. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, pp. 138, 454, Paris, 1905; J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 163–164, 178–179, London, 1906; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii. 1473–74; W. von Baudissin, in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiii. 631–645; and the commentaries on II Maccabees.

NANAK, nā'nāk, **SHAH:** Indian religious founder. See India, I., 3, § 3; Sikhs, Sikhism.

NANTES, nants or nānt, **EDICT OF:** One to regulate the relations between the Reformed Church in France and the State, issued by Henry IV. in 1598 and revoked by Louis XIV. in 1685. The Reformed Church of France, formed in 1559, found it difficult to maintain its rights against the Roman Catholic majority. At last, in 1589, when Henry of Navarre became king of France, all difficulties seemed to have been overcome. In 1593, however, Henry adopted the Roman Catholic faith, and the existence of the Protestant Church seemed to be again in danger. But Henry's apostasy from the Reformed faith was prompted exclusively by political motives, and the fears of the Huguenots were without basis in fact; the king was still inclined to secure for the Reformed Church a stable existence in his country. The deputies of the Reformed churches met in Sept., 1593, at Nantes and in the next year at Montauban to guard their interests. There also met at Sainte-Foy in 1594 a political convention of members from all provinces, where the Reformed effected an organization to defend their rights. A general council was constituted upon which was conferred all authority in religious matters, and under its jurisdiction all provinces were to be placed. It consisted of ten members, one for each province, four from the nobility, four from the third estate, and two from the clergy. Provincial councilors were also chosen, consisting of five to seven members, of whom at least one was to be a clergyman. This organization rendered great service and showed the power of the Huguenots against their enemies. The next convention took place in 1595 at Saumur. It requested in vain freedom of religious worship in the kingdom. The following year, at the convention of Loudun, the Protestant cause met with greater success. Du Plessis-Mornay (q.v.) rendered great services by his negotiations between the king and the Protestants. The meeting aimed at nothing more than freedom of conscience; it did not represent a party, but a church. Toward the end of 1597 both parties agreed upon the principal articles, and on Apr. 13, 1598, the king signed the Edict of Nantes. On Apr. 30 and then on May 2 he signed secret supplementary articles.

The rights granted to the Reformed by this edict did not differ materially from those of former edicts; the position of the Protestants was still very different from that of the Roman Catholics. The edict did not permit freedom of worship; the Reformed were satisfied with "a certain freedom of religion and some justice in the courts." The freedom of conscience granted was not of great import while the civil and political rights were not the same for all and while there existed no freedom of worship. The Roman Catholic service was reinstituted in the whole kingdom; churches and ecclesiastical possessions were returned to the clergy; the Reformed were obliged to pay tithes to the priests, to observe the feasts and fasts of the Roman Catholic Church and conform to its marriage laws; they were allowed to celebrate divine service only in certain places under restrictions. But they gained admission to the universities, schools, and hospitals; and the king made all offices of the State accessible to them. Mixed courts were established for cases in which the litigants were of different denominations. The edict nullified the authority of the provincial and general councilors instituted by the convention of Sainte-Foy. It forbade political meetings without the consent of the king and to take up arms. The children of refugees were acknowledged as Frenchmen. All families were reinstituted in their rights, honors, and possessions. The Reformed had the right to hold consistories, colloquies, provincial and general synods, to open schools in the towns where freedom of worship was granted to them, and to impose taxes for the support of their clergy, the expenses of their synods, and the like.

The ratification of the edict by the parliaments presented many difficulties. The clergy objected to each one of the articles. The parliaments opposed especially the establishment of the mixed courts and the admission to public offices, and they succeeded in making a number of important modifications. The ratification took place only under compulsion by the king. The execution of the edict was even more difficult than its ratification. The Reformed were not satisfied with it in its modified form. They appealed to former promises and concessions of the king, but he paid little heed to the complaints although he made some secret promises in regard to a few articles. In the mean time, the edict had been introduced in some territories by commissaries appointed by the king. The deputies of the Reformed were assembled to watch and hasten the execution of the edict. In order to avoid trouble, the king ordered them to disperse and to call no new conventions. The Reformed resisted as long as possible and succeeded in obtaining permission to reassemble in Sainte-Foy in Oct., 1601, to appoint general deputies who were to reside at the royal court and to hear the grievances of the provinces and present them before the king. (C. Schmidt†.)

The Huguenots were not satisfied with the Edict of Nantes because it gave them much less than they thought they were entitled to; while the Roman Catholics were furious because it gave the Huguenots so much. But the Edict is a mile-stone in the pathway to the ideal—a free Church in a free State. The Huguenots got much more than the most liberal Roman Catholic sovereign could or would have given them, and Henry evinced a courage and broad-mindedness which place him among the great rulers of history. For many years the Huguenots had little to complain of respecting the way the Edict was enforced. It threw around them many safeguards and they prospered so greatly, especially in the quiet years between 1629 and 1665, that to be as rich as a Huguenot became a proverb in France. But such religious liberty and material prosperity were hard for the Roman Catholic clergy to endure and they complained to the king, Louis XIV., who in 1665 assumed an unfriendly attitude toward the Huguenots. He issued then the first of nearly two hundred orders and laws which took away every vestige of protection afforded by the

Edict to the Huguenots. For twenty years he continued this gradually encroaching legislation. To mention a few of these orders: on June 20, 1665, he prescribed penalties to those who once having been "converted" to Roman Catholicism should relapse; on Oct. 24, 1665, he declared that little children who were claimed by the priests to have been "converted," that is, had used words which were interpreted as implying a preference for the Roman Catholic faith, although owing to the tender years of these children it was doubtful if they knew what they were saying, that such children were to be forcibly taken from their parents and brought up in the alleged preferred faith; in Aug., 1669, he forbade the Huguenots to leave France; on July 31, 1679, he forbade the Huguenots to hold any service while the place was being visited by the archbishop or bishop; on Oct. 10, 1679, he forbade the Huguenots to hold synods without his permission, and without the presence of a royal commissioner; on Feb. 20, 1680, he forbade Huguenot women to act as midwives; on June, 1680, he forbade marriages between Roman Catholics and Huguenots. So it went. The Huguenots saw the walls slowly closing in on them and knew that it was only a question of time when they would be crushed. Meanwhile every inducement was held out to them to abandon their faith. On doing so their temporal fortunes immediately changed and employment of a lucrative character came to them, from which their faith had excluded them. One of the active agencies in effecting the "conversion" of those who were indifferent to worldly advantages was the dragonnades, those incursions of brutal soldiery, allowed by their officers to practise every outrage and insult and every cruelty, short of taking life, upon those on whom they were billetted until the unhappy victims were almost, and sometimes quite, willing to yield up their faith and so escape their tormentors. [It was from the ranks of the forcibly converted and their descendants that the rationalistic movement (represented by Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and others) proceeded, which had much to do with precipitating the French Revolution (q.v.). A. H. N.]

By this combination of persecution and deprivation many of the Huguenots were driven out of France and many others into the Roman Catholic Church. The king supposed that the Huguenot church had been destroyed, and as the Edict of Nantes had become a mockery he revoked it on Oct. 17, 1685. Then followed a great exodus of Huguenots. With broken hearts, at the risk of their lives, for the exodus was forbidden, with the loss of their property, they turned their backs upon the land they loved so well, and in strange lands with dignity, patience, and success began life afresh. They greatly enriched the lands to which they came, for they brought with them the manufactures and the culture in which France was then preeminent.

But what of those who did not leave? Deprived of all legal standing, proscribed by the State, spoken of as dangerous to the body politic, with a sentence of death hanging over them if they dared to meet for religious worship (and many a minister was put to death and many a layman died in the galleys for this monstrous "crime"), these men and women, and even the children, showed the finest qualities of character. In spite of persecution they preserved their faith, both in its private and public exercises, and so when after a century a better day dawned for them their numbers showed that Protestantism had never ceased to be a faith in France. The pages of Huguenot history during this period are lighted by many a persecutor's fire, and across them move as heroic figures as history can show.

Bibliography: The text of the edict and of that of revocation are in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 349–353, 381–386, and in Aguesse, below; translations of the edict and revocation and of related documents are in the important *Tercentenary Celebration of the Promulgation of the Edict of Nantes . . . by the Huguenot Society of America*, New York, 1900, and in J. Fontaine, *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*, New York, 1907. Besides the literature given under Du Plessis-Mornay; Huguenots; and France, consult: E. Benoît, *Hist. de l'édit de Nantes*, 5 vols., Delft, 1693–95; *Mémoires et correspondance de Duplessis-Mornay*, vols. vi. sqq., Paris, 1824; E. Bonnemere, *Les Dragonnades. Hist. des Camisards sous Louis XIV.*, Paris, 1882; *Édits, déclarations et arrests concernans la religion . . . réformée, 1662–1751*, ib. 1885; F. Puaux and A. Sabatier, *Études sur la révocation*, ib. 1885; T. Schott, *Die Aufhebung des Edikts von Nantes*, Halle, 1885; L. Aguesse, *Hist. de l'établissement du protestantisme en France*, iv. 557 sqq., Paris, 1886; O. Douen, *La Révocation de l'édit de Nantes*, 3 vols., ib. 1894; J. Faurey, *Henri IV. et l'édit de Nantes*, Bordeaux, 1903; P. Bert, *Hist. de la révocation de l'édit de Nantes à Bordeaux*, Paris, 1908; Abbé Rouquette, *Études sur la révocation de l'édit de Nantes en Languedoc: les fugitifs (1685–1715)*, ib. 1908; Robinson, *European History*, ii. 183 sqq., 287 sqq., 316 sqq.

NARD (SPIKENARD): A plant (*Valeriana jatamansi* or *Nardostachys jatamansi*) growing on heights and in plains of northern and eastern India, and in southern Arabia and Gedrosia, from which a favorite and costly perfume was obtained (cf. Cant. i. 12, iv. 13–14; Mark xiv. 3–5). It was brought into the trade of the West, including Palestine, by the Phenicians. The common nard unguent consisted of a mixture of oils of several aromatic plants belonging to the genus *Valeriana*, and was usually placed in small alabaster boxes (cf. Mark xiv. 3) or in scent bottles. Nard was used not only as an unguent but also to flavor wine, and the oil was even drunk. With such costly nard Mary anointed Christ at Bethany six days before the Passover (John xii. 1 sqq.), typifying his approaching burial, since this oil was also used to preserve the corpse from decay (Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, v.). (R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: Theophrastus, *Hist. planitarum*, IX., vii. 2; Pliny, *Nat. hist.*, xii. 26–27, xiii. 2; O. Celsius, *Hierobotanicum*, ii. 1–11, Amsterdam, 1748; *Asiatic Researches*, ii. 405–417, Calcutta, 1876; W. Dymock, *Pharmacographia Indica*, ii. 233–238, London, 1891; *DB*, iv. 611; *EB*, iv. 4749–51; *DCB*, ii. 227, 671; *JE*, ix. 170; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii. 1478–80.

NASH, HENRY SYLVESTER: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Newark, O., Dec. 22, 1854. He was educated at Harvard (A.B., 1878) and at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., from which he was graduated in 1881. In 1882 he was appointed to his present position of professor of the literature and interpretation of the New Testament in the latter institution. He was also rector of the Church of the Redeemer, Chestnut Hill, Mass., from 1888 to 1903. He has written: *The Genesis of the Social Conscience* (New York, 1897); *Ethics and Revelation* (1899); *History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament* (1900); and *Atoning Life* (1908).

NASMITH, nĕ'smith, **DAVID:** Scotch philanthropist; b. at Glasgow Mar. 21, 1799; d. at Guildford (30 m. s.w. of London) Nov. 17, 1839. He was the originator of city missions, having established the first one, in Glasgow, 1826. 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. With this in view he visited the United States and Canada in 1830, establishing there many missions and associations; and France, in 1832. He founded the London City Mission in 1835, and was its secretary till 1837; in 1837 he formed the British and Foreign Mission for the purpose of unifying and propagating the work of city missions.

Bibliography: J. Campbell, *Memoirs of David Nasmith*, London, 1844; *DNB*, xl. 111–112.

NATALIS, nɑ-tɑ̄'lis, **ALEXANDER (Alexandre Noel):** French Dominican; b. at Rouen Jan. 19, 1639; d. at Paris Aug. 21, 1724. He entered the Dominican order in 1655, became teacher of philosophy and theology in the convent of St. Jacques at Paris, and in 1706 provincial. At the instance of Colbert he wrote his *Selecta historiæ ecclesiasticæ capita* (24 vols., Paris, 1677–86), to which he later appended the history of the Old Testament in six volumes. The work is practically a series of monographs of the most important points of church history, and the treatment is polemic and dogmatic rather than historic, the more modern opponents of Roman Catholicism, especially the Reformed, being attacked. The first volumes won the author high praise at Rome, but so strong was the anti-papal tendency of the later volumes that Innocent XI., by a decree of July 13, 1684, forbade his writings to be read under pain of excommunication. Natalis refused to submit and published a defense in 1699. His history was edited with emendations and dissertations directed against himself by Roncaglia at Lucca in 1734, and was then removed from the Index by Benedict XIII. Other editions appeared at Lucca in 1749 sqq., Venice in 1778 sqq., and Bingen in 1784. Another important work of Natalis is the *Theologia dogmatica et moralis* (10 vols., Paris, 1693, and often). (G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: J. Quétif and J. Échard, *Script. ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 810 sqq., Paris, 1721; A. Touron, *Hist. des hommes illustres de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, v. 805, 6 vols., ib. 1743–49; Niceron, *Mémoires*, xxiii.

NATHAN: An important prophet of the reign of David whose history is given in II Sam. vii. 1 sqq., xii. 1 sqq.; and I Kings i. In the passage last named, Nathan, the former tutor of the prince (II Sam. xii. 25), joined Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, in influencing David to make Solomon his successor, both by recalling David's promise to Bathsheba to this effect and by informing David of Adonijah's premature assumption of royal power. The other occasion (II Sam. xii. 1 sqq.) in which Nathan appeared most prominently was after the death of David's son by Bathsheba. In this narrative appears the well-known parable told by the prophet to David, who, after pronouncing judgment, received the application of the parable to himself in the words " thou art the man " (II Sam. xii. 7). The parable is apparently an independent account woven into the main story, and there are, accordingly, two accounts, one prophetic and the other more secular. There is, however, no real reason to doubt the historicity of either. The third record concerning Nathan (II Sam. vii.), though showing in its present form traces of Deuteronomic redaction, stands on the same basis of probability as II. Sam. xii. 1 sqq. From these accounts it appears that Nathan was one of the most influential persons at the court of David. (R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: The commentaries on the passages cited; the pertinent sections in the works on Hebrew history given under Ahab; and Israel, History of; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxviii. 1482; *DB*, iii. 488; *EB*, iii. 3337–3338; *JE*, ix. 176.

NATHANAEL. See Bartholomew.

NATHUSIUS, nɑ-tū'si-ūs, **MARTIN VON:** German Lutheran; b. at Althaldensleben (13 m. n.w. of Magdeburg), Saxony, Sept. 24, 1843; d. at Greifswald Mar. 9, 1906. He studied at the universities of Heidelberg, Halle, Tübingen, and Berlin from 1862 to 1867, and was successively assistant preacher at Wernigerode (1869–73), pastor at Quedlinburg (1873–85) and Barmen (1885–88), and professor of practical theology at the University of Greifswald (1888–1906). His principal works are: *Timotheus, ein Ratgeber für junge Theologen in Bildern aus dem Leben* (Leipsic, 1881); *Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie* (Heilbronn, 1883); *Katechismus-Predigten* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1883–84); *Das Wesen der Wissenschaft und ihre Wendung auf die Religion* (1885); *Die Verfassung der evangelischen Kirche und die neuesten Versuche zu ihrer Verbesserung in Preussen* (1888); *Mitarbeit der Kirche an der Lösung der sozialen Frage* (2 vols., 1893–94); *Die Kernfrage im Streit für das Apostolikum* (Heilbronn, 1893); *Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift und die historische Kritik* (1895); *Die christlich-soziale Idee der Reformation-Zeit und ihre Vorgeschichte* (Gütersloh, 1897); *Ueber die wissenschaftliche und religiöse Gewissheit* (Heilbronn, 1902); and *Handbuch des kirchlichen Unterrichts nach Ziel, Inhalt und Form* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1903–04).

NATIONAL CATHOLIC CHURCH. See Old Catholics, III., § 2.

NATIONAL COVENANT (1638). See Covenanters, § 3.

NATIVITY OF JESUS CHRIST. See Christmas.

Stoic Origin.

NATURAL LAW: In an ethical sense (for another sense, see Nature, Laws of), those absolute and universally valid imperatives that are innate in the reason of every individual and necessarily come into consciousness with the development of the mind. This thought originated with the Stoics (see Stoicism). They wished to show that " the good " is not binding because of arbitrary human statute, but because of inner necessity, and to establish, in contrast to the former ethical particularism, a system of morals binding on everyone. The thought was plausible by reason of the fact that among the peoples of the earth a far-reaching unanimity in moral judgment actually prevailed. This agreement seemed merely to have been brought to light by social intercourse, though in reality it had been, for the most part, created by such intercourse. The vehicle for the development of the thought was metaphysics and the psychology of the idealistic philosophy. By converting Plato's archetypal " ideas " into immanent, active " logoi " and combining these into a single " logos," which they identified with the Godhead, the Stoics reached the conception of a divine world-reason, of which the reason of the individual is a part. It manifests itself in the dictates of finite reason as the imperative law of the Godhead. Knowledge of this natural moral law is instinctive and a priori, it being perceived by means of intuitively evident " common notions " (Gk. *koinai ennoiai*). Although these ideas were designated as " innate " (*emphytoi*) before Cicero's time, he was really the first so to regard this original outfit of the practical reason, and, too, not only in embryo but also in general outline, inasmuch as the germs of moral laws are found in the animal impulses to procreation and care for the young, and since the four cardinal virtues are already pre-formed in the sense of perception for truth, social order, size and independence, and fitness and harmony. Under the emperors this thought was taken up in Roman jurisprudence, when Roman society had exchanged its national for a cosmopolitan character. To the arbitrary laws of man, changing with time and place, conditioned by practical considerations, and not always perfect, it opposes the natural law, sanctioned by God, universally valid and unchangeable—the perfect law, and the standard for all statute-law.

In Christian Theology.

This Stoic conception was brought into Christian theology by the apologists to establish the truth of revelation and fix a boundary between Christianity and Judaism. Their argument was, that the eternal, universal, natural law, because it had been obscured by sin, was publicly promulgated by Moses and afterward confirmed by Christ, with the repeal of the ceremonial and political adjuncts. At first the natural moral law, this fundamental postulate of Christianity, which was intended to explain, establish, and put into effect the ethical knowledge already at hand, was conceived as an original endowment of the reason. Then the natural moral law, together with the conception of natural right, became in the church system the foundation of the new law revealed in Christ, which takes into account the supernatural purpose of man. This new law transcends both the natural and the Mosaic law, in that it applies to intention as well as to overt act, demands spiritual acts that cultivate grace, and finally gives the Evangelical Counsels (see CONSILIA EVANGELICA). The fact that the natural law was regarded as obscured gave to the Church, as the custodian of revealed law, the control and administration of the laws of the land.

In the Reformation.

In contrast to the Roman Catholic conception of Christianity as *nova lex*, the Reformation recognizes Jesus as Redeemer only, and not as law-giver. It sees in the natural law the recognition of man's supernatural destiny, which is imparted to him with the creation of the reasoning faculty; and, consequently, it includes in natural law, and the Mosaic law confirming the same, the highest demands of Christianity; viz., humility, dependence, humble trust in God, etc. Since, however, as regards its content, the natural law is obscured and requires the grace of God to make it appear in all its splendor, the assertion that it is innate is nothing but an expression of the feeling of obligation to meet the Christian demand. If this is to move conscience, then the soul must be formed in accordance with it. Further, the conception of natural law served in the conflict with the visionaries to separate the parts of the Mosaic law that were universally binding from those that were binding on the Jews alone. Finally, it established the independence of the temporal authorities as opposed to the Church, since the external acts it regulates are discovered by the reason. With Melanchthon comes the title under which this humane basis of Greco-Roman ethics was used to teach the Gospel and prove its truth. In the sequel natural right and natural moral law became the means of emancipation from the continued activity of Roman Catholic motives in Protestantism.

Further Development.

The theocratic conception of the State as the guardian of both tables made the State responsible for the true worship of God and the salvation of its subjects. Now, through the further development of the idea of natural law, a new conception gains the ascendency, which regards the State as a human institution having as its object temporal peace. Revelation had always shown itself as a source of freedom of personality, and, at the same time, as the tyrannizing domination of a foreign will. As a means of emancipation from this supernatural authority of revelation representatives of Deism and the Enlightenment (qq.v.) made use of the traditional innate moral law. In philosophical ethics rationalism and empiricism are here opposed to each other. According to the rationalistic view, either the truth of absolute ethical imperatives, like that of mathematical and logical axioms, brings its evidence to conscience intuitively, or else, as Kant maintains, the moral law followed from the formal power of the reason to apprehend the unconditioned or posit unity. On the other hand, the empiricists hold that the moral law is only the sum total of those rules of life, learned by experience, which, if followed, will bring the greatest possible amount of satisfaction to a pre-moral instinct, either the egoistic, the altruistic, or both. The fact that among different peoples, and in different ages, the moral law has not always had the same content, has made it evident that the moral consciousness has had a history, that it is the result of a gradual development. With this new viewpoint the old antagonism between rationalism and empiricism becomes absorbed in that between idealism and evolutionism. While idealism conceives of the mind as the immanent cause of this development, evolutionism deduces these changes from external factors, after the analogy of the methods of natural science (see EVOLUTION). Recognizing that it is not the origin of the moral law that gives to it its validity, but rather its power to lift the personality to a higher plane, even Christian theology has now abandoned the fundamental part of the doctrine of an innate moral law. The supposed innate moral law is completely subject to the changes of history, in which Christian revelation proves itself by its fruits. See ETHICS. J. GOTTSCHICK†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: M. Voigt, *Die Lehre vom jus naturale*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1859; K. Hildenbrand, *Geschichte und System der Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*, vol. i., ib. 1860; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. iii., part 1, ib. 1880, Eng. transl., London, 1880–81; H. Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, London, 1883, and often; F. Jodl, *Geschichte der Ethik*, Stuttgart, 1889; H. Weiss, *Einleitung in die christlichen Ethik*, Leipsic, 1890; E. Tröltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei J. Gerhard und Melanchthon*, Göttingen, 1891; T. Elsenhaus, *Wesen und Entstehung des Gewissens*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1894.

NATURAL THEOLOGY: The favorite term in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries designating the knowledge of God drawn from nature in distinction from the knowledge of God contained in revelation. This division of theology into natural and revealed had its roots in the scholastic distinction between the two truths, one derived from nature by the use of the Aristotelian logic, subject to the authority of the Church, the other, truth above reason, revealed by God but formulated and taught solely by authority of the Church (see ALBERTUS MAGNUS; SCHOLASTICISM). The deists relied exclusively on natural theology, on the ground that the being and attributes of God could be exhaustively ascertained from the constitution and course of the world, thus superseding the necessity of supernatural revelation (see DEISM). David Hume, by his theory of knowledge, proved that even this knowledge was too precarious for rational certitude. On the other hand, Bishop Butler (*Analogy of Religion*, London, 1736 and often) maintained that natural and revealed religion were so far one that the truths of natural theology provided a basis for the characteristic truths of the Christian faith, such as miracles, the incarnation, and redemption. Later, the wisdom, power, and even the goodness of God were held to be demonstrable by the processes of natural theology (S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*, London, 1705; Wm. Paley, *Natural Theology*, ib. 1802; *Bridgewater Treatises*, q.v.). The function and name of natural theology continued in vogue until the latter portion of the last century (see GOD, IV.; and consult T. Chalmers, *Natural Theology*, Edinburgh, 1849; A. P. Chadbourne, *Lectures on Natural Theology*, New York, 1867; E. H. Gillett, *God in Human Thought, or Natural Theology*, ib. 1874; W. Jackson, *Philosophy of Natural Theology*, London, 1874; J. H. Kennedy, *Natural Theology and Modern Thought*, ib. 1891; G. C. Stokes, *Natural Theology*, ib. 1891; G. P. Fisher, *Manual of Natural Theology*, New York, 1893). This habit of thought has, however, been strongly opposed by Ritschl and his school. Relying on Kant's distinction between the pure and the practical reason, they seek the source of the knowledge of God not through the theoretic judgments of science or philosophy, but only through value-judgments to which revelation is addressed. Nature being impersonal can neither receive nor communicate the personal redemptive disclosure of God which man needs for reconciliation with him; this is to be sought ultimately only in Christ and the Christian community. Recent thought tends to yet another mode of viewing the whole subject. The distinction between natural and supernatural, in which natural theology arose and flourished, is effaced. Ruling ideas are: philosophical monism; psycho-physics tending to the personal interpretation of reality; evolution involving and revealing the unity of the world; the divine immanence as a postulate of religious thought. Moreover, the material included in natural theology is treated from a different point of view, as, e.g., the science of religion (C. P. Tiele, *Elements of the Science of Religion*, New York, 1897; J. Caird, *Philosophy of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1880; O. Pfleiderer, *Philosophy of Religion*, London, 1886; G. T. Ladd, *Philosophy of Religion*, New York, 1905; H. Höffding, *Philosophy of Religion*, London, 1906); apologetics (A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, New York, 1892; G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion*, Chicago, 1906); theism (Samuel Harris, *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, New York, 1886; B. P. Bowne, *Theism*, ib. 1902); or individual aspects of fundamental religious questions are discussed with reference, e. g., to psychology (E. D. Starbuck, *Psychology of Religion*, London, 1899; G. A. Coe, *The Spiritual Life*, New York, 1900; W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, ib. 1902); religion (L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion, Its Genesis and Growth*, Edinburgh, 1905; A. Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and Religions of the Spirit*, New York, 1906); Christianity (A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* London, 1901); metaphysics (J. Royce, *The World and the Individual*, New York, 1900–01); science (J. LeConte, *Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought*, New York, 1894; E. Caird, *The Evolution of Religion*, London, 1893); history (A. Menzies, *History of Religion*, London, 1895; W. Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion, dargestellt in ihrer Geschichte*, Halle, 1904). C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the works mentioned in the text, the reader may consult: J. A. Thomas, *The Bible of Nature*, London, 1908; and R. Otto, *Naturalism and Religion*, ib. 1909.

NATURE, LAWS OF: In general a law is a statement of the rule according to which something either necessarily takes place, as in external nature, or ought to take place, as in the normative sciences. While the laws of logic or ethics are often violated, no exception to the law of gravitation has ever been observed. Indeed, it is this assumed element of necessity that distinguishes the laws of nature from the recognized rules of thought, conduct, etc.

However, it is by no means certain to what extent laws of nature, e.g., that of mechanical causation, find application; and it is still a mooted question whether they control psychical life and the progress of history, as well as physical happenings, or whether a teleological element must be reckoned with. Further, since such laws are derived largely from experience, which is highly diversified and seemingly endless, it is impossible to fix upon a limited number of laws of nature and say that they are all. Attempts to set up a single law, upon which all natural processes depend, have proved as ineffectual as similar attempts of metaphysicians to reduce all ontology to some one formal proposition. In both cases the unifying principle is empty and abstract, and its truth is denied by the very multiplicity of existence. The law of causation has been taken as such a general formula; but it is seen at once that this transcends mere natural events. Evolution, as the single law to which all natural events are to be subordinated, is likewise unsatisfactory. It would also control all psychical life, individual and social, as well as natural phenomena. Merely with such general formulas very little would have been accomplished by science; for they really give no explanation of phenomena. In the very conception of event and phenomenon, evolution and causation are already assumed. Even from the law of the conservation of energy, which seems to have more content than the two just mentioned, it is impossible to deduce the single laws that actually govern natural events.

Attempts to formulate the laws of nature reach far back into antiquity. In the philosophy of Anaximander and Heraclitus the eternal flux of things expresses the most general law; and similarly Anaximenes. Plato and Aristotle speak of laws of nature, but do not formulate them. As to the origin of these laws, there are two familiar views. According to the first, which originated with Anaxagoras, they were given to the world by the Godhead. Thus hold both deists and theists. According to the second, or naturalistic, view, which originated with Democritus, these laws are eternal and immanent in the world. Thus held Spinoza. Kant opposed both these views. He taught that man is not only his own law-giver in the practical field, but that he is even the law-giver of nature, since all the concepts, axioms, and laws which make possible a synthesis of perceptions, or experience, or science based upon experience, are immanent in his understanding. While there may be an *a priori* element in the laws of nature, the fact remains that such laws, even the most universal, are discovered only on the basis of experience. With the laws of nature must not be confused Natural Law (q.v.). (M. HEINZE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. D. Campbell (the duke of Argyll), *The Reign of Law*, new ed., New York, 1885; F. Schultze, *Philosophie der Naturwissenschaft*, 2 parts, Leipsic, 1881; H. Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, London, 1883 and often; G. D. Campbell, *The Unity of Nature*, ib. 1884; idem, *The Reign of Law*, ib. 1867 and often; N. S. Shaler, *The Interpretation of Nature*, Boston, 1893; G. C. Zimmer, *Ueber das Wesen der Naturgesetze*, Giessen, 1893; R. Röbrich, *Rätselhafte Dinge. Einführung in die Grundgesetze der Natur*, Leipsic, 1897; C. H. Crawford, *Natural Laws Governing the Mortal and Immortal Worlds*, Chicago, 1904; E. Dennert, *Naturgesetz, Zufall, Vorsehung!* Hamburg, 1906; E. Boutroux, *Ueber den Begriff des Naturgesetzes . . . in der Philosophie der Gegenwart*, Jena, 1907.

NAUDÉ, nō″dē′, **PHILIPPE:** Franco-German Reformed; b. at Metz Dec. 28, 1654; d. at Berlin Mar. 7, 1729. As a boy he spent four years as page to the count of Weimar at Marksuhl. Attempts made here to convert him from the Reformed to the Lutheran faith led him to devote himself to theological studies, which he continued on his return to Metz. On the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) he fled to Germany. In 1687 he settled at Berlin as a teacher of mathematics, becoming professor of mathematics at the Academy of Sciences in 1704. His mathematical works are overshadowed by his numerous theological writings. These are all devoted to defending the sovereign grace of God on a supralapsarian basis. In his *Morale evangélique* (2 vols., Berlin, 1699), he attacked naturalistic ethics, divorced from revealed religion, which denied the origin of evil in the world. His *La Souveraine Perfection de Dieu dans ses divers attributs* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1708) was directed primarily against the philosopher Pierre Bayle and the French preacher at Berlin, Isaac Jaquelot, the former doubting Christianity, the latter being universalistic in tendency. The *Recueil des objections* (1709) sought to show that infralapsarians differ from supralapsarians only in phraseology. He renewed his attack on Bayle in *Refutation du "Commentaire philosophique"* (Berlin, 1718). His *Examen de deux traités* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1713) was directed against the non-traditional theology of the Copenhagen preacher La Placette and the Swiss theologian Osterwald. He assailed the mysticism of Pierre Poiret in his *Gründliche Untersuchung der mystischen Theologie* (Zerbst, 1713) and polemized against the universalistic tendency of the theological faculty of Frankfort in his *Theologische Gedanken über den Entwurf der Lehre von der Beschaffenheit und Ordnung der göttlichen Ratschlüsse* (1714).

(F. W. CUNO†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. H. Hering, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der reformierten Kirche in den preussisch-brandenburgischen Ländern*, vol. ii., Breslau, 1785; Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xli.

NAUMBURG, naum′bŭrg, **BISHOPRIC OF:** An ancient bishopric in what is now Prussian Saxony, founded at the same time and under the same circumstances as those of Merseburg and Meissen (qq.v.). The original seat of the bishopric was at Zeitz. It included the Wendish districts on the right bank of the upper Saale. The conversion of the inhabitants was a slow process, and had not been completed by the beginning of the twelfth century. This accounts for the transference of the see from Zeitz to Naumburg, on the borders of the German-speaking territory, at the instance of Conrad II., which was confirmed by John XIX. in 1028.

(A. HAUCK.)

The town of Naumburg was presented to the bishop at the time of the transfer; but the margraves of Meissen, nominally protectors of the see, kept the secular authority in their own hands until Bishop Meinher (d. 1280) established the sovereignty of the bishop. In the time of Philip, palsgrave of the Rhine and duke of Bavaria (1517–41), a usually non-resident bishop, the Reformation made great progress in the district. At his death the canons elected Julius von Pflug, the last Roman Catholic bishop (1541–64), whose place was contested by Nicholas von Amsdorf, on the strength of consecration at the hands of Luther.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. P. Lepsius, *Geschichte der Bischöfe des Hochstifts Naumburg*, part i., Naumburg, 1846; S. Braun,

Naumburger Annalen . . . 799–1613, ib. 1892; E. Hoffman, *Naumburg . . . im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Leipsic, 1901.

NAUMBURG, naum'bûrg, **CONVENTION:** An assembly held at Naumburg from Jan. 20 to Feb. 8, 1561, to unite the Protestant estates by the subscription of the Augsburg Confession, and to discuss common measures against the Council of Trent, which was soon to be reopened. Since the second colloquy of Worms (q.v.) in 1557 various attempts had been made to unite the Protestants (see FRANKFORT RECESS). The adherents of Flacius (q.v.) requested a general synod; but the Philippists (q.v.) opposed this plan. During the Diet of Augsburg (Mar., 1559), Duke Christoph of Württemberg proposed a new convention of the Evangelical princes, and at a meeting of Duke Christopher, Elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate, and his son-in-law, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, at Hilsbach, it was decided that the convention should be held at Naumburg. Landgrave Philip, Count-Palatinate Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, and Elector August were also won for the plan. The rulers of Württemberg and the Palatinate invited the princes of Upper Germany, while Elector August and John Frederick of Saxony invited those of North Germany.

Several princes were represented in the convention by their councilors. From Jan. 20 to Feb. 8 there were held twenty-one sittings. In accordance with a preliminary agreement that nothing else was to be discussed but the subscription of the Augsburg Confession, Frederick III. of the Palatinate proposed the following points: (1) Comparison of all editions of the Augsburg Confession in order to decide which copy should be subscribed; (2) the drawing up of a preface stating the occasion and purpose of the meeting; (3) an explanation to the emperor concerning the purpose of the meeting; (4) discussion on the question whether and how the uninvited counts, lords, and cities were to be persuaded to subscribe. Immediately difference of opinion arose as to what edition should be subscribed; and some demanded also the subscription of the Schmalkald Articles. Frederick III. demanded the subscription of the Latin confession of 1530, since the corresponding German text contained the offensive words, *unter Gestalt des Brotes und Weines*, which admitted transubstantiation. The subscription of the Latin text was in Frederick's eye equal to an implicit acknowledgment of art. x. of the *Variata*, regarding the Lord's Supper. The work of collating the different editions occupied two full days. Various points of dispute now arose, on the question whether the edition of 1531 or 1540 or 1542 should be subscribed, and whether the German text in art. x. of the *Invariata* seemed to confirm transubstantiation. In the mean time orthodox theologians had not missed the opportunity to influence the princes. David Chytræus of Rostock pointed out the Melanchthonian heresies in the *Variata* and advocated the subscription of the *Invariata*, together with the Schmalkald Articles; and the adherents of Flacius sent an epistle warning against any subscription of the Augsburg Confession, unless the subscription of the Apology and the Schmalkald articles were included. The assembled princes finally agreed upon the edition of 1531, and a preface was drawn up to be sent to the emperor. John Frederick and Ulrich of Mecklenburg refused to sign the preface on the ground that the obnoxious heresies, especially those of the Sacramentarians, were not specially mentioned and condemned, and that no direct explanation of the disputed articles had been given. The sudden and secret departure of John Frederick from Naumburg caused great alarm among the princes. The preface was signed by the two electors, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Duke Christopher, and the margrave of Baden. Neither Duke Ulrich signed, nor the councilors of the other absent princes, as most of them had already departed.

More harmony prevailed in the negotiations regarding the Council of Trent. Two papal legates and an imperial embassy arrived at Naumburg. When it was discovered that the papal briefs inviting the Protestant princes to participate in the Council of Trent began with the words *Dilecto filio* ("[to my] beloved son"), they were sent back unopened, with the remark that the Protestant princes were not, and would never be, the sons of the pope. The convention finally answered the emperor and the pope to the effect that none of its number would participate in the Council of Trent, that they wanted a national German council in which they could not only be heard, but also have a vote.

At the entreaty of the persecuted French Huguenots, the assembled princes sent letters of intercession to King Charles IX. and King Anthony of Navarre. There appeared an ambassador from Queen Elizabeth of England, who, in consideration of the coalition of the Roman Catholic powers, urged the necessity of a closer union of the Evangelicals and proposed steps to be taken for the purpose of a mutual agreement in regard to the Council of Trent. The princes promised to comply with her wishes, and also notified the king of Denmark of their attitude toward a council. The princes pledged themselves to induce each one of their counts, lords, and cities to subscribe the Augsburg Confession together with the preface. For the preservation of peace they resolved upon a careful censorship of new writings and the suppression of all libelous literature. Thus the convention came to an end; but the work of peace was soon destroyed by the opposition of John Frederick of Saxony and by the zealous labors of the anti-Philippist theologians. At the Convention of Lüneburg in July of the same year the leading theologians of Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Rostock, Magdeburg, and Brunswick unanimously rejected the Naumburg preface and asked for a severe condemnation of the heresies. The princes of Lower Saxony likewise rejected the preface. The only palpable result of the Naumburg Convention was a common protest against pope and council. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: There are three monographs on the subject: G. P. Hönn, *Historia des von denen evangelischen Ständen 1561 zu Naumburg gehaltenen Convents*, Frankfort, 1704; J. H. Gelbke, *Der Naumburger Fürstentag*, Leipsic, 1793; R. Calinich, *Der Naumburger Fürstentag*, Gotha, 1870. Consult further: H. Heppe, *Geschichte der deutschen Protestantismus 1555–81*, i. 364 sqq., Marburg, 1852; A. Kluckhohn, *Briefe Friedrichs des Frommen*, i. 154 sqq., Brunswick, 1868; idem, *Friedrich der Fromme*, pp. 79 sqq., Nördlingen, 1879; O. Zöckler, *Die Augsburger Konfession*, pp. 48 sqq., Frankfort, 1870; B. Kugler, *Christoph Herzog zu Württemberg*, ii. 183 sqq., Stuttgart, 1872; M. Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation*, i. 153–154, 209 sqq., ib. 1889; A. Heidenhaim, *Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philipps von Hessen, 1557–1562*, pp. 185–286, Halle, 1890.

NAUSEA (GRAU), FRIEDRICH: German Roman Catholic; b. at Waischenfeld, Upper Franconia, Bavaria, 1480; d. at Trent Feb. 6, 1552. He seems to have taught for a time at Nuremberg, and was then a private tutor of a son of Schwartzenberg, first at Leipsic, and then at Pavia and Padua, where he received his doctorate in law in 1523. In 1524 he went to Germany as secretary to Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio (q.v.). The same year, besides being commissioned to restore Melanchthon and Erasmus to the Roman Catholic Church, he was made papal notary and count of the Lateran. In 1525 he was given the parish of St. Bartholomew, Frankfort, which, however, on account of Lutheran opposition, he exchanged for the post of cathedral preacher in Mainz. Here he became one of the chief Roman Catholic preachers and apologists of the Reformation period. As preacher and counselor he was active at the Diet of Speyer in 1529. After a year in Italy, where he received the theological doctorate at Sienna, he went to Vienna as court chaplain and councilor to the Emperor Ferdinand. In 1538 he was made bishop coadjutor of Vienna, but still preached regularly before the court. In 1539 he published at Leipsic brief postilla of the Gospels to replace those of Luther. At the emperor's request, Nausea took part in the Hagenau conference in 1540, and in the same year delivered at Worms his *Hortatio ad ineundam in Christiana religione concordiam* (Mainz, 1540), in which he urged the acceptance of the tradition of the Fathers. In 1541 he succeeded to the episcopal see of Vienna. His attempts at reform within his diocese failed to secure imperial support; but in 1551 he attended the Council of Trent as Ferdinand's orator, taking an active part in the debates on the Eucharist, penance, and extreme unction, and on Jan. 7, 1552, preaching on the mass and the priesthood. His works include, besides many sermons: *Responsa . . . ad aliquot Germanicæ nationis gravamina* (1538); *Catechismus catholicus* (1543; 2d ed., Antwerp, 1551); *Pastoralium inquisitionum elenchi tres* (Vienna, 1547); and *Isagogicon de clericis ordinandis* (1548). (G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: A volume of *Epistolæ miscellanea* to him was published Basel, 1551. Consult: the biography by J. Metzner, Regensburg, 1884; T. Wiedemann, *Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation im Lande unter der Enns*, i. 227 sqq., ii. 27 sqq., Prague, 1878–80; W. Friedensburg, in *ZKG*, xx (1899), 500 sqq., xxi (1900), 537 sqq.; *ADB*, xxiii. 321 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 50 sqq.

NAVIGATION.

Hebrew Names for Ships (§ 1).
Form, Construction, and Tackle (§ 2).
Early Hebrew Navigation. Tarshish (§ 3).
Later Hebrew Navigation (§ 4).

1. Hebrew Names for Ships.

The most frequent name for ship in the Old Testament is *'oni*, a collective, *'oniyyah* being a noun of individuality. It is applied to vessels of the most various sizes. In Job ix. 26 the expression "swift ships" is probably identical in meaning with the "vessels of bulrushes" of Isa. xviii. 2, and recalls the boats known, e.g., to Pliny (*Hist. naturalis*, xiii. 21 sqq.), and still used in the Sudan, made out of papyrus reeds. They are practically rafts of no great size, made of bundles of reeds tied together and kept in motion with poles or short oars. But the word *'oni* is used with qualifying words ("ships of the sea," Ezek. xxvii. 9; "ships of Tarshish," Ezek. xxvii. 25) to denote vessels which sail the open seas. A rarer word is *ẓi* (Num. xxiv. 24; Isa. xxxiii. 21; Ezek. xxx. 29; Dan. xi. 30), which in Daniel and Numbers implies ships of war, probably also in Isaiah, but the passage in Ezekiel is better represented by "swift ships." The word *sephinah* is found only in Jonah i. 5.

2. Form, Construction, and Tackle.

Exceedingly instructive is the passage Ezek. xxvii. 1–9a, 25–36, in the matter of construction, equipment, and manning of vessels. Tyre is pictured as a splendid ship of commerce. The double planks are of cypress brought from Senir (Hermon); the mast is of cedar of Lebanon, while the oars are of oak brought from Bashan; the deck (or cabin?) is of "*te'asshur*" wood inlaid with ivory, brought from "the isles of Chittim" (a name derived originally from Cition in Cyprus, and then applied generally to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean). The sail is of some valuable material wrought in Egypt and decorated with figures which had some connection with the business or the importance of the ship. The awning is of blue and purple. The word which is rendered "mariners" in verse 27 (*mallaḥ*) is not to be connected with the word for salt (*melaḥ*), but with the Babylonian *malaḥu*, "sailors." A part of the ship's company consisted of "pilots" (i.e., the sailors who managed the tackle); and a part, of rowers. There can be no doubt that the prophet who penned this picture drew upon his knowledge of Phenician shipping, and the account is the more valuable since no other reports are known of the material and equipment of a Phenician vessel. There are, however, pictured on a relief from Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh vessels which are probably of Phenician origin. Two kinds of ships appear, one of which is a war vessel, equipped with a ram. They have two banks of oars, four in each bank, and each has two steering oars or rudders toward the stern, one on each side. Each ship has one mast and carries a yard, the ends of which are connected with the mast by ropes. The sail is apparently four-cornered, and from it one rope is carried to the bow and two to the stern. The other kind of ship is without the ram, is somewhat shorter and decidedly rounded in shape. This has no mast or tackle; three men on board are equipped with two spears each; and other general characteristics indicate that this is a second and smaller variety of war vessel. The merchant vessels were probably of this latter type, shorter and rounder, equipped with mast, stays, yard, sail, and steering oars, sometimes also oars for propulsion, though these could hardly be used for heavy ships of burden. It is likely that the bow was decorated with some device which served also as a mark of identification; Greek and Roman writers say that Phenician ships carried the head of a horse at the bow, as did an Assyrian ship figured in the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad.

3. Early Hebrew Navigation. Tarshish.

The Hebrews of the highlands of Palestine had necessarily nothing to do with seafaring matters. Whether the smaller tribes which for a time or always had their homes by the sea engaged in marine business the notices in Gen. xlix. 13 and Judges v. 17 do not make sufficiently clear. Outside of these, the reigns of David and Solomon seem to have been the first period when Hebrews used the sea, being then in close connection with the Phenicians. The embassies between Jerusalem and Tyre and the exchange of commodities imply sea traffic (II Sam. v. 11; I Kings v. 15 sqq., ix. 11, 14). Hiram sent the timbers needed by Solomon in rafts (I Kings v. 9), and the Chronicler asserts that these came to Joppa (II Chron. ii. 16); possibly Solomon had control of the trade routes and so of the road to Joppa, though it is more likely that Dor (see PHILISTINES) was the port used, since this is known to have been in the region already subject to Solomon. From Elath or from Eziongeber traffic was carried on with Ophir (q.v.). Tarshish was also a port to which ships sailed. The Old Testament does not make clear where Tarshish lay, except that it was somewhere in the West, either on the Mediterranean or still farther west. It is mentioned as belonging to the islands or coast lands of the Mediterranean, known as of importance and celebrated by Sidonian seafarers, as belonging to the Greeks (Isa. xxiii. 1, lx. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 12, 25; Gen. x. 4), and as reached by sailing from Joppa (Jonah i. 3); Isa. lxvi. 19 implies that its distance was great. Eusebius and Jerome did not know where it was, but thought of Tarsus, and it was also located at Carthage and in India. The identification which has the best authority is Tartessus in Spain, on the river Guadalquivir, on which was the Phenician colony of Gadir (Gadeira, Gades, Cadiz), founded according to the Romans about 1100 B.C. Greeks from Phocæa settled at Tarshish c. 600 B.C., since the control of the region by the Phenicians ceased about 700 B.C. because of their wars with the Assyrians. But between 500 and 300 the Carthaginians held Gades. The earlier passages in the Old Testament assign Tarshish to the Phenicians, while later passages (P in Gen. x. 4) reckon it to the Greeks, and this is significant. It is noteworthy that the wares said to be from Tarshish were those of Tartessus. It is reported of Solomon in I Kings x. 22 that he had "ships of Tarshish" which made a trip every three years, and the passage gives the lading; the parallel text (II Chron. ix. 21) affirms that the ships sailed to Tarshish. It has been supposed that the expression "ships of Tarshish" merely means "great seagoing vessels," which is indeed the case in, e.g., Isa. ii. 16; Ps. xlviii. 7. But the passage in Kings is to be taken as expressing ships which sailed to Tarshish in company with the ships of Hiram on the Mediterranean, and Dor must have been the home port. The time consumed indicates a great distance. But in the Greco-Roman times the passage from Tyre to Tarshish consumed about twenty-four days, therefore it took perhaps thirty days in Solomon's time. Probably the meaning is that during the first summer the outward voyage was made, the lading was secured during the second summer, and the return journey was made in the third, since during the stormy season the sea was not traversed, and stops were probably made at many ports on the way. Closer conclusions as to the merchandise can not be reached from the passage under discussion, since it is not said that these came only from Tarshish, and possibly Northern Africa was a second source whence the wares were derived. From I Kings xxii. 48–49 and II Chron. xx. 35–37 other conclusions follow. The first of these passages clearly means by "ships of Tarshish" vessels like those which sailed to that port, and the Chronicler again affirms that they sailed from Eziongeber to Tarshish. This was indeed not impossible if the route by way of the Nile and a canal to the Red Sea be thought of. But it is probable that the thought of the earlier passage (I Kings xxii. 48) ruled the statement of the supposed facts.

4. Later Hebrew Navigation.

Of Azariah it is reported in II Kings xiv. 21–22 that he regained Elath, though it was soon recovered from the Jews (II Kings xvi. 6); but the Jews who were there may have engaged in navigation. Nothing is said of participation by the northern kingdom in the commerce of the Phenicians during the alliance between the dynasty of Omri with that of Tyre. The oracle on Issachar and Zebulun in Deut. xxxiii. 18–19 necessitates participation in sea traffic on the part of the latter at least, with the Bay of Accho as the point of departure. Similarly Hos. xii. 7–8, implying that Hebrews had learned the ways of the Canaanites, involves the interpretation that the former participated in commerce by sea, though of course only a part of the population was so engaged. For post-exilic times there are indications such as Ps. cvii. 23–30. Jonah i. gives a fair idea of the ideas of mariners of antiquity concerning the causes of storms; Prov. xxxi. 14 compares the prudence of the good housewife with the management of a ship; Eccles. xi. 1 may refer to traffic by sea; Ecclus. xxxiv. 9–16 hints at a sea voyage; the late passage Isa. xxxiii. 23 takes its figures from the tackle of a ship. Simon the Maccabee made Joppa a Hebrew port in 145 B.C. (see PHILISTINES); Josephus (*Ant.*, XIV., x.) reports decrees of the Romans which imply that the Jews had dealings on the sea, and Hyrcanus charged his brother Aristobulus before Pompey with permitting sea-robbery to exist, and in *War*, II., xxi. 8 mentions 330 (230?) boats on the Sea of Tiberias, while the Gospels speak frequently of the fisheries there. The account in Acts xxvii.–xxviii. of Paul's journey is valuable for the new light it affords on sea travel. Ships had by this time reached a considerable size, the Isis of Alexandria being 180 feet long, forty-five feet beam, and forty-three and a half feet deep, giving a tonnage of about 2,700. Such ships carried a foremast, used also probably as a crane; besides the mainsail and the foresail, a topsail was sometimes carried.

At the stern was the flagstaff from which the pennant flew. The rudder could be unshipped either when in harbor or during severe storms. Some ships carried several anchors (Acts xxvii. 29), though sometimes heavy stones were used. Exactness in direction was unattainable in early navigation, the course being laid by the stars, and only dead reckoning of a sort was available, though a certain facility in calculating the ship's position was gained by practise, and charts were in the possession of sailors. On account of the necessity of sailing under clear skies, navigation was as a rule suspended between October and the spring. The "undergirding" of the ship (Acts xxvii. 17) is understood in two ways; one is the stretching of a strong rope around the ship just above the water line, the other places the rope amidship, passing under the keel and over the bulwarks and deck. The latter method was especially adapted to a ship of burden which carried its freight chiefly in the waist. (H. GUTHE).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the names consult: S. Fränkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, pp. 209 sqq., Leyden, 1886; E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im A. T.*, part i., Halle, 1902. On form and construction: C. Torr, *Ancient Ships*, Cambridge, 1894; A. Jal, *Archéologie navale*, Paris, 1840; A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1894. On Tarshish: F. C. Movers, *Die Phönicier*, ii. 2, pp. 588 sqq., 3, pp. 35 sqq., 92 sqq., Berlin, 1850–56; G. Oppert, in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxv (1903), 50–72, 212–265. Light on the naval affairs of Greek and Roman times may be found in: J. Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, London, 1880; A. Böckh, *Urkunden über das Seewesen des attischen Staates*, Berlin, 1840; A. Breusing, *Die Nautik der Alten*, Bremen, 1886; J. Vars, *L'Art nautique dans l'antiquité, d'après A. Breusing*, Paris, 1887; H. Balmer, *Die Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus und die Seefahrtskunde im römischen Kaiserzeitalter*, Bern-Münchenbuchsee, 1905. In general: F. Vigouroux, *Le Nouveau Testament et les découvertes archéologiques modernes*, pp. 321–350, Paris, 1896; idem, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1494–1515 (two excellent articles, with reproductions of Assyrian, Egyptian, and Roman monuments); *DB*, ii. 105, iv. 505–506, 683–685; *EB*, iv. 4477–4484; *JE*, ix. 193–194.

NAVILLE, EDOUARD HENRI: Swiss Egyptologist; b. at Geneva June 14, 1844. He studied in Geneva, London, and Paris, and being interested in Egyptology sat under Lepsius at Berlin. In 1869 he made his first visit in Egypt. Since 1882 he has been connected with the Egypt Exploration Fund (q.v.) and has published many remarkable papers through it (see the list of publications in the article EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND). His first contribution (1885) attracted wide attention since in it he detailed his investigation of the store cities of Pithom and the route of the Exodus, which he thought he had determined. In 1874 he was entrusted by the Congress of Orientalists in London with a new edition of the text of the Book of the Dead and published the same, *Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der 18. bis 20. Dynastie* (Berlin, 1886). In 1891 he became professor of Egyptology in the University of Geneva. He is the author also of *The Old Egyptian Faith* (London, 1910).

NAVILLE, JULES ERNEST: Swiss philosopher and theologian; b. at Chancy in the canton of Geneva Dec. 13, 1816; d. in Geneva May 27, 1909. He was educated in Geneva and in Germany, was professor of philosophy in the University of Geneva from 1840 till 1846, when he lost his place in consequence of the Revolution, but was from 1860 till 1890 professor of apologetics and then till death honorary professor. His writings on religious and philosophical subjects embrace *Maine de Biran, sa vie et ses pensées* (Paris, 1857, 3d ed. 1874); *La vie éternelle* (1861, 2d ed. 1862; German transl. Leipsic, 1863; Eng. transl., *Life Eternal*, London, 1863); *Madame Swetchine* (a Russian convert to Protestantism; 1863, 2d ed. 1864); *Le Père céleste* (1865, 3d ed. 1880; German transl., Leipsic, 1865; Eng. transl., *The Heavenly Father, Lectures on Modern Atheism*, London, 1865; Greek transl., Cyprus, 1893); *Le Devoir* (Lausanne, 1868; German transl., 1869); *Le Problem du mal* (1868, 2d ed. 1869; German transl., Jena, 1871; Eng. transl., *The Problem of Evil*, Edinburgh, 1871); *L'Église romaine et la liberte des cultes* (Geneva, 1878); *Le Christ* (1878, 2d ed. 1880; German transl., 1880; Eng. transl., *The Christ*, Edinburgh, 1880); *La Logique de l'hypothèse* (Paris, 1880); *La Physique moderne* (1883, 2d ed. 1890); *Le Libre arbitre* (1890, 2d ed. 1898); *La Science et matérialisme* (1891); *La Condition sociale des femmes* (Lausanne, 1891); *Le Témoignage du Christ et l'unité du monde chrétien* (Geneva, 1893); *La Définition de la philosophie* (1894); *Les Philosophies negatives* (1899); *Le Credo des chrétiens* (1901).

NAYLER, JAMES: English Friend; b. at Ardsley (5 m. s. of Leeds), Yorkshire, about 1617; d. at Holme (near King's Ripton, 16 m. n.w. of Cambridge) Oct., 1660 (buried Oct. 21). He was the son of a well-to-do farmer, and received an excellent education; on the outbreak of the civil war in 1642 he joined the parliamentary army, and became quartermaster; while in the army he became a preacher, but was taken ill, returned home, and took up farming in 1650. In 1651 he was converted under the preaching of George Fox, and became a preacher among the Friends, suffering imprisonment on the charge of unsound doctrine. His success as a preacher disordered his mind; he allowed himself to be treated in such a quasi-reverential way, that in 1651 he was tried by parliament for blasphemy, and condemned to be whipped twice, to be branded, to have his tongue bored with a hot iron, and to be imprisoned during pleasure, with hard labor. After two years in jail he recovered and was released and received into the confidence of the Friends. He was a collaborator with George Fox (q.v.) in the production of Quaker tracts, and his *Writings* were published in a collected edition (London, 1716).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Deacon, *The Grand Impostor Examined; or the Life, Tryal, and Examination of J. Nayler*, London, 1656; idem, *An Exact Hist. of the Life of J. Naylor*, ib. 1657; *A True Narrative of the Examination, Tryall, and Sufferings of J. Nayler*, London, 1657; *A True Relation of the Life, Conversation, Examination, Confession and just Deserved Sentence of J. Naylor*, London, 1657; *Memoirs of the Life, Ministry, Tryal, and Sufferings of . . . James Nailer*, London, 1719; J. G. Bevan, *A Refutation of Some of the more Modern Misrepresentations of the Society of Friends, with a Life of J. Nayler*, London, 1800; *DNB*, xl. 130–133.

NAZARENE, CHURCH OF THE. See PENTECOSTAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE.

NAZARENES: The name given to two modern religious sects. For Nazarene as applied to Jesus Christ and his disciples see NAZARETH.

1. Adherents of Jacob Wirz, a silk-weaver of Basel (b. 1778; d. 1858). This little sect owes its origin to the most various spritual elements. Its doctrines are based upon medieval Catholic ideas and the mystical conceptions of Jakob Böhme, Michael Hahn, and Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (qq.v.). Among its beliefs were the following: Jesus wished to be thoroughly and perfectly engendered in Wirz, who was to become by grace what Jesus is by nature; Jesus Jehovah, one being with the Father and the Holy Ghost, is the basis of man's life and action, whom we embrace in connection with the holy mother community in heaven, and its true members on earth, so that we may together grow into a perfect temple of the divine wisdom in Christ. The following elements are prominent: (1) the Catholic element, as expressed in the supplications to Mary and the saints, in the practise of making the sign of the cross, and in the high estimation of celibacy; (2) the theosophical element, from which source the adherents draw their higher wisdom. Regarding the objective facts of salvation as well as the subjective process of salvation, the crudeness of the conceptions is striking, as, for instance, in the explanation of the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ. If "the blood of Jesus" is the material for the rebirth of the whole universe "then the man who wishes to be blessed must entirely absorb this human and divine substance by faith, which possesses a magnetic power." Therefore, justification is imputed only in the beginning; it must rise to the grade of a sanctifying and unifying justification, which brings with it a transformation into the divine being of light. The firm faith in this supposedly higher knowledge produced a certain self-consciousness which not only turned against ecclesiastical Christianity, but also, and more especially, assumed an attitude of opposition to theologians and set its face against all scientific investigation as a falling away from Christ. The vitality and growth of this sect is very limited; it exists only in a few scattered places, such as Barmen and Elberfeld, and in a few districts in the hill-country of Württemberg, and does not appear to have any future. J. HERZOG.

2. Hungarian Anabaptists. They originated about 1845 and number at present about 15,000. They have an active propaganda, are growing in importance, and have reproduced the quieter and purer type of Anabaptism of the middle of the sixteenth century. Little is known of them because they are inactive in the work of publication, and are averse to everything not strictly religious. Their hymn-book is their only official publication (Zurich, 5th ed., 1889). There is an excellent article concerning them by G. Schwalm (*JPT*, xvi. 484–545, 1890).

The name "Nazarene" has long been officially used. Probably the brothers Hemsey, who labored about 1840 as artizans in Switzerland and came into contact with Fröhlich and his adherents in Thurgau or near Strasburg, brought this type of Christianity to their native land. After 1848 a large number of Nazarenes were found in Hungary, whose most zealous apostle was Stephen Kalmár (d. 1863). They have since spread through southern Hungary. They have only one article of faith: the Bible gives God's commandments; to keep them conscientiously is "the way" to salvation. They admit that in the other churches children of God are found, but claim that they should join the Nazarenes. They lay stress upon the doing of God's will, and upon suffering. Complete passivity and patient bearing of insults and ill-treatment characterize them. They do not complain of severe oppression, to which they were formerly especially exposed. This is the lot, they say, of the children of God. They firmly refuse to take an oath and decline military service. It is not the bearing of arms in itself to which they object, but the purpose of killing the enemy which they regard as antichristian. In their religious phraseology they agree with other pietists and prefer to use Biblical language. They are noted for their beautiful singing. They kneel at prayer, sometimes observing silence. Baptism is of adults and by immersion, followed by prayer and imposition of hands by the elders. They are sought as laborers because of their diligence, sobriety, honesty, and thrift, and are not opposed to amassing wealth. The persecutions through which they passed often produced in them a certain fanaticism, characteristically Anabaptist, evinced by their hatred of the church, of priests, and of the educated ministry. To these they apply all words spoken by Jesus against the Pharisees and scribes. From their pietistic standpoint, every external formality of worship appears to belong to the kingdom of apostasy. They therefore form no church organization; they do not even record their baptized members. All who become "converted" and "have the testimony of the congregation" may receive immersion. These join thereby not an organized "church" but the "Christ-believing congregation." But almost all Nazarenes know each other personally, however dispersed they may be. Their elders enjoy an almost unrestricted influence, they advise in all possible concerns, even in matrimonial affairs. Their position is not fixed by rule; there is no formal control over financial administration and relief; everything is a matter of confidence. The Nazarenes have personal and epistolary intercourse with the Fröhlichians in Zurich and Strasburg, with some neo-Baptists in Württemberg, with Lothringians, and with the Amish Mennonites in America, whom they call coreligionists. But their relation to the Baptists, otherwise nearest to them, is by no means friendly. The Baptist congregations they put on the same basis as the "church." Baptists who join them they baptize again. Their following is from the lower classes. Their future, when their virtues, their growing wealth, and their industry procure for them greater importance and when their narrow vision gives place to needed scientific education, can not be foreseen. Political changes in Hungary have greatly ameliorated their condition. The period 1848–1868 was their time of struggle. Their children were forcibly removed and baptized in the churches; and they themselves suffered long terms of imprisonment for refusing military service.

Many died in prison, some were even sentenced to death in the war of 1866 on account of this refusal. Since 1868 the constitution has granted liberty of conscience, but this has not always been observed. As late as 1902 many, otherwise blameless, were in prison for refusing military service. Even their marriage customs brought them into conflict with the authorities. With the new Hungarian legislation of 1894 and 1895 some relief has come; they are no more obliged to belong to any of the acknowledged confessions. The State recognizes them as undenominational citizens when they apply as such, and they show respect for the "authority appointed by God." They are not molested because their children take no part in the religious instruction of the church and disregard obligatory attendance at church. In their propaganda they are also unmolested. They do not believe in universal salvation. Hence in their propaganda they aim to save from the world only the "susceptible souls."

S. Cramer.

Bibliography: On 1 consult: The founder's *Biographie; ein Zeugniss der Nazarenergemeinde von der Entwicklung des Reiches Gottes auf Erden*, Barmen, 1862; his *Zeugnisse und Eröffnungen des Geistes durch J. J. Wirz heilige Urkunden der Nazarenergemeinde*, 2 vols., ib. 1863–64; and C. von Palmer, *Die Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs*, pp. 143 sqq., Tübingen, 1877.

NAZARETH: The native city of Jesus (Matt. xii. 54; Mark vi. 1; Luke iv. 23). There his parents lived (Matt. ii. 23; Luke i. 26, ii. 4, 39) and his brothers and sisters (Mark vi. 3); and there he grew up (Luke ii. 51, iv. 16). As the name of the place does not occur in the Old Testament and is not authentically certified in later Jewish literature, its Hebrew form can be inferred only from the Greek form in the New Testament, *Nazareth*, *Nazaret*, or *Nazara*. The meaning of the name is uncertain. Jerome thought of *neẓer*, "flower" (*Epist.* xlvi., *Ad Marcellam*). In the Talmud Jesus is called "the Nazarene" and his disciples "Nazarenes" from a Greek form *Nazarēnos* (cf. Mark i. 24, x. 47), though another form is *Nazōraios* (Matt. xxvi. 71; Luke xviii. 37). In Eusebius' *Onomasticon* the form is interpreted either as "holy, pure," or it is brought into connection with the Hebrew for "twig, flower," ut sup. Hitzig proposed to derive the word from the Hebr. *nẓyry* in the unpointed text of Isa. xlix. 6 and to interpret the plural Acts xxiv. 5, "saved ones," in contrast with the "perishing" of I Cor. i. 18, 21; II Cor. ii. 15. At a later time, according to Hitzig, the same word, as singular, was referred to Jesus himself, in the sense of "saved one" as well as in allusion to Nazareth (Matt. ii. 23).

Little is known of the early history of Nazareth. It was situated in Galilee (Matt. xxi. 11; Mark i. 9), on the slope of a hill (Luke iv. 29), and had a synagogue in which Jesus taught, though without success (Matt. xiii. 53–58; Mark vi. 1–6). According to Epiphanius (*Hær.* i. 136) the town had only Jewish inhabitants until the time of Constantine, and even then only a few Christians settled there. Nazareth was evidently only at a comparatively late period received into the number of holy places of pilgrimage. Hence the authenticity of the holy places now revered in Nazareth is doubtful. Under the dominion of the crusaders Nazareth was apparently a purely Christian place, the seat of a bishop, later of an archbishop. It suffered severely from the victories of Saladin 1187 and of Sultan Bibars 1263, also from the Turkish conquest in 1517. It flourished for a time under the dominion of Faḫr el-Din, prince of the Druses (1620–1634), but soon declined owing to discords among the inhabitants and attacks from outside.

Nazareth rests concealed in a hollow surrounded by hills as if in the cavity of a shell. The slopes are well cultivated toward the south and east, cornfields alternating with vineyards and fig-trees. The present population is estimated at 11,000, of whom the orthodox Greeks and Mohammedans form each a third, while the Latins number 1,500, the United Greeks 1,000, the Protestants 250, the Maronites 200; Jews are not tolerated there. Nazareth is the capital of a district and an important market town. Of the holy places in Nazareth the orthodox Greek Church of St. Gabriel or the Church of the Annunciation is especially attractive, being built beside the spring of St. Mary in the northeast of the town. It was mentioned as early as 670, but the present structure was erected in 1780. The Roman Catholic church was built in 1730. Nazareth is now the seat of an orthodox Greek bishop and has a Greek monastery with a school for boys and girls; the Russians support several schools there. The Roman Catholic Church is represented by the Franciscans and by several orders of women. The Maronites also have a church. In 1851 the English Church Mission founded a Protestant congregation, and the Female Education Society in London erected in 1872–75 a stately orphans' home for girls.

(H Guthe.)

Bibliography: An excellent treatment is to be found in F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. xxviii. 1521–1542, Paris, 1906. Consult further: Hitzig, in *Tübinger theologische Zeitschrift*, i (1842), 410–413; T. Tobler, *Nazareth in Palæstina*, Berlin, 1868; V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, iii., *Galilee*, i. 83–102, Paris, 1880; *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, i. 275–279, London, 1881; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book, Central Palestine*, pp. 310–322, New York, 1882; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, i. 302 sqq., Stuttgart, 1883; G. Schumacher, in *ZDPV*, xiii (1890), 235 sqq.; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 432–435, London, 1894; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, pp. 215 sqq., Tübingen, 1896; Robinson, *Researches*, iii. 183 sqq.; *DB*, iii. 496–497; *EB*, iii. 3358–62; *JE*, ix. 195; *DCG*, ii. 235–237. The recent monograph is G. Le Hardy, *Hist. de Nazareth et de ses sanctuaires*, Paris, 1905. The subject is treated also in many of the works on the life of Jesus Christ.

NAZIRITES: The name given to Hebrews who assumed certain vows or upon whom these vows were imposed by their parents. The naziritic institution (Hebr. *nazir*, "separate," Gk. *naziraios*, *nazaraios*) included both sexes, involved abstinence from intoxicating drinks, avoidance of contact with the dead, and the unchecked growth of the hair. It was a distinctly religious institution, and the resolution to assume the obligations which it imposed was regarded as inspired by Yahweh (Amos ii. 11), to whom the nazirite was consecrated (Num. vi. 2). This consecration might be for a lifetime (Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist), or for a shorter period, and it might be assumed by the parents for a child even before his birth. The law of the nazirite is given Lev. vi. 1–21. In the required abstinence from wine there is discerned the survival of a prehistoric puritanic conception of the Semites which held the enjoyment of wine and like luxuries to be hindrances in the way of perfect service of the deity. The abstinences of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.), of the Nabateans (Diodorus Siculus, xix. 94), and of Mohammedans are examples of the survival of this conception. In the case of the nazirite there is a connection with the priesthood found in the prohibition of contact with the dead, even of participation in the mourning ceremonies for his own kin, showing the sanctity of the nazirite; this is illustrated by the fact that the Talmudic tract *Nazir* (vii. 1) places the nazirite and the high priest on the same footing. But the naziritic vow did not necessarily involve special service at the sanctuary. The prohibition to cut the hair arises from the fact that the hair is sacred to Yahweh. Many peoples regarded the growth of the hair as a divine energy which was not to be assailed or weakened by contact with a tool of man's workmanship; the full growth of hair exhibited by a nazirite was, therefore, a sign of consecration, and with Samson was a condition of his divine power. Illustrative of this is the fact that the term *nazir* was applied to the untrimmed vine of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years. If during the period of his consecration the nazirite incurred pollution, his hair was shorn, the term of consecration was begun anew, and certain expiatory offerings were made (Num. vi. 9 sqq.). The Talmudic tract *Temurah* (vi. 4) prescribes that the hair of the polluted nazirite be not burned but buried; the implication is therefore that when the hair was burned in the sanctuary, the ceremony was constructively a sacrifice, and this is illustrated by ethnic usage like that of Mohammedan pilgrims who leave their hair unshorn from the time of taking the vow of pilgrimage until they reach Mecca and then cut the hair and burn it on holy ground. In the case of the nazirite who assumed the vows for a period only and not for life, the end of the term was marked by several kinds of sacrifices—burnt offering, sin-offering, peace-offering, with their accessories (Num. vi. 13 sqq.). Not to be overlooked is the difference in spirit between this institution and similar observances among Hindus and even Christians; in the latter case the object is suppression of sensual inclinations, in the Hebrew institution the purpose was to conserve the full vigor of the body for the service of God.

Postexilic Judaism employed the naziritic vow in case of illness or misfortune (Josephus, *War*, II., xv.), when undertaking a journey (*Nazir*, i. 6), and on like occasions; it even furnished a form of oath which gave rise to Pharisaic casuistry and brought naziritism into disrepute. Paul seems to have a casual relationship to naziritism in the incident mentioned Acts xviii. 18, though there is doubt whether the vow referred to Paul or Aquila, and indeed whether the vow was actually naziritic. On the other hand, Paul assumed the not inconsiderable expenses attending the completion of the vows of four indigent Jews (Acts xxi. 23 sqq.). This was a friendly service often rendered by the wealthy (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XIX., vi. 1; Mishna, *Nazir*, ii. 6). C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult: the commentaries on the passages cited; H. Vilmar, in *TSK*, xxxvii (1864), 438 sqq.; H. Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, pp. 84–88, Boston, 1876; J. Grill, in *JPT*, vi (1880), 645 sqq.; J. B. Gray, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, i (1900), 201 sqq.; C. Grüneisen, *Der Ahnencultus*, pp. 46, 71, 92, 112 sqq., Halle, 1900; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 361–362; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 134–138; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, xxviii. 1515–20; *DB*, iii. 497–501; *EB*, iii. 3362–64; *DCG*, ii. 237–238; *JE*, ix. 195–198.

NEAL, DANIEL: Historian of the Puritans; b. in London Dec. 14, 1678; d. at Bath Apr. 4, 1743. He studied first at Merchant Taylors' School, London, then (1696–99) in Rev. Thomas Rowe's academy in Little Britain, and then for three years at Utrecht and Leyden. Returning to London in 1703, the next year he was chosen assistant pastor, and in 1706 full pastor, of the Independent Congregation in Aldersgate Street, and faithfully served it, until, a few months prior to his death, he was compelled by ill-health to resign. He was the author of two works which have given him lasting fame: *The History of New England, Containing an Impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country to the Year of Our Lord 1700* (2 vols., London, 1720) and the standard *History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-conformists, from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1688* (4 vols., 1732–38; 2d. ed., 2 vols., 1754; ed. J. Toulmin, with *Life*, 5 vols., Bath, 1793–97; ed. J. O. Choules, 2 vols., New York, 1844).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Life* by Toulmin, ut sup., consult: Walter Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches in London*, iii. 90–102, London, 1810; *DNB*, xl. 134–136.

NEALE, JOHN MASON: Ecclesiastical historian and hymnologist; b. at London Jan. 24, 1818; d. at East Grinstead (23 m. s. of London) Aug. 6, 1866. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (A.B., 1840). While a student he developed an extraordinary interest in church archeology, especially in architecture, and with a few others organized in 1839 the Cambridge Camden Society, which lasted till 1845. He was ordained deacon in 1841, and priest in 1842; was for a few months of 1842 incumbent of Crawley in Sussex, but ill-health compelled him to resign. He then married and the next winter went to live in Madeira. There he found facilities and strength to continue his literary work, which had already brought him considerable reputation. He returned to England finally in 1845, and from 1846 till his death was warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead. The " college " really was an almshouse for a few old people of both sexes, and the salary was only some £24 a year! But the duties were light and congenial and his opportunities for remunerative literary work were unimpaired. Still the position meant that in all likelihood he was out of the line of preferment.

He belonged to the most advanced section of High-churchmen; and his outspoken and consistent championship of Puseyism (see PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE) won him not only suspicion, but obloquy. He was under the inhibition of his bishop (Chichester) from 1846 to 1863; but his zeal and industry matched his great and varied talents. " His life was divided," says 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, and he was more appreciated for his writings abroad than at home. His most important writings are his *History of the Holy Eastern Church* with *The Patriarchate of Alexandria* and *The Patriarchate of Antioch* in the appendix (5 vols., London, 1850–73); and *Commentary on the Psalms from Primitive and Mediæval Writers* (4 vols., 1874; in association with R. F. Littledale). Mention may be made also of *Hierologus, or the Church Tourists* (1843); *Ecclesiological Notes on the Isle of Man* (1848); *Readings for the Aged* (4 series, 1850–58); *History of the So-Called Jansenist Church of Holland* (1858); *Voices from the East* (1859); and *Sermons for Children* (1867). Yet almost everything which he wrote provoked controversy. He had strong convictions, and the full courage of them: in his own view he was a witness of a system of absolute truth. On almost every page of his writings, whether prose or verse, learned or popular, his point of view and his resolute purpose are apparent: they are books of faith and of intention. To him " religion was the solidest of all realities," and religion and the Church were inseparably one. Nowhere is this more marked than in his wonderful stories for children and young people. Most of these have a historical foundation; many of them recite real or supposed facts, dealing with ancient or obscure trials and martyrdoms. His sympathies seem rather Roman than Protestant, and dubious legends are accepted with unquestioning belief; but the charm of style, the minute knowledge of distant times and places, the vivid realization, the subdued feeling, at once profoundly devout and intensely human, form a combination which few English popularizers of Christian history have approached. *The Farm of Aptonga* (1856); *The Egyptian Wanderers* (1854); *The Followers of the Lord* (1851); *Lent Legends* (1855); *Tales of Christian Heroism and Endurance* (in the *Juvenile Englishman's Library*, vi., 1846), and some others, are as much prized by adult as by juvenile readers.

As a poet, Neale eleven times gained the Seatonian prize. An edition of his *Seatonian Poems* (Cambridge, 1864) was dedicated, by permission, to his bishop, after their reconciliation. His *Songs and Ballads for the People* (London, 1843) and *Songs and Ballads for Manufacturers* (1850) are secular only in name. But his greatest services have been rendered, and his widest fame won, through his hymns. Here he worked in a field entirely congenial. His twenty *Hymns for the Sick* (1843), and eighty-six *Hymns for Children* (1843) include some gems and much useful matter. *The Hymnal Noted* (1851–54) is chiefly given to long metres, which seem somewhat dry and formal. *Mediæval Hymns and Sequences* (1851; 2d ed., enlarged, 1863) afford more variety and many valuable notes. Among the most precious of these is Neale's first selection from the famous *Rhythm of Bernard de Morlaix*, completed in 1858, beginning with the line, " Jerusalem, the golden." After the *Rhythm of Bernard* his noblest work is *Hymns of the Eastern Church* (1862). There he was on ground familiar to him, and to him alone, and the mine he opened yielded treasures indeed. Almost unknown to the English Church were original sacred lyrics of such beauty as " Art thou weary," " The Day is past and over," and " Safe home." Within twenty years, many of these Greek hymns have made their way almost everywhere.

Neale was a singular compound of medieval (he would have called it primitive) doctrine and devotion with modern culture and English manliness. He was the sworn foe of breadth or liberalism; but his large gifts and nature transcended his self-imposed (or, as he thought, God-imposed) limits, and made much of his work catholic 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, and his heroic and unflinching faith.

Bibliography: *Letters of John Mason Neale, Selected and ed. by his Daughter*, London and New York, 1910; Eleanor A. Towle, *John Mason Neale, A Memoir*, London, 1906; W. Jowett, *Memoir of the Rev. Cornelius Neale* (his father), ib. 1834; G. Huntington, *Random Recollections*, pp. 198–223, ib. 1893; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 271–273 et passim, New York, 1886; S. M. Jackson, *Sources of "Jerusalem the Golden,"* passim, Chicago, 1910; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 785–790; *DNB*, xl. 143–146.

NEANDER, JOACHIM: Principal poet of the Reformed Church; b. at Bremen 1650; d. there May 31, 1680. He was educated at the Latin school of Bremen and in 1666 entered the Gymnasium illustre. After a carelessly spent youth he was converted by a sermon of Theodor Undereick, pastor of St. Martini in Bremen, by whom he was led into the path of Reformed pietism. As the tutor of the sons of distinguished Frankfort merchants, and also to continue his studies, Neander went to Heidelberg. In 1674 the Reformed congregation of Düsseldorf called him as rector to their Latin school, but private religious meetings instituted by him in 1676 and some arbitrary rules in the administration of the school, brought him into conflict with the preacher and consistory. He was deposed in 1677, but before the notification reached him he signed a declaration in which among other things he condemned separation from the external church community as practised by Labadie and his people. He also renounced secret meetings and the " detention of members from the Lord's Supper." Neander was in consequence merely suspended. In 1679 he was called to Bremen as third preacher of the church of St. Martin, but died in the following year. The first edition of his songs appeared under the title, *A & Ω Joachimi Neandri Glaub- und Liebes-Uebung: Auffgemuntert durch einfältige Bundes Lieder und Danck-Psalmen* . . . (Bremen, 1680), contained fifty-seven songs, of which about twenty editions appeared before 1730. Although not suitable for church hymns because of their marked subjectivity, and though they contained reminiscences of Labadie and of Cocceius, the songs were taken into the hymnals. In the second part of the hymn-book for Cleve, Jülich, Berg, and Mark of 1738, Neander's name stands beside that of Luther on the title page.

While some of Neander's productions are awkward and lack polish, others are so powerful and impressive, so devout and sincere, and so highly imaginative that they secured an honorable place among spiritual songs. Neander proved himself also a true musician, for of the melodies to his hymns nineteen originated with him. (E. Simons.)

Bibliography: J. H. Reitz, *Historie der Wiedergeborenen*, iv. 44–57, Itzstein, 1717; M. Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westfälischen Kirche*, ii. 322–358, Coblenz, 1849; C. Winkworth, *The Christian Singers of Germany*, London, 1869; W. Nelle, *Joachim Neander, der Dichter der Bundeslieder und Dankpsalmen*, Hamburg, 1903; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 790–792; *ADB*, vol. xxiii.

NEANDER, JOHANN AUGUST WILHELM.

Career (§ 1).
Works (§ 2).
Place in Church History (§ 3).
Conception of Church History and Methods (§ 4).
Defect as a Historian (§ 5).
Personal Characteristics (§ 6).

1. Career.

Johann August Wilhelm Neander was born at Göttingen Jan. 17, 1789; d. at Berlin July 14, 1850. He was of Hebrew descent, bearing the name of David Mendel before his conversion to Christianity; and through his mother he was related to the philosopher Mendelssohn. Soon after his birth 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 the councilor 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*. 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, which was an attempt to describe the various stages of religious development; and it was apparent that he regarded Christianity from an ideal standpoint, rather than as the absolute truth. Until 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 (q.v.); but he was compelled, by the commotions of war, to exchange for Göttingen, where Gottlieb Jacob Planck (q.v.) was then teaching. On his return to the university from a visit to Hamburg, in the fall of 1807, he substituted for Schleiermacher, Friedrich Schelling and Johann Fichte (qq.v.) the New Testament and the Church Fathers. A few months afterward, he laid a confession before his friends, binding himself to the study of church history, and praying the Lord to preserve him from errors. In the spring of 1809 he returned to Hamburg, where he taught for eighteen months, preached from time to time, and continued with great zeal the study of church history. In 1811 he habilitated at Heidelberg with the dissertation, *De fidei gnoseosque Christianæ idea et ea, qua ad se invicem atque ad philosophiam referantur, ratione secundum mentem Clementis Alexandrini*. In 1812 he was made professor extraordinary at the university, and the same year issued the first of his monographs, *Ueber den Kaiser Julianus und sein Zeitalter* (Hamburg, 1812; Eng. transl., *Julian the Apostate*, New York, 1850). In 1813 he was called to Berlin to labor at the side of Schleiermacher, Wilhelm De Wette, and Philip Marheineke (qq.v.) where he lectured on church history and the exegesis of the New Testament with great success and continued his literary labors.

2. Works.

Neander published: *Der heilige Bernhard und sein Zeitalter* (Berlin, 1813); *Die genetische Entwickelung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme* (1818); *Der heilige Johann Chrysostomus und die Kirche besonders des Orients in dessen Zeitalter* (1821–22); *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums und des christlichen Lebens* (1822–24); and *Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullianus und Einleitung in dessen Schriften* (1826). All these monographs were a preparation for the main work of his life, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* (6 vols. in 11, Hamburg, 1825–52; 4th ed., Gotha, 1863–65; Eng. transl., J. Torrey, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 5 vols., and Index [by Mary Cutler Torrey], new ed., New York, 1882). This work comes down to the martyrdom of Jerome of Prag. *Die Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel* (1832; Eng. transl., J. E. Ryland, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles*, Edinburgh, 1842; revised by E. G. Robinson, New York, 1865) is an independent introduction to the history. The controversy evoked by the Life of Jesus Christ by Strauss led him to write *Das Leben Jesu Christi in seinem geschichtlichen Zusammenhang* (1837; 7th ed., Gotha, 1873; Eng. transl., J. McClintock and C. E. Blumenthal, *The Life of Jesus Christ*, New York, 1848), pronounced the best answer offered to Strauss' work. He also wrote commentaries on Philippians (Berlin, 1849; Eng. transl., New York, 1851), James (1850; Eng. transl., 1859), and I John (1851; Eng. transl., 1852). Other activities were his lectures on systematic theology and, after Schleiermacher's death, on ethics which appeared after his death in *Dogmengeschichte* (Berlin, 1857), *Katholizismus und Protestantismus* (1863), and *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik* (1864).

3. Place in Church History.

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 among church historians. The most important church historian of that time was Planck, and he belonged to the so-called pragmatic school. It must not be forgotten, however, that higher conceptions of church history had begun to be expressed by Schelling, Marheineke, and Johann Gieseler (q.v.). The pragmatic school only looked at Christianity as a system of doctrine and not as a historical development. In its interest in individuals and their thinking and plans as the only causes of changes, it lost sight of objective forces. Of higher causes it knew nothing. It substituted for the fulness of a living development, its poor shallow conception of Christianity. Instead of dealing with events or a revelation of the fulness of Christ's life, church history was turned into a picture gallery representing human follies and errors, which the historians felt free to condemn or to ridicule.

Neander broke through the rules of the pragmatic school in his very first work, *Julian*, at the beginning of which he affirms eternal Providence to be the molding spirit of history rather than human creation. He substituted for psychological arts the rich results of a study of the historical sources. The general principle of Neander's method is seen to even better advantage in his monograph on Bernhard. Author and subject were kindred spirits; and, in the treatment of Bernhard's career, Neander lays bare the innermost principle of his life, and derives his activity from it. In his *Chrysostom*, the most elaborate of his biographies, Neander displays the same method.

4. Conception of Church History and Methods.

Neander's conception of church history is set forth in the Introduction to his great work in these words: "We look upon Christianity, not as a system born in the hidden depths of man's nature, but as a power which has come down from heaven, in that heaven has opened itself to a hostile world—a power which in its essence, as well as in its origin, is exalted high above all that man can create with his own powers, and which was designed to impart to him new life, and transform him in his innermost nature." He regards Christianity as also a force, a life, and not alone as a dogma, or a divine power which has come down from heaven. In his view, therefore, the history of the church is the history of the process of the interpenetration of man's life with the divine life; or the history of the divine life of Christ pervading humanity. This new life was perfectly manifested in Christ, the second Adam, and becomes concrete in the lives of individuals whose peculiarities are not destroyed, but transformed and glorified. Every Christian, therefore, repeats the life of Christ in his own characteristic way. In no one is that life repeated in its comprehensive fulness. Each only presents a single aspect of it. Neander is constantly representing the one life of Christ in its conflict with sin, and in its adoption and rejection of worldly principles and forces in the various phases of rationalism and supernaturalism, scholasticism, and mysticism, and in speculative and practical effort. To this general conception is due the edificatory character of Neander's *History*. One of Neander's characteristics as a 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 intruding his own subjective thoughts and opinions. Closely connected with this talent is his ability, which has already been referred to, of understanding and sympathizing with the experiences of others, and unveiling the Christian element in their lives.

5. Defect as a Historian.

The objectivity of Neander's portrayal of events and persons is the most important feature of his work; but also its weakest point, for the concrete and individual are relatively far more prominent than the universal. Neander's defect was failure to appreciate the Church and allow it due prominence. Instead of the Church there is a collection of single portraits of individuals animated with the life of Christ. The biographical element predominates. Neander 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 and experience, the history of the Church in his hands does not present a harmonious and progressive development. Neander has given a commentary of the parable of the leaven, but fails to render justice to 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 the second is the growth of a priesthood—a fact to which he can not call attention too often; for his history is a history of the universal priesthood. The first period is a period of pure spiritual religion; the second is characterized by a reinswathement of Christianity in habiliments like those of the Old Testament; the third is marked by a reaction and an effort of Christian liberty to reassert itself.

Neander's personal influence in the classroom was little less important than his literary activity. He labored in Berlin for thirty-eight years. In his exegetical lectures and commentaries he pursued a practical method.

6. Personal Characteristics.

His personal influence upon his students was also very great. He presents the figure of a man of simple and childlike spirit, helpless in the practical affairs of life, faithful to his calling, severe toward himself, and temperate, full of love and gentleness toward others, and wholly and unreservedly devoted to the Lord. But he could be severe; he entered a protest against the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 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. Among 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 practical results be considered.

Throughout the whole of his life he 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 passed away.

Bibliography: O. Krabbe, *August Neander*, Hamburg, 1852; P. Schaff, *Germany; its Universities, Theology, and Religion*, chap. xxv., Philadelphia, 1857; idem, *Saint Augustin, Melanchthon, Neander*, New York, 1886; J. L. Jacobi, *Erinnerungen an August Neander*, Halle, 1882; L. Schulze, *August Neander*, Leipsic, 1890; A. Wigand, *August Neanders Leben*, Erfurt, 1890; K. T. Schneider, *August Neander*, Schleswig, 1895.

NEBO: The deity of the Babylonian city of Borsippa, mentioned in Isa. xlvi. 1 together with Bel (Marduk-Merodach), the patron god of Babylon. His name is cognate with the Hebrew *nabhi*, "prophet." Previous to the reign of Hammurabi (c. 2200 B.C.; see Hammurabi and his Code), Nebo of Borsippa seems to have been more prominent than Marduk of Babylon. Primarily he determined destiny at the Babylonian new-year festival, and when Babylon became the metropolis Nebo was made a scribe in the chamber of fate, being at the same time regarded as the son of Marduk. In the prehistoric period, however, Nebo was superior to Marduk, for in the accounts of the wars with the Elamites, dating (though preserved only in Neo-Babylonian recensions) from the time of Hammurabi, Nebo is "the guardian of the world," and the archaistic inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian kingdom mention Nebo before Marduk. Nebo is pre-eminently "the scribe," writing on his tablets the fate of mankind; since writing was essentially in the hands of the priests, Nebo was the patron deity of the priesthood. The planet Mercury was sacred to him, and the extension of his cult to Arabia is shown by an inscription found on the island of Bahrein, dating from the early Babylonian period (cf. F. Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, pp. 150, 156, Munich, 1900). Further evidence of the latter fact is afforded by the name of the Arab tribe Nabayoth (see Nabatæans) and by the god Anbai in South Arabia. The Mandæan list of planets mentions N'bu, "learned in writing and wise," while in the anti-Christian polemics of the Mandæans Enbu, or Nebo-Mercury, is the false Messiah, Jesus. As the planet Mercury Nebo was likewise a chthonic deity; the procreation and life of new-born children were under his protection. The Greeks identified him with Hermes or Apollo as a god of oracles and wisdom.

Besides the mention of Nebo in Isaiah already noted, he is implied by "the man clothed in linen, which had the inkhorn by his side" of Ezekiel (ix. 2 sqq.); and he appears as the archangel of the Book of Enoch who "writeth all the works of the Lord." The name Nebo was borne by the mountain whence Moses beheld the future fortune of Israel (Deut. xxxii. 49 sqq., xxxiv. 1 sqq.), and the cities of Nebo and Nob show that a knowledge of Nebo had early penetrated west of the Jordan. The following theophoric names of the Old Testament have Nebo as a component: Nebuchadnezzar ("Nebo, protect my boundaries"), Nebuzar-adan ("Nebo hath given posterity"), Nebushasban ("Nebo, save me"), and Abednego (for Abednebo, "servant of Nebo"). Nebo is likewise frequent in names on post-Christian Aramean and Palmyrene inscriptions, as Nabu-duri ("Nebo my fortress"), Nabu-sar-iddin ("Nebo hath given the king"), Nabu-sar-uẓur ("Nebo, protect the king"), and 'Abad-nabu ("servant of Nebo"). See Babylonia, VII., 2, § 11. (Alfred Jeremias.)

Bibliography: A. Jeremias, in W. H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, iii. 45–68, Leipsic, 1898; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 399–408; F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, xxvii., cols. 1434–36; *EB*, iii. 3366–3369; and particularly the works on the religion named under Assyria; Babylonia.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR, neb″yu-cad-nez′zar: The Biblical form of the name of two Babylonian kings (see Babylonia, VI., 6, § 1, 7, § 2.) The Babylonian form (*Nabu-kudurri-uṣṣur*, "Nebo, protect my boundary") suggests the form Nebuchadrezzar, which most scholars now prefer. It is used mostly by Jeremiah and always by Ezekiel.

NECHO, nî′cō: King of Egypt 609–593(?). He was a son of Psamtik I., the founder of the twenty-sixth dynasty, whose ambitious designs he attempted to carry out. He took advantage of the decay of Assyrian power (see Assyria, VI. 3, § 15) to recover Syria for Egypt, on the way defeating Josiah (q.v.) at Megiddo, 608 B.C. On his return from the Euphrates he dethroned Jehoahaz (q.v.) as king of Judah and set up Jehoiakim (q.v.) in his place. But he was defeated in turn by Nebuchadrezzar at Carchemish, 605 B.C. (see Babylonia ,VI., 7, § 2), and in 597 B.C. the Egyptians were again completely driven out of Asia (see Egypt, I., 4, § 4).

Bibliography: The literature under Egypt, particularly the works of Petrie and Breasted. Consult especially the latter's *History of the Ancient Egyptians*, pp. 404–407, New York, 1908.

NECKAM (NECHAM), ALEXANDER: English Augustinian monk and Latin poet, foster brother of Richard I. of England; b. at St. Albans Sept. 8, 1157; d. at Kempsey (3 m. s. of Worcester), Worcestershire, 1217. He was educated at St. Albans; became master of the Dunstable school, a dependency of the abbey of St. Albans; went to the University of Paris for study and by 1180 was a famous teacher there; in 1213 he became abbot at Cirencester, Gloucestershire. He was a man of wide learning, one of the best Latin poets of his age, and wrote among many other things two curious productions, *De naturis rerum* (of no scientific value, but interesting for the information it conveys), and *De laudibus divinæ sapientiæ* (both ed. T. Wright, in *Rolls Series*, No. 34, 1863); also *De vita monachorum* (ed. T. Wright, ib., No. 59, ii. 175–200, 1872). He wrote also on grammar and lexicography, commentaries on parts of Scripture, on Aristotle, and on Ovid.

Bibliography: Besides the preface to Wright's ed. of the *De naturis*, ut sup., consult: T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, ii. 449–459, London, 1842–46; *DNB*, xl. 154–155 (where other scattered notices are recorded).

NECTARIUS: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. in the first half of the fourth century; d. at Constantinople Sept. 27, 397. He was elected to the patriarchate by the council held at Constantinople in 381, but the precise reason for his selection is doubtful. According to Socrates (*Hist. eccl.*, V., viii. 12), Nectarius was of senatorial rank and a prætor, a layman, and the candidate of the people. Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., viii.) states that he was a native of Tarsus, and also gives a number of less credible details, such as that Nectarius was still an unbaptized neophyte and that, recommended by Diodorus of Tarsus to the bishop of Antioch as a suitable candidate for the episcopate, he had been placed last on the list, but was chosen by the Emperor Theodosius and made bishop while still in his baptismal robes. He was not a man of great importance. It is possible that he was the Nectarius to whom Basil addressed a letter of consolation on the death of his son. Nor was the earlier career of Nectarius particularly honorable, if the allusion of Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., x. 2) may be accepted. His episcopate was equally inglorious. In the conduct of his office he was dependent upon the guidance of others, the funeral eulogies at court which were part of his duties were actually delivered by Gregory of Nyssa, and he unwisely abrogated the office of penitential priests. He is occasionally regarded as a saint in the East. Numerous manuscripts ascribe to him a eulogy of the martyr Theodore (*MPG.*, xxxix., 1821–40), a production of little note except for its archeological allusions. (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: *DCB*, iv. 11–14 (takes a view of Nectarius opposite from that in the text); G. Rauschen, *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius*, Freiburg, 1897; J. Kunze, *Das nicänisch-konstantinopolitanische Symbol*, Leipsic, 1898; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, v. 18, 280–282. The sources are sufficiently indicated in the text.

NECTARIUS: Patriarch of Jerusalem; b. in Crete 1605; d. about 1680. He was educated by the monks of Sinai where he himself became a monk; but when thirty-five years of age he studied at Athens with the Neo-Aristotelian Theophilus Corydalleus. About 1660 he was in Constantinople on business connected with his monastery, and on his return to Sinai was chosen abbot. But on his way to Jerusalem to be consecrated he was informed that he had been chosen patriarch of the Holy City, and was consecrated in April, 1661. As early as 1666 he sought to be relieved of his duties and by 1669 Dositheus had become his successor. He remained in Jerusalem, however, except when driven by the Latin monks for a short time to Sinai. He took part in the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. Among the writings of Nectarius the most important is his refutation of the theses of a certain Peter regarding the papal supremacy (ed. Dositheus, with a life of Nectarius, Jassy, 1682). He is still better known by his recommendation of the *Confessio orthodoxa* of Mogilas (latest ed., É. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, ii. 208 sqq., 4 vols., Paris, 1894–96). A letter to the monks of Sinai is also contained in E. Renaudot's *Genadii patriarchæ Constantinopolitani homiliæ de sacramento eucharistiæ*, etc. (Paris, 1709, pp. 171–183). In his doctrine of the Eucharist Nectarius was strictly orthodox, and a zealous opponent of Cyril Lucar (q.v.) and the "Calvinistic" movement. (F. Kattenbusch.)

Bibliography: Besides the biography noted in the text and the work of Legrand, vols. ii.–v. passim, consult: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 520–522, Paris, 1740; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, i. 474–481, Munich, 1864 (deals with the tract against Peter).

NEESIMA: Founder of Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan; b. at Yedo (Tokyo), Japan, Jan. (or in Christian reckoning Feb.) 14, 1843; d. at Oiso (40 m. s.w. of Tokyo) Jan. 23, 1890. In Japan he was called Neesima Shimeta, on the ship coming to America the captain dubbed him "Joe," when he was baptized he added the name of his benefactor, and so he is now commonly called Joseph Hardy Neesima. His father was of the Samurai class, a teacher of penmanship and secretary to his prince, and he was born in the palace. He received an excellent education according to Japanese standards at the time. When Commodore Perry came to Yedo on July 7, 1853, his curiosity in the western world was awakened, and when later he came in contact with Dutch traders and learned their language, and especially when he read in Chinese Elijah Coleman Bridgman's "Church History," and William Alexander Parsons Martin's "Evidences of Christianity" he determined to visit the lands whence these persons (qq.v.) had come and learn the way of truth more perfectly. By the connivance of friends he was smuggled into an American brig lying in the harbor of Hakodate in July, 1864, and reached Boston in August, 1865. There he was befriended by the prominent merchant, Alphaeus Hardy, who sent him to Phillips Academy, Andover, to the scientific department of Amherst College, where he was graduated B.S. in 1870, and to Andover Theological Seminary, where he took a special course with the class of 1874. He was the interpreter of the Japanese embassy in 1871, although his knowledge of the English language was always defective, and as a partial reward for his services in this matter he received pardon for his capital crime in leaving his country without permission. He made no disguise of his absorbing desire to promote Christian education in Japan, even when with non-Christian Japanese. In 1874 he was appointed a corresponding member of the Japanese Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and was ordained in Mount Vernon Church, Boston, Sept. 24, 1874. Before he sailed he made a plea for his project of a Christian college at the meeting of the American Board at Rutland, Vt., and thus secured $4,000. He opened it at Kyoto, Nov. 29, 1875, with eight pupils. The enterprise quickly became a success. In 1884 he made his first appeal for funds to enlarge the college into a university. In 1885 he returned to America and pleaded so successfully that he made the enlargement in 1886. In 1888 and again in 1889 he obtained large sums, not only from Americans, but from natives, even from non-Christians. In 1888 Amherst gave him the honorary doctorate of laws. The name Doshisha given to the university means "one counsel." On Jan. 3, 1876, he married a Japanese woman. Ill-health, especially in the later years of his life, compelled him to remit his efforts, but he lived for the institution which he had founded and which flourished so greatly under him. It has since been carried on, and in 1905 reported 5,000 students, and 1,000 graduates, but only eighty had become preachers.

Bibliography: A. S. Hardy, *Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima*, Boston, 1891; J. D. Davis, *Sketch of the Life of Joseph Hardy Neesima, LL.D.*, New York, 1890, 3d ed., 1905.

NEFF, FÉLIX: Swiss Evangelist; b. at Geneva Oct. 8, 1798; d. there Apr. 12, 1829. He entered, when he was seventeen years old, upon a military career in the garrison of his native city, but was afterward reached by the religious revival which at that time took place in the city, and became a revival preacher among his comrades. In 1819 he resigned his position in the army; and May 19, 1823, he was ordained in Mr. Clayton's chapel, in the Poultry, London. After laboring for some time at

Mens, he settled in the lonely valleys of the Quéras and Freissinière 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 piety 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 valleys which had been the scene of his labors were converted and flourishing.

Bibliography: *Lettres de Félix Neff*, ed. A. Bost, 2 vols., Geneva, 1842, Eng. transl., *Letters and Biography of Felix Neff*, London, 1843; T. S. Ellerby, *Memorials of Felix Neff*, London, 1833; *Vie de Felix Neff, Pasteur dans les Hautes Alpes*, in French and English, London, 1836; W. S. Gilly, *Memoir of Felix Neff*, London, 1855; A. Christ, *Felix Neff*, Basel, 1873; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, ix. 568–570.

NEGEB, THE.

Character, Location and Extent (§ 1).
Subdivisions and History (§ 2).
Cities of Simeonitic Negeb (§ 3).
Cities of Judaic Negeb and the Border (§ 4).

1. Character, Location and Extent.

[The Negeb is a term which covers the stretch of country by which the descent is made from the hill country of Judah just south of Hebron to the arid desert on the south. This descent is made by a series of great terraces with rolling hills, cut by a number of wadies running east and west. It forms a natural barrier on the south of Judah, by its broken surface and comparatively infertile soil so completely protecting Judah that the latter has seldom been invaded from the south. The geology of the region differs from that farther south, the crystalline rocks of the desert being covered in the Negeb by soft limestone. Possibilities of fertility are there, dependent, however, upon continual irrigation. There are signs that at one time a considerable population maintained itself in the region.] Although no precise boundaries are indicated in the Old Testament, the general situation is given by the geography of Judah (Josh. xv. 21–32), the account of the spies (Num. xiii. 17, 21–26), and the wanderings of Abraham (Gen. xx. 1). The Negeb is often mentioned in connection with the other southern parts of the land of Israel and with the hill country and the lowland (Judges i. 9; Deut. i. 7; Josh. x. 40; Jer. xvii. 26). Rimmon was on the northern boundary (Zech. xiv. 10), and the boundaries given for Judah (Josh. xv. 1 sqq.) and for Canaan (Ezek. xlvii. 18–19; Num. xxxiv. 3 sqq.) essentially coincide with those of the Negeb. Since the eastern boundary varied at different times, its exact merging with the southern boundary of Judah (Josh. xv. 1 sqq.) can not be given. On the southern boundary, however, may be placed Gerar (cf. Gen. x. 19, xx. 1; II Chron. xiv. 13), especially as the modern Wadi Jerur empties westward, through the Wadi al-Sheraif into the Wadi al-'Arish or "brook of Egypt," which formed the southern boundary of Israel to the sea (Josh. xv. 3 sqq.; Ezek. xlvii. 19; Num. xxxiv. 4–5), though it is not probable that the Negeb extended as far as the coast. The Western boundary seems to have been still more indistinct than the Eastern. The Negeb, therefore, apparently designated in general the level slope of the land to the west of the watershed; and as this merged into the plain without marked interruption, the region was without fixed boundaries.

2. Subdivisions and History.

Originally Negeb was not a proper name, but merely denoted "the dry, parched country." It played a small part in history, for it was a region of pasturage rather than of settled civilization (cf. Josh. xix. 8; Gen. xxv. 16), and remained a mere appanage of the settled district, sometimes abandoned to the Bedouin and at other times won for trade and cultivation by centers of population. In the Old Testament the district is named in five (or six) ways, according to the tribes which controlled it. The Negeb of the Jerahmeelites has been identified with the Jebel and Wadi Raḥameh about eighteen miles south of Tell al-Milḥ. The Negeb of the Kenites may be sought in the southeast, possibly near Kedesh; but if the preferable reading of the Septuagint, "Kenesites," be adopted, this part of the Negeb would abut on the Negeb of the Calebites (cf. Judges i. 15; Josh. xv. 19). But if (Judges i. 16; cf. I Sam. xv. 6) the Kenites lived in the vicinity of Arad and were neighbors of the Amalekites, the Negeb of the Kenites would then be on the watershed some nine miles south of Carmel and Maon (cf. Num. xxi. 1). The Negeb of the Cherethites lay to the west of Beersheba (cf. I Sam. xxx. 14, 16). The Negeb of Judah was doubtless a later designation, arising after the establishment of the kingdom of Judah, and is synonymous with the Negeb of Caleb. Besides these tribes mention is also made in the Old Testament of the Negeb of the Amalekites (Num. xiii. 29) and of the Geshurites (I Sam. xxvii. 8). So long as the Davidic kings were important rulers, the trade routes, especially those to Egypt and to Elath on the Red Sea, were under their protection. The first of these routes soon lost its importance; and the second was lost in the reign of Joram (II Kings viii. 20), regained by Azariah (II Kings xiv. 19–22), and finally lost to the Judeans with Elath and its tributary commerce in the reign of Ahaz (II Kings xvi. 6). In the course of the seventh century the Negeb seems to have come progressively under the sway of the Edomites and other tribes from Arabia. In postexilic writings, therefore, the Negeb was no longer regarded as Jewish (Obadiah 19–20; cf. Jer. xiii. 19). The Hasmonean dynasty and Herod troubled themselves little about the Negeb. The Romans were the first, by their roads, cities, and castles, to reduce this district of Canaan. Ptolemy reckoned the Negeb partly to Idumæa and partly to Arabia Petræa, and in the fifth and sixth centuries the Negeb formed part of Palestina Tertia or Salutaris. After the Arab conquest in the seventh century and particularly after the crusades the Roman structures fell into decay and the Bedouin became the lords of the district.

The cities of the Negeb are given partly to Judah

329786B

3. Cities of Simeonitic Negeb.

(Josh. xv. 21–32) and partly to Simeon (Josh. xix. 2–8). Among the cities mentioned as being in Simeon was Beersheba (Josh. xix. 2), a noted shrine visited by Israelites (Amos v. 5, viii. 14), where were a tree planted by Abraham (Gen. xxi. 33) and an altar built by Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 55). The city formed the southern extremity of the land inhabited by the Israelitic tribes (II Sam. xvii. 11). It was noted for the well from which it derived its name, said to have been dug by Abraham (Gen. xxi. 30) or Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 32–33). It was still in the days of Jerome and Eusebius a large village eighteen miles south of Hebron. Some churches were seen there by William of Boldensele (1332) and Ludolph of Sudheim (1335–41), although the place was then deserted. The locations of Moladah and Hazar-shual are unknown. Azem suggests Azmon on the southwestern boundary of Canaan (Num. xxxiv. 4 sqq.). Hormah is probably identical with the place where David sent presents of Amalekite booty (Josh. xv. 30; I Sam. xxx. 30). Ziklag lay northwest or west of Beersheba (I Sam. xxx.), perhaps in the Ḥirbet Zuḫailiḳe, e.s.e. of Gaza. Beth-marcaboth (Josh. xix. 5), or Madmannah (Josh. xv. 31), was Calebitic (I Chron. ii. 49). Shaaraim (I Chron. iv. 31), or Shilhim (Josh. xv. 32), apparently corresponds to a place mentioned in an inscription of Thothmes III. between Tanis and Gaza. Ain and Rimmon, apparently the En-Rimmon of Nehemiah xi. 29, is apparently the modern Umm al-Ramamin, nine miles north of Beersheba.

4. Cities of Judaic Negeb and the Border.

In the Negeb of Judah, Kinah may be associated with the nomadic Kenites (I Sam. xxx. 29). Adadah is probably the modern ‘Ar‘ara, three hours southeast of Beersheba. The Kedesh of Joshua xv. 24 may perhaps be the Kadus mentioned by al-Muḳaddasi as a day's journey southeast of Hebron. Hazor is perhaps the modern al-Ḥuderah, while Ithnan may be the Calebite Ethnan of I Chron. iv. 7. Ziph must not be confused with the Calebite place of the same name between Carmel and Juttah (Josh. xv. 55). Telem is apparently the Telaim of I Sam. xv. 4, and so the eastern boundary of the Amalekites. Bealoth seems to have been located to the northeast of Kadesh-Barnea. Kerioth-Hezron (Josh. xv. 25) was a Calebite site and may denote the plateau north of the Wadi Marrah. The Shema of Josh. xv. 26 appears to be connected with Simeon. In the list in Nehemiah xi. 26 it is represented by Jeshua, which has been identified with Ḥirbat Sa‘weh, north of Tell al-Milḥ. Tamar, which formed a southern boundary of Israel in the east (Ezek. xlvii. 18–19; xlviii. 28), was located by the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius (ed. Lagarde, 210, 85) a day's journey from Mapsis. The Medeba mosaic (see Medeba) likewise locates Tamar south of the Dead Sea at the eastern foot of the mountain east of Mapsis, and it is apparently identical with the Tamar built by Solomon (Hebr. of I Kings ix. 18, A. V., Tadmor) to protect the southern trade route. Kadesh-Barnea (Deut. i. 19, 46), lying on the southern boundary of Israel (cf. Num. xx. 1) and between Tamar and the brook of Egypt (Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28; cf. Num. xxxiv. 4), was east of Gerar (Gen. xx. 1) and was long inhabited by Israelitic tribes. The site corresponds to the modern ‘Ain Ḳadis. Its vicinity is called the wilderness of Kadesh (Ps. xxix. 8) or the wilderness of Zin (Num. xx. 1, 22; Deut. xxxii. 51). Here Moses brought water from the rock by his staff, whence the spring was called " the water of strife " (Num. xx. 2 sqq.; Deut. xxxiii. 8). This latter name, however, is associated in Ex. xvii. 2–7 with Massah and located on Horeb; and Massah seems originally to have been distinct from Kadesh, or Meribah, though later identified with it. Kadesh was also the place where Miriam, the sister of Moses, died and was buried. The place was called also En-mishpat (Gen. xiv. 7), and seems to have been the scene of a battle against the Amalekites (Ex. xvii.), and possibly the occasion of the expedition of Saul described in I Sam. xv.

The Negeb also included the wells Esek, Sitnah, and Rehoboth, dug by the servants of Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 19–22). The two latter have been identified with the remains of an ancient city with wells some eighteen miles southwest of Beersheba. The term Negeb was also often used to connote the south (e.g., Gen. xiii. 14), and in Daniel even denotes Egypt (xi. 5 sqq.; and possibly also in Isa. xxx. 6). See Palestine, II., § 2. (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: The three works of moment are: Robinson, *Researches*, vol. iii.; A. Musil, *Arabia Petræa*, vol. ii., parts 1–2, Vienna, 1907–08; and E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, vol. ii., ib. 1871. Consult further: G. Williams, *The Holy City*, i. 463–468, 487 sqq., London, 1849; E. Wilton, *The Negeb or " South Country " of Scripture*, ib. 1863; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, ib. 1865; V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, part I., *Judée*, vol. iii., 7 vols., Paris, 1868–80; H. C. Trumbull, *Kadesh Barnea*, New York, 1884; F. Buhl, *Geographie von Palästina*, Freiburg, 1896; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 278 sqq., London, 1897; H. Guthe, *Palästina*, Bielefeld, 1907; *DB*, iii. 505–506; *EB*, iii. 3374–80.

NEGRO EDUCATION AND EVANGELIZATION.

I. Education.
  Early Status (§ 1).
  In the Northern States (§ 2).
  In the South (§ 3).
  Benevolent Societies (§ 4).
  Educational Agencies (§ 5).
  Results (§ 6).
II. Evangelization.
 1. General History.
  Religious Condition of Early Slaves (§ 1).
  Lack of Early Missionary Effort (§ 2).
  Efforts for Negro Evangelization (§ 3).
  Results (§ 4).
 2. Statistics.
 3. Denominational Evangelization.
  a. Methodists.
  b. Baptists.

1. Early Status.

I. Education: Negro slaves imported to America were kept designedly in ignorance. The written and unwritten law of the land was that Negroes should receive no instruction. In the North this custom gradually was given up, but with the cotton gin in the South it crystallized into law. The law of Georgia (1829) is typical: "If any slave, Negro or free person of color, or any white person shall teach any other slave, Negro or free person of color to read or write, either written or printed characters, the same free person of color or slave shall be punished by fine and whipping, or fine or whipping, at the discretion of the court; and if a white person so offend, he, she, or they shall be punished with a fine not exceeding $500 and imprisonment in the common jail at the discretion of the court." Such laws were broken by individual planters here and there in the case of favorite house-servants; but in general they were enforced. In the northern states few actual prohibitory laws were enacted, but in Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and elsewhere, mob violence frequently arose against Negro schools, and in Connecticut the teaching of Negroes was restricted in 1833. Notwithstanding this attitude Negro schools early developed. In the North such schools fall roughly under five different periods: (1) 1704 to 1774, period of the pioneers; (2) 1774 to 1820, efforts of the free Negroes; (3) 1820 to 1835, period of partial public aid; (4) 1835 to 1870, period of separate public schools; (5) 1870 to 1890, period of mixed schools.

2. In the Northern States.

In the first period fell the epoch-making efforts and far-seeing sacrifice of Elias Neau in New York and Anthony Benezet in Philadelphia. One of the first Negro schools in the land, if not the first, was that established in New York by Elias Neau in 1704. He gathered slaves and free Negroes, to the number of 200, in his own house nightly, and kept the school open until his death in 1722. So, too, Anthony Benezet and the Quakers of Philadelphia opened a Negro school in 1700, which has had a continuous existence until our day. After the revolution the free Negroes were quickened to exertions in many directions, especially in founding churches, beneficial societies, and schools. In Massachusetts a Negro school was formed at the house of Prince Hall, in 1798, and the teacher paid by the Negroes. In 1807 the Negroes of the District of Columbia, led by Bell, Franklin, and Liverpool, three free Negroes, founded the first Negro school. This school, supported by the Negroes, lapsed for awhile, but was revived in 1818, and many other schools were supported simultaneously. In Ohio the Negroes of Cincinnati opened a school of their own about 1820, and in New York the Negroes rallied to the support of the Old Neau school. No record is available of the moneys thus spent by Negroes for education, but at a later period, 1839, it is instructive to know that the Negroes of Cincinnati alone were paying nearly a thousand dollars a year ($889.03) for their schools. The energy and persistence of the Negroes led to benevolence and partial state aid. At first the State made no efforts to educate Negroes. In 1800 the Negroes of Boston tried to get the city to adopt their school, but it refused. About 1806 the city was induced to grant $200 a year to the school, and the children paid 12½ cents a week as tuition. It was claimed at the time that technically the public schools were opened to Negroes, but no inducements were offered to make them attend, and the abstract right was rarely tested. In 1812 the Negro school was adopted by the city. A benevolent society conducted the Negro schools in New York until 1834, when the city took hold. In Ohio the Negroes were excluded from white schools in 1828, and practically no provision was made for them save through benevolence until 1849. The attempt to open private schools for Negroes was frowned upon as in the Prudence Crandall case, and nearly all higher institutions, except Oberlin, were closed to Negroes. From about 1835 on it became general for the northern states to support wholly a separate system of Negro schools. They were usually poorer than those for whites, being worse taught, worse equipped, and wretchedly housed. Beginning with Massachusetts, in 1855, these separate schools have been abolished in nearly all northern states.

The history of schools for Negroes in the South falls also in five main epochs: (1) the ante-bellum schools; (2) the army schools; (3) the schools of the Freedmen's Bureau; (4) the missionary schools; and (5) the public schools.

3. In the South.

Some few schools for Negroes existed here and there in the South before the war. In the District of Columbia, as already mentioned, no less than fifteen different schools were conducted between 1800 and 1861, mainly at the expense of the colored people. In Maryland, St. Frances Academy, for colored girls, was founded by the Roman Catholics in 1829. In North Carolina there were before 1835 several schools maintained by the free Negroes. They had usually white teachers. After 1835 the few clandestine schools were taught by Negroes. In Charleston, S. C., there was a school for Negroes opened in 1744, which lasted some ten years. It was taught by a Negro and was for free Negroes only, although some slaves who hired their time managed to send their children there. Free Negroes in Georgia used to send children to Charleston for education. They returned and opened clandestine schools in Georgia. In Savannah a French Negro, Julien Froumontaine, from San Domingo, conducted a free Negro school openly from 1819 to 1829, and secretly for some time after. Schools were stopped nearly everywhere after 1830, and as slavery became more and more a commercial venture all attempts at Negro education were given up. During the war the first complication that confronted the armies was the continual arrival of fugitive slaves within the Union lines. At first the commands were rigid against receiving them. "Hereafter," wrote Halleck early in the war, "no slaves should be allowed to come within your lines at all." Other generals, however, thought differently. Some argued that confiscating slaves would weaken the South, others were imbued with abolition sentiment for right's sake. Twice attempts were made to free the slaves of certain localities by proclamation, but these orders were countermanded by the president. Still the fugitives poured into the lines and gradually were used as laborers and helpers. Immediately teaching began and schools sprang up. When at last the emancipation proclamation was issued and Negro soldiers called for, it was necessary to provide more systematically for Negroes. Various systems and experiments grew up here and there. The freedmen were massed in large numbers at Fortress Monroe, Va., Washington, D. C., Beaufort, and Port Royal, S. C., New Orleans, La., Vicksburg and Corinth, Miss., Columbus, Ky., Cairo, Ill., and elsewhere. In such places schools immediately sprang up under the army officers and chaplains. The most elaborate system, perhaps, was that under

General Banks in Louisiana. It was established in 1863 and soon had a regular board of education, which laid and collected taxes and supported eventually nearly 100 schools with 10,000 pupils, under 162 teachers. At Port Royal, S. C., were gathered Edward Lillie Pierce's "ten thousand clients." Pierce began the organization of relief societies in the North and established an economic system with schools. Eventually they passed under the oversight of General Rufus Saxon, who sold forfeited estates, leased plantations, received the camp followers of Sherman's march to the sea, and encouraged schools. In the West, General Grant appointed Colonel John Eaton, afterward United States Commissioner of Education, to be superintendent of freedmen in 1862. He sought to consolidate and regulate the schools already established, and succeeded in organizing a large system. The Freedmen's Bureau was especially active in the establishment of schools for Negroes. In General Howard's first Freedmen's Bureau report, he says: "Schools were taken in charge by the Bureau, and in some States carried on wholly in connection with local efforts—by use of a refugees' and freedmen's fund which had been collected from various sources. Teachers came under the general direction of the assistant commissioners, and protection through the department commanders was given to all engaged in the work."

The increase of Negro education, 1866–1870, is thus reported by the Freedmen's Bureau:

Year	Schools	Teachers	Pupils
1866	975	1,405	90,778
1867	1,839	2,087	111,442
1868	1,831	2,295	104,327
1869	2,118	2,445	114,522
1870	2,677	3,300	149,581

EXPENDITURES FOR SCHOOLS.

Year	Freedmen's Bureau	Benevolent Associations	The Freedmen	Total
1866....	$123,655.39	$82,200.00	$18,500.00	$224,359.39
1867....	531,345.48	65,087.01	17,200.00	613,632.49
1868....	965,806.67	700,000.00	360,000.00	2,025,896.67
1869....	924,182.16	365,000.00	190,000.00	1,479,182.16
1870....	976,853.29	360,000.00	200,000.00	1,536,853.29
Total .	....	....	$785,700.00	$5,879,924.00

4. Benevolent Societies.

The chief benevolent society was the American Missionary Association, and next in importance came the various Freedmen's Union Commissions, the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Home Mission Society, and Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Besides these the Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, and Friends did some work. The American Missionary Association, representing the Congregational Church, still maintains three colleges with high schools attached, one theological school, twenty-six high and industrial schools, and seven graded schools; these schools have about 450 instructors and 14,000 students. The work of Northern Baptists among Negroes is carried on by the American Baptist Home Mission Society. This society in the last forty years has spent about $4,000,000 in educational work, and is spending now $140,000 a year in educational and mission work. It maintains and aids thirty-two schools, of which thirteen are high schools and eight high schools with additional college departments. In these schools there were, in 1907, 342 teachers and 7,746 students; the value of school property was $1,576,450; the students pay $42,000 a year in tuition, and Negro churches and individuals $27,000 a year. The work of the Presbyterian Church for Negro education is carried on through the Board of Missions for Freedmen, which represents work begun as early as 1864. The church property used and owned by the board is worth $670,000, besides $122,000 invested in funds. There are the following schools: one college preparatory school, five girls' schools, thirteen boarding schools, and ninety-five graded schools; in all, 114 schools, with 13,576 pupils. The patrons of the schools paid in $72,000, in addition to $72,229 contributed by the board. The work of the Methodist Episcopal Church among Negroes is done through the Freedmen's Aid and Southern Educational Society (organized August, 1866). This society had, in 1904–05, twenty-four institutions; including one theological school, three medical schools, ten schools with college and preparatory departments, and eleven academies, with 409 teachers, 7,924 students, and property valued at $1,352,258. Between August, 1866, and June 30, 1905, the society had expended for educational work in the South, chiefly among Negroes, but partially among whites, $7,800,000. Students pay about $90,000 a year in tuition at present; 200,000 pupils have been instructed, of whom 3,000 entered the ministry, 12,000 have become teachers, 800 have become physicians, pharmacists, and dentists. Negro churches also support schools: the African Methodists spend $70,000 a year on twenty-five schools with 3,700 pupils, and have $500,000 in school property. The Colored Methodists have five schools, and the Zion Methodists nine; the latter collect $17,000 a year for their schools and have $134,950 in school property. The Negro Baptists have 107 schools, chiefly small graded schools, with property valued at $737,377, and expenditures in 1906 amounting to $148,883.50. They have 16,664 students enrolled.

5. Educational Agencies.

The most prominent Negro schools are five colleges, with preparatory and other departments: Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.; Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va. Eight high and industrial schools, with higher work: Talladega, Ala.; Tuskegee, Ala.; Brick, N. C.; Lincoln, Pa.; Straight, La.; Biddle, N. C.; Hampton, Va.; Claflin, S. C. Three high and industrial schools for girls: Spellman, Ga.; Scotia, N. C.; Hartshorn, Va. Four professional schools: Howard University (medicine, law, and pharmacy), Gammon (theology), Meharry (medicine and pharmacy), and Shaw (medicine and pharmacy). Gammon, Brick, and Meharry are well endowed; Tuskegee, Hampton, Howard, and Talladega have some endowment. The rest have small funds.

Four special funds for Negro education have been provided: (1) The Peabody fund of $2,000,000 given in 1867 and 1869. The income of this fund has gone principally to the education of the whites, but a small part has provided teachers, institutes, and schools for Negroes. (2) The John F. Slater fund of $1,000,000 given in 1882. The income of this fund has been given exclusively to Negro schools and more especially to industrial schools. (3) The Daniel Hand fund of $1,500,894.25, given to the American Missionary Association in 1888 for educating needy Negro students. (4) The Jeanes fund, of $1,000,000, was given by Miss Anna T. Jeanes; the income goes to Negro rural education, chiefly industrial.

There are the following 127 private institutions for Negroes, including certain state-aided schools:

States	Schools	Teachers	Students
Alabama	13	297	5,521
Arkansas	5	57	1,706
Delaware	2	20	213
Dist. Columbia	2	97	1,008
Florida	5	57	1,421
Georgia	14	239	5,462
Kentucky	5	42	773
Louisiana	8	146	4,410
Maryland	5	49	594
Mississippi	10	120	2,726
Missouri	2	29	513
North Carolina	17	169	4,250
Ohio	1	7	63
Oklahoma	1	8	319
Pennsylvania	2	23	219
South Carolina	10	155	4,087
Tennessee	6	163	2,958
Texas	7	118	2,574
Virginia	10	225	3,341
West Virginia	2	36	342
Total	127	2,057	42,500

6. Results.

Besides the private schools there is in the South a separate Negro public-school system. The governments of the southern states which survived the war made few attempts to establish public-school systems, particularly so far as Negroes were concerned. They especially feared idleness and social revolution on the part of the blacks, and sought to keep them in serfdom. Alabama, for instance, declared "stubborn or refractory servants" or those who "loiter away their time" to be vagrants, who could be hired out at compulsory service by law, while all Negro minors, far from being sent to school, were to be "apprenticed," preferably to their fathers' former "masters and mistresses." The enfranchisement of the Negro changed this. The so-called "carpet-bag" governments, which under the sway of the army and the Freedmen's Bureau succeeded the state governments at war time, have undoubtedly many sins to answer for. Supported by ignorant and unlettered Negroes, and led in many cases by unscrupulous Northerners and Southerners, they were extravagant and often ludicrous. And yet, as Albion Winegar Tourgee says: "they instituted a public-school system in a region where public schools had been unknown." There have been enrolled in the Negro public schools in the South the following children:

1865–66	90,778
1869–70	149,581
1876–77	571,506
1877–78	675,150
1878–79	685,942
1879–80	784,709
1880–81	802,374
1881–82	802,982
1882–83	817,240
1883–84	1,002,313
1884–85	1,030,463
1885–66	1,048,659
1886–87	1,118,556
1887–88	1,140,405
1888–89	1,213,092
1889–90	1,296,959
1890–91	1,329,549
1891–92	1,354,316
1892–93	1,367,515
1893–94	1,432,198
1894–95	1,423,593
1895–96	1,449,325
1896–97	1,460,084
1897–98	1,540,749
1898–99	1,509,275
1899–1900	1,560,070
1900–01	1,594,308
1901–02	1,575,659
*1902–03	1,578,632
*1903–04	1,577,385
*1904–05	1,620,194
*1905–06	1,617,998

* Subject to correction by United States Bureau of Education.

In 1905–06, 55.27 per cent of the Negroes five to eighteen years of age were enrolled in school, and of these 60.98 per cent were in daily attendance. There were 129 public high schools (53 of these being in Texas and Missouri) with 891 teachers and 45,037 students. To these may be added the private and state schools (ut sup.). Of these students less than 3,000 are in college courses, 736 were studying theology, 125 law, 670 medicine, 106 dentistry, 98 pharmacy, and 186 nurse training. These public schools, save in the case of a few city systems, have been paid for by the Negro population. It has been estimated that in the years 1870–99 the Negro school systems of the former slave states did not cost the white taxpayers a cent, except possibly in a few city systems.

Cost of Negro schools, 1870–99	$69,968,671.48
Estimated total direct taxes paid by Negroes 1870–99	$25,000,000.00
Indirect taxes and pro rata share of endowments	45,000,000.00
Approximate total, 1870–99	$70,000,000.00

Of the cost of their private schools also the Negroes bear a large share. The cost of seventy-four leading schools for the last nine years has been a little under $12,000,000, and the Negroes paid about 45 per cent of the total cost. Richard R. Wright, Jr., concludes "that it is probably true that the Negroes pay possibly a larger percentage of the cost of their schools than any other group of poor people in America. The Negroes have paid in direct property and poll taxes more than $45,000,000 during the past forty years. They have contributed at least $15,000,000 to education through their churches. The Negro student possibly pays a larger percentage of the running expenses of the institutions which he attends than any other student in the land" (*Self Help in Negro Education*, Cheyney, Pa., 1909).

The result of this education on the illiteracy of the Negro has been as follows: Negroes ten years of age and over, per cent of illiteracy: 1870, 79.9 per cent; 1880, 70 per cent; 1890, 57.1 per cent; 1900, 44.5 per cent. At present probably two-thirds of the Negro Americans can read and write. Further results can be seen in the occupations of Negroes, the spread of organized effort, the publication of books and newspapers, and the appearance of men and women of distinction.

II. Evangelization. 1. General History: Negro slaves arrived in America with that strong tendency

1. Religious Condition of Early Slaves.

to Nature worship and that belief in witchcraft common to all primitive peoples. Some had more or less vague ideas of a supreme being and higher religious ideas, while a few were Mohammedans, and fewer Christians. Some actual priests were transported and others assumed the functions of priests, and soon a form of African religion and witchcraft appeared in the West Indies, which was known as Obi, or sorcery. The French Creoles called it Vaudois (" Waldensian "), because of the witchcraft charged against the followers of Peter Waldo, whence comes the dialect term Voodoo or Hoodoo. While in its origins the system was undoubtedly African, and part of some more or less well-defined religious system, it often degenerated into mere imposture. There were probably traces of blood sacrifice and worship of the moon, but unfortunately information comes not from serious students of curious human phenomena, but rather from persons apparently unable to understand why a transplanted heathen should cling to heathen rites. The most obvious reason for the spread of witchcraft and persistence of heathen rites among Negro slaves was the fact that at first no effort was made by masters to offer them anything better, due to the wide-spread idea that it was contrary to law to hold Christians as slaves, an idea which had become well established by the end of the sixteenth century. This did not involve any wide-spread abhorrence of forced labor from serfs or apprentices, and it was linked with the idea that the enslavement of the heathen was meritorious, since it punished their blasphemy on the one hand and gave them a chance for conversion on the other. When, therefore, the slave-trade from Africa began it met only feeble opposition here and there. That opposition was in nearly all cases stilled when it was stated that the slave-trade was a method of converting the heathen to Christianity. The corollary that the conscience of Europe immediately drew was that after conversion the Negro slave was to become in all essential respects like other servants and laborers, bound to toil under general regulations, but personally free with recognized rights and duties. Most colonists believed that this was not only actually right, but according to English law. And while they early began to combat the idea they continually doubted the legality of their action in English courts.

2. Lack of Early Missionary Effort.

It was not until 1667 that Virginia attacked the issue squarely and declared by law: " Baptisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage or freedom, in order that diverse masters freed from this doubt may more carefully endeavor the propagation of Christianity " (quoted from a law passed in Virginia in 1667; cf. Henning, *Statutes*, vol. ii., p. 260). Following this Virginia took three further steps in 1670, 1682, and 1705. First she declared that only slaves imported from Christian lands should be free. Next she excepted Negroes and mulattoes from even this restriction unless they were born of Christians and were Christians when taken into slavery. Finally personal Christianity in Africa or actual freedom in a Christian country exempted a Virginia Negro slave from lifelong slavery. This changing attitude of Christians toward Negroes was reflected in John Locke's *Fundamental Constitutions of South Carolina* (published in B. R. Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, vol. ii., New York, 1836), one article of which read: " Since charity obliges us to wish well to the souls of all men, and religion ought to alter nothing in any man's civil estate or right, it shall be lawful for slaves as well as others to enter themselves and to be of what church and profession any of them shall think best, and thereof be as fully members as any freeman. But yet no slaves shall be hereby exempted from the civil dominion his master hath over him, but be in all things in the same state and condition he was in before." So much did this please the Carolinas that it was one of the few articles reenacted in the constitution of 1688. It is clear from these citations that in the seventeenth century not only was there little missionary effort to convert Negro slaves, but that there was, on the contrary, positive refusal to let slaves be converted, and that this refusal was one incentive to explicit statements of the doctrine of perpetual slavery for Negroes. The French Code Noir of 1685 made baptism and religious instruction of Negroes obligatory. There was no such legislation in English colonies. In Massachusetts John Elliot and Cotton Mather both were much concerned that " so little care was taken of their [the Negroes'] precious and immortal souls," which were left to " a destroying ignorance merely for fear of thereby losing the benefit of their vassalage." So throughout the colonies it was reported in 1678 that masters, " out of covetousness," refuse to allow their slaves to be baptized; and in 1700 there was an earnest plea in Massachusetts for religious instruction of Negroes since it was " notorious " that masters discourage the " poor creatures " from baptism. In 1709 a Carolina clergyman wrote to the secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in England that only a few of 200 or more Negroes in his community were taught Christianity, and they were not allowed to be baptized. This state of affairs led to further laws, and the instructions to some of the royal governors contain a clause ordering them to " find out the best means to facilitate and encourage the conversion of Negroes and Indians to the Christian religion."

In 1729 an appeal from several colonies was made to England on the subject in order to increase the conversion of blacks. The crown attorney and solicitor-general replied that baptism in no way changed the slave's status. The first organized effort to convert slaves was by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

3. Efforts for Negro Evangelization.

In 1702 some work was done among the Negroes of Carolina, and in 1704 a Negro school was established in New York, under Elias Neau, a French Protestant. The records of the society abundantly establish the fact that the greatest obstruction to the religious instruction of the Negroes was in the masters themselves. From 1711 to 1783 thousands of sermons and leaflets advocating the conversion of slaves were distributed in

America. In 1783–84, soon after the separation of the colonies from the mother country, the society's operations ceased, leaving in all the colonies forty-three missionaries, two of whom were in the Southern states, one in North Carolina and one in South Carolina. The Moravians or United Brethren were the first who formally attempted the establishment of missions exclusively to the Negroes, cooperating with the trustees under the will of Dr. Bray, who left funds for converting the slaves of Carolina. Finally Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians began efforts among the slaves more or less spasmodically.

Thus the efforts to convert Negroes in America fall in three main periods: The first period was early in the eighteenth century after it was decided that baptism did not free slaves. Results were meager, and the effort spasmodic. A second period came between the Revolutionary war and 1820, when the "Cotton Kingdom" came into being. More was accomplished in this period, though "on the whole but a minority of the Negroes, and that a small one, attended regularly the house of God; and, taking them as a class, their religious instruction was extensively and most seriously neglected." The third period followed after the depression of the thirties. This depression was severe, and lasted nearly twenty years. For instance, the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1833, said of the slaves: "There are over two millions of human beings in the condition of heathen and some of them in a worse condition. They may justly be considered the heathen of this country, and will bear a comparison with heathen in any country in the world."

4. Results.

As the result of such appeals a reaction set in about 1835, and the Methodists and Baptists especially were active among the slaves. By 1840 enough had been done to furnish Negroes with their own ministers and missionaries and to establish numbers of Negro churches. A minister in Mississippi testified that he had charge of the Negroes of five plantations and 300 slaves; another in Georgia visited eighteen plantations every two weeks. "The owners have built three good churches at their own expense, all framed; 290 members have been added, and about 400 children are instructed." Another traveling minister declares, in 1841, that in many places like Baltimore, Alexandria, and Charleston, the Negroes had large, spacious churches. This religious activity among Negroes brought to the front a number of distinguished Negro preachers: Nat Turner and Denmark Vesey, who led insurrections; Richard Allen, who founded the African Methodist Episcopal Church (see Methodists, IV., 6); Abraham Jones, the first Negro Protestant Episcopal rector; Harry Hosier, the companion of Bishop Asbury; George Lisle, the West Indian missionary, and Lott Carey, the African missionary. To these may be added the names of Lemuel Haynes, who pastored white New England churches; John Chavis, who taught a fashionable white school in North Carolina; Henry Evans, a black missionary to whites and Negroes; James Varick, who founded the Zion Methodist Church; Jack of Virginia, Ralph Freeman, and Lunsford Lane,—thirteen remarkable characters.

The gradual increase of these Negro Christians, however, brought peculiar problems. Clergymen, despite the law, were reproached for taking Negroes into the church and still allowing them to be held as slaves. On the other hand, it was not easy to know how to deal with the black church-member after he was admitted. He must either be a subordinate member of a white church or a member of a Negro church under the general supervision of whites. As the efforts of missionaries slowly increased the number of converts, both these systems were adopted. But the black congregations here and there soon aroused suspicion and fear of the masters, and as early as 1715 North Carolina passed an act which declared: "That if any master or owner of Negroes or slaves, or any other person or persons whatsoever on the government, shall permit or suffer any Negro or Negroes to build on their, or either of their, lands, or any part thereof, any house under pretense of a meeting-house upon account of worship, or upon any pretense whatsoever, and shall not suppress and hinder them, he, she, or they so offending, shall, for every default, forfeit and pay fifty pounds, one-half toward defraying the contingent charges of government, the other to him or them that shall sue for the same." This made Negro members of a white church a necessity in this colony, and there was the same tendency in other colonies. It gradually became true, as Brackett says, that "any privileges of church going which slaves might enjoy depended much, as with children, on the disposition of the masters." After the Civil War the Negroes were segregated in their own churches in the South and to some extent in the North.

2. Statistics. [The distribution of the Negroes in the churches as given in the appended tables may receive some illumination and interest from the following facts. The first church in the United States to receive Negroes was the Anglican, the baptism of a Negro child taking place in Virginia in 1624. There has always been a considerable proportion of the Negro population in fellowship with this church and its successor, the Protestant Episcopal. The ceremonial of the service is grateful to the Negro mind, and the rolls of the Protestant Episcopal ministry include over 150 Negro preachers since the first, Alexander Crummell, was ordained in 1839. The connection with the Methodist communion was inevitable. The strongly emotional element in the Negro mind receives the appeal of vigorous Methodist evangelism with special favor. This relationship with the Methodist bodies began as early as the activity of Bishop Thomas Coke (q.v.), whose servant, Harry Hosier (d. 1810), was a noted colored minister. Almost as inevitable was the trend of the Negro toward the Baptist denomination. Here the attractive element was the symbolism of immersion. The explanation given above for the attraction to the Protestant Episcopal Church applies with equal force to the Roman Catholic communion. The next denominations in point of strength, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, do not enlist so strongly the mental leanings of the race.]

COLORED CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES 1890–1906.

DENOMINATION.	NUMBER OF COLORED ORGANIZATIONS.		NUMBER OF COMMUNICANTS OR MEMBERS REPORTED.		VALUE OF CHURCH PROPERTY REPORTED.	
	1906	1890	1906	1890	1906	1890
All denominations consisting in whole or in part of colored organizations	36,770	23,462	3,685,097	2,673,977	$56,636,159	$26,626,448
Denominations consisting wholly of colored organizations	31,393	19,158	3,207,307	2,321,313	44,673,049	20,525,141
Baptist bodies:						
Baptists—National Convention	18,534	12,533	2,261,607	1,348,989	24,437,272	9,038,549
Colored Primitive Baptists in America[1]	797	323	35,076	18,162	296,539	135,427
United American Freewill Baptists	251	......	14,489	....	79,278	....
Church of God and Saints of Christ	48	......	1,823	....	6,000	....
Churches of the Living God:						
Church of the Living God (Christian Workers for Friendship)	44	......	2,676	....	23,175	....
Church of the Living God (Apostolic Church)	15	......	752	....	25,700	....
Church of Christ in God	9	......	848	....	9,700	....
Evangelistic associations:						
Voluntary Missionary Society of America	3	......	425	....	2,400	....
Free Christian Zion Church of Christ	15	......	1,835	....	5,975	....
Methodist bodies:						
Union American Methodist Episcopal Church	77	42	4,347	2,279	170,150	187,600
African Methodist Episcopal Church	6,647	2,481	494,777	452,725	11,303,489	6,468,280
African Union Methodist Protestant Church	69	40	5,592	3,415	183,697	54,440
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	2,204	1,704	184,542	349,788	4,833,207	2,714,128
Congregational Methodist	......	9	....	319	....	525
Colored Methodist Episcopal Church	2,381	1,759	172,996	129,383	3,017,849	1,713,366
Reformed Zion Union Apostolic Church	45	32	3,059	2,346	37,875	15,000
Reformed Methodist Union Episcopal Church	58	......	4,397	....	36,965	....
Evangelist Missionary Church	......	11	....	951	....	2,000
Presbyterian bodies:						
Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church	196	224	18,066	12,956	203,778	195,826
Denominations consisting in part of colored organizations	5,377	4,304	477,790	352,664	11,963,110	6,101,307
Adventist bodies:						
Advent Christian Church	2	......	72	....	3,800	....
Seventh-day Adventist Denomination	29	......	562	....	6,474	....
Baptist bodies:						
Baptists—Northern Convention	108	406	32,639	35,221	1,561,326	1,087,518
Baptists—Southern Convention	......	7	....	651	....	3,875
Free Baptists	197	5	10,876	271	186,130	13,300
Primitive Baptists[2]	4	......	102	....	2,300	....
Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists	......	15	....	265	....	930
Christians (Christian Connection)	92	63	7,545	4,989	69,505	23,500
Churches of God in North America, General Eldership of the	15	......	329	....	5,500	....
Congregationalists	156	85	11,960	6,908	459,497	246,125
Disciples or Christians:						
Disciples of Christ	129	277	9,705	18,578	170,265	176,795
Churches of Christ	41		1,528		14,950	
Independent churches	12	......	490	....	2,750	....
Lutheran bodies:						
United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South	......	5	....	94	....	1,750
General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America	1	......	15	....	5,000	....
Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of America	6	5	224	211	10,000	13,400
Methodist bodies:						
Methodist Episcopal Church	3,750	2,984	308,551	246,249	6,104,379	3,630,093
Methodist Protestant Church	64	54	2,612	3,183	62,651	35,445
Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America	22	......	1,258	....	21,000	....
Independent Methodists	......	2	....	222	....	4,675
Moravian bodies:						
Moravian Church (Unitas Fratrum)	2	......	351	....	8,000	....
Presbyterian bodies:						
Presbyterian Church in the United States of America	417	233	27,799	14,961	752,387	391,650
Cumberland Presbyterian Church	1	......	50	....	1,000	....
Presbyterian Church in the United States	44	45	1,183	1,568	32,850	22,200
Associate Reformed Synod of the South	1	......	18	....	200	....
Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America	......	1	....	76	....	1,500
Protestant Episcopal Church	198	49	19,098	2,977	1,773,279	192,750
Reformed bodies:						
Reformed Church in America	2	......	59	....	....	....
Reformed Episcopal Church	38	37	2,252	1,723	28,287	18,401
Roman Catholic Church	36	31	38,235	14,517	678,480	237,400
United Brethren bodies:						
Church of the United Brethren in Christ	10	......	277	....	3,100	....

---

[1] The organizations shown for this denomination in 1890 were returned at that census as belonging to the Primitive Baptist denomination.

[2] The colored organizations returned for this denomination in 1890 are included in the present report as belonging to the Colored Primitive Baptists in America.

COLORED CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS BY STATES AND TERRITORIES, 1906.

STATE OR TERRITORY.	Number of Colored Organizations.	MEMBERS.		VALUE OF CHURCH PROPERTY.		DEBT ON CHURCH PROPERTY.	
		Number of Organizations Reporting.	Total Number Reported.	Number of Organizations Reporting.	Value Reported.	Number of Organizations Reporting.	Amount of debt Reported.
Continental United States	36,770	36,563	3,685,097	34,660	$56,636,159	9,003	$5,005,905
North Atlantic division	1,026	1,021	134,711	901	8,363,962	558	1,585,575
Maine	1	1	25	1	3,000	1	1,600
New Hampshire	1	1	20	....	....	....	....
Vermont	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Massachusetts	64	64	9,402	52	646,425	35	159,508
Rhode Island	20	20	2,114	18	184,346	15	37,350
Connecticut	49	48	4,492	42	379,855	23	44,264
New York	203	202	30,482	169	2,366,796	93	513,412
New Jersey	259	257	28,015	239	1,289,335	145	231,632
Pennsylvania	429	428	60,161	380	3,494,205	246	597,809
South Atlantic division	15,250	15,163	1,741,491	14,448	21,779,621	3,584	1,692,995
Delaware	125	125	10,583	122	319,832	74	40,836
Maryland	624	620	71,797	592	1,979,408	277	314,861
District of Columbia	102	102	46,249	83	2,051,942	60	328,454
Virginia	1,983	1,974	307,374	1,874	3,562,930	440	308,680
West Virginia	271	268	14,949	209	496,946	76	42,282
North Carolina	2,813	2,797	283,707	2,610	3,238,735	511	127,879
South Carolina	2,860	2,853	394,149	2,808	3,366,223	666	145,878
Georgia	4,834	4,790	507,005	4,608	5,125,207	1,182	264,966
Florida	1,638	1,634	105,678	1,542	1,638,398	298	119,159
North Central division	2,023	2,012	166,356	1,872	5,824,226	764	681,494
Ohio	371	367	33,667	336	1,473,251	132	125,636
Indiana	202	200	23,133	191	596,625	105	73,680
Illinois	359	358	32,058	333	1,040,148	148	165,422
Michigan	43	43	3,235	43	167,950	19	17,009
Wisconsin	11	11	310	10	26,850	4	851
Minnesota	10	10	1,453	9	74,300	5	5,362
Iowa	72	72	4,108	61	167,125	30	25,711
Missouri	655	651	50,074	605	1,690,119	202	229,805
North Dakota	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
South Dakota	2	2	38	2	3,900	1	1,700
Nebraska	12	12	1,007	11	73,500	5	2,130
Kansas	286	286	17,273	271	510,458	113	34,188
South Central division	18,341	18,237	1,634,055	17,322	19,863,508	4,036	963,785
Kentucky	1,007	1,005	116,918	964	1,845,538	263	102,328
Tennessee	1,879	1,855	172,867	1,743	2,631,502	364	136,630
Alabama	3,734	3,715	397,178	3,474	3,920,253	790	168,554
Mississippi	3,877	3,863	358,708	3,741	3,524,880	857	139,001
Louisiana	2,085	2,067	185,918	2,032	2,796,242	559	158,708
Arkansas	2,094	2,081	146,319	1,992	1,628,303	417	77,810
Oklahoma[1]	618	616	29,115	543	410,689	140	31,957
Texas	3,047	3,035	227,032	2,833	3,106,101	646	148,797
Western division	130	130	8,484	117	804,842	61	82,056
Montana	6	6	135	6	11,650	4	432
Idaho	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Wyoming	1	1	45	1	10,000	....	....
Colorado	25	25	2,507	24	241,455	17	26,494
New Mexico	7	7	221	7	10,050	3	440
Arizona	5	5	208	2	7,500	1	130
Utah	1	1	30	1	4,000	1	216
Nevada	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
Washington	18	18	614	13	57,900	8	6,125
Oregon	4	4	160	3	44,000	3	3,950
California	63	63	4,564	60	418,287	24	44,209

[1] Oklahoma and Indian Territory combined.

3. Denominational Evangelization: Evangelization of Negroes through the various sects may be set forth as follows:

a. Methodists: The history of the Negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church is of far-reaching interest in any study of the relation of the white and black races in the United States. This is the one church with a centralized episcopal government which has a large membership, and the efforts to adjust the races in this organization throw light on the problem in the whole country.

There were in 1790, 11,682 Negro members of this church; in 1890, 246,249 Negro members, and in 1906, 327,000. The color question in the church cropped out very early. In 1800 colored deacons were allowed; in 1844 the church split on the slavery question and many Negro congregations in border states were left without pastors. They asked for colored ministers and conferences, and the colored ministers were authorized and a colored annual conference was established in 1852. In 1856 and 1866 two Negro bishops were sent to Africa. In 1864 colored annual conferences were recognized and raised to full powers, and Negro bishops sat as delegates in the general conference of 1868. From 1872 to the present there has been an ungranted demand for a Negro bishop, but Negro general officers have been elected and a third Negro bishop to Africa. From this church there have been two secessions on account of color discrimination.

African Methodist Episcopal Church (see Methodists, IV., 6): Certain Negroes seceded from the Methodist Church in Philadelphia in 1787 and eventually formed the church which has grown as follows:

	Members	Ministers
1787	42	2
1818	6,778	7
1822	9,888	15
1826	7,937	17
1836	7,594	27
1846	16,190	67
1856	19,914	165
1866	73,000	265
1876	206,331	1,418
1886	403,550	2,857
1888	452,782	3,569
1890	452,725	3,809
1906	494,777	6,000 (?)

It had in 1903, nine and a half million dollars' worth of property and thirteen bishops. It raises $1,000,000 a year.

African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church (see Methodists, IV., 7): A second secession from the Methodists took place in New York in 1796. The growth of the Zion Methodists has been as follows:

	Ministers	Members
1821	....	1,500
1864	375	13,340
1890	....	349,788
1896	2,473	409,441
1900	2,602	551,591
1906	....	184,542

The Colored Methodist Episcopal Church (see Methodists, IV., 8): This church, consisting of Negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, set aside in 1866, has grown as follows:

	Ministers	Members
1866	....	80,000
1872	635	67,889
1896	1,400	129,383
1906	2,000	172,996

Its property was reported in 1906 as $1,715,566.

b. Baptists (see Baptists, II., 3, § 10): Most of the early colored Baptist churches were identified with white churches, and in churches of mixed membership the whites were often in the minority. In the mixed churches of this period, the colored members had no voice in affairs except in the reception and discipline of members of their own race. After the emancipation of slaves, the Negro Baptists of the Southern States very generally separated from the white churches, and organized churches and associations of their own. Their growth is shown thus:

	Ministers	Churches	Members
1850	....	....	150,000
1885	4,590	9,097	1,071,902
1890	8,637	12,856	1,367,151
1894	10,119	13,138	1,604,310
1901	14,861	15,654	1,975,538
1902	16,080	16,440	2,038,427
1906	....	19,582	2,311,172

Between 1890 and 1906 the value of property increased from $9,173,176 to $24,733,811.

The growth of the other denominations can be seen in the tables given above. The Roman Catholics, whose efforts were checked a while by the racial question, have been making especial effort in the last two decades and have doubled their membership in sixteen years. The Episcopalians show a large increase due to recently renewed efforts, while the Presbyterians and Congregationalists have grown more slowly. W. E. B. DuBois.

Bibliography: Vera Sieg, *The Negro Problem. A Bibliography*, Madison, Wis., 1909; C. C. Jones, *Religious Instruction of the Negroes of the United States*, Savannah, 1842; I. G. Penn and J. W. E. Bowen, *The United Negro*, Atlanta, 1903; *Atlanta University Publications*, Nos. 6, 8, 12, Atlanta, 1902 sqq.; W. B. Parks, *Possibilities of the Negro*, Atlanta, 1904; M. A. Ames, *From a New England Woman's Diary in Dixie in 1865*, Springfield, Mass., 1906; H. P. Eastman, *The Negro, his Origin, History and Destiny*, Boston, 1906; J. H. Jackson, *Hist. of Education from the Greeks to the Present Time*, 2d ed., Colorado, 1906; S. N. Vass, *The Progress of the Negro Race*, Raleigh, N. C., 1906; R. E. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, New York, 1907; J. A. Price, *The Negro: Past, Present and Future*, Washington, 1907; B. T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois, *Negro in the South*, Philadelphia, 1907; J. Dowd, *The Negro Races. A sociological Study*, vol. i., New York, 1907; A. H. Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, ib. 1908; B. T. Washington, *The Story of the Negro; the Rise of the Race from Slavery*, 2 vols., ib., 1909; W. Archer, *Through Afro-America. An English Reading of the Race Problem*, London, 1910.

NEHEMIAH.

His Lineage (§ 1).
His Commission and Its Purpose (§ 2).
External and Internal Opposition (§ 3).
His Achievements and Character (§ 4).

Post-exilic Jewish patriot and governor. According to Neh. viii. 9, xii. 26, he bore the titles of *tirshatha* and *peḥah* (governor), the first of which is probably a Persian title given to royal commissioners, and the second is in origin Babylonian. The inference of the Syriac and Arabic translators from the title tirshatha and from Neh. x. 9 that Hacaliah and his son were priests is unfounded, the words "these were the priests" (verse 8) not referring to the opening verse, and quite opposed to such an office is the passage Neh. vi. 11.

1. His Lineage.

More probable is the very early and persistent tradition that Nehemiah was of the family of David. This is supported by the fact that he calls Jerusalem "the place of my fathers' sepulchers" (ii. 3, 5) and agrees with the known liking of Persian kings to have about them the descendants of royal families (Dan. i. 3). Accordant also with this supposition is the confession in i. 6–7.

2. His Commission and its Purpose.

It was in the month Chisleu of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I. Longimanus (445 B.C.) that Nehemiah first heard directly from Jerusalem of the pitiful condition at the capital, of the breaches in the wall, and the burning of the gates. The sadness induced by these tidings manifested itself in his countenance and came to the notice of the king as he exercised his office of cupbearer. The latter asked for an explanation, which brought to the king's ear the cause of Nehemiah's sorrow, and gave to the latter opportunity to ask to be sent home with the commission to build the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. ii. 5). That the mission was an extraordinary one is shown by the appointment of a definite time for his return (ii. 6), and the circumstances of his return to the king twelve years later imply that during that time the king appointed him to the permanent office of governor. Furnished with a letter of safe-conduct to the governors of the region beyond the Euphrates and with orders to take from the king's forest the necessary materials for repair of the gates and walls, and provided with orders that an official residence be furnished him, and also with an official escort, he arrived at Jerusalem (Neh. ii. 7-12). After three days' residence, he made a visit by night to the wall and gates of the city and observed the conditions. He then made an appeal to the national pride of the Jews and succeeded in stirring them up to the work of reconstruction, showing them the authority which he had from the king to accomplish the work. The zeal, cleverness, and energy of the man are sufficiently revealed by the account of the work and by the shortness of the time in which Jerusalem became again a fortified city. The work of construction was done by the community under the leadership of the principal people, associations, and gilds within fifty-two days. The result was intense disappointment to the enemies of the Jews (Neh. vi. 15), and great thankfulness on the part of Nehemiah for the accomplishment of his plan and for the triumph over hindrances both external and internal.

3. External and Internal Opposition.

Nehemiah was aware from the first that the accomplishment of his purpose would go contrary to the political plans of the enemies of his people. These at first charged the Jews with harboring rebellious intentions (ii. 20), went on to the use of insult and mockery (iv. 1-3), and finally prepared for actual hostilities, a plan foiled by the military readiness and foresightedness of Nehemiah. They went on to treacherous attempts to lure Nehemiah outside the walls that they might seize him, and attempted to compromise him by inducing him to invade as for personal security the temple area (vi. 2 sqq., 10). Especially noteworthy among the active enemies were three men, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem. Geshem doubtless had at heart the interests of the settlers in the south and southwest of Judea; Tobiah was related to some of the first families of the land and had a strong following among them; while Sanballat (called "the Horonite," ii. 10, 19) enjoyed the authority and prestige of the position of priest at Samaria, a position which possibly was a consequence of the event narrated in II Kings xvii. 28. The internal hindrances Nehemiah had to combat were despondency arising from the nature of the work, the rumors of attacks in force by the neighboring people (iv. 10, 12), and the hard economic conditions of the country (v. 1-8). The first obstacle was overcome by Nehemiah's encouragement and leadership and example, the last by inducing the voluntary release by creditors of the conditions which made life so hard for the poor. Besides the foregoing hindrances is to be mentioned the fact that while part of the people were tractable, another part wished to maintain their relations with the foes on the outside, and assisted in the carrying out of plots against the leader (vi. 9-14, 17-19), even to the procuring of false prophecy.

4. His Achievements and Character.

When the honor of the city was restored by the completion of the walls, Nehemiah turned to the maintenance of that position. The city was half depopulated, and that condition had to be altered, but in accordance with legal and moral rights. To that end a search of the records and a census were ordered (vii. 4-5). The latter process was a lengthy one, and it is possible that to carry this through Nehemiah sought the office of governor. The former was accomplished by the casting of lots and the bringing of one out of ten to dwell in the city (xi. 1-2), the "princes of the people" taking up their residence there. The narrative of events is somewhat confused under the editing which the memoirs of Nehemiah have undergone. It is not improbable that the great feast detailed in chaps. viii.-x. took place in the year 444 B.C., while the consecration of the wall fell in the year 430 B.C., after the return of the governor from the king. Other accomplishments were the purifying of the temple by the exclusion of those unlawfully domiciled therein (xiii. 4-9, 28), provision was made for the orderly conduct and maintenance of the public service, and enforcement of the law against intermarriage with the heathen (xiii. 10, 23). The accomplishments of Nehemiah which are worthy of note then are the awakening of the sense of national honor and of regard for the law, and the reestablishment of Jerusalem as the capital of the country and the rallying-point of the community. While Ezra brought together the Jewish communities of the diaspora and the homeland under the dominion of the law, Nehemiah brought about "the national-political organization as the amphictyony of the holy state." His character appears as that of a man with a lively sense of honor and distinction. He was true to his family, to the God of Israel, and to his duty to his people. He used his high rank, his official position, and his powers in the service he had undertaken, the purpose of which was to preserve the glory of God and to further the welfare of his nation. He permitted no opposition to stand in the way of this service, and employed his own means with great liberality. His first concern was to keep a good conscience toward God, and the memoirs which he left are a testimony to the honesty of his purposes and the diligence and discretion with which he carried them out. II Macc. ii. 13 attributes to Nehemiah also the creation of a library and collection of historical archives and sacred books, and by tradition the formation of the third part of the canon is practically traced to him.

(A. KLOSTERMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature under EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, BOOKS OF, P. Riessler, in *Biblische Zeitschrift*, i (1903), 232–245, ii (1904), 15–27; *DB*, iii. 507–510; *EB*, iii. 3380–87; *JE*, ix. 208–211; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, xxviii. 1565–73.

NEIL, CHARLES: Church of England; b. in London May 14, 1841. He graduated from Trinity Hall, Cambridge (B.A., 1862; M.A., 1866); he was ordained deacon 1865, and priest 1866; became curate of Bradford Abbas, near Sherborne, Dorset, 1865; vicar of St. Paul's, Bethnal Green, 1866; incumbent of St. Matthias, Poplar, London, 1875; and vicar of St. Mary's, Stamford Brook, London, 1899. He was called to the bar (Inner Temple) in 1864; and has been joint editor of the *Clergyman's Magazine*, London, 1876 sqq. He is the author of the volume on Romans, in the *Expositor's Commentary* (London, 1877); the volumes on Genesis, the Gospels, and Acts, in the *Teacher's Catechising Bible* (1893–94); *The Fallacy of Sacramental Confession; Discourses Delivered at St. Matthias, Poplar* (1896); and contributed the volume on the Pauline epistles to *The Biblical Elucidator* (1896). He edited John Todd's *Index Rerum* (London, 1881); with H. D. M. Spence and J. S. Exell he edited *Thirty Thousand Thoughts* ([1883] sqq.); and, with C. H. H. Wright, *A Protestant Dictionary* (1904).

NELLES, SAMUEL SOBIESKI: Methodist educator; b. at Mount Pleasant, near Brantford, Canada, Oct. 17, 1823; d. at Cobourg, Canada, Oct. 17, 1887. He received his education at Lewiston Academy, N. Y., Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, N. Y., Victoria College, Cobourg, Canada, and Wesleyan University, Conn. (B.A., 1846); after teaching for a year he entered the ministry, serving as pastor at Port Hope, Toronto, and at London, Canada; in 1850 he became president of Victoria College, and held the position till his death. See METHODISTS, IV., 10, § 3.

NELSON, CLEVELAND KINLOCH: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Georgia; b. at Greenwood, near Cobham Station, Va., May 23, 1852. He was educated at St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. (B.A., 1872) and attended lectures at the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from which, however, he was not graduated. He was ordered deacon in 1876 and ordained priest in the following year, after which he was rector of St. John the Baptist's, Germantown, Pa., from 1876 to 1882, and of the Church of the Nativity, South Bethlehem, Pa., from 1882 to 1892, when he was consecrated bishop of Georgia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 337, New York, 1895.

NELSON, DAVID: Presbyterian; b. near Jonesborough, Tenn., Sept. 24, 1793; d. at Oakland, Ill., Oct. 17, 1844. He was graduated at Washington College, Virginia, in 1810. He practised medicine, imbibed infidel opinions, but was converted, and licensed to preach in 1825. After five years' service in Tennessee and Kentucky, he established Marion College in Missouri, and was its first president, holding the position for six years; but his abolitionist views at last forced his departure, and in 1836 he opened at Oakland, Ill., a training-school, particularly for missionaries. He wrote *Cause and Cure of Infidelity* (New York, 1836), often reprinted and edited, while it exists in translation in French, German, and Spanish.

NELSON, HENRY ADDISON: Presbyterian; b. at Amherst, Mass., Oct. 31, 1820; d. at St. Louis, Mo., Dec. 31, 1906. He was educated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (A.B., 1840), after which he taught at Eaton, N. Y., and Homer, N. Y., until 1843, when he entered Auburn Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1846. He was then pastor at the First Presbyterian Church, Auburn, N. Y. (1846–56), and at the First Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, Mo. (1856–68), professor of systematic and pastoral theology at Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati (1868–74), pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Geneva, N. Y. (1874–1885), and acting pastor at Independence, Mo. (1885–86). From 1886 until his retirement from active life in 1897 he was editor of *The Church at Home and Abroad* (Philadelphia). He was a member of the joint committee of thirty appointed by the general assemblies of the northern and southern branches of his denomination in 1866 to effect their reunion, and in theology "accepted the standards of the Presbyterian Church, but would much prefer a fair statement of the consensus in doctrine of all the churches which acknowledge each other as evangelicals, eliminating all the dogmas which distinguish them from each other." His works include: *Seeing Jesus* (Philadelphia, 1869); *Sin and Salvation* (New York, 1881); and *Home Whispers* (Philadelphia, 1885).

NELSON, RICHARD HENRY: Protestant Episcopal bishop coadjutor of Albany, N. Y.; b. in New York City Nov. 10, 1859. He was educated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (A.B., 1880), the University of Leipsic (1880–81), and Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from which he was graduated in 1883. After being curate of St. John's, Stamford, Conn. (1883–84), he was rector successively of Grace Church, Waterville, N. Y. (1884–87), Christ Church, Norwich, Conn. (1887–97), and St. Peter's, Philadelphia, Pa. (1897–1904). In 1904 he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Albany, N. Y.

NEMESIUS, ne-mī'si-us, **OF EMESA:** Bishop of Emesa in Phenicia in the fourth century. Of his life nothing whatsoever is known, nor was his work, generally known as "On the Nature of Man" (ed. I. Casaubon, Antwerp, 1565; ed. J. Fell, Oxford, 1671; best ed. by Matthäi, Halle, 1802; with collected prefaces also in *MPG*, xl.; Eng. transl. by G. Wither, London, 1636), mentioned before Maximus Confessor in the seventh century. The date of the work rests entirely on internal evidence, as in its polemics against Apollinarius and Eunomius, and in its evident allusions to Antiochene Christology. On the other hand, there is no allusion to controversies later than the fourth century, such as

Eutychianism and Nestorianism, or to the dyophysitic problem. The work is a noteworthy endeavor to make a Christian philosophical compend of anthropology. Paul and Moses are equated with Menander and Aristotle, and the influence of Galen is also marked. The highest proof of divine providence and of the exalted destiny of man is based on the incarnation; lofty praise is accorded the unity and harmony of the entire creation, while, on the other hand, redemption is robbed of its value as a historical fact. The book shows how strong and complete was the blending of Christianity and Hellenism in the fourth century. It was much used and highly esteemed until the Renaissance, and was translated into Latin by Alfanus in the eleventh century (ed. Holzinger, Prague, 1887) and in the twelfth century by Burgundio of Pisa (ed. Burkhardt, Meidlinger, 1891–96), as well as by the Humanists Kono and Valla. An Italian version appeared in 1509 and an Old Armenian translation was also made. (R. Schmid.)

Bibliography: M. Evangelides, *Nemesius und seine Quellen*, Berlin, 1882; Bender, *Untersuchung über Nemesius*, Heidelberg, 1898; B. Domanski, *Die Psychologie des Nemesius*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. iii., Münster, 1900; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vi. 283–285; *DCB*, iv. 16.

NENNIUS: The traditional author of the *Historia Britonum*, a work which purports to be a history of Britain to the Saxon conquest. It has little historical value and there is much dispute concerning its origin. It has been ascribed to Gildas, to an Irish bishop of the ninth century known as Mark the Hermit, and to an anonymous writer. The later investigators believe it to be a compilation of various dates, in which Nennius may have taken part. If so, he is to be assigned to the close of the eighth or first half of the ninth century and was probably a monk of Wales. But information concerning him is late and doubtful and the work itself offers little that is conclusive. The best edition is by T. Mommsen in *Chronica minora*, iii. (*MGH*, *Auct. ant.*, xiii. 1898), Eng. transl. by J. A. Giles (London, 1841, and in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library*).

Bibliography: C. W. Scholl, *De ecclesiasticæ Britonum Scotorumque historiæ fontibus*, Berlin, 1851; W. F. Skene, *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, i. 37–41, Edinburgh, 1868; A. de la Borderie, *Études historiques bretonnes; l'historia Britonum attribuée à Nennius*, Paris, 1883; H. Zimmer, *Nennius vindicatus*, Berlin, 1893; idem, in *NA*, xix (1894), 436–443; the preface to Mommsen's edition, ut. sup.; R. Thurneysen, in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Theologie*, xxviii (1895), 80–113; F. Lot, in *Le Moyen Âge*, viii (1895), 177–184, ix (1896), 25–36; *DNB*, xl. 217–221.

NEOPHYTES (NOVICES): A term applied in the early Church to newly baptized Christians (I Tim. iii. 6). It was used especially during the "week of the neophytes," during which the newly baptized wore the white baptismal garments; it designated also the younger members of the congregation, and where a regular annual season for baptism was observed the members baptized during the last year seemed to have been termed neophytes. The "apostolic rule" (I Tim. iii. 6) that no neophyte could be a bishop is frequently repeated, and in the second Nicene canon of 325 this prohibition is made to include the priestly office. The rule was frequently violated, or at least considered capable of suspension, so that laymen were repeatedly chosen bishops, and Ambrose (q.v.) and Synesius (q.v.) were not even baptized when elected to the episcopate. In the East the rule was milder, Justinian enacting that a layman should be in orders at least three months before being made bishop (*Novellæ*, cxxiii. 1). (H. Achelis.)

NEOPLATONISM.

I. Character and Origin.
II. The System of Plotinus.
    Doctrine of the "One" (§ 1).
    The World-Soul (§ 2).
    Religion and Ethics (§ 3).
III. Further Development of Neoplatonism.
    Porphyry (§ 1).
    Jamblichus and Others (§ 2).
    The Athenian School (§ 3).

I. Character and Origin: Neoplatonism is the last development of Greek philosophy, in which the mind of antiquity, using many elements of the older systems, especially the Platonic, passed beyond the realistic tendencies of the Stoics and Epicureans, dogmatically conquered skepticism, and rose to a height of mystic speculation which was influenced partially by Oriental and Christian ideas. This speculation was directed principally upon the Godhead and the relation to it of mankind and the universe, though physics, ethics, and logic were not wholly neglected. The theosophic-mystical tendency which is apparent in Plato is responsible for a desertion, to a certain extent, of the path of scientific strictness of reasoning followed by the older Greek philosophers. In the historical development the Neoplatonists follow immediately upon the Neopythagoreans and the Pythagoreanizing or eclectic Platonists; but the Neoplatonist school had much more that was original and independent than the school which preceded it, bringing the sum total of knowledge into a new philosophic system. As a definite school, it originated in Alexandria, where the mixture of nationalities made for a fusion of earlier philosophic and religious tendencies. Its founder was Ammonius Saccas (q.v.), who had been brought up a Christian and had then returned to Hellenism. He left no written remains, and it is thus difficult to determine his exact relation to his successors. Among his pupils were Plotinus, the two Origens (the Neoplatonist and the Christian), and Longinus the critic. When Neoplatonism is mentioned in a general way, it connotes mainly the teaching of Plotinus (b. at Lycopolis, in Upper Egypt, 204; d. at Campania 270). After studying under Ammonius for some ten years he accompanied the Emperor Gordian in his campaign against the Persians, in order to learn something of their philosophy. In 244 he went to Rome and won numerous adherents to his teaching, among them the Emperor Gallienus and his wife Salonina. He taught here till about 268, retiring then to the country estate of a disciple in Campania. He did not reduce his doctrine to writing until toward the close of his life, and then did not publish it, leaving this to be done by his pupil Porphyry, who arranged the fifty-four treatises of the master in six *Enneades*, placing them in logical order from the simplest to the most abstruse—although he also gives their chronological sequence. They were first printed in a Latin translation by Marsilio Ficino at Florence in 1492, then in Greek and Latin at Basel, 1580.

II. The System of Plotinus: What principally distinguishes Plotinus from both Plato and his immediate predecessors is the assumption of a principle higher than the *nous*. This assumption proceeds from the requirement of unity as an attribute of the highest principle; the *nous*, as at once subject and object of perception, *nooun* and *nooumenon*, is twofold. Therefore something higher must be sought, which is absolute unity, the One, identical with the Godhead and wholly transcendent—the first cause, the source of all thinking and being, all the good and beautiful, and all activity. The utter transcendence of God being thus taught by Plotinus in a more extreme form than by any of his predecessors, he admits the insolubility by human reason of the most difficult of all metaphysical problems—how becoming arose out of immutable being and plurality out of unity. The theory of Emanation (q.v.), which he accepts, does not answer the question; but, following Plato, he suggests that the explanation may be found in the goodness or benevolence of God. All other beings produce yet others; and how should the most perfect of all beings, the primal goodness and the highest power, remain absorbed in itself as though impotent to produce? This, of course, is rather an anthropomorphic-ethical than a metaphysical explanation; an attempt to supply the latter is found in the view that the highest being is over-full, and, as the higher, does not precisely contain the lower in itself but allows it to flow forth from its superabundant perfection. This doctrine may possibly show oriental influence; but the idea of emanation occurs in the Stoic teaching, and still more in Philo, though in neither so fully developed as with Plotinus.

1. Doctrine of the "One."

2. The World-Soul.

That which first issues from the One is the *nous*, which is conscious of being a product and image of the One and receives from its relation to the One its power to produce other existences. It is not mere thought but actual being, comprehending all things as the genus comprehends the species. It contains the ideas, contrary to the teaching of Plato, who conceived it as being contained in one of them, that of good. Another difference is that whereas Plato asserted the existence of ideas only for such objects as had a common concept or name, Plotinus attributes them to all single existences. From the *nous* proceeds further the soul, the third principle. As the highest principle has neither thought nor consciousness, so the *nous*, which is purely contemplative, has no reflective, logical thought. This is the work of the world-soul, which is the link between the intelligible and the phenomenal world, carrying on the process of emanation down to its lowest terms. Matter is conceived by Plotinus not exactly as an emanation from the world-soul, but rather (as with Plato) in the guise of a receptive or passive principle in contrast to the formative or active. What the world-soul sees in the *nous*, with that it is pervaded and that it strives to reproduce. The content of the soul descends to lower stages. This content is composed of the ideas; and thus in the image of the *nous* and soul images of the ideas are also contained. These are the *logoi*, concepts, whose sum, the *Logos par excellence*, like the world-soul itself, is an emanation from the *nous*. These *logoi* are the essential factor in the giving of form to matter, which is formed in an organic, not a mechanical, manner. This formative process presupposes purpose, but not knowledge or deliberation—just as in Heraclitus all becoming takes place on rational principles, yet without any conscious foresight. If everything, therefore, is formed and pervaded by rational powers, the world-soul with its content permeating all, all must be rational or reason. Although the *logoi* are lower than their prototypes, and their relations with formless matter go lower still, yet Plotinus finds in the world of phenomena traces of the highest; the absolutely Good and Beautiful is visible even in the world of sense. The spirit of Plato, as expressed in the close of the *Timæus*, the idea that the sensible world is a great and beautiful and perfect thing, dominates Plotinus also, so that in spite of matter producing evil, he is far from regarding this world as evil or hateful, representing rather in this point the general optimism of Greek philosophy than the tendency of the early Christian writers to despise the visible world. On the whole, in his explanation of the existence of evil in the universe and his justification of the higher powers in respect to it, he follows the Stoics.

3. Religion and Ethics.

From the world-soul proceed individual souls, but they are not parts of it. Going down into bodies, they have forgotten the higher, the divine, from which they came, and have believed themselves independent; thus they have gone continually lower, and stand in need of a return to the better; but Plotinus does not make it plain whether this can be executed with freedom by men. The ethical goal is sometimes represented, after Plato, as approximation to the Godhead, sometimes in a more Aristotelian fashion as operation in conformity with the nature of the operator, and again, with Heraclitus and the Stoics, as obedience to reason. Among the virtues Plotinus distinguishes first the "political" or social, which are the four commonly accepted by the Greeks—prudence, courage, temperance, and justice; but these can not make the soul like God. Above them are the purifying virtues, which have that effect. They consist in freeing oneself as far as possible from the body and from sin by an avoidance of what is sensual, though without any exaggerated asceticism. Man, however, is not to be satisfied by mere freedom from sin, but must strive actually to become God. To this end serve the deifying virtues, which are the reproduction on a higher plane of the primary or political virtues. Through these the true nature of man comes to its fulfilment; and thus his beatitude consists in the maintenance of his proper attitude toward himself, undisturbed by external happenings or relations. The supreme aim, indeed, with Plotinus as with Philo, lies not in the realm of thought (as the detailed exposition of the deifying virtues might suggest), but in ecstatic elevation to

the highest good, to the Godhead. Logical knowledge is only a preliminary to this, which consists in immediate knowledge of and union with God. To this Plotinus himself, according to the testimony of Porphyry, attained only four times in the six years that the disciple was with him. The reason why man on earth can not remain permanently in this state is that he has not yet succeeded in turning wholly away from the earthly; the time of permanent union will come when he is no longer tormented by any restlessness of the body. On the immortality of the soul Plotinus wrote a separate treatise, in which he follows Plato in the main, especially emphasizing the fact that the soul, as incorporeal and incomposite, is incapable of dissolution. A reunion of soul and body in the higher life is inconceivable to him, since the passage into this higher life is conditioned by the desertion of the body, whose nature is in essential opposition to that of the soul.

III. Further Development of Neo-Platonism:

1. Porphyry.

Among the disciples of Plotinus the most important was Porphyry (q.v.; b. at Batanea, Syria, 233; d. in Rome c. 304), the head of the Syrian school. He wrote lives of Plotinus and Pythagoras, treatises *De abstinentia* and *De antro nympharum*, a letter to Marcella, another *De diis dæmonibus ad Anebonem*, a brief compendium of the doctrines of Plotinus entitled *Aphormai pros ta noēta*, and an introduction to the "Categories" of Aristotle, besides a number of other works not now extant. The work last named is of considerable importance in the history of philosophy, as it contains the germ of the whole controversy between realism and nominalism. The religious character of Porphyry's philosophy is shown by his placing its aim in the "saving of the soul." He mentions four kinds of virtues: the political, which make an ordinary good man; the purifying, which make him a "dæmonic" man; those which look up to the *nous*, their cause, constituting the rational activity of the soul; and the virtue of the *nous* itself, the paradigmatic. Connected with the purification on which he insists so strongly is the strict asceticism which he recommends, including abstinence from meat and from sexual intercourse. He asserts that he has reached once, but only once, and that when he was sixty-eight, the height of his desire, being permitted to approach and to be united with the most high God. While he regarded the national religions as justifiable, making no distinction between those of the Greeks and those of the barbarians, he opposed strongly the complete novelty of Christianity in his fifteen books "Against the Christians," which were totally destroyed by Theodosius II. in 335. This work is an indication that the Neoplatonists felt the whole Hellenic system and their own position to be threatened by Christianity. It was considered of so much importance that replies were published by Methodius and Eusebius of Cæsarea among others.

2. Jamblichus and Others.

The sober character of Neoplatonism was lost in the soaring speculations of Jamblichus (b. in Cœle-Syria c. 283; d. at Alexandria c. 330). In his belief in magic, miracles, and theurgy, or the art of compelling demons and other supernatural powers to produce desired results, he goes beyond all measure. His miracle-seeking followers believed him a being of a superior order, and called him "the Divine" or "Divinest." Besides his principal work, the *Synagōgē tōn Pythagoreiōn dogmatōn*, five others are extant, of which the most important are the *Vita Pythagorica* and the *Adhortatio ad philosophiam*. The treatise *De mysteriis*, said to have been ascribed to him by Proclus, is certainly not his, but probably belongs to some member of his school. Jamblichus attempted to justify the whole polytheistic system, and added a still more absolutely primal and exalted One above the One of Plotinus. The lower powers are divided into a long series of hierarchies, described with a Pythagorean fondness for exact numbers. With the whole theurgic system is connected the belief that images of the gods, whether fallen from heaven or made by men, partake of divinity and are capable of working miracles. The surest method for winning the divine protection is by prayer, which the gods can hear apart from any tangible medium. The return to the suprasensual world is made by means of the virtues, of which at first Jamblichus adopted the fourfold classification of Porphyry, afterward adding a fifth class, the priestly or simple virtues (simple as referring directly to the One), by which the soul rises to mystic union with the Supreme. Among the disciples of Jamblichus the most independent thinker was Theodorus of Asine. Others of the Syrian school were Dexippus, Ædesius of Cappadocia, who long conducted a flourishing school at Pergamum, Chrysanthius of Sardis, and Eunapius, known by his biographies of philosophers and sophists. A singular combination of learning and attractiveness won wide renown for Hypatia (q.v.). Her disciple and admirer Synesius (q.v.) showed a great deal of Neoplatonist influence in his writings.

3. The Athenian School.

The Athenian school was later in time than the Syrian, and devoted itself rather to scientific efforts, especially the exposition of Plato and Aristotle. Its first leader was Plutarch of Athens, head of the school there until 433, who seems to have followed Plotinus closely. His successor was Syrianus (until about 450), who was succeeded in his turn by Proclus the Lycian. He remained the head of the school until his death in 485. His principal works are his commentaries on Plato (especially on the *Timæus* and the *Republic*), the *Stoicheiōsis theologikē*, and the *Peri tēs kata Platona theologias*. He undoubtedly deserves the second place in importance among the Neoplatonists for breadth of knowledge and dialectical power and acuteness. He attempted like the later scholastics to reduce the entire philosophical tradition to a complete logical system. He regarded the Platonic writings in the light of a revelation, but paid much attention also to Homer and Hesiod, and had an unbounded reverence for Jamblichus, on whom, with Plotinus, he depends for a large part of his system. Of less importance are his successors at Athens, Marinus, Zenodotus, Isidore of Alexandria, Hegias, and Damascius. In 529 the teaching of philosophy at Athens was suppressed by Justinian and the property of the school confiscated. Two years later, Damascius, with Simplicius, the well-known commentator on Aristotle, and five other Neoplatonists, went to Persia in the hope of finding in King Chosroes a friend of philosophy, but were grievously disappointed and returned to Athens in 533. From this time on the efforts of those who were interested in such matters tended more and more to limit themselves to the exposition of earlier philosophers, especially Plato and Aristotle.

The final dissolution of Neoplatonism was due partly to its unbounded recklessness of speculation and partly to the moral and religious force of Christianity, which borrowed what was most valuable of the Neoplatonist system and breathed new life into it. Augustine, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Scotus Erigena (qq.v.) were particularly influenced by it, and through the two latter both the mystical and the pantheistic movements of the Middle Ages received much of their direction. Neoplatonism had a marked revival at the Renaissance, especially through Marsilius Ficinus and Pico della Mirandola (qq.v.); and through Giordano Bruno (q.v.) in particular it has come down to modern times in one form or another, being discoverable by an acute analysis in the theories of Schelling, Fichte, Hegel, and other leading nineteenth-century philosophers. (M. HEINZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is treated from three different standpoints in three kinds of works: (1) in those on the history of philosophy such as: B. Erdmann, Eng. transl., London, 1893; W. Windelband, Eng. transls. of two works, New York, 1893, London, 1900; A. Weber, London, 1896 (an excellent manual); F. Ueberweg, ed. M. Heinze, vol. ii., Berlin, 1905; (2) in the works on the church history of the period; and (3) in works on the history of dogma. To these general works the student is therefore referred. For special treatment of the subject consult: C. Bigg, *Neoplatonism*, London, 1895; T. Whittaker, *The Neo-Platonists*, Cambridge, 1901; C. Elsee, *Neoplatonism in Relation to Christianity*, New York, 1908; K. P. Hasse, *Von Plotin zu Goethe. Die Entwicklung des neuplatonischen Einheitsgedankens zur Weltanschauung der Neuzeit*, Leipsic, 1909; and cf. E. Zeller, *History of Eclecticism*, London, 1883.

On the members of this school, for **Plotinus** consult: his *Opera*, ed. A. Kirchhoff, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1856, Eng. transl. of select works, by T. Taylor, London, 1794, 1834; of his *De pulchritudine*, by T. Taylor, ib. 1787; *Two Books on the Essence of Soul, and One on the Descent of Soul*, by T. M. Johnson, Osceola, Mo., 1880; Selections from the "Enneads" in Germ. transl. by O. Kieser, 2 vols., Jena, 1905. Consult: J. Simon, *Hist. de l'école d'Alexandrie*, 2 vols., Paris, 1846; A. Daunas, *Plotin et sa doctrine*, ib. 1848; C. H. Kirchner, *Die Philosophie des Plotin*, Halle, 1854; A. Richter, *Neuplatonische Studien*, 5 parts, Halle, 1864–67; M. Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, pp. 306–329, Leipsic, 1872; H. von Kleist, *Plotinische Studien*, Heidelberg, 1883; H. F. Müller, *Dispositionen zu den drei ersten Enneaden des Plotin*, Bremen, 1883; A. Lang, *Lessons on Literature*, pp. 92–101, London, 1889; K. S. Guthrie, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, Philadelphia, 1896; O. Gollwitzer, *Plotins Lehre von der Willensfreiheit*, Kempten, 1900; A. Drews, *Plotin und der Untergang der antiken Weltanschauung*, Jena, 1907. For **Porphyry**: his *Opera tria*, ed. A. Nauck, Leipsic, 1860; *Opuscula*, ed. Nauck, ib. 1886; Eng. transl. of his select works by T. Taylor, London, 1823, of his work on abstinence by S. Hibberd, ib. 1851, and of his sentences by T. Davidson, in *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, iii (1869), 46–73; N. Bouillet, *Porphyre: son rôle dans l'école néoplatonicienne*, Paris, 1864; M. Haupt, *Marci Diaconi vita Porphyriis*, Berlin, 1875; A. J. Kleffner, *Porphyrius der Neuplatoniker und Christenfeind*, Paderborn, 1896. For **Jamblichus**: his *De vita pythagorica*, ed. under the direction of the St. Petersburg Academy, St. Petersburg, 1884; his *De mysteriis*, ed. G. Parthey, Berlin, 1857, Eng. transl. by T. Taylor, Chiswick, 1821; his *Adhortatio ad philosophiam*, Lat. text ed. H. Pistelli, Leipsic, 1888, the Gk. text ed. the same, ib. 1894; H. Dodwell, *De fide et ætate Jamblichus*, in his *Exercitationes . . . de ætate Pythagori*, London, 1704; J. Simon, ut sup., ii. 187–265; E. Vacherot, *Hist. critique de l'école d'Alexandrie*, ii. 57–65, 126–146, Paris, 1846; G. C. A. von Harless, *Das Buch von den ägyptischen Mysterien*, Munich, 1858; A. Wilden, *Jamblichos on the Mysteries*, in *The Platonist*, Aug., 1885–July, 1887. On **Ammonius**: the *Aristotelis vita*, ed. in *Diogenis Laertii de . . . philosophorum vitis*, Gk. and Lat., Paris, 1850; *Fragments conservés par Nemesius*, ed. M. N. Bouillet in *Les Enneades de Plotin*, ib. 1857; L. J. Dehaut, *Essai historique sur la vie et la doctrine d'Ammonius Saccas*, Brussels, 1836; E. E. Vacherot, ut sup.; E. Zeller, in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, vii (1894), 295–312. Consult also the convenient compend *Plotina opera omnia, Porphyrii liber de vita Plotini cum Marsilii Ficini commentariis et ejusdem interpretatione castigata, annotationem in unum librum Plotini et in Porphyrium attitit Daniel Wyttenbach, apparatum criticum disposuit, indices concinnavit G. H. Moser, ad fidem codicum MSS. et in novæ recensionis modum Græca Latinaque emendavit indices explevit, prolegomena introductiones, annotationes, explicandis rebus ac verbis itemque Nicephori Nathanaelis antitheticum Adversus Plotinum et Dialogum Græci scriptoris anonymi ineditum de anima adjecit F. Creuzer*, 3 vols., London, 1835.

NEOSTADIENSIUM ADMONITIO: The most important of the replies evoked by the Formula of Concord. The brief enforced return of Heidelberg to Lutheranism under the Elector Louis (1576–83) obliged the Reformed to flee to Neustadt, where they found themselves obliged to defend their beliefs against the Lutheran doctrines; Ursinus accordingly wrote, in their name, the *Admonitio* (Neustadt, 1581, found also in his *Opera*, vol. ii., Heidelberg, 1612). Its twelve chapters contain a presentation of the Reformed doctrines, a refutation of the principles advanced in the Formula of Concord, and a critique of the Augsburg Confession and Luther. The distinctive Reformed tenets discussed are Christology, communion, and predestination. The two natures of Christ are declared to be both united and distinct, the personal union consisting "in the subsistence and constitution of substance of a single person." Fellowship with Christ in the communion is regarded as given only through faith, thus excluding all idea of the real presence. The treatment of predestination is chiefly a sharper definition of the views advanced more vaguely and incorrectly by the Lutherans. The Latin edition of the *Admonitio* was soon followed by one in German, and the work naturally called forth several refutations, especially by Selnecker, Chemnitz, and Timotheus Kirchner, which were answered in the *Examen recitationum Nicolai Selnecceri* (1582) and the *Defensio admonitionis Neostadianæ contra apologiæ Erfurtensis sophismata* (1586). Throughout this period Neustadt was the Reformed center, and the place of publication of a number of the writings of the theologians of Anhalt and Bremen.

(E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Schweizer, *Die protestantischen Centraldogmen*, i. 491 sqq., Zurich, 1854; R. Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, pp. 432 sqq., Elberfeld, 1857; H. Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, iv. 277 sqq., Marburg, 1859.

NEPOMUK. See JOHN OF NEPOMUK.

NEPOS, nī'pes: Egyptian bishop before the middle of the third century. He is known from the attack by Dionysius of Alexandria on his lost "Refutation of the Allegorists" in the second book of the *Peri Epangeliōn*. From this it is clear that the chiliasts in Arsinoe regarded the works of Nepos as irrefragable proof of the future reign of Christ on earth and of the realistic interpretation of the Apocalypse. According to Gennadius (*De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, lv.), Nepos held that after the resurrection of the righteous there would be throughout the millennium a world of the unconverted, which would war upon the just at the expiration of the thousand years, only to be destroyed by God. Nepos was also a writer of hymns, and seems to have been an excellent exegete. His position represented the conflict between the eschatology of the early Church and the spiritualizing tendency of Origen; but the Nepotians mentioned by Fulgentius (*MPG*, lxv. 709) were at most mere chiliasts, having no organic affiliations with the doctrines of Nepos. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VII., xxiv.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 261 sqq.; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, ii. 152–167, 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762–85; *DCB*, iv. 23; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ii. 404–405, 564–565.

NERGAL, ner′gal: The patron deity of the Babylonian city Cutha, forming from the Assyrian period a political triad with Marduk of Babylon and Nebo of Bursippa. Nergal, who appears in the Assyrian lists of gods as Ne-uru-gal ("Lord of the Great Dwelling," i.e., of the dead), was the divinity of the burning heat of the sun, then of war and the chase, of disease (especially fever) and pestilence, and above all of the realm of the dead, of which his temple (yet undiscovered) was a copy. He was identified with the unlucky planet Saturn, but later was confused with Mars (cf. the Mandæan names Nirig and Nargil, "Mars"; see Mandæans). As the god of the glowing sun Nergal was represented as a lion, a symbol of the sun common throughout eastern Asia, especially as during the dog-days the sun is in Leo. Nergal was known in Cyprus, Syria, and Sidon, the latter a center of his cult.

The Babylonian and Assyrian cult of Nergal is mentioned in II Kings xvii. 30; and in Isa. xxxv. 7 *sharabh* (R. V., "glowing sand") has been interpreted as an allusion to Nergal, especially as a Babylonian list of gods states that Nergal was called Sharrabu among the Amorites. Winckler (*Altorientalische Forschungen*, i. 293, Leipsic, 1893), reading *nergalim* for *nidhgaloth* (R. V., "army with banners") in Cant. vi. 4, 10, seeks to find here an allusion to Gemini, which was sacred to Nergal. The name of the deity occurs in the Old Testament as a component of the Babylonian Nergal-sharezer ("Nergal protect the king") in Jer. xxxix. 3, 13. See Babylonia, IV., § 10, VII., 2, § 8. (Alfred Jeremias.)

Bibliography: Consult, besides the pertinent literature under Babylonia: A. Jeremias, in W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, iii. 250–271, Leipsic, 1895; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 412 sqq.; P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, i. 303–305, Tübingen, 1905.

NERI, PHILIP, SAINT, AND THE ORATORIANS: The founder of the Roman Catholic order of Oratorians and his followers. The founder was born at Florence, Italy, July 22, 1515, and died at Rome May 26, 1595. In early childhood he showed marked evidence of piety, and in 1533 he went to Rome, where he studied with the Augustinians, at the same time practising works of asceticism, mercy, and religious instruction. On May 23, 1551, he was ordained to the priesthood in the church of St. John Lateran, and took an active part in the confraternities and other organizations evoked by the revival within the Roman Catholic Church for strengthening it and for saving the half-heathen populace in body and soul. He was one of the founders of the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, designed primarily for the care of strangers and the convalescent poor. St. Philip gathered old and young, priests and laymen, to meditations held each evening, which, after 1556, crystallized into definite form. The meditations were held in the evening in an oratory, where prayer, readings from the Bible, the Church Fathers, and histories of martyrs alternated with catechizings and hymns set to music more popular in character than the Gregorian chant. No address was allowed to exceed half an hour in length, and all rhetoric and casuistry was excluded. From his apologetic lectures delivered here, Baronius formed the nucleus of his immortal *Annales ecclesiastici*, and from the music here sung the "oratorio" had its rise. The house of the community breathed a spirit of friendliness, joyfulness, and service, and several times a week the founder and his friends visited the hospitals to tend the sick, neglecting no menial tasks either there or in their own house. St. Philip was firmly convinced that a joyous demeanor was far more suited to win souls to Christian virtue than a melancholy air. His apparent light-heartedness and sociability brought upon him the suspicion of more puritanical leaders of the Roman Catholic movement for reform, and he was accused before the cardinal vicar of Rome of seeking empty honors and striving for high-church offices under cover of his conferences. He bore with patience his suspension from hearing confession and from preaching, and the charge that he contemplated establishing a new sect was abruptly ended by the sudden death of the cardinal vicar. The accusations were later renewed, though without disturbing his somewhat whimsical humor, in which he seems to have sought to rebuke the pharisaical puritanism which held sway in Rome at the period. At the same time, he was capable of severe ascetic sternness, and it must be borne in mind that his biographers commonly ascribe his apparent levity to his humility and his determination to avoid all praise of men. He was thus curiously like the rigid Pope Sixtus V. (1585–1590), whose invincible humor likewise made a deep impression on the memory of the Roman people. Repeated efforts were made to induce St. Philip to accept the cardinal's hat, but in vain. Such was his influence, however, that when Clement VII. long refused to release Henry IV. of France from excommunication after his submission to the Church in 1593, St. Philip bade Baronius deny the pope absolution after his confession until he should grant it to Henry. Baronius obeyed in trembling, but

Life and Character of the Founder.

the desired absolution was soon given to the king, thus accomplishing what had been impossible for the entire French episcopate.

The Italian Oratory.

The Oratorians were confirmed by the pope in 1575 and again in 1612. All members were equal, the brethren even having legislative and judicial power over the superior. Government was by majority vote, and the members of the community were secular priests, bound by no vows, retaining their own property, and at liberty to withdraw at any time. They paid a certain amount monthly for the maintenance of their house, receiving only room-rent free. Nevertheless, their " Institution " contained many strict rules, such as a triweekly scourging in memory of the scourging borne by Christ for man (see FLAGELLATION; FLAGELLANTS); and the problems and cases of conscience considered at meals were designed especially for confessors. On the other hand, St. Philip wished his followers to restrict themselves to prayer, the administration of the sacrament, and preaching. He permitted the establishment of daughter houses unwillingly, but such institutions, once founded, were placed more or less under the jurisdiction of their respective bishops, so that the Oratorians have no general, no convention of delegates, and no central organization. The oratories of Naples and Milan were founded by Tarucci in 1586, almost contemporary with those at San Severino, Fermo, and Palermo, and these were quickly followed by others. Some years before his death, St. Philip resigned his place as superior to Baronius, though until his death he remained active as a confessor and in pastoral care, filled with the deepest humility to the last. In 1622 he was canonized. Among the distinguished members of the order which he founded were Baronius and Reynaldus (d. 1671), the brothers Thomas and Francis Bozius (d. 1610 and 1635; the former the first to declare that Luther committed suicide and to recount the terrible deaths of Œcolampadius, Butzer, Calvin, and others in his *De signis ecclesiæ*, Cologne, 1593), Antonius Gallonius (d. 1615; the author of the *De sanctorum martyrum cruciatibus*, Rome, 1594, and frequently), Giovanni Marciano, Andrea Gallandi (q.v.; the editor of the celebrated *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, 14 vols., Venice, 1765 sqq.), and Cardinal Capecelatro (q.v.). The English Oratorians established in 1849 included F. W. Faber (q.v.) and Cardinal J. H. Newman (q.v.).

The French Oratory.

A French oratory resembling the one founded by St. Philip was established at Paris in 1611 by Pierre de Bérulle, who was born 1575, and died at Paris Oct., 1629. Ordained to the priesthood in 1599 and created cardinal by Urban VIII. in 1627, he designed his order primarily to hear confessions and to give religious instruction. The French Oratorians were required to render to their respective bishops the same obedience as that given by the Jesuits to the pope, and the exaction of any monastic vow was expressly forbidden. Of Bérulle's successors the first two (Condren (1629–41) and Bourgoing (1641–62) contributed most, both to extend the congregation and to develop it. It was far more centralized than the Italian branch and had both a convention of delegates and a general, who later received coadjutors. It gained the enmity of the Jesuits, however, and later, after Jansen had invited Oratorians to settle in the Spanish Netherlands to teach strict Augustinian doctrines of sin and grace, became involved in the fortunes of Jansenism, besides being suspected of Cartesianism. Nevertheless, in 1760 the congregation possessed seventy-three houses, fifty-eight in France, eleven in Holland, two in Venaissin (a papal district in Provence), one in Savoy, and one in Liége, some of these being seminaries and others colleges (both in contradistinction to the Italian organization). So deeply did the French Oratorians resist the absolutism of Church and State in the eighteenth century, that at the outbreak of the Revolution some of them united with the nobler advocates of the upheaval. During the first half of the nineteenth century the congregation was in abeyance, but with the beginning of the second half it revived under the leadership of Pététot (d. 1887) and commenced to make progress toward its former standard of learning, its success being evinced by such Oratorians as Auguste Joseph Alphonse Gratry (q.v.) and H. de Valroger. The English Oratorians, already mentioned above, received many accessions from the Tractarian movement, and as early as 1850 had a house in each of the cities of Liverpool, London, and Birmingham. Here their organization favored their increase, being more in harmony with English traditions than the majority of Roman Catholic orders. They have materially aided the progress of Roman Catholicism in England, in part by their publication of the records of the Roman Catholic martyrs under the Tudors. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vitæ* by A. Gallonio (Ital., Rome, 1600, 1818; Lat., Mainz, 1602; Germ., Mainz, 1611) and G. Barnabei (Rome, 1622, 1703) are in *ASB*, May, vi. 460 sqq. Other lives are by: P. J. Bacci, Rome, 1622, 1837, Germ. transl., Regensburg, 1859; P. Guérin, Lyons, 1852; N. P. S. Wiseman, London, 1856; A. Capecelatro, 2 vols., Milan, 1884, Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1894; G. M. Zampini, Turin, 1884; C. Massini, Milan, 1894; Comtesse D'Estienne d'Orves, Paris, 1900; A. F. von Pechmann, Freiburg, 1900; F. Baset, Albi, 1902; and Antrobus, St. Louis, 1903; and in *KL*, ix. 213 sqq.

On the congregation consult: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 413–424; I. Marciano, *Memorie istoriche della Congreg. dell' Oratorio*, 5 vols., Naples, 1693–1703; C. A. de Villaroso, *Memorie degli scrittori Filippini*, 2 vols., ib. 1837–42; A. Perraud, *L'Oratoire de France*, Paris, 1865; J. de la Pasardière, *L'Oratoire de St. Philippe de Neri*, Draguignan, 1880.

NERO: Roman emperor from 54 to 68 A.D.; b. at Antium (38 m. s. of Rome) Dec. 15, 37; d. near Rome June 9, 68. His name is associated with the first great persecution of the Christians known to history, and immediately connected with the conflagration which swept over Rome for six days and nights, beginning with the night of July 19, 64. These events fall in the darkest period of Nero's life; and though it is uncertain how well founded were the popular suspicions and the direct accusations of Roman historians that he deliberately caused the fire, there is much evidence, such as his policy for rebuilding and beautifying the city, for believing them. At all events, the conflagration was atoned for by the blood of the Christians to avert the suspicions of the people from himself, after all other attempts to appease the populace had failed. The precise reason why the Christians were especially chosen as the victims is unclear. It is certain, however, that it was not jealousy of the Empress Poppæa for the alleged Christian mistress of Nero, Acte, as Aubé supposed; or a religious motive of making the Christians, as despising the Roman temples, an expiation for their destruction, as Renan held. Nor can Hilgenfeld's theory that the persecution was due to paganism's instinctive fear of its approaching doom be maintained, for Christianity was not yet regarded as in itself a "forbidden religion." It would seem, therefore, that a prime factor in the selection of the Christians was the popular hatred of Jews and of orientals in general, the Christians being involved because they were still regarded by the heathen as a Jewish sect. The situation was complicated, moreover, by the messianic expectations of the Jews which led them to proclaim divine judgment on the heathen and to see such a visitation in the burning of the metropolis of the world. On the other hand, the Christians, with their expectation of an immediate second advent, looked for the destruction of the world by fire (cf. Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, xi. 1; Rev. xviii. 9 sqq.); they thus afforded a ready basis for the suspicion that they had kindled the conflagration. The restriction of the accusation was not due to Jewish charges, as some have thought, but to the fact that, on the one hand, the Jewish population of Rome was so large and that the Jews were already intensely embittered against the Romans, and, on the other hand, that the Christians were regarded as the greatest fanatics and as guilty of grave vices, besides being the instigators of Jewish riots (cf. Suetonius, *Claudius*, xxv.). While the precise course of investigation is not absolutely certain, Tacitus (*Annales*, xv. 44) seems to imply that certain Christians were first arrested, and that in consequence of their statements the Christians were seized and condemned *en masse*, their mere adherence to Christianity and their alleged hatred of all the rest of the human race being regarded as sufficient evidence of guilt, without proving their actual incendiary acts in every case.

The execution of the Christians was made a festival of the Roman populace. In Nero's gardens, the present Place of St. Peter's, some were crucified or sewn in skins and torn by dogs, and others were rolled in pitch and burned at night as living torches. According to Tacitus, moreover, Nero himself appeared as a charioteer at the circus games given in connection with these executions and mingled with the people; yet even so he was unable to avert the suspicion among the populace that the Christians were not being sacrificed to the public weal but to the cruelty of an individual.

It is clear from Tacitus and Suetonius, notwithstanding the assertions of Orosius (vii. 7) and Sulpicius Severus (ii. 28), that the persecution was restricted to Rome; nor is the allusion to the martyrdom of Antipas at Pergamus in Rev. ii. 13 sufficient evidence for a more general persecution. But though the actual scene of the Neronian persecution was local, its effects were far-reaching. In the burning of the great metropolis and the bloody reaction of paganism against Christianity was seen the approaching end of the world, and this belief was confirmed by the events of the years following—the fall and death of Nero, the Jewish war, and the savage internecine strife for the throne of the Cæsars. Nero's demoniac figure became interwoven in the eschatology of the time (cf. Rev. xviii.). Escaping from his murderers, or, in another version, raised from the dead, he was to return as Antichrist to wage the last great war of annihilation against the followers of Christ, only to be crushed by the Messiah appearing in judgment.

(ROBERT PÖHLMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. T. Klette, *Die Christenkatastrophe unter Nero nach ihren Quellen*, Tübingen, 1907; B. Aubé, in *Comptes rendus de l'académie des inscriptions*, 1866, pp. 194 sqq.; idem, *Hist. des persecutions de l'église*, p. 421, Paris, 1875; E. Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, chaps. vi.–viii., Paris, 1873, Eng. transl., London, 1889; T. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, pp. 171–181, Zurich, 1878; idem, *Rom und das Christenthum*, pp. 132 sqq., ib. 1881; G. Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, pp. 241–250, New York, 1879; C. F. Arnold, *Die neronische Christenverfolgung*, Leipsic, 1888; A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 627 sqq., New York, 1897; Schaff, *Christian Church*, i. 376–390; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ed. J. B. Bury, ii. 79 sqq.; articles in *ZWT*, by Hilgenfeld, xii (1869), 421 sqq., xxx (1890), 223 sqq., by Hildebrand, xvii (1874), 94 sqq.; and by E. Zeller, xxxiv (1891), 357 sqq.; and in general, works on the church history of the apostolic period and on the history of the Roman empire

NERSES, ner′siz: The name of several Armenian prelates.

1. **Nerses I. "The Great":** Armenian catholicos; b. of royal (Arsacidan) lineage—also a direct descendant of Gregory the Illuminator (q.v.)—at Vagharshabad (now a village near Echmiadzin) c. 310; d. after 381. He studied in Greece and returning became chamberlain of King Arshak. King and people united in urging him to renounce civil and military pursuits and honors and to assume the duties first of bishop (c. 364) and afterward of catholicos or patriarch (c. 366). He was active alike in combating heathenism, which still survived, and the more primitive forms of Christianity, which resisted the intrusion of Greek doctrine and practise. In the interest of the Church he founded schools and charitable institutions. He was sent as an ambassador by King Arshak to the Emperor Valentinian I. and was able to restore amicable relations between these rulers. He failed in a similar embassy to the Emperor Valens, whose Arianism he disapproved, and was banished by him to a desert island, where he was obliged to remain until liberated by the Emperor Theodosius the Great (381), who recalled him to Constantinople and detained him for awhile to participate in the second ecumenical council. Returning to Armenia he found that he had been supplanted by Chad of Bagravand and was out of favor with the king. Still more unfriendly were his relations with the succeeding King Pap, who is said to have caused his death by poison (384). If Moses of Chorene is correct in stating that Nerses was catholicos for thirty-four years, he must have been installed about 350, which is several years earlier than other authorities indicate.

2. **Nerses II.:** Armenian catholicos 524–533. He was called "Nerses of Ashtarak" from his native town in Bagravand. A reforming synod was

held by him in 527 at Tvin (Dwin). See NESTORIANS, § 3.

3. Nerses III.: Catholicos 640–661; d. 661. He was called "the builder" because he rebuilt Tvin, the patriarchal city that had been destroyed by the Arabs. He lived in troublous times, when Greeks and Arabs alike were seeking to subjugate the Armenians. During a short interval of peace he held a synod at Tvin in which the Chalcedonian symbol was rejected. A successful Arab invasion (646) led the Emperor Constans II. to march an army into Armenia. Nerses met him and succeeded in pacifying him, but was obliged to accept the Chalcedonian symbol. After the emperor's departure another synod (648) requested him to give the Armenians freedom to accept or reject the Chalcedonian symbol. Nerses now lost his popularity by adhering to that statement of faith and retired from Tvin in 649, leaving the anti-Chalcedonian party in control. After this the Arabs again gained possession of the country, and, the anti-Chalcedonian leader Theodorus having died, Nerses returned to Tvin (654) and resumed the ecclesiastical leadership.

4. Nerses IV.: Catholicos 1166–73; b. about 1098; d. Aug., 1173. Of royal lineage and princely birth, he was early dedicated to the Christian ministry and was carefully educated under the guidance of his elder brother, the Catholicos Gregory III., and later of Stephen, abbot of the "Red Monastery." In 1135 he was ordained priest and soon afterward elevated to the episcopate. At a synod at Rom-Klah, held shortly before his death, Gregory, with the approval of the synod, consecrated Nerses his successor. Before this time Nerses had become deeply interested in the question of union with the Greek Church and just after his brother's death received from the Emperor Manuel I. an invitation to visit Constantinople in this interest. He was unable to accept the invitation, but wrote approvingly of union (*Opera*, i. 195–204, Venice, 1873). A second embassy from the emperor (1170) led to another synod at Rom-Klah and further union measures (*Opera*, i. 231–238). As a result of other overtures from the emperor (1173) nine points that had been in dispute between Greeks and Armenians were agreed upon (excommunication of all Monophysite leaders—Eutyches, Dioscurus, and others; acknowledgment of two natures, wills, and energies in Christ united in one personality; omission of the words "who was crucified" in the Trisagion [see THEOPASCHITES]; celebration of the Greek festivals on the dates fixed by the Eastern Church; olive-oil to be used in the preparation of the myrrh for unction; leavened bread and wine mixed with water to be used in the eucharist; laity as well as clergy to remain in church during communion and divine service; acknowledgment of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh ecumenical councils; the catholicos to be appointed by the Greek emperor). Before the negotiations were completed he died. Nerses was an eloquent speaker and an elegant writer. He wrote a commentary on Matthew and many minor exegetical pieces, and a number of somewhat elaborate doctrinal tracts and letters. Several occasional discourses have been preserved. His most widely known work is his collection of short prayers for every hour of the day and night. This has been translated into thirty-six languages and frequently published in this polyglot form (e.g., Venice, 1882). By his poetry he gained literary renown. Besides many shorter poems, an epic on the history of Armenia, an elegy on the destruction of Edessa by the sultan of Aleppo, and a long religious poem, "Jesus the Son," have been preserved (Venice, 1824). The Armenians regard him as their national Homer. He is said to have introduced riming into Armenian.

5. Nerses of Lambron: Archbishop of Tarsus; b. 1133; d. July 14, 1198. He was son of a prince and on his mother's side a scion of the royal house of Arshak, also a nephew of Nerses IV., by whom at the age of sixteen he was ordained priest. When eighteen years of age he was offered an abbacy and a bishopric. These preferments he declined in favor of a long course of study with his teacher Stephen in a desert place. In 1176 he reluctantly accepted the archbishopric of Tarsus and Lambron and the abbacy of Skyrra. He was a highly gifted writer in prose and verse and was not devoid of statesmanship. In 1179, at the request of the Catholicos Gregory, he participated in a synod at Rom-Klah called in the interest of union with the Greek Church. He spoke in favor of union and had the concurrence of the synod; but the death of the Emperor Manuel (1180) prevented its consummation. These efforts at union resulted from considerations of political expediency rather than from theological conviction, and when (1190) Frederick Barbarossa approached the borders of Cilicia, Nerses accompanied the catholicos and the governor of Cilicia to meet him, evidently hoping to form an alliance with the Western Empire and the Latin Church. Frederick died before they reached the German army. Negotiations with the Latins embittered the Greeks against the Armenians, whom they stigmatized as Eutychians. In 1193 union with the Latins was consummated by the Cilician Armenians, Leo, the governor, having been made king by the Latins and twelve Roman bishops, of whom Nerses was first, having been recognized. Nerses was highly honored by Greeks, Latins, and Syrians, as well as by his own people. He was sometimes designated "the second Apostle Paul of Tarsus." But this high praise is hardly deserved, and he seems to have been more of a politician than of an apostle or theologian. He was familiar with the Latin, Greek, Syriac, and Coptic languages and translated a number of works from these languages into Armenian. He wrote several commentaries and many practical works, drawing largely from the writings of Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Egyptian fathers. Among his poetical works is a somewhat lengthy necrology of his uncle Nerses IV. (St. Petersburg, 1782).

A. H. NEWMAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: In general consult: F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, pp. 222–225, Marburg, 1895 (refers to others bearing names of Nerses and gives literature); M. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1345, 1375, 1399, Paris, 1740. On Nerses I. consult: J. B. Chabot, *Narsai le docteur et les origines de l'école de Nisibis d'après la chronique de Barḥadbesabbe* in *JA*, vi. 157–177; F. X. E. Albert, *The School of Nisibis, its History and Statutes*, in *Catholic Uni-*

versity Bulletin, xii., 2, pp. 160–181. In addition, on Nerses IV.: his writings were edited by the Mechitarists in Armenian with Latin translation, Venice, 1830; a collection of his letters (excerpts in Mai, *Nova collectio*, vi. 415–424) appeared in Echmiadzin, 1865; and the encomium of him by Nerses of Lambron, ib. 1875; *Liber superiorum . . . Mar Narætis homiliæ in Joseph, documenta patrum de quibusdam veræ fidei dogmatibus*, ed. P. Bedjan, Leipsic, 1901. Consult: J. S. Assemanni, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, ii. 364–365, Rome, 1719; Arsak Ter-Mikaelian, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen (4.–13. Jahrhundert)*, pp. 88 sqq., Leipsic, 1892. On Nerses of Lambron consult: S. C. Malan, *Life and Times of Gregory the Illuminator*, pp. 35–36, London, 1868; C. F. Neumann, *Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur*, p. 148, Leipsic, 1836; Ter-Mikaelian, *Nerses. Das armenische Hymnarium. Studien zu seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipsic, 1905; *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, in *TS*, viii. 1 (1909); and the literature under ARMENIA.

NERVA, MARCUS COCCEIUS: Roman emperor from Sept. 18, 96, to Jan. 27, 98; b. at Narnia (40 m. n. of Rome), Umbria, 32; d. at Rome Jan. 27, 98. [He came of a family eminent as jurists, father and grandfather both having followed with distinction that profession. His own training was civil rather than military. These facts have bearing upon the character of his relations to the Christians as indicated below.] Proclaimed emperor immediately after the assassination of Domitian, probably in accord with a previous understanding, his reign was characterized by mildness. Domitian had already ceased persecuting the Christians and recalled the fugitives, who actually returned under Nerva (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xix. 20; Tertullian, *Apol.*, v.; Dio Cassius, lxviii. 1). He also stopped the abuses of the informers, forbade all complaints against Jewish practises, and abrogated the fiscal disabilities of the Jews (among whom the Christians were included). The legal status of Christianity, however, remained unchanged; and the reign of Nerva marked for them the transition from persecutions of caprice, such as those of Nero and Domitian, to those begun by Trajan, based upon the execution of existing law.

(G. UHLHORN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Peter, *Geschichte Roms unter den Kaisern*, iii. 507, Halle, 1871; B. Aubé, *Hist. des persecutions de l'église*, i. 195 sqq., Paris, 1875; K. Wieseler, *Die Christenvervolgungen der Christen*, pp. 12 sqq., Gütersloh, 1878; A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, p. 73, New York, 1899; and the works on the church history of the period and on the history of the Roman empire.

NESTLE, nĕst″lê′, **CHRISTOF EBERHARD:** German Lutheran; b. at Stuttgart May 1, 1851. He was educated at the theological seminaries at Blaubeuren and Tübingen and at the universities of Tübingen (Ph.D., 1874) and Leipsic (1874–75), after which he spent two years in further study in England. He was then a tutor at the Evangelical theological seminary at Tübingen (1877–80), deacon at Münsingen, Württemberg (1880–83), gymnasial professor at Ulm (1883–90, again 1893–98), and provisional supply for the vacant professorship of Semitic languages at the University of Tübingen (1890–93). Since 1898 he has been professor in the Evangelical theological seminary at Maulbronn, Württemberg. Theologically he is an adherent of the mediating school. He has written: *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Haarlem, 1876); *Conradi Pellicani de modo legendi atque intelligendi Hebræum* (Tübingen, 1877); *Psalterium tetraglottum, Græce, Syriace, Chaldaice, Latine* (Leyden, 1879); *Psalmi Chaldaice et Syriace* (Tübingen, 1879); *Psalterium Syriacum* (1879); *Brevis linguæ Syriacæ grammatica* (Carlsruhe, 1880); *Veteris Testamenti Græci codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati* (Leipsic, 1881); *Syrische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1888; really a translation and second edition of the Latin Syriac grammar; Eng. transl. by A. R. S. Kennedy, 1889); *De sancta cruce, ein Beitrag zur christlichen Legendengeschichte* (1889); *Septuagintastudien* (4 parts, Ulm and Maulbronn, 1886–1903); *Marginalien und Materialien* (Tübingen, 1893); *Novi Testamenti Græci supplementum* (Leipsic, 1896); *Philologica sacra, Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1896); and *Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament* (Tübingen, 1897, 3d ed., 1909; Eng. transl. by W. Edie, London, 1901). He edited the sixth and seventh editions of Tischendorf's *Septuaginta* (Leipsic, 1880, 1887) the Syriac version of Plutarch's *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* (London, 1894), an edition of the Greek and German New Testament since 1898, and an excellent edition of the Latin and Greek-Latin New Testament since 1906.

NESTOR: Russian monk of the eleventh century, incorrectly regarded as the earliest Russian annalist. According to his own statements, he entered the cave-monastery of Kief shortly after the death of Abbot Theodosius in 1074, where he was soon ordained deacon or archdeacon, and where he wrote his "Readings from the Life and Death of the Blessed Martyrs Boris and Gleb" and "Life of the Abbot Theodosius"; both works are characterized by edifying material and rhetoric rather than by history. The first Russian historical writer, however, was Jacob a monk of the same cloister, possibly identical with the priest Jacob, who seems to have come from the monastery of Boris and Gleb in Pereiaslaf, whom Abbot Theodosius on his death-bed desired for his successor. Before 1072 Jacob wrote his "Account of the Martyrdom and Eulogy of the Murdered Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb," and his "Memorial and Eulogy of the Russian Prince Wolodimer."

As early as the middle of the thirteenth century the oldest Russian annals became connected with the name of Nestor; wrongly, however, for the annalist expressly states that he was an inmate of the monastery in the lifetime of Theodosius. He was apparently born at Kief, and entered the cloister shortly after 1065, when seventeen years of age. He was, in all probability, Silvester, abbot of the monastery of St. Michael, who in 1116 stated that he had written the annals in question. Though borrowing from John Malalas and Gregorius Hamartolus, this pioneer Russian historian adhered strictly to the simpler annalistic form.

(N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Chronica Nestoris*, ed. F. Miklosich, pp. 183–186, Vienna, 1860; L. Leger, *La Chronique dite de Nestor*, Paris, 1884; P. Strahl, *Beiträge zur russischen Kirchengeschichte*, Halle, 1827; J. J. Sreznevskij, "The Narratives concerning the Holy Boris and Gleb," St. Petersburg, 1860 (in Russian); Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 35, 356–357, 408.

NESTORIANS.

Rise in Persia (§ 1).
Diffusion in Arabia, India, and China (§ 2).
Varying Fortunes (§ 3).
Under Mohammedans and Mongols (§ 4).
Persecutions; Rapprochement with Rome (§ 5).
History from the Sixteenth Century (§ 6).
Kurdish Nestorians (§ 7).
Nestorians of India (§ 8).

In the Christological controversies of the fifth century (see CHRISTOLOGY, V., and references given there) the East Syrian Church adopted and developed independently the doctrines ascribed to Nestorius (q.v.), broke all connection with the monophysite and Catholic churches of West Syria, and became a mighty church party which was called by his name and extended its missionary influence as far as China. **1. Rise in Persia.** The first extension of Nestorianism was from the eastern boundary of the Roman Empire over Persia. The prime impulse was the letter of the Presbyter Ibas of Edessa (q.v) to Bishop Mari of Hardashir in Persia, written shortly after the reconciliation of Patriarch John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria (q.v.), evidently inclining more to the former, but at the close expressing his joy at the reconciliation between Cyril and the Antiochian bishops. This letter and the Syriac translations of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia spread the doctrines of Nestorius throughout Persia. The movement was aided by the expulsion of the Nestorian teachers from the school at Edessa and by their settlement in Nisibis, the most noteworthy of these scholars being Barsumas, who, as bishop or metropolitan of Nisibis (435–489), where he established a celebrated theological school, zealously sought to extirpate the adherents of Cyril. Christianity was established in Persia apparently in the post-apostolic age, but its primitive history is wrapped in obscurity. Under the Arsacids the Christians were apparently unmolested, except for one brief persecution and Trajan's invasion of the Parthian kingdom. Though the Christians were widely spread and well organized in Persia in the third and fourth centuries (cf. A. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 295 sqq., New York, 1905), as is clear from the writings of the pseudo-Bardesanes, Aphraates, and the older *Acta martyrum*, they did not yet form a distinct church with catholicos, bishops, and other clergy. Nevertheless, the bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon gradually rose to be primate of the Christians in the Seleucid kingdom and the entire orient, though his claims were long contested by the bishop of Persia. In 313 the bishop of Persia was still independent of the bishop of Seleucia, and the former was considered at the Nicene Council the representative of all Persia and India; nor was it until the episcopate of Timotheus (778–820) that Seleucia definitely became the metropolitan see. Both bishoprics were first actually, and then nominally, subject to the patriarch of Antioch, but the frequent wars between the Romans and Persians rendered it practically impossible for the prelates to be consecrated at Antioch. Shahlufa (d. 244) seems to have been the first to be consecrated by the oriental bishops at Seleucia. This see thus early gained a certain measure of independence. His successor, Papa, was called archbishop; later prelates, beginning with Babæus (Syr. Babhai) in 499, assumed the title of patriarch, or catholicos, and ranked themselves after the patriarch of the West. While his predecessors Dadhisho, Babæus, and Acacius wavered between Catholicism and Nestorianism, Babæus II. was the first to break entirely with the Occidental Church. At a synod held by him in 499 he enacted, among other things, that unconditional obedience should be rendered to the patriarch of Seleucia; that the bishops should assemble for consultation on ecclesiastical affairs with their metropolitan annually instead of semi-annually and with their patriarch quadrennially instead of biennially; and that the patriarch, bishops, priests, and monks should be permitted to marry one wife each and that the presbyters should be required to marry another wife on the death of the first, the object of this canon being to do away with immoral relations of the clergy with several wives at once. The successors of Babæus followed in his course, placing Nestorians in all episcopal vacancies and eagerly seeking to extend their domain in all directions. Nestorianism was also advocated by numerous writers, especially the monks of several monasteries in Assyria, as well as by the pupils of various schools, of which the oldest and most famous was that of Nisibis.

2. Diffusion in Arabia, India, and China.

Christianity had also spread at a very early time to Arabia, to the wide districts south of Palestine, Damascus, and to Mesopotamia (cf. Gal. i. 17). Though these Arabic communities, including such bishoprics as that of Bostra, were connected with those of Rome, both Nestorians and Jacobites later sought to introduce their doctrines. The former were the more successful. Under the califs they extended through Syria and Palestine, and during the patriarchate of Mar Aba II. (742-752) there was a bishop of the Nestorians in Egypt under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Damascus. The Arabian bishops were originally subject to the metropolitan of Persia, who also had jurisdiction over India, the western coast of which must have been partly Christianized by the beginning of the seventh century. A very ancient tradition, given in the third century Acts of Thomas (Eng. transl. in *ANF*, viii. 535–539), makes Thomas the apostle to India, so that the Indian Christians are commonly termed Christians of St. Thomas. Many Christians seem to have fled to India from the persecutions in Persia; and in 345 a bishop with priests from Jerusalem are said to have gone to Malabar. Cosmas Indicopleustes (q.v.; about 530) mentions churches at Malabar, there was one in Ceylon, as well as a bishop at Calliana; and in 570 the presbyter Bodh was sent to inspect the Indian churches. After a period of ecclesiastical declension, Timotheus (778–820) appointed a metropolitan for India. China received Christianity from Chorassan, and a long inscription in Syriac and Chinese at Si-ngan-fu, giving a lengthy list of Nestorian clergy, testifies to the prosperity and wide extension of Nestorianism in China in 781. This famous Nestorian monument was visited in 1907 by

Frits V. Holm, who had a replica made of it which is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (cf. *The Nestorian Monument: an ancient Record of Christianity in China*, ed. P. Carus, Chicago, 1909, which contains an account of the securing of the replica, the Chinese text of the inscription, A. Wylie's Eng. transl., and historical notes). The first metropolitan for China was appointed by Selibhazecha (714–726), and about the same time Herat and Samarcand received metropolitans. At Balkh, whence several bishops were sent to China, a bishopric had early been erected; and Nestorianism later spread through Tartary.

3. Varying Fortunes.

The fortune of the Nestorians varied widely. Expelled by the emperors of the East, they enjoyed protection under the Parthian Arsacids, but with the revival of Zoroastrianism by the Sassanids, their persecution began anew, though seldom except when wars broke out with the Greek emperors. Toward the end of the reign of Kobad (488–531) a twelve years' schism broke out among the Nestorians, two patriarchs, Nerses (see NERSES II.) and Elisæus, being elected by rival factions and each appointing his own bishops. The schism was ended by the death of Nerses in prison and the deposition of his rival. Mar Aba I. (536–562), a convert from Zoroastrianism, translated from Greek into Syriac the Nestorian liturgy still in use. Among his many activities, he held a synod in 544 at which the rule, still in force, was adopted that neither the patriarch nor the bishops might marry. Here the former canons were confirmed, and strict adherence to the Nicene Creed was required, while the standard of exegesis was declared to be Theodore of Mopsuestia. Various local schisms, moreover, caused by anti-patriarchs and anti-bishops were ended by deposition of the disturbing clerics. A second synod was held in 577 by the patriarch Ezekiel (577–580), the chief result being an edict against the Messalians. After repeated persecutions by Chosroes I. (who is said by tradition to have become a Christian in his later years), the Nestorians were highly favored by Hormisd IV. and Chosroes II., the latter even forcing all Christians to adopt Nestorianism. Nevertheless, the latter monarch also persecuted them for choosing Gregorius patriarch against his will, and after the death of this prelate in 608 the patriarchate remained vacant twenty years until the accession of Siroes. Under this ruler and his successors the Nestorians enjoyed peace.

4. Under Mohammedans and Mongols.

Mohammedan persecutions of the Nestorians were rare, especially as Mohammed was traditionally said to have received his knowledge of Christian doctrines from a Nestorian monk named Sergius; and the Nestorians claim to have received letters of protection from the prophet, Omar Ali, and others. They held high posts as governors of cities and districts, secretaries of califs and emirs, and physicians in ordinary; while they were also distinguished translators into Syriac and Arabic. Such was their influence that Qa'im bi'amr Allah and Muqtadir Billah subjected the Catholic Christians, the Melchites, and the Jacobites to the jurisdiction of the patriarchs. Except for a brief persecution by Harun al-Rashid, only two occurred during the entire period—one by Mutawakkil, and the other by Hakim bi'amr Allah, the latter including all Christians and the Jews, but restricted to Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. After the foundation of Bagdad, the patriarchs were chosen and had their residence there, though consecrated in Seleucia. Under the Mongols, in like manner, the conditions of the Nestorians were generally peaceful. Hulagu Khan, who took Bagdad in 1268, and most of his successors favored the Nestorians not only because they were opposed to the Mohammedans, the political foes of the Mongols, but also on account of the superficial similarities between Nestorian Christianity and the Mongol type of Buddhism and through the Christian wives of some of the khans. Certain Mongol rulers, indeed, became converts to Christianity, particularly in the district of the Keraites south of the Lake of Baikal; and the dynastic title of these latter khans, Unk-khan or Owang-khan, corrupted to Joan or Johannes, seems to have given rise to the legend of Prester John (q.v.), which was later transferred to the hitherto unknown Christian king in Ethiopia (i.e., Abyssinia). In 1292 the Minorite Johannes de Monte Corvino converted a descendant of Unk-khan and several of his court from Nestorianism to Catholicism; but the Roman Catholic community thus founded proved of short duration, the converts returning to Nestorianism in 1299 (see MONGOLS, § 2).

5. Persecutions; Rapprochement with Rome.

The first direct persecution of the Nestorians, after their centuries of peace under Arabs and Mongols, was by Timur, who oppressed Christian and Mohammedan alike. The Nestorian connections with the Far East now came to an end and the churches there fell into decay. The advance of Islam oppressed or destroyed the Christians in Tartary and India, and a like course was pursued by the Shiites in Persia and by the Mohammedan dynasties in Hither Asia. In addition to all this, the popes, especially after the advent of the pro-Christian Mongols, sent many missionaries to counteract Nestorianism. Their efforts were largely successful, the first distinguished convert being the metropolitan Sahaduna in 628, and shortly afterward Heraclius, in his journey to Assyria, converted numbers of Nestorians and Monophysites. During the pontificate of Eugene IV., Timotheus of Tarsus, metropolitan of the Nestorians in Cyprus, attended the synods of Florence and Rome in hopes of union. Innocent IV. sent certain bishops with a letter to Rabban Ara, vicar of the Nestorian East, and in his reply was included a creed prepared by the archbishop of Nisibis and signed by two other archbishops and three bishops, in which Mary was designated "the Mother of Christ" (1247). Similar letters were written at the same time by the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius and the Mafrian Johannes. Nicolas IV. addressing a letter with a creed to the patriarch Yahballaha in 1288, his successor Benedict XI. received an answer in 1304 in which the Roman Catholic Church was termed "the mother and teacher of all others" and the Pope was called "the chief shepherd of all Christendom." In 1445, moreover, all the Cyprian Nestorians with their patriarch Timotheus of Tarsus were converted to the Roman Catholic faith by Archbishop Andrew.

6. History from the Sixteenth Century.

More lasting contact with the Roman Catholic Church began with the middle of the sixteenth century. Except for the Christians of St. Thomas in India, the Nestorians were then a small remnant with a few bishops in the Kurdish mountains. The patriarchate had become hereditary, nephew succeeding uncle. In 1551 this system resulted in a schism, and one faction sent its candidate for consecration to Rome, where he was proclaimed patriarch of the Chaldeans by Julius III. The schism still exists, the Uniate patriarch of the Chaldeans, always called Joseph, residing at Diarbekr, Mosul, and since 1830, Bagdad. In 1888 his jurisdiction included four archdioceses and seventeen dioceses, with some 33,000 souls. The patriarch of the non-Uniate Nestorians, always termed Simeon, lives in the almost inaccessible valley of Kochannes in the Kurdish mountains on the boundary between Persia and Turkey. In 1833 the number of these Nestorians, living in the Kurdish mountains and on the shores of the Lake of Urumiah, and constituting, except for the scanty communities in India, the sole remnants of this once powerful sect, were estimated at 70,000 souls. They do not, however, call themselves Nestorians—a term now employed only for the Nestorian Uniates—but Chaldeans, Meshiḥaye ("followers of the Messiah"), Nasrani (Arab., "Christians"), Syrians, Assyrians, and Madenḥaye ("Orientals"), declaring that Nestorius, whose language they did not know, was not their patriarch, and that he followed them rather than they him. Since 1834 American missionaries have worked among the non-Uniates, not only keeping them from being absorbed by the Roman Catholic missions surrounding them—especially the Dominicans stationed at Mosul to counteract the American Protestant influence—but also raising their moral and intellectual status, a task the more difficult since they are unstable and inclined to sensuality and superstition. The American missionaries, moreover, have preserved the modern Syriac dialect of the Nestorians and developed it into a literary language, into which they have translated the Bible and written or translated an abundance of religious literature. The spoken language is divided into a number of dialects, falling mainly into the plain and mountain groups, the latter presenting the fuller forms. The liturgies and other ritual books of both Nestorians and Chaldeans are in classical Syriac. They live in almost constant open hostility with the Mohammedan Kurds, who in 1846 massacred some 6,000 of all ages and both sexes.

7. Kurdish Nestorians.

The Chaldean Nestorians have eight ranks in their clergy: Ḳatholiḳa or patriarḳa; metropoliṭa or muṭran; episkopa; arkidyaḳona; kasshisha ("priest"); shammasha ("deacon"); huhpodyaḳona ("subdeacon"); and ḳaroya ("reader"). The Kurdish Nestorians are characterized by a pronounced Judaic Christianity which is also apparent in their rituals. Those in northern Mesopotamia now have nine dioceses with metropolitans, bishops, etc. Among their peculiarities is their aversion to all religious representations, only the Cross and the portrait of Christ being allowed in their churches. Their number of sacraments varies. In the medieval period it was seven, Timotheus II. (1318–60) defining them as ordination, consecration of a church or altar, baptism and unction, the Eucharist, benediction of monks, office for the dead, and marriage, with indulgence, or penance, and absolution as an appendix. Assemani held that they had but three sacraments: baptism, the Eucharist, and ordination. Among the modern Nestorians the Eucharist is a magic ceremony with certain peculiar usages. The Nestorian fasts are very numerous, meat being forbidden on 152 days. They eat no pork, and keep both the Sabbath and Sunday. They believe in neither auricular confession nor purgatory, and permit their priests to marry. The Nestorians of the plains, who are more intelligent than their mountain brethren, have peculiar marriage customs, and some of the usages of their other feasts are of interest. The mountain Nestorians are employed chiefly in hunting and pasturage. Their houses are in general wretched affairs, often having but one room, sometimes underground. They add to their resources by selling nut-galls, and are renowned for their basketry, especially in the district of Cheba, whence basket-venders traverse all Asia. They also engage in weaving and apiculture. Their chief food is barley bread, roasted meal, dried mulberries, and milk and its products. Despite their poverty they are extremely hospitable. They are governed by hereditary village sheiks called malik (Arab., "king"). Their clergy, who are greeted by kissing their hands and raising the hat (a usage not common elsewhere in the East), are ignorant but highly honored.

8. Nestorians of India.

The Nestorians of India, after receiving a metropolitan from the Patriarch Timotheus (778–820), had bishops appointed henceforth immediately by the patriarch. They enjoyed special privileges from the native princes, particularly after the beginning of the ninth century, these being due primarily to Thomas Kananæus (also called Mar Thomas), who seems to have been a wealthy and influential merchant, and not a bishop. Thanks to these privileges and their increase in population, they gradually became able to have kings of their own, but on the extinction of the dynasty their little domain was inherited by the rulers of Cochin. The internecine strife of the Indian princes so oppressed the Christians of St. Thomas that in 1502 they offered the crown to Vasco da Gama, when he landed in India. The bond between the Indian Nestorians and the patriarch seems to have been broken at an early date. About 1120–30 their spiritual head, Johannes, seems to have gone to Constantinople to request consecration, and thence to Rome. Later the church sank so that only a deacon was left to perform all ecclesiastical functions. Georgius and Joseph were accordingly sent in 1490 to the Nestorian patriarch to obtain a bishop; they were ordained priests and received the monks Thomas and Johannes as bishops. The patriarch Elias (d. 1502) consecrated three more monks bishops and sent them to India, where they reported some 30,000 Christian families, scattered in twenty cities, chiefly in Carangol, Palor, and Colom, although there were churches in all cities. Later Portuguese accounts reduce the number of Christian families to 16,000. In extreme poverty and oppressed from every side, they declared their sole allegiance to King Emmanuel of Portugal. The result was their destruction, oppressed both by the native princes because of this Portuguese alliance and also crushed by the Portuguese themselves. They were obliged, moreover, by Alexius Menezes, archbishop of Goa, to accept the decisions of the synod held at Diamper in 1599, so that only a few communities in the mountains remained true to the faith of their fathers. But in 1653 they revolted from their enforced union with the Roman Catholic Church, nor have the efforts of the Discalced Carmelites since that time availed to reconcile the Indian Nestorians with Rome. In 1665, on the other hand, the patriarch Ignatius of Antioch sent the Jacobite metropolitan Gregory of Jerusalem to Malabar, where he introduced a Jacobite tendency among the non-Uniates which became wide-spread, the Malabar Jacobites being estimated at nearly 170,000 by the younger missionary Baker.

The present number of Nestorians in Kurdistan and Persia is estimated at something over 150,000, with 250 churches, twelve archbishops and bishops, and more than 300 priests; the Chaldeans at over 100,000, with 150 churches and more than 250 priests. In India there are some 120,000 Nestorians and 250,000 Uniates. (K. Kessler†.)

Bibliography: The chief source, outside the writings named in the text, is J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, especially vol. ii., part 2, 3 vols., Rome, 1719–28. Consult further: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 3 vols., Paris, 1740; Gregory Barhebræus, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, 3 vols., Paris, 1872–1877; J. Guidi, *Ostsyrische Bischöfe und Bischofssitze*, in *ZDMG*, xliii (1889), 388–414; E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of Governors: The Historica Monastica of Thomas, Bishop of Marga, A.D. 840, forming a History of Nestorian Monasticism and Asceticism for over Three Hundred Years*, 2 vols., London, 1893; *Histoire de Mar Jab Alaha, ed. P. Bedjan*, Paris, 1895; Mari ibn Sulaiman, *Maris Amri et Slibæ de patriarchis Nestorianorum commentaria*, ed. H. Gismondi, 2 parts, Rome, 1896–99; the "Chronicle" of Michael the Syrian has been edited by J. B. Chabot, 2 vols., Paris, 1899–1901; O. Braun, *Das Buch der Synhados*, Stuttgart, 1900; G. Diettrich, *Die Nestorianische Taufliturgie ins Deutsche übersetzt*, Giessen, 1903; *The East Syrian or Nestorian Rite translated by A. J. Maclean*, London, 1905; Acts of the synods collected in A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, vol. x., Rome, 1838; and by J. B. Chabot, in *Notes et extraits*, xxxvii. 695 sqq., Paris, 1902. On Nestorian canonical law cf. the dissertation by H. Leclercq in the Fr. transl. of Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 1271–1301, Paris, 1908. For Nestorian authors consult: Assemani, ut sup., i. 1–362; W. Wright, *A Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, pp. 166 sqq., London, 1894; R. Duval, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes*, vol. ii., Paris, 1900; H. Labourt, *De Timotheo I. Nestorianum patriarcha (728–823)*, Paris, 1904. General accounts are: J. W. Etheridge, *The Syrian Churches*, London, 1846; G. P. Badger, *The Nestorians and their Ritual*, 2 vols., London, 1852; A. Grant, *Hist. of the Nestorians*, London, 1855; Georgius Ebedjesu Khayyath, *Syri orientales seu Chaldæi Nestoriani*, Rome, 1870; A. Kleisz, *Sur les missions nestoriennes en Chine au vii. siècle*, Paris, 1880; A. d'Avril, *La Chaldée chrétienne*, Paris, 1892; H. Holme, *The Oldest Christian Church*, London, 1896; J. E. Heller, *Das nestorianische Denkmal in Singan-fu*, Budapest, 1897; W. Köhler, *Die katholischen Kirchen des Morgenlandes*, Darmstadt, 1898; B. Szechenyi, *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Reise in Ostasien 1877–80*, vol. ii., Vienna, 1898; W. Barthold, *Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung*, Tübingen, 1901; S. Jamil, *Genuinæ relationes inter sedem apostolicam et Assyriorum orientalium seu Chaldæorum ecclesiam*, Rome, 1902; J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire Perse sous la dynastie Sassanide, 224–632*, Paris, 1904; *DCB*, iv. 29–33. For the Nestorians in India consult: G. B. Howard, *Christians of St. Thomas and Their Liturgies*, Oxford, 1864; J. D. Macbride, *The Syrian Church in India*, Oxford, 1856; W. J. Richards, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas, otherwise Called the Syrian Christians of Malabar*, London, 1908; V. A. Smith, *Early Hist. of India*, pp. 218 sqq., Oxford, 1908. For Kurdish and Mesopotamian Nestorians consult: J. Perkins, *A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians*, Andover, 1843; *Sketches of Pious Nestorians . . . at Oroomiah, Persia*, Boston, 1857; T. Laurie, *Dr. Grant and the Mountain Nestorians*, Boston, 1874; A. J. Maclean and W. H. Brown, *The Catholicos of the East, his People*, London, 1892; G. Oussani, *Modern Chaldeans and Nestorians*, in Johns Hopkins Semitic Papers, 1902, pp. 72–90.; W. A. Wigram, *The Doctrinal Position of the Assyrian or East Syrian Church*, London, 1908. Much of interest and importance will be found under Syrian Church. Material is also to be found in the periodicals *Der christliche Orient*, *Oriens Christianus*, *Bessarione*, and *Revue de l'orient chrétien*.

NESTORIUS.

Life and Writings (§ 1).
Teaching (§ 2).
Beginning of Opposition to Him (§ 3).
Formal Attack (§ 4).
The Council of Ephesus (§ 5).
Events till Nestorius' Death (§ 6).

1. Life and Writings.

Nestorius, the famous patriarch of Constantinople and the founder of the sect which still bears his name (see Nestorians), was born in Germanicia, not far from the boundary between Cilicia and Cappadocia, and died in exile after 451. Educated at Antioch, he lived as a monk in a monastery before the city walls. Here he won fame as a pulpit orator. In April, 428, he was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople, succeeding Sisinnius (d. Dec. 24, 427), his election being due to the court, which would not choose as patriarch a resident of Constantinople. The impression which he made on the bishops present at his consecration was extremely favorable, and he quickly manifested great zeal against the heretics, destroying an Arian place of worship in Constantinople on the fifth day after being enthroned. He claimed to be the real inspirer of the edict against heretics of May 30, 428; he proceeded against the Novatians, the Macedonians on the Hellespont, and the Quartodecimanians in Asia Minor. Yet in Dec., 430, Nestorius himself, the firm opponent of all heretics, was anathematized as a heretic by Cyril of Alexandria. Before proceeding to an account of the origin of the Nestorian controversy, some description of the fragments of his numerous writings should be given. Gennadius (*De vir. ill.*, liv.; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2. ser., iii. 394–395) states that Nestorius wrote "a great many treatises on divers themes" while still a presbyter at Antioch, and that after his consecration he wrote a work on the Incarnation. Ebed Yesu (J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, III., i. 35–36, Rome, 1719) mentions, besides "several books" destroyed by non-Nestorians, the following: *Liber tragœdiæ*, a history of his controversy; *Liber Heraclidis; Epis-*

tola ad Cosmam; a liturgy; *Liber epistolarum;* and *Liber homiliarum et orationum.* The extant fragments comprise only his anathemas against Cyril as translated by Marius Mercator; twelve other anathemas in Syriac translation; fragments of the "Tragedy"; fourteen letters or fragments of letters; some sermons translated by Marius Mercator; and a number of citations in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, Marius Mercator, Cassian, Arnobius the Younger, Leontius, the *Synodicon,* the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, and other sources. The fragments are collected by F. Loofs in *Nestoriana* (Halle, 1905). P. Bedjan has edited a newly discovered Syriac translation of the *Liber Heraclidis* (Paris, 1910). The material has been employed by J. F. Bethune-Baker in his *Nestorius and his Teaching. A fresh Examination of the Evidence* (Cambridge, 1908).

2. Teaching.

The origin of the Nestorian controversy doubtless lay in the antithesis between the Antiochian training of Nestorius and the Alexandrine traditions, or Apollinarian coloring, which prevailed in his new surroundings. Nevertheless, there were representatives of the two schools in Constantinople before Nestorius came, and it was already a moot question whether Mary was to be called mother of God or mother of man. Nestorius entered upon the struggle with the first of his "Sermons against the 'Mother of God,'" delivered not later than Christmas, 428. This was quickly followed by other sermons on the same theme. Declaring himself sharply opposed to the epithet "mother of God," he declared: "Mary did not give birth to divinity, but to man, the instrument of divinity." Here his motive was his desire to exalt the divinity of Christ, holding, as he did in his first sermon, that "the creature hath not given birth to the uncreatable." He was also offended by the cult of Mary easily arising from the belief that she was the mother of God, yet he never failed to recognize that the epithet might be employed if the views and tendencies which he opposed were separated from it. Since, however, such a use of the term as he advocated seemed to him to be very rare at the beginning of his patriarchate at Constantinople, he recommended that Mary be called "mother of Christ" instead of "mother of God." This, he held, like the terms "Son" and "Lord," referred to both natures of Christ. Following Antiochian Christology, he yet sought to avoid the charge that it taught two Sons, saying, for instance, "we have not two Christs or two Sons; for there is not with us a first and a second, or one and another, or one Son at one time and another at another, but the same one is twofold, not in honor, but in nature." While holding that most of the statements of the Bible concerning the Son of God refer to the incarnate Word, Nestorius taught that after the incarnation the Son of God was no longer the Logos *per se.* The immediate basis is indeed purely Antiochian, declaring emphatically that the Son was twofold in nature and that the mother of Christ bore the Son of God as man who was the Son through the Son conjoined, thus distinguishing the natures but unifying adoration of him. On the other hand, Nestorius modified the Antiochian dyophysitism by holding that each nature worked by sharing in the peculiar properties of the other. His Christology was thus based on the primitive double view of the historic Christ which was the basis of the earliest Christology, saying "we confess the God in man, we reverence the man worshiped together with God Almighty through the divine union." The earnestness of his endeavor, despite his dyophysitism, to see a single God-man is shown in his denunciation as a monothelite by the synod of 680 because he had written "God the Logos was not one and the man born therein another, for there was one person of them both, in reverence and honor distinguished neither in manner nor time by difference of decree or will." [*]

3. Beginning of Opposition to Him.

The condemnation of Nestorius for these teachings was brought about by Cyril of Alexandria (q.v.), though Nestorius had already met with considerable opposition in Constantinople. Nestorius did not fail to return the attacks in kind, securing the condemnation of Philip, one of his former rivals for the patriarchate. But notwithstanding all these difficulties, Nestorius could write to Pope Celestine (Mansi, *Concilia,* iv. 1022 D, 1024 C), that the church at Constantinople was flourishing. In the latter part of 430 he and his clergy had determined in what sense the term "mother of God" could and should be used, thus retracting his opposition to the phrase, and John of Antioch thought that the troubles in Constantinople were at an end. The complaints of Cyril and the monks opposed to Nestorius, alleging grievous schism in Constantinople, accordingly deserve no credence. While still at Antioch Nestorius seems to have prepared sermons for publication, and after his consecration he united these older sermons and more recent ones, including several on the mother of God, into a book of considerable size (at the latest by the beginning of 429), afterward circulating other sermons subsequently delivered. Individual sermons, or possibly the entire book, were sent by Nestorius to Rome, and a collection of his sermons also found its way to Egypt, doubtless without the author's wish. Shortly after Easter, 429, Cyril took occasion to write to all the monks of Egypt justifying the use of the term "mother of God" and opposing the arguments of Nestorius without mentioning his name. Copies of this letter were brought to Constantinople, where they strengthened the opposition, hitherto weak, against Nestorius. Photius, a presbyter of Nestorius, now wrote against Cyril's letter, and Nestorius preached a sermon to prove that the Logos could be subject neither to birth nor suffering. Both the letter and the sermon were sent to Alexandria, but before they reached there Cyril heard of his opponents' disapproval of his attitude and wrote his first letter to Nestorius. For a time the correspondence was conducted with external courtesy, but soon the hostility between the two patriarchs became irreconcilable. This was due less to dogmatic reasons, however, than to calumnies uttered to Nestorius against Cyril. The latter now wrote his second letter early in 430, in which, after a brief mention of the Alexandrine charges, he proceeded to instruct Nestorius in the true faith. While it would seem from these letters that the controversy was essentially theological, Cyril's letter to the clergy in Constantinople, written almost at the same time, makes it clear that his real motive was his fear of being cited to appear at Constantinople to answer the charges brought against him.

---

[*] In ATHANASIUS (II., § 2) a reference appears promising a minute examination of the Athanasian Christology in the article Nestorius. This was probably inspired by the fact that writings usually attributed to Athanasius would make him a forerunner of Nestorius. But Professor Loofs (*Leitfaden zum Studien der Dogmengeschichte,* pp. 264–266, Halle, 1906) refers to R. Hoss (*Studien über das Schriftthum und die Theologie des Athanasius* . . . , Leipsic, 1899) and A. Stülcken (*Athanasiana,* ib. 1899) as disproving the alleged Athanasian authorship of those writings. This leaves as the salient facts that the Athanasian Christology remained essentially unchanged from the first, that it was the divine side which engaged his attention, that his references to the human side were traditional and never closely analysed, and that in the historical Christ there was only one subject, the Logos, and that Christ grew, hungered, and suffered in his flesh. No vital connection can be established between the Christology of Athanasius and of Nestorius so far as the human side is concerned. C. A. B.

4. Formal Attack.

His war of extermination against Nestorius now began. To this end he wrote three lengthy letters covertly attacking his rival to the emperor, his sister, and the empress, and at the same time endeavored to win over Celestine, of whose position he was uncertain. For the latter purpose, he wrote, early in 430, his five books "Against the Blasphemies of Nestorius," attacking in detail forty-three citations from the writings of his antagonist. In the spring of the same year he sent this work, together with numerous sermons of Nestorius, and his own two letters to him, to Celestine, with a clever letter of his own to the pope, not free from misrepresentations. The result was fully successful for Cyril, although the reason is somewhat problematical. It would seem that Cyril actually convinced Celestine that "at one time Nestorius made Christ mere man, and at another attributed to him participation in divinity." This is the attitude, at least, assumed by Cassian in *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*. At the same time Celestine was evidently offended at Nestorius by his kindly, but innocent, reception of Cœlestius, Julian, and three other bishops, who had been convicted of Pelagianism in the West. With their views Nestorius could not possibly have sympathized, nor did he intend to oppose the pope. He learned of the nature of the charges against them through the *Commonitorium* of Marius Mercator, which resulted in the expulsion of the Pelagians from Constantinople. Nestorius had already written Celestine at least twice to learn the reason of their condemnation at Rome, but the pope was so offended by the patriarch's protection of the refugees that he left his letters unanswered. In Aug., 430, Celestine held a synod at Rome and excommunicated Nestorius unless he should publicly recant within ten days after learning of the decree. He wrote to the same effect to Nestorius, the clergy of Constantinople, John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, the Macedonian bishops, and Cyril. The latter was formally authorized to pronounce anathema on Nestorius unless he should recant within the appointed time. He accordingly held his synod at Alexandria early in November and wrote a synodical epistle to Nestorius, which was given him, together with a letter from Celestine, on Dec. 6, 430. Cyril could now consider himself close to his goal of crushing Nestorius if he could have equal success at court in parrying the charges against himself by accusing his opponent. But here he failed, and though the course of events is obscure, it is certain that his letter found very unfavorable reception at court and that the charges against him were still believed. Nestorius himself, who enjoyed the favor of the court, had purposed to hold a general synod in the summer of 430 to discuss primarily other ecclesiastical matters than his controversy with Cyril, though the latter was also doubtless intended to be considered. The Emperor Theodosius accordingly directed the synod to convene at Ephesus at Easter, 431, at the same time again manifesting his disapproval of Cyril. Under these circumstances Nestorius was little disturbed by the letters of Celestine and Cyril. He enjoyed the support of his clergy and speedily opposed twelve counter-anathemas to the twelve anathemas of Cyril attached to his synodical letter, which were equally offensive to John of Antioch, Theodoret, and Andrew of Samosata.

5. The Council of Ephesus.

After some delay, the Council of Ephesus was opened on June 22, 431, with 198 bishops, fifty of these being partizans of Cyril, who was also supported by forty bishops from Asia and twelve from Pamphilia, while John of Antioch with his bishops and the delegates from Rome were still on the way. The Imperial Commissary Candidian and sixty-eight dissenting bishops pleaded in vain that the council be not opened until all had arrived. On the very first day of the council Nestorius was condemned and declared deposed from all clerical office. The emperor, however, on June 29, commanded further consideration of the matter. Meanwhile the Antiochian bishops had reached Ephesus and opened a counter-council on June 27 at which they excommunicated Cyril's partizans and declared Cyril and his chief adherent, Memnon of Ephesus, deposed. This condemnation was signed by forty-three bishops and both parties sought through their sympathizers to defend themselves at court. The Roman envoys came in July, joined Cyril, and held a second session with them on July 10, joining on the following day in the condemnation of Nestorius. Other sessions of Cyril's council were held on July 16, 17, 22, and Aug. 31; but the real decision now lay with the court since the factions both of Cyril and of Nestorius refused to change their position. While still maintaining his views, Nestorius declared himself ready to retire to his monastery at Antioch. In the first half of August the court sent the Comes Sacrorum Johannes and confirmed the deposition of both councils. Cyril and Memnon were interned and Nestorius was committed to the custody of his friend Candidian. Johannes was unable to reconcile the factions, and eight delegates of both sides were summoned to the imperial court. It is noteworthy that the Antiochian party, which included John of Antioch and Theodoret, made no special plea for Nestorius, while their opponents worked earnestly in behalf of Cyril and Memnon. Nestorius was now required to retire to his monastery at Antioch and readily obeyed. Henceforth he was dead to the court, where Alexandrine influence for some unknown reason now became supreme; and on Oct. 25, 431, Maximian was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople, soon showing his sympathy with Cyril by deposing four of the chief supporters of his predecessor.

6. Events till Nestorius's Death.

Despite the victory of Cyril, he was still but partially successful, for ecclesiastical union between him and the Antiochians was still broken. The emperor, however, forced peace on the Church, and after a long series of negotiations in which Paul of Emesa acted as mediator and letters were exchanged not only between Cyril and John of Antioch, but also between the latter and Pope Sixtus and Maximian of Constantinople, Cyril, in the spring of 433, accepted a creed submitted to him by John (which shows a striking similarity to the Antiochian creed of 431 which is ascribed on creditable authority to Theodoret, to which Nestorius himself might have subscribed), while John acquiesced in the condemnation of Nestorius and recognized Maximian as patriarch. This peace resulted in the schism of the Persian Nestorians (see Nestorians, § 1), and was also unpleasing to many Antiochians, including Theodoret and Acacius of Berea. Some of the bishops even allowed themselves to be deposed, yet within a few years it was possible for such decided friends of Nestorius as Irenæus to be consecrated bishop. The dogmatic problem was still unsolved and was to be threshed out anew in Eutychianism (q.v.). Nestorius lived in high honor at Antioch after the autumn of 431, although Celestine urged that he be banished from all human society. On July 30, 435, however, Theodosius promulgated an edict in which he branded the Nestorians with the name of Simonians and ordered the writings of Nestorius to be burned. About the same time Nestorius himself was exiled to Oasis in Egypt. The reason for this stern measure is unknown, but it is not impossible that either the *Tragœdia* of Nestorius had excited the imperial displeasure or that John of Antioch was disturbed by the presence in the same city of the friend he had denied. Nestorius was still living in Oasis when Socrates completed his church history in 439. Indeed the *Liber Heraclidis* proves that he survived the opening of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Evagrius has preserved two letters written during his banishment, according to which he was set free by an attack of the nomads on Oasis, whereupon he surrendered himself to the governor of the Thebaid "lest he be suspected of flight or some other crime." He was then dragged within a short time from one place of banishment to a second, a third, and a fourth. The tenor of these letters and other details of the life of Nestorius during his exile may be shown by the *Liber Heraclidis*, as yet accessible, however, only in the Syriac. (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: Most of the sources are indicated in the text. Specially of note are the *Opera* and *Literæ* of Cyril of Alexandria, in *MPG*, lxxvi.–lxxvii.; the *Opera* of Marius Mercator, ed. Garner (cf. the preface), Paris, 1673, and Baluze, ib. 1684, also in *MPL*, xlviii., the *Opera* of Cassian, especially his *De incarnatione*, in *CSEL*, vol. xvii.; the *Opera* of Theodoret, *MGP*, lxxx.–lxxxiv.; and the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins, in *MPL*, vol. l. Of first importance are the Acts of the Council of Ephesus in Mansi, *Concilia*, vols. iv.–v.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii., Eng. transl., vol. iii., Fr. transl. ii. 1, pp. 219–377, cf. ii. 2, appendix 4 on the Nestorian collection of canons; and particularly, with voluminous discussion, the ed. of J. Chrystal, 3 vols., Jersey City, 1895–1908.

Consult further: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. xiv., Venice, 1732; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, v. 289–936, Leipsic, 1770; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 529–549, Hamburg, 1807; A. Thierry, *Les Grandes Hérésies du Vième siècle, Nestorius et Eutychès*, Paris, 1878; L. Fendt, *Die Christologie des Nestorius*, Kempten, 1910; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 366–374 et passim; *DCB*, iv. 33–34; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 714–729; and in general the works on the church history of the period.

NETHERLANDS. See Belgium; Holland.

NETHERLANDS BIBLE SOCIETY. See Bible Societies, II., 3.

NETHINIM. See Levi Levites, § 3.

NETO, nē'to, SEBASTIAN JOSÉ: Patriarch of Lisbon and cardinal-priest of The Twelve Apostles; b. at Lagos, Portugal, Feb. 8, 1841. He entered the order of Observantine Minorites, and in 1879 was consecrated bishop of Angola and the Kongo. Eleven years later, he was enthroned patriarch of Lisbon, and in 1884 was created cardinal. He is a member of the Congregations of the Propaganda, Rites, Indulgences, and the Lauretana.

NETTER (WALDENSIS), THOMAS: English Carmelite and leading theological opponent of the doctrines of Wyclif; b. at Saffron-Walden (35 m. n.n.w. of London), Essex (whence his appellation Waldensis), probably about 1380; d. in Rouen (?), France, Nov. 3, 1431. He was educated at Oxford and, entering the Carmelite order, became English provincial in 1414. In the same year, having already attended the Synod of Pisa in 1409, he went to the Council of Constance, both in his official capacity and as mandatary of Henry V., whose confessor and private secretary he was from 1413 to 1422. He was an important figure in Henry's measures against the Lollards, as in the trials of Lord Cobham (1413) and William Sartor (1422). He visited Lithuania in 1419 to reconcile King Jagello with the grand master of the Teutonic Knights, and in 1431 accompanied Henry VI. to his coronation in France.

Although Netter is said to have written commentaries on several of the works of Aristotle, as well as *Super sententias libri quatuor* and *Super omnes Bibliorum libros postilla scholastica*, but two of his books are extant—*Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei ecclesiæ catholicæ* (3 vols., Paris, 1521–32; 4th ed., by T. B. Blanchiotti, Venice, 1757–59) and *Fasciculi zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wiclif cum tritico* (ed. W. W. Shirley, No. 5 of *Rolls Series*, London, 1858). The former of these was composed between about 1415 and 1429, and, like the second, which is a collection of documents for the history of Wyclif and the Lollards, was written to contravene Wyclifite tenets. Wyclif's appeal to Scripture is accepted by Netter with the proviso that the exegesis be that of the early Fathers, especially as individual interpretation is only too often used to afford a basis for heresy. If, moreover, as in Wyclif's case, only the authority of Christ be recognized, then Christ, the head, is severed from his body, the Church; and while the authority of a single Father may be doubted, the consensus of practically all must be respected. And, more than this, the usages of the Church, her "living faith," give light when written sources fail or disagree. Again, since canonical authority was first given the Bible by the Church, and since the law of Christ had in those books reached perfection, therefore neither doubtful books nor strange doctrines could be accepted or taught either by the Church or by individuals. The strange doctrines of Wyclif must accordingly be rejected.

Proceeding from strict Roman Catholic patristic exegesis, but relatively ignoring scholasticism, and in complete harmony with the theological position of his period, Netter refuted in detail the teachings of Wyclif, with whose writings he shows himself thoroughly acquainted, supporting his arguments by the Bible and citations from the Fathers and older theologians and schoolmen. His special objects of attack are Wyclif's predestination, which leads to determinism and pantheism, besides subverting freedom and service; and his anthropology and Christology. The first book of the *Doctrinale* is thus devoted primarily to theological doctrines; but Netter's main interests being practical, the second book treats of the Church, the third of the perfected in religion, the fourth of mendicancy, the fifth of the sacraments, and the sixth of the Sacramentals (q.v.). In the second book the primacy of Peter and of the pope is demonstrated; and Wyclif's doctrine that the Church is "the totality of the predestined" is rejected. In the third book the "religion of those made perfect" is defended by the examples of the Sethites, the Rechabites, and Samuel; and in the fourth mendicancy is based on the interview of Christ with the woman of Samaria and the teaching of the apostles. In the fifth book Wyclif is branded as despising the sacraments, and adoration of the host and transubstantiation are zealously defended. Utraquistic tendencies are condemned, for if the "all" of Matt. xxvi. 27 were rigidly interpreted, it would imply that even children and heinous sinners should receive the cup. The scholastic concept of "character," disposing the soul to fulfil the commandments of God and to receive sacramental grace, is maintained regarding baptism and declared to be found in Eph. iv. and the Fathers. The primitive nature of the hierarchy is defended, as are the usual doctrines of auricular confession and the "Power of the Keys" (q.v.). The distinction between mortal and venial sins is held to be implied in the Bible, as in the account of Cain; and venial sins are declared to be committed through ignorance and frailty, but mortal sins through contempt. The concluding book, treating in detail of sacramentals, discusses, among other themes, prayer, rites, the mass, intercession, the veneration of saints, canonization, pilgrimages, and the adoration of the cross.

(R. Seeberg.)

Bibliography: The most complete life is prefixed to Blanchiotti's ed. of the work noted in the text, i., ix.–xvii. Other material is found in: J. Leland, *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. A. Hall, pp. 438–441, Oxford, 1709; Cosme de Villiers de Sainte-Etienne, *Biblia Carmelitana*, ii. 824–826, 833–842. Consult also *DNB*, xl. 231–234.

NETTLETON, ASAHEL: American Congregationalist and revivalist; b. at North Killingworth, Conn., Apr. 21, 1783; d. at East Windsor, Conn., May 16, 1844. He graduated at Yale in 1809; and, after studying theology, was licensed in 1811, and ordained as an evangelist in 1812. From 1812 to 1822 he was active as an evangelist in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York. In 1827 he went to Virginia for his health, returning in 1829. He held meetings in Connecticut and New York City in 1830–31, and visited Great Britain in 1831. In 1833 he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in the recently established theological institute of East Windsor (now Hartford Seminary), but though he declined, yet he settled there and occasionally lectured to the students. He was a powerful preacher, and large accessions to the church resulted from his efforts, which were strongly doctrinal and Calvinistic. He was regarded as the representative of the conservative tendency, in opposition to Charles G. Finney (q.v.), whose evangelistic labors aroused much criticism. He published *Village Hymns* (1824), regarded as one of the best of American collections of hymns.

Bibliography: B. Tyler, *Memoir of Rev. A. Nettleton*, Hartford, 1844; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 542–554, New York, 1859.

NEUBURG, RELIGIOUS COLLOQUY OF. See Candidus (Weiss), Pantaleon.

NEUCHÂTEL, nū″shɑ-tel′, **INDEPENDENT EVANGELICAL CHURCH OF:** A free Evangelical church organized in 1873 in the canton of Neuchâtel, the object being to create a church entirely independent of the State.

In origin the Independent Church of Neuchâtel may be said to date back to the time of the Reformation. At that time the sovereigns of the country remained attached to Roman Catholicism; 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. But the Reformed Church was established in Neuchâtel 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, since the grand councils 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 Neuchâtel to discuss the affairs of their churches. From these spontaneous reunions originated the body called the "Company of Pastors," which continued at the head of the church of Neuchâtel 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 Neuchâtel had stood to Prussia since 1707 overthrew the ecclesiastical sovereignty of the Company of Pastors. From the negotiations between that body and the new authorities resulted a reorganization 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.

Under this constitution the church lived until about 1865. At that time a number of freethinkers who had acquired great influence in the circles of the government resolved to disrupt the stubborn dogmatic unity. A revision of the ecclesiastical law was decided upon in the grand council; and shortly after a new law was carried by a majority of seven votes. According to Art. 4 of the new law, every citizen of the State is by birth a member of the church, and has the franchise. According to Arts. 6 and 12 every minister is eligible to an office in the church, if he has a license to preach; and he can not be bound in advance by any measure, regulation, or creed. 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. This led to a debate as to the measures necessary under the circumstances, in which differences of opinion developed.

Some thought that it was their duty to submit to the new law, though it was ruinous to the church, and to 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. The adherents of the latter opinion assembled in 1873, 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 over 110,000 francs, each pastor being paid from 2,500 to 2,800 francs a year. As the use of the church-buildings is by law guaranteed to all religious denominations, the independent congregations can use the buildings; and about one-half of them do so. But the others, having met with various impediments in the exercise of their right, have built their own places of worship, and spent for that purpose another million. These sacrifices, however, are not considered a burden since by those sacrifices the contributors 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 state establishment, 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. F. GODET†.

In 1906 it was conceived by a political party that for financial reasons the time had come to disestablish the national church of the canton, giving to all who care for religion the opportunity to apply some of the principles taught for twenty-five years by the independents. The motion was rejected by a majority of five in the grand council, but was again brought forward by the central commission in September of the same year. The electoral campaign which followed was marked by the admission of the state church that if the new motion should not carry, yet a new financial basis ought to be found for the support of their church. The popular vote of Jan., 1907, was against disestablishment by a majority of 6,679 in 23,500 votes, showing that free-church principles had not won.

The statistics of 1908 show 24 parishes with 4,429 voters, 6,140 female members, and a body of adherents of about 15,000. N. WEISS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Bulletins de Synodes;* G. Godet, *La Question ecclésiastique de Neuchâtel*, in *Revue chrétienne*, Sept., 1873–Jan., 1874; C. Monvert, *Hist. de la fondation de l'église évangélique neuchâteloise indépendante de l'état*, Neuchâtel, 1898.

NEUDECKER, nei-dek'er, **JOHANN CHRISTIAN GOTTHOLD**: German Protestant; b. at Gotha (27 m. w. of Weimar), Germany, Apr. 10, 1807; d. there July 11, 1866. He was educated at the University of Jena (1826–29), and after a brief residence at Leipsic, followed by a tour of southern Germany and Alsace, he became a private tutor at Cassel. From 1832 to 1842 he resided at Gotha as a private scholar, but in the latter year was appointed teacher at the Knabenbürgerschule; he became titular conrector there in the following year, and in 1855 was made second rector of the garrison and Erfurt Vorstadtschule, while from 1860 until his death he was director of the Gotha Bürgerschule. Among his writings of theological interest are: *Allgemeines Lexikon der Religions- und christlichen Kirchengeschichte für alle Konfessionen* (4 vols. with supplement, Weimar, 1834–37); *Urkunden aus der Reformationszeit* (Cassel, 1836); *Merkwürdige Ak-*

tenstücke aus der Zeit der Reformation (2 parts, Nuremberg, 1838); *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipsic, 1840); *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Reformation, mit historisch-kritischen Anmerkungen* (2 vols., 1841); *Geschichte der Reformation von 1517–1532* (1842); *Geschichte des evangelischen Protestantismus in Deutschland für denkende und prüfende Christen* (2 parts, 1844–46); and *Die Hauptversuche zur Pacifikation der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche Deutschlands von der Reformation bis auf unsere Tage* (1846). He also edited *Handschriftliche Geschichte Matthäus Ratzebergers über Luther und seine Zeit* (Jena, 1850) and *Georg Spalatins historischer Nachlass und Briefe* (with L. Preller; 1851), besides continuing the third edition of W. Münscher's *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Cassel, 1838).
(A. Schumann†.)

Bibliography: *Gothaische Zeitung*, July 14, 1866; *ADB*, xxiii. 479 sqq.

NEUMANN, neiʹmăn, **CASPAR:** Lutheran theologian and hymnist; b. at Breslau Sept. 14, 1648; d. at Breslau Jan. 27, 1715. He was pastor at St. Elizabeth's, Breslau, inspector over all the local churches and schools, and first professor in the two municipal gymnasia. He commanded wide learning in the spheres of political and natural science, but in theology he accomplished little that was noteworthy. Though unfriendly to Pietism, he was still characterized by deep devoutness, with some touch of Spener's spirit. He was less known through his collected sermons *Licht und Recht* (Berlin, 1716; Leipsic, 1731) than he was through his prayer-book *Kern aller Gebete* (enlarged in 2d–4th eds., Wittenberg, 1686–93; twenty-two issues down to his death; new edition Eisleben, 1882). Written originally for his private use, it became expanded into a comprehensive prayer-book. In the Evangelical Church of Germany, Neumann is even still better known through his thirty-nine church hymns, of which ten or twelve are retained to this day in the state church hymnals. A few of his hymns are: "Grosser Gott von alten Zeiten," Eng. transl. by H. J. Buckoll, "God of Ages never ending"; "Herr, es ist ein Tag erschienen"; "Nun, bricht die finstre Nacht herein"; and "Herr, auf Erden muss ich leiden," Eng. transl. by Miss Winkworth, "Lord, on earth I dwell sad-hearted." There is, however, more poetry in Neumann's prose than in his hymns. Hermann Beck.

Bibliography: Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 795; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, v. 456 sqq., 7 vols., Stuttgart, 1866–72; A. F. W. Fischer, *Kirchenlieder-Lexikon*, pp. 459 sqq., 2 vols., Gotha, 1878–79; *ADB*, xxiii. 532 sqq.

NEUMARK, neiʹmărk, **GEORG:** Hymnist; b. at Langensalza (19 m. n.w. of Erfurt), Germany, Mar. 16, 1621; d. at Weimar (?) July 8, 1681. He studied jurisprudence at Königsberg, then at Weimar he became ducal librarian and recorder, and later was keeper of the archives for the Palatinate. He belonged to the "pompous court set" of poets. Some of his spiritual hymns were meritotious, expressing, as they did, both a strong trust in God that was rooted in the depth of experience, and an intrinsic sensibility, and have remained in use to the present. His most famous hymn was: "Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten" (Eng. transl. by Catherine Winkworth, "My God, I leave to thee my ways"). Hermann Beck.

Bibliography: E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iii. 410 sqq., iv. 146 sqq., 7 vols., Stuttgart, 1866–72; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 795–797; *ADB*, xxiii. 539 sqq.

NEUMEISTER, ERDMANN: Lutheran theologian and hymnist; b. at Uchteritz near Weissenfels (20 m. s.w. of Leipsic) May 12, 1671; d. at Hamburg Aug. 18, 1756. He studied at Schulpforta and Leipsic, and after transient academic occupation entered the ministry, becoming pastor at St. James' Church in Hamburg in 1715. He was a vehement antagonist of Pietism, and took the field against Spener himself, and afterward against Zinzendorf. The influence he had with his contemporaries came through his ascetic writings and his hymns. Of the former mention may be made of his manual for communion: *Der Zugang zum Gnadenstuhl Jesu Christi* (Weissenfels, 1703 and often); *Das Aufheben heiliger Hände zu Gott* (2d ed., Hamburg, 1726); and *Das Gott suchende und von Gott lebende Herz* (Hamburg, 1731). He wrote many hymns of worth, not a few of which have survived to this day, among which may be named "Jesu, grosser Wunderstern," Eng. transl. by E. Cronenwett, "Jesus! great and wondrous star"; and "Jesus nimmt die Sünder an!" often translated into English, e.g., by Mrs. Bevan, "Sinners Jesus will receive." He was also the creator of the Church cantata. J. S. Bach, in particular, composed the music for seven of his cantatas.
Hermann Beck.

Bibliography: Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 797–798; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds*, v. 371, 7 vols., Stuttgart, 1866–72; *ADB*, xxiii. 543 sqq.

NEUTRI. See Francis, Saint, of Assisi, and the Franciscan Order, III, § 7.

NEVIN, ALFRED: Presbyterian; b. at Shippensburg, Pa., Mar. 14, 1816; d at Lancaster, Pa., Sept. 2, 1890. He graduated from Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., 1836, and from the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., 1839; was pastor of the Cedar Grove Church, Pa., 1840–45; of the German Reformed Church, Chambersburg, Pa., 1845–52; of the Second Presbyterian Church, Lancaster, Pa., 1852–57; and of the Alexander Church, Philadelphia, 1857–61; he was also lecturer in the National School of Oratory, Philadelphia, 1878–80. Among his works are: *Churches of the Valley; or, An Historical Sketch of the Presbyterian Congregations of Cumberland and Franklin Counties in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1852); *Guide to the Oracles* (Lancaster, 1857), reissued as *The Book Opened; Analysis of the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1869); *The Age Question: or, A Plea for Christian Union* (1868); *Popular Expositor: Gospel and Acts* (1872); *Notes, Exegetical, Practical and Devotional, on Exodus* (1873); *Parables of Jesus* (1881); *Triumph of Truth: or, Jesus the Light and Life of the World* (1881); *Encyclopædia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (1884).

NEVIN, EDWIN HENRY: Presbyterian; b. at Shippensburg, Cumberland County, Pa., May 9, 1814; d. at Philadelphia July 2, 1889. He was graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., 1833, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1836; became pastor at Portsmouth, O., 1837; president of Franklin College, New Athens, O., 1841; pastor at Mount Vernon, O., 1845; of the Plymouth Congregational Church at Cleveland, O., 1851; Lancaster, Pa., 1855; in Philadelphia (First Reformed), 1870; retired from the pastorate 1875, and joined the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia. He is the author of numerous hymns, perhaps the best known being "Always with us, always with us." He was also the author of *Man of Faith* (Boston, 1858); *The City of God* (Lancaster, Pa., 1868); *The Minister's Handbook* (Philadelphia, 1872); *Thoughts about Christ* (1882). He was one of the editors of *History of all Religious Denominations* (1872).

Bibliography: S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 28–29, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 799.

NEVIN, JOHN WILLIAMSON: Reformed (German); b. near Strasburg, Pa., Feb. 20, 1803; d. at Lancaster, Pa., June 6, 1886. He graduated from Union College in 1821; and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826, where he taught Hebrew, 1826–28; he was stated supply at Big Spring, Pa., in 1829; professor of Hebrew and Biblical literature in the Western Theological Seminary, 1829–1840; then professor of theology at Mercersburg Theological Seminary, 1840–53; president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., 1841–53; professor of esthetics and history in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1861–66; and president 1866–76, then professor, at the same college, of mental and moral philosophy, 1868–76. In 1876 he retired to private life at Caernarvon Place, near Lancaster, Pa. He was one of the founders of the Mercersburg Theology (q.v.). He edited the *Mercersburg Review*, 1849–53, writing the largest part of its contents. He published *A Summary of Biblical Antiquities; Compiled for the Use of Sunday School Teachers* (Philadelphia, 1828; revised 1830); *The Anxious Bench* (Chambersburg, Pa., 1843); *The Mystical Presence; or a Vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (Philadelphia, 1846); *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism* (Chambersburg, 1847); *Antichrist; or the Spirit of Sect and Schism* (New York, 1848).

Bibliography: T. Appel, *Life and Work of John Williamson Nevin*, New York, 1890.

NEVIUS, JOHN LIVINGSTON: American missionary; b. near Ovid, Seneca Co., N. Y., Mar. 4, 1829; d. at Chefoo, North China, Oct. 19, 1893. He was educated at Union College, Schenectady, 1845–47, and Princeton Theological Seminary, 1850–53. In the latter year he was ordained, accepted as a missionary by the Presbyterian Board, and assigned to Ningpo, China. He labored at this post 1854–59; at the mission center of Hang-chow, 1859, where he was the first to find a footing; and in 1859–61 sojourned in Japan, preparing a "Compendium of Theology" for Chinese students. On his return he removed to the Shantung district, North China, serving at Tung-chow, 1861–64; and at Chefoo, 1871–93, where at his death he was occupied with a translation of part of the Bible. He wrote *China and the Chinese* (New York, 1869), and *Demon Possession and Allied Themes* (1895).

Bibliography: Mrs. H. S. C. Nevius, *Life of John Livingston Nevius*, New York, 1895.

NEW APOSTOLIC CHURCH. See Miscellaneous Religious Bodies, 20.

NEW CONGREGATIONAL METHODISTS. See Methodists, IV., 9.

NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.

I. Definition and Characterisation.
II. Preliminary Conditions.
  The Period of Settlement in America, 1620–60 (§ 1).
  The Period of Decline, 1660–1726 (§ 2).
III. The Founders.
  1. Jonathan Edwards the Elder.
    His Fundamental Position (§ 1).
    His Doctrine of the Will (§ 2).
    Original Sin and Virtue (§ 3).
  2. Edwards' Successors, Bellamy and Hopkins.
IV. The Development.
  1. The Younger Edwards to Samuel Harris.
    Doctrine of the Atonement (§ 1).
    Regeneration (§ 2).
  2. The Great Controversies.
    The Universalist Controversy (§ 1).
    The Unitarian Controversy (§ 2).
    The Unitarian Position and the Answer (§ 3).
    The Separation of the Unitarians (§ 4).
V. The Ripened Product.
  Taylorism (§ 1).
  Bushnell, Smith, and Finney (§ 2).
  Edwards Amasa Park (§ 3).
  Summary of Park's Theology (§ 4).
VI. The Collapse of the School.

I. Definition and Characterization: New England theology, in the technical sense of these words, designates a special school of theology which grew up among the Congregationalists of New England, originating in the year 1734, when Jonathan Edwards (q.v.) began his constructive theological work, culminating a little before the Civil War, declining afterwards, and rapidly disappearing after the year 1880. During this period it had become the dominant school among Congregationalists, had led to a division among Presbyterians, resulting in the creation of a new denomination, the New School Presbyterian (1838–69), had founded all the theological seminaries of the Congregationalists and several of the Presbyterians, had furnished the vital forces from which had sprung the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, had established a series of colleges from Amherst in the East to Pacific University in the West, and led in a great variety of practical efforts for the extension of the kingdom of Christ. It may be formally defined as the Calvinism of Westminister and Dort modified by a more ethical conception of God, by a new emphasis upon the liberty, ability, and responsibility of man, by the restriction of moral quality to action in distinction from nature, and by the theory that the constitutive principle of virtue is benevolence. This article sketches its history genetically, details

as to the individual men being remitted to the special articles upon them.

1. The Period of Settlement in America, 1620–69.

II. Preliminary Conditions: The emigrants to New England were, in England, Calvinistic Puritans. In Holland, John Robinson (q.v.) had come in contact with the Arminians, and had taken sides against them. Arminianism was a recoil from the extreme positions of a scholastic Calvinism, but as it had no better psychology or philosophy by which to establish its objections than Calvinism had developed, it was unable to obtain the general assent of minds of the first rank which had been thoroughly trained in the old system. At a disputation which was held in the University of Leyden in 1613, Robinson had appeared for the Calvinistic party, and subsequently published a *Defence of the Doctrine Propounded by the Synod of Dort* (Leyden, 1624). Two years after the Westminster Confession (see WESTMINSTER STANDARDS) had been prepared in England it was adopted in New England (1648) as the general theological standard of the new churches. The type of theology thus fixed remained unchanged during this period, the two theological events which occurred exercising no perceptible influence upon it. The first of these was the Antinomian controversy, which was stirred up by the teachings of Mrs. Ann Hutchinson in Boston, and which was brought to an end by the Synod of 1637 and subsequent civil action (see ANTINOMIANISM AND ANTINOMIAN CONTROVERSIES, II., 2). Mrs. Hutchinson taught that the evidence of justification was the immediate revelation of the indwelling Spirit, and was independent of sanctification; and this was no sooner fully understood than it was rejected. The second event was the publication in 1650 of a treatise upon *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption* by William Pynchon (q.v.), the leading personality at Springfield, and a layman. Pynchon's principal contention was against the idea that Christ suffered the pains of hell, but he also rejected the imputation of our sins to Christ and of Christ's merits to us, making justification to be forgiveness, and presenting for a positive theory of the atonement the thought that Christ's obedience more highly pleased God than our sins displeased him, thus repeating substantially the theory of Anselm. The book met with a stern reception, being publicly burned by order of the General Court, and then, by order of the same body, refuted by John Norton (q.v.) who pursued quite the line of the standard orthodoxy. And thus the book fell into obscurity without leaving a trace of its influence. But meantime this Westminster theology of the New England Fathers was working out its natural results. It was characteristic of Calvinism to lay so much stress upon the sovereignty of God as to neglect the freedom of man. The tone of mind in New England was unphilosophic. The sovereignty of God was the great doctrine of theology in the popular estimation. Man was abased that God might be exalted; and hence the common preaching dwelt so much upon man's helplessness that the function of the pulpit to rouse the people to repentance and the exercise of vigorous faith was suspended, if not destroyed. Man's activity was so lost sight of in the contemplation of God's agency that faith was represented as something to be waited for as a mysterious gift from on high. It could not be understood as primarily an act of the will, for the will itself had not been separated from the other faculties of the mind so that theology could ascribe to it any independent activities. As was natural, a paralysis spread over the churches. Conversions were rare, and the second generation of New England was largely unconverted, and even failed to bring their children to baptism. The results were alarm and that effort to remedy the evil by outward means which was the first event with which the next period opens, the "Half-Way Covenant" (q.v.); but the effort was vain.

2. The Period of Decline, 1660–1726.

The religious paralysis continued, degeneration of the public character followed, indifference to religion increased, and immorality began to abound. Things grew so bad that in 1679 a "Reforming Synod" was called in Boston. The account given by the synod of the state of morals is so dark that some exaggeration must be suspected. But the positive sins mentioned, the increase of profanity, intemperance, and licentiousness, show that there was rising about the Church a community which the Church was not making its own. The causes of this decline were not all theological, for the roughness of frontier life, the perils and losses of the Indian wars, the deprivation of the privileges of education which the fathers had enjoyed in England, and even the effect in the new country of such untoward events in the old as the restoration of the Stuarts, are to be considered. But the theological currents of the times had contributed their part. Latitudinarianism and that form of Arminianism which was represented by Tillotson, Clarke, Whitby, Taylor, and others, whose writings were freely read in New England, helped to loosen the hold of conviction upon the minds of men, producing a state of indecision and inactivity, accompanied by some new sense of the dignity of human nature, without performing any deep and thorough work of theological reconstruction. The tide soon set toward Arminianism; the Arminian theories were more or less accepted; the doctrine of the new birth which, in the forms of a theology of dependence upon a sovereign God, was inconsistent with the new feeling of freedom which was stirring in the thought of the times, was forgotten or denied; under the operation of the Half-Way Covenant and the theory of Solomon Stoddard (q.v.) that the communion should be opened to unbelievers as a converting ordinance, vital piety was neglected for an outward piety of good works; and thus not only the Calvinistic theology, but even the religious life of New England was endangered. An Increase Mather might still be found to preach powerful revival sermons and to protest against destructive innovations, but protest was rare and ineffectual. New England was in a bad way. The Puritan experiment of founding a pure church to sustain and extend vital piety and pure doctrine from generation to generation was near utter failure. Who would or could save it?

1. His Fundamental Position.

III. The Founders.—1. Jonathan Edwards the Elder: By birth and early training belonging to the strictest circles of the old theology, and by nature and religious experience inclined to the heartiest acceptance of the great central doctrine of Calvinism, the sovereignty of God, Jonathan Edwards the Elder (q.v.) was essentially a defender of the old, with little sympathetic appreciation of the new thought which was struggling for expression. Much less was his work a new movement, beginning at a new point, and producing a theology which by its very radicalness was able to replace the old with something destined to mark one of the great advances of the human spirit. The times were not ripe for any such work. The principle of authority was still dominant in the Protestant world. The Deists had shaken it off from their own minds, but they had made no permanent impression upon their times. The new views had not succeeded in establishing themselves by such an interpretation of the Scriptures as should render it necessary for the theologian to admit that they were favored by revelation, much less that they were its evident meaning. Calvinism still seemed to have the Scriptures in its favor; and, upon the generally accepted principles of the day, to say this was to pronounce the doom of Arminianism. Edwards accordingly set himself, first for his own people, and then for the community at large, to the task of overcoming Arminianism, and he performed it by presenting the old theology afresh, but in such a form as he believed would carry the assent of his generation. He formed the distinct purpose of proving every proposition he advanced with so cogent logic that every consistent thinker should be compelled to accept it. His premises were Scriptural, but his method was purely rational, however it may seem now and then to clothe itself in the form of consecutive interpretation; and by this he introduced a new force into American theology. It was to prove at last more powerful than any other element of this theology. He began his work by preaching that series of sermons upon justification by faith which led to his first revival in 1734. It may be said that there is nothing new in these sermons. They present the old doctrine in the old formulas, but with the intensity of a man who had an independent grasp upon the thought he was urging. But there was something in the earnestness of the preacher, something in his exaltation of the work of Christ, which evoked action, and thus introduced a new element into the religious life of New England. It became natural to look for conversion as the result of preaching, and so the doctrine of the new birth was reintroduced into New England as a living idea, and soon became a controlling theological principle. By logical necessity the next step was the reerection of the fact of the new birth as the indispensable condition of church-membership, the original peculiarity of the New England churches. Edwards took it, and it led to his dismissal from his parish.

2. His Doctrine of the Will.

In the retirement of Stockbridge the work went on. Driven now by a mental necessity, he went into a more fundamental refutation of Arminianism. He attacked it in his most famous treatise, that upon the *Freedom of the Will*. The book is not that of an investigator, or even that of an impartial judge. It is the work of an advocate. Edwards was firmly fixed upon the basis of the Calvinistic doctrine of the divine sovereignty, which he viewed as a doctrine not only glorious but unspeakably sweet and precious. He perceived the necessity of philosophical determinism to that conception of the divine government which he had formed, and it was, therefore, determinism which he embraced and advocated. He believed the Arminian position to be thoroughly opposed to that sound philosophy which everybody accepted and which was already before the world in the works of John Locke. All that was necessary to banish it from the earth was elaborately to exhibit this fact. He did not condescend to notice Locke's own suggestion of a threefold division of the mind, whereby the will obtained a separation from the other faculties which seemed to suggest its independent operation. He reverted to the standard twofold division which had come down from Calvin, and, simply taking Locke's theory, as it was presented in the *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, without the addition of a single important element or even argument, he set it forth in contrast with Arminianism, and exposed Arminianism in the light of it, till for himself and the majority of his age there was no reply to be made. Indeed, grant him his postulate, and there is no answer. This postulate is that the law of causation reigns in the intellectual world as completely as it does in the natural. There can be no such thing as an uncaused event. Hence the will is moved by causes, and these are the motives which operate upon it. The will always is as the greatest apparent good. Freedom consists in the power to do what the will has chosen. There is no liberty of the will apart from this. The self-determination of the Arminians is an impossible hypothesis. A self-determined volition is an uncaused event, an impossibility, or it is caused by some previous action of the will. But if a previous action of the will determining it is necessary to constitute it free, then an action still previous is necessary to make that act free, or else it, being unfree, can not give rise to a free act, and so on *ad infinitum*. This is his reduction of his adversaries' position to absurdity, repeatedly employed in his work. The Arminians were more nearly correct upon the main point than Edwards was; and yet they had so mingled their real advance with errors of excess in the direction of other anthropological doctrines that they seemed as much to ignore the agency of God in man's religious life as the Calvinists ignored that of man. In spite of his main position, which would have reduced man to a mere machine, Edwards gave to him a real activity, and laid great emphasis upon the fact that moral agency consists in choosing. He also introduced a distinction between natural and moral ability, which, though fallacious, as he stated it, was seized upon by his successors and made the basis of effective preaching. But, faulty as was the book in these respects, it was a marvel of acuteness in dialectic. So thorough-going and minute discussion of this theme had never yet been had. It made the greatest sensation in the literary world and remains to this day the main support of Edwards' literary fame as one of the greatest of Americans.

3. Original Sin and Virtue.

But Edwards' strictly theological work did not stop here. In his treatise upon *Original Sin* he advanced a step by laying down the principle that all sin is voluntary. In this book he becomes the investigator and innovator. However defective his definition of the word voluntary might be, sin consisted in choosing and choosing wrongly. While retaining the doctrine of original sin, and thus of man's connection with Adam, he thought it necessary to explain it in such a way as to give room for this new principle, which he did by substituting mediate for immediate imputation, teaching that we must consent to Adam's sin by voluntarily sinning before his sin can be imputed to us. This idea went down to his successors, as well as the idea of connection with Adam by a " divine constitution," under which idea Edwards taught a certain identity of all men with Adam, spending some energy upon a discussion of personal identity and the possibility of embracing Adam and his descendants in such identity. This treatise is, then, no mere piece of reaction. Edwards learns as he writes. What he opposes are for the most part real errors. He says nothing about other principles of Taylor's (whose work he is reviewing) which were later to form a large part of the working materials of the school. And he has put the theology more markedly upon an ethical basis by making corruption of nature an ethical corruption, consisting principally in deprivation of the presence of the Holy Spirit—nothing physical, nothing merely mysterious. The greatest constructive work of Edwards' life, however, was done in a little treatise, commonly left unmentioned, the *Nature of Virtue,* in which he arrives at the principle that benevolence is the constitutive element of true virtue. The idea is not original with him, but is derived from Hutcheson and Cumberland. But Edwards rises at once upon a plane of rational intuition upon which his predecessors had no footing. Indeed, he does not so much prove his position as unfold it. And thus beginning with the idea of harmony, which is the ideal condition of the universe, he proceeds at once to bring the idea of virtue into connection with it; and when that connection is established, his work is done. Virtue, he teaches, is something beautiful, or some kind of beauty. It is a moral kind of beauty, one belonging to the disposition and will. Nor is it any " particular " beauty, or beauty in a limited sphere, but one which is still beautiful when viewed in the most comprehensive manner. Now, " beauty does not consist in discord and dissent, but in consent and agreement; and if every intelligent being is in some way related to being in general, and is a part of the universal system of existence, and so stands in connection with the whole, what can its general and true beauty be but its union and consent with the great whole? " That is substantially the whole argument. Virtue is beauty, and beauty is harmony. Virtue, then, is harmony, or the choice of harmony. It is agreement to being, or consent to being. This being is general being, and hence virtue is love to being in general, or disinterested benevolence. A volition is virtuous when it is the exemplification of such benevolence; an act is virtuous when it rests upon the motive of love. Both Edwards and his school thought their conception to be identical with that of Jesus when he said that the whole law hung on the two commandments, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; and thy neighbor as thyself. This theory is the central root from which grew most that was distinctive of New England theology, and may be said to be that theology in germ; and yet its importance was not perceived by its originator, nor did he make any recognizable application of it to the system.

Thus Edwards revivified the doctrine of the new birth, introduced the work upon the theory of the will which was to occupy so much of the strength of his successors, made one application of it in the way of an improvement in the doctrine of imputation, and propounded the theory of virtue. These were his contributions of material to the New England school; but his theological work was far wider than this. Through his personal contact with a number of young minds in their formative period he did much to instil his spirit, the spirit of unfettered, rational inquiry, into the next generation of ministers, and to form a " school." Among those who resorted to his house to study theology with him for a longer or a shorter time were especially two, who remained his intimate friends and advisers throughout his life, Joseph Bellamy and Samuel Hopkins (qq.v.; see also HOPKINSIANISM).

2. Edwards' Successors, Bellamy and Hopkins: Bellamy fully adopted Edwards' theory of virtue, and made extensive applications of it in his principal work, *True Religion Delineated* (Boston, 1750). This work defines religion as consisting in conformity to the law of God and compliance with the Gospel of Christ. The law is fulfilled by love. Under the Gospel, Bellamy considers the principal points of theology, and here the effects of Edwards' influence begin to appear. Ability is emphasized, and men are exhorted to immediate repentance, as a thing wholly within their powers. Their inability is recognized, but it is an inability arising from a want of a good disposition, and therefore culpable. " The more unable to love God we are," he says, " the more are we to blame." Under original sin he says that " our corruptions " are " free, spontaneous inclinations." Election is founded upon God's goodness. In the doctrine of the atonement, Bellamy made the transition for the school from the Calvinistic theory that the sufferings of Christ were a satisfaction to justice, rendered to God as the offended party, to the Grotian theory that they are a penal example, and that God in this matter is to be considered as a moral governor. He performed a very great service also in discussing the *Wisdom of God in the Permission of Sin* (1758), justifying it on the ground that evil is the necessary means of the greatest good. And, above all, he so preached the Gospel, under the influence of the new conceptions, as to stir men powerfully to spiritual activity, and to do much to enlarge the influence of the revivals which had begun under Edwards. Hopkins began his career in a storm of opposition called out by his adherence to high Calvinism. His first published work was entitled *Sin through the Divine Interposition an Advantage to the Universe* (1759). The title was enough for most readers. It occupied substantially the position of Bellamy. More serious was the opposition to his views upon conversion and regeneration. Over against this new theology of the new birth was a tendency which sought to win men to God by presenting something less radical than an entire, immediate, and voluntary surrender to God as the condition of the divine acceptance. Mayhew, Mills, Hart, and Hemmenway represent various forms of this opposition, which was met by Hopkins in a series of tracts. One of them, which went to the root of the opposition, was the *Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness* (1773), which presented the theory of Edwards, but in an original way, and modified it by making all sin to consist in selfishness, as all holiness in benevolence. By all this work Hopkins was finally brought to the preparation of his *System* (1793). It was the first system of theology prepared in New England which could be called original; but it followed quite strictly the conventional selection and arrangement of topics. The modifying elements are Edwardsean, that moral agency consists in choice, that man possesses true ability to repent, that love is the essence of virtue. Hopkins advances upon Edwards in the emphasis which he lays upon the real freedom of man. He grounds his doctrine of the divine decrees distinctly upon the divine love. He defends the freedom of men under the decree by asserting that the decree includes freedom, though he does not say how. He really fails to deliver himself from the supralapsarianism of his predecessors. The doctrine of sin he improves by teaching that "there is, strictly speaking, no other sin but actual sin." And upon the atonement, he teaches the Grotian theory distinctly as to what is accomplished by the sufferings of Christ, but holds that there is another part of Christ's work, which he accomplished by his obedience. This is, however, not imputed to believers, as in the old theology, but by a merit of congruity Christ procures the gift of the Holy Spirit for believers, by whom they are sanctified and made meet to receive eternal life. Thus the new ideas have begun to work; and thus there has appeared before the second century of American life has closed a system which, for comprehensiveness, thoroughness, high tone, power of reasoning, independence, ethical and spiritual value, and solid contributions to the advancing school, deserves to be called a great work.

IV. The Development.—1. The Younger Edwards to Samuel Harris: Up to this point the new theology had been wrought out by patient thinkers in the retirement of quiet studies, but their results had commonly been produced in reply to some distinct call, some error which had arisen, some need which had been felt. This continued to be the case; and the development of the school was always conditioned by controversy. The doctrine of the atonement was no exception. There arrived in America in 1770 an English Universalist, John Murray (q.v.), who began to advocate universal salvation upon the basis of the theory of James Relly (q.v.), of London, which he called "union." It was nothing but the old Calvinism of satisfaction and imputation plus the proposition that Christ died for all. Relly concluded that Christ's merits were imputed to all, and therefore that all were saved. This conclusion could not be accepted by the New England divines. Their views upon the subject of the future had been settled by long consideration. But the logic of the Universalist argument was good, and hence the trouble must lie in the premises. It could not lie in the proposition that Christ died for all. Bellamy had shown this. It must therefore lie in the proposition that Christ's merits are imputed to us. The Grotian theory of the atonement had already been introduced into the New England thinking on account of its closer agreement with the theory of virtue, and the idea was already familiar that God does not act in the matter of sin as the offended party, chiefly concerned in the satisfaction of his own attribute of justice, and that the sufferings of Christ are not the payment of the sinners' debt but a penal example, opening the way for the free exercise of God's merciful love of men. Following this suggestion, a group of thinkers in Connecticut, with Stephen West of Stockbridge (q.v.), set forth almost simultaneously the New England theory of the atonement as the answer of New England to Universalism. Jonathan Edwards the Younger (q.v.) was the chief of these, and his sermons at New Haven in 1785 are to be regarded as its first adequate presentation. As presented by Grotius, the theory was legal in its forms and without the ideal side. That ideal was given by the Edwardsean theory of virtue. God's government rests upon his character, and that character is love. Love puts men under a moral government, and controls them by motives. It prescribes just penalties for disobedience; but these will not be exacted simply because God is just. There is no virtue in an act of justice apart from love. Hence God will act from love—that is, from a regard for the general good of the universe. His character must be shielded, his law maintained, because love to men demands all this. But if this can be done, authority maintained, sinners forgiven, and yet no moral influence exerted thereby upon the sinner calculated to result in his hurt, love demands that it shall be done. All this is actually effected by setting forth Christ as a penal example. Thus public justice, or love, is satisfied by the atonement, but distributive justice not; and it is rendered consistent with the good of the universe to forgive repentant sinners, but the debt of man is not paid nor are the merits of Christ imputed to him. Thus the major proposition of the Rellyan argument is taken away. From this time on the words "moral government" are found on many a page of the New England writers. They worked patiently upon the theory, developing this feature and that with some greater degree of fulness; and yet the main ideas were fully stated in the beginning. Stephen West (q.v.) brought out the relation

1. Doctrine of the Atonement.

of the atonement to the character of God; Edward Dorr Griffin (q.v.) expatiated upon the provision made in it for all men, and developed more fully the nature of the divine government; Caleb Burge brought out the fact that the atonement is necessary that God should be "just to himself" by properly representing his character; and Nathaniel William Taylor (q.v.) restated the nature of God's moral government with unsurpassed fulness and clearness.

2. Regeneration.

From the time of Edwards the doctrine of regeneration had excited continual attention. It was the doctrine of the most immediate practical importance. The doctrine of the will was fundamental to it; and hence, the subject of the will, and particularly Edwards' great work, was subjected to long study, and passed through a development of great interest to the thinker, and of fateful significance for the school itself. Edwards' treatise produced so tremendous an impression that for twelve years after its appearance no criticism of it was sent forth. Then James Dana published an *Examination* (Boston, 1770) which urged with persistent force the position that upon Edwards' basis the only efficient causation in the universe must be that of God. To this work Stephen West of Stockbridge replied in his *Moral Agency* (1772), in which he followed Edwards in the main, but was driven boldly to announce the position to which Dana had tried to drive the Edwardseans, that moral agency consists in exercises (i.e., acts of the will), which are the action of deity as the sole true efficient cause. He thus reversed the motion of Hopkins in the direction of a greater freedom than Edwards had given to man. Samuel West (q.v.) of New Bedford was stirred by this reduction of man to a mere machine, to send out his *Essays* (1795) which were remarkable for first proposing in New England the division of the mind into three fundamental faculties, which he styled the "perception, the propension, and the will," and taught that the mind, by divine communication, is a first cause in the same sense as God is himself. This revolutionary psychological proposal received no appropriate attention, for it was too far in advance of its times. West himself did not appreciate its importance nor give to it the weight which it ought to have received in the discussion. He attacked the main positions of Edwards, but each by itself, strongly maintaining that motives are not the causes of volitions, and denying the distinction between natural and moral ability. He shows how Stephen West's idea of efficient cause makes God the only living principle in the universe. But the main argument for freedom is consciousness, and in this the real strength of the book lies. "We feel ourselves free." This work was replied to by the younger Edwards in a *Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity* (1797). He comes stoutly to the defense of his father, though modifying the position of motives, making them occasions rather than causes of the action of the will. His favorite method of reply is to show that West really meant, and often said, just what Edwards said. Fundamentally it is rather a verbal than a material answer. He follows Stephen West in making God the cause of men's volitions, and then banishes true efficient causation not only from the finite world but also from the universe, saying that God "is no more the efficient cause of his own volitions than of his own existence." Thus the tendency of New England theology was still to exalt the agency of God at the expense of that of man. Nathanael Emmons (q.v.) closed this branch of the development and expressed the dependence of man in the extremest forms. God creates our volitions. But in Emmons the other tendency, which was found in Bellamy and Hopkins, also reappears, and the freedom of man is asserted with the most unflinching disdain of apparent inconsistency. Men are as free as if God did not act in their volitions. If their volitions are created, they are created free. But at this point of paradox and contradiction there appeared a book which was finally to reverse the current and set the Edwardsean school upon the road to a doctrine of true freedom, Asa Burton's *Essays on Some of the First Principles of Metaphysicks* (Portland, 1824). This service was rendered by the proposal of the same threefold division of the faculties of the mind which West had vainly made, now so presented as to make its way to general acceptance. The "taste," as Burton calls the sensibility, is entirely separated from the will, the two faculties being completely distinct; but for the sake of preserving the same certainty for which Edwards labored, and which was supposed to be necessary to the divine sovereignty, an "infallible connection" is declared to have been established by God between the taste and volition. The action of the taste is necessary. It is the "spring of action in all moral agents," and operates as the cause of volitions. Burton leaves man in the toils of Edwards' necessity. He has corrected one by one the minor errors of his predecessors—of Hopkins that freedom consists in voluntariness, of Emmons that the mind is a chain of exercises, and that volitions are created by God. He has distinguished between the kind of necessity with which the intellect operates, and that by which the will is determined. But he has not given a true freedom. This work was performed by Nathaniel William Taylor (q.v.), who had come under the influence of the Scotch school and seized upon the new division of the mind as giving a neutral point in humanity, not corrupted by original sin, to which the Gospel could appeal. He made man the efficient, though not the sole efficient, agent of his own actions. In possessing agency, man has a "power to the contrary," or capacity of alternate choice. Motives have influence but not causative power to produce volitions. But the certainty of future moral events is not relinquished, though left unexplained. Charles Grandison Finney and James Harris Fairchild (qq.v.), at Oberlin, cleared this position of some unnecessary complications. And Samuel Harris (q.v.), the Sir William Hamilton of the school, brought this development to its highest point by defining the will as the power of a person "to determine the end or objects to which he will direct his energy and the exertion of his energy with reference to the determined end or object." Man "has the power of self-direction, self-exertion, and self-restraint." He distinguishes between choice as self-direction and volition as self-exertion and self-restraint. And, upon the basis of consciousness, criticism, and history, he affirms that "freedom is inherent in rationality." Edwards was wrong, he says, in considering the will from the point of view of efficient causation and forgetting that it might be exercised (in choice) prior to all causation.

2. The Great Controversies: The first of these to take a distinct form was the Universalist, beginning, as already said, with John Murray in 1770.

1. The Universalist Controversy.

Other leaders followed him, some of whom came from the Congregational ministry, such as Huntington, whose posthumous *Calvinism Improved* was entirely upon the basis of Relly, and Charles Chauncy (q.v.), who published a *Salvation of All Men* (1782). The general reply to Rellyanism was the theory of the atonement, as explained above. But elaborate replies to these and other Universalist publications were made by John Smalley (q.v.), the younger Edwards, and others. After a time whatever danger there may have been that Universalism would invade the Congregational ranks passed by, and the interest of divines in this discussion slackened, as another occupied their attention more and more. But meantime Elhanan Winchester (q.v.) had appeared as another original Universalist, and Hosea Ballou (q.v.) had made the change of Universalist theology from the old orthodox basis to a Unitarian, while Walter Balfour had written voluminous exegetical works in the interest of Universalism. Moses Stuart (q.v.) closed this controversy upon the orthodox side by elaborate exegetical discussions.

2. The Unitarian Controversy.

But this controversy, interesting as it is in itself, was of little importance in comparison with the Unitarian controversy. This has its roots in the early divergence to Arminianism against which Edwards set himself. Successful as he was in recalling the majority of the ministers and churches back to Calvinism, there were circles in which the *Freedom of the Will* was regarded with great objection from the first. In view of the development of the Edwardsean school itself toward a doctrine of more genuine freedom, it may be said that Edwards made a great theological blunder when, for the sake of avoiding certain unevangelical concomitants of self-determinism, he turned his back upon so plain and simple a truth as freedom. He missed the opportunity of carrying New England forward in a common movement to a better theology, and founded a school instead of guiding a church. Many of the Edwardsean ideas were accepted by theologians who would not suffer the name of Edwardsean to be applied to them. This was particularly true of the theory of virtue. And when Arminianism began to turn in the direction of Unitarianism in New England, Edwards and his successors had for a long time nothing really helpful to say. They do not seem to have understood the issue presented, though that issue was clearly enough put in the first book of a Unitarian sort which obtained any influence in America, Thomas Emlyn's *Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ* (5th ed., Boston, 1756). Was the theory of two natures in the one person of Christ correct? Was it so managed as to meet the difficulties raised by the evident limitations laid upon the attributes of Christ? Calvinism had been open from the time of Calvin down to the charge of substantial Nestorianism, for it had never been able to do more than assert the Chalcedon doctrine of the unity of Christ's person, and had treated the divinity and humanity in such a way as to render any true unity impossible. The old theology was now summoned either to justify its exegesis by a satisfactory rationale, or surrender its doctrine of Christology and the Trinity.

3. The Unitarian Position and the Answer.

This issue was not at all met in New England. Half a century after the appearance of the book on this side of the water, Henry Ware (q.v.), believed to be a Unitarian, was made Hollis professor of divinity in Harvard College (1805). But during this period Unitarianism was progressing by private reflection and study, not by open controversy. The public debate began after 1815 when the large departure from the old theology became known, and after 1819, in particular, when William Ellery Channing (q.v.) preached his Baltimore sermon on "Unitarian Christianity." On the orthodox side the debate was carried on by Moses Stuart and Leonard Woods (qq.v.), professors at Andover Seminary, and closed by Nathaniel William Taylor (q.v.). On the Unitarian side, Ware and Norton came to Channing's support. Among lesser men the controversy spread over a large territory and a long time. But the Unitarian argument was completely stated by Channing. He said, "According to this [Trinitarian] doctrine, there are three infinite and equal persons, possessing supreme divinity, called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They love each other, converse with each other, and delight in each other's society. They perform different parts in man's redemption, each having his appropriate office, and neither doing the work of the other. Here, then, we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, and different perceptions, performing different acts, and sustaining different relations; and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are formed." Of the nature of Christ he said: "According to this doctrine, Jesus Christ, instead of being one mind, one conscious, intelligent principle, whom we can understand, consists of two souls, two minds; the one divine, the other human; the one weak, the other almighty; the one ignorant, the other omniscient. Now we maintain that this is to make Christ two beings." Thus was again set forth the rational issue exactly as Emlyn had done. Stuart's reply sought, first, to remove certain misunderstandings, and make certain qualifications. In these he himself left the orthodox ground of his time and approached Channing. He dropped the separation of functions of Father and Son to which Channing objected, rejected the "eternal sonship" of Christ, gave up the word "person," and reduced the Trinity to an otherwise undefined eternal "distinction" in the divine nature. He did nothing to clear up the doctrine of the person of Christ. The weight of his argument was, however, exegetical; and here in the estimation even of a Unitarian critic (Ellis) he proved his main point, that the doctrine of the true deity of Christ is the doctrine of the New Testament. The contest was a drawn battle. The Unitarians made a demand for a rationale which the orthodox did not meet, although they substantially taught that whatever was Biblical was rational. Not to meet the demand was, therefore, in a measure to fail. The orthodox made a Biblical argument which the Unitarians could not invalidate, although they were bound, by their own adherence to the inspiration of the Scriptures, to show that their new positions were the true meaning of the Bible. The orthodox were still maintaining the principle of Biblical authority in theology, and their thinking was being lamed by it, unconsciously to themselves. The Unitarians had already substantially passed over upon the ground of pure rationalism, but were hampered by their supposed adherence to the inspiration of the Scriptures. The time had not come on either side for complete clearness of thought.

4. The Separation of the Unitarians.

Yet the antagonists had come so near to one another in respect to the Trinity and Christology that one questions why they did not come nearer. The answer is to be seen in the further development of the controversy, particularly in the writings of Ware and Woods. The difference between the two parties lay deeper than has yet appeared. The Unitarians were full of the thought of the dignity of human nature, and they greatly softened the idea of sin and guilt. They were thus out of sympathy with the spiritual and experiential attitude of the orthodox, with their practises of worship and service, with revivals and missionary efforts. They were religiously sterile and cold. In fact these defects had appeared long since, for in the time of Edwards the same religious community out of which Unitarianism ultimately sprung had opposed the revivals; and when James Freeman (q.v.) carried King's Chapel in Boston (1785) over to Unitarianism, a certain detachment from the sterner and sadder realities of life marked the new preaching. What theoretical dogmatics might not have been able to do, difference of tone and estrangement of sympathies effectually accomplished, and the two parties separated in church fellowship as well as theology, and a new denomination was produced. The result is the stranger since the Unitarians were, after all, children of the same theological home as the Trinitarians, had as generally adopted the distinguishing feature of the Edwardsean school, the principle of benevolence, as their opponents, and emphasized many of the cardinal maxims of the other tendency, even anticipating sometimes results to which the Edwardseans were finally to come.

V. The Ripened Product: The name of N. W. Taylor has already been mentioned, who seized upon the suggestions of Burton to develop a better doctrine of the will than New England had yet had. A large part of his active life was passed in theological controversy, to which he was introduced by a *Concio* which he preached at New Haven in 1828 to an assembly of clergymen. In this sermon he incidentally introduced the topic of the prevention of sin, as to which he advanced the view, arising from his new conception of the will as free under whatever pressure of motives might be brought to bear upon it, that, possibly, owing to the nature of moral agency, God could not prevent sin, or at least the present degree of sin, in the moral system. Three important controversies sprung from this single proposal.

1. "Taylorism."

The first was with Joseph Harvey, who regarded Taylor as having wholly gone over to Arminianism because he seemed to have relinquished the certainty of human moral action, and understood him as teaching that sin is an evil which God did not choose to permit but which he could not prevent. The second was with Leonard Woods of Andover, who discussed the prevention of sin from the basis of the Burtonian kind of necessity, aside from which theory as to the action of the will, there was little difference between the antagonists, as Taylor was careful to point out. More serious was the third controversy, that with Bennet Tyler (q.v.), which had its roots in the distant past, in the long interest of New England in the theory of conversion, and was set in motion by a *Dissertation on the Means of Regeneration* (1827) by Gardiner Spring (q.v.). Upon the basis of Emmons' theology, Spring taught that no motives presented to men can produce in them holy love to God. Taylor had been a great revival preacher, and he felt this doctrine to be bad because so paralyzing to all human effort, and he therefore opposed it upon the basis of his new views of human nature. There was in man a neutral point to which motives might appeal, and this point gave courage to the preacher and effectiveness to his words. He found this neutral point in man's natural desire for happiness (which he styled self-love, following Hopkins and others), to which the motives of the Gospel could certainly appeal since they really urge to what is the highest happiness of man. He conceived regeneration as taking place after this method: the Spirit of God suspended the " selfish principle " in man, that is, broke the control of sinful purpose, the motives of the Gospel appealed to the native desire for happiness, a choice was made by the act of the free will which choice was " using the means of regeneration," and thus the man was regenerated, the whole complex operation being " instantaneous." Tyler failed to get his point of view. He did not grasp the idea of freedom which Taylor had introduced, classified him with the Arminians and Socinians, and from that moment lost all capacity for understanding him. Out of all this confusion came, however, the good result of greater clearness upon the moral government of God, which had been over and over again confounded with his physical government, and the fact that it is a government by means of motives, while the other is a government by forces. Taylor at last broke away from the subjection to Edwards in which the school had heretofore lain, and controverted the position of the great leader as to moral inability. In his lectures he further modified his position upon the prevention of sin, teaching finally that the freedom necessary to a moral system, unchecked by influences which may be inconsistent with the highest perfection of that system, may lead to that degree of sin which is actually found in the world. "Taylorism" when finally developed might be defined as an attempt, while maintaining the principal doctrines of Calvinism, including the previous certainty of every moral act, to introduce a philosophy into the explanation and defense of the system which should be true to the facts of human consciousness. Its prominent feature, which could never be hid and seemed to most men utterly inconsistent with Calvinism, was the freedom of the will, which was now made for the first time in New England the real working theory of theology and practise. It therefore led to powerful attacks upon the whole New England school, particularly from Princeton, and was the great theological reason for the disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838.

2. Bushnell, Smith, and Finney.

Later writers connected more or less intimately with the Divinity School of Yale University carried on the work of theological development in more or less accord with the prevailing line of New England thought. Among these one of the most important was Horace Bushnell (q.v.). In his *God in Christ* (New York, 1849) he dwelt upon the defects of human language and forms of thought, and hence maintained a great degree of reticence as to the nature of the immanent Trinity and of the divinity of Christ, while affirming both. He did much to save the doctrine of Christ's real, consubstantial humanity from the reaction of orthodoxy against Unitarianism by which it might have been lost. He emphasized the method of nurture in religious training whereby a "child was to grow up as a Christian and never know himself as being otherwise." His work upon *Nature and the Supernatural* (1858) did much to establish the realm of the supernatural as the realm where free will prevails. But perhaps his greatest work was in his contribution to the doctrine of the atonement, where, while neglecting the objective side of it, and formally denying the governmental theory, the substance of which he held, he emphasized as had never been done in theological history the direct work of Christ in saving men, his loving service by which he moves their souls toward holiness. George Park Fisher (q.v.), the great master in church history, was also an active and strong apologist. But he and Samuel Harris, while thoroughly loyal in their own persons to the New England school, had come to base their reasonings and general treatment of the subject so entirely upon foreign, and chiefly German, scholarship, that they constitute the transition from this school to later forms of theology. Among the New School Presbyterians, Henry Boynton Smith (q.v.) was a loyal son of New England, whom extensive studies abroad and wide theological scholarship did not carry out of the precincts of the school. He belonged to the conservative side, having studied with Woods at Andover, and remained to the end a determinist in his doctrine of the will. His effort to form a "Christocentric" theology, and thus promote the development, resulted in little more than a nominal embodiment of this idea. The Oberlin theologians were very productive, especially in the early years of the institution (1833 sqq.). Charles Grandison Finney (q.v.) had early come to the adoption of the great New England principles in a substantially original manner. In its matured form, his theology was substantially Taylorism. An early discussion in Oberlin upon sanctification and the possibility of perfect holiness in this life led to the formulation of a principle which was long current in Oberlin, to which the name of "the simplicity of moral action" was given. Supposing that there could be at any instant but one moral choice of the will, it was affirmed that that single and indivisible moral act must be either wholly sinful or entirely holy. And, since the will is free, the possibility of an uninterrupted series of perfectly holy choices, and hence of perfect holiness, must be maintained. James Harris Fairchild (q.v.) closed the line of New England theologians at Oberlin with *Elements of Theology* (1892), which was the summing-up of the previous growth, stated with great simplicity and clearness, a moderate and sensible working theology for the average minister.

3. Edwards Amasa Park.

The New England system received its fullest, most comprehensive, and most representative expression in the lectures of Professor Edwards Amasa Park (q.v.). There is scarcely a great thought, and certainly no great contribution to the growing system in any of his predecessors, which he did not take up and give its due place and influence in his own theology. He was of that line of theological descent which, beginning with Edwards, flowed through Hopkins, Emmons, and Woods; but he was greatly modified by Taylor, and took up, with one great and fatal exception, all of the results of his study into his own thought. From his system as a point of view the meaning of the whole development becomes plain. As thus constituting the key to the whole school and embracing it all, Park's theology may be considered the culmination of the school. It is, first of all, a "system," a structure in which course is built upon course till all is complete. Adopting the Scotch philosophy, Park began with the doctrine of causation and built upon this the argument for the existence of God. He thus obtains, not a perfect conception of God, but an elemental idea, upon which the rest of the argument may be founded. He then proceeds to the proof of the benevolence of God, and here he discusses the prevention of sin, and, as a *lemma* to this argument, the immortality of the soul. His argument here is generally the later position of Taylor, that perhaps God can not consistently prevent sin in the best moral system. He did not follow Taylor into indeterminism, but remained more nearly with Edwards, accepting, however, Taylor's discriminations in respect to the moral government of God. Park then proceeds to the positive arguments for the benevolence of God, the greatest of which is man's moral nature, which makes it certain that God can not occupy a lower level than we. The structure of his argument never flinches, and never advances propositions for which a preparation has not been made before. The fact that God is benevolent is made the basis of an argument to show that his benevolence comprises his entire moral nature, and that all his acts are referable to this motive. This is the consistent and full application of the Edwardsean theory of virtue. The love of God is thus made the determinative principle of Park's theology. In his treatment of the Bible, Park prepared for the next stadium of American theology, though not himself entering upon it. The discovery of various readings of the original texts, Stuart's treatment of minor forms of error in the Bible, the rumor of the higher criticism, and the influence of the *Origin of Species*, had combined to make Park first reject the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and then limit its inspiration to its "religious and moral impression and teaching" as to the matter, and to "suggestion" and "superintendence" as to the manner. Thus some of the most objectionable features of the idea of Biblical authority were removed. Miracles were accepted and defended principally from their necessity to revelation, which makes them so probable that they need very little evidence to commend them to present acceptance. As to the Trinity and Christology, Park left these doctrines where Stuart had left them. The weight of his argument is expended in maintaining the divinity of Christ. He does nothing to advance the rationale of either doctrine. This was itself an almost fatal omission, for the questioning which the Unitarians began in the middle of the preceding century had now become so insistent that not to attempt to meet it was a confession of incompetence to meet the issues of the day. But Park was still hindered from perceiving the full demand of the times by his reliance upon the sufficiency of the Biblical argument to prove any position of theology, although in practise his proof was almost entirely a rational one for the doctrines which he really discussed.

4. Summary of Park's Theology.

These favorite doctrines of Park, and of New England, are met in the anthropological group. He was a high Calvinist. He maintained the "previous certainty of all events which actually occur." To maintain this, he also maintained Edwards' theory of the will, not following Taylor into his modifications in the interest of freedom. Hence he also defended the doctrine of election, which he founded in God's benevolence by adopting the general principle that God elected as many as he consistently could, that is, as many as he could without interfering too much in the system which he had established. Park taught that all sin is voluntary, and that original sin is not sin "properly so called." The "proximate" occasion of man's sinning is the corruption of his nature; but this proceeds from the sin of Adam, which is therefore the "remote" occasion of man's sinning. As to the theory of the connection existing between Adam and his descendants, Park observed silence. In his treatment of the atonement, Park followed closely his predecessors in the nature and scope of the doctrine, and in the forms under which it was presented, retaining and employing the old governmental analogies. He thus failed to ethicize the theology, and made the idea of atonement unreal to the modern mind. But he powerfully refuted the idea that God is an angry God to be placated by a blood-offering; he enlarged the idea of sacrifice; he made the whole universe, and not merely this little globe, the theater of the atonement; and he strips from the older forms of the theory many merely adventitious elements. And he defines it formally thus: "The atonement exhibits and honors the holiness, distributive justice, and law of God, and it promotes the holiness and happiness of the universe, so as to make the conduct of God in forgiving men consistent with the honor of his holiness, distributive justice, and law, and so as to satisfy his general justice in rescuing sinners from unconditional punishment, in adopting measures for inducing them to repent, and in eternally rewarding them if they do repent." The underlying idea of punishment which determines this theory is that punishment is an expression of the divine disapproval of sin, eternal in its very nature as the disapproval is eternal, for the ultimate object of preventing further sin in the universe. Thus while the idea that punishment is a satisfaction to justice is outgrown, the idea that it is essentially for the reformation of the criminal himself has not yet appeared. To dispatch remaining elements more briefly: Park's treatment of regeneration did not reach the height of Taylor's discussions, because he did not follow Taylor in modifying Edwards' theory of the will, feeling apparently no necessity for a "neutral point" in the mind to which motives might be addressed; he made the truth the means of regeneration; sanctification is progressive, and men do not actually become perfectly holy in this life; justification is synonymous with forgiveness; and the future punishment of those who die without having surrendered themselves to the claims of apprehended duty, will be eternal.

VI. The Collapse of the School: The theology of Park was a highly elaborated and finished structure and the source of great light to many minds; but, like a great lighthouse, it was placed among the waves, and those waves were destined to rise to an unexampled height and to sweep the edifice away. It is a simple historical fact that in 1880 the New England theology was taught at all the Congregational seminaries with the possible (and only partial) exception of Hartford, and that in about fifteen years, the great professors who represented it had all passed away and were succeeded in every case by men who anxiously sought to separate themselves from all identification with it. And this collapse was the more complete in that no one appeared to maintain the system by formal and careful exposition or defense. And within ten more years the theological tone of the whole denomination had completely altered. The New England theology, as constituting a distinct school, having recognized leaders, conscious of its own worth and able to resist encroachments and perform the theological service demanded by the day, had passed away. It remains to ask whether there is anything in the history here traced to explain this remarkable end of so long and great a movement. (1) It will be evident that with all its brilliant modifications and substantial "improvements" in theology, the New England theology was essentially defensive, conservative, immovably Calvinistic. Edwards had no thought of innovation. He did innovate, but it was by the internal necessity of his own thinking, a fact which was largely hidden from himself. To the end, the leaders in general supposed themselves to be saying substantially what had been said, only in better ways, with the removal of this or that error, supposed in every case to be incidental rather than central and vital. And at the end the main features of the Calvinistic view of the world, the sovereignty of God, determinism, and human helplessness, remained unaffected so as to give to the whole system, in the eyes of a world where humanity had begun to find itself, an air of abstractness and unreality which could not be suited to the actual needs of men. The world had passed on into another atmosphere in the three hundred years since Calvin's death, and his great doctrines seemed to have no reality to men now living. (2) But the difficulty was more specific than this. The new philosophy of the day was evolutionistic. Professor Park had done his best to be just to Darwin, but it may be said that the Darwinian idea never once entered his mind, was never comprehended by him. Evolution magnifies law, it rejects miracles. It consequently rejects the idea of a miraculous revelation of religion from God to man. It explains even the Bible as a development. Hence it is the foe of authority in the sphere of religion, and acknowledges only such an authority as the evident truth has, however discovered and in whatever department of human thought. New England theology did nothing essential to meet this condition. It yielded the point of verbal inspiration, it admitted a modified development in the Old Testament, it retired within the very citadel of theology by concentrating the inspiration of the Bible upon its religious message alone; but it did not consider the facts about the Biblical miracles, it contented itself with an untenable apology, and it did not once raise the question of any such necessity of revelation as it had always assumed. With all this it preserved the authority of the Bible, and when it was faced, as in the Unitarian controversy, with a demand for a rationale or a surrender of its doctrine, it took shelter behind this authority, which the age no longer acknowledged, and refused a rationale. A new conception of revelation was what the new age demanded; and when New England theology showed itself unable even to comprehend the question, it pronounced its own sentence. (3) And then the system, by the exigencies of a rational defense of the several doctrines, which it was not willing to modify, had depotentiated the old system which it sought to replace, and had become at many points lean and meager. Its Trinity was a Trinity of "distinctions" which lent itself little to the worship of the Church which had long been addressed to "the Father of an infinite majesty, his adorable, true, and only Son, also the Holy Ghost." Its Christ was too entirely a God and not a man in any conceivable way. Even its work of atonement had become so abstract as to seem superfluous, and yet it was not recognized as superfluous. In no place was it full, warm, living, palpitating with life, except in its purely ethical and psychological portions, where it dealt at first hand with accessible facts. No wonder that men educated by it, who felt the breath of the new life of the new age, accepted its silent lesson, more powerful than its open one, rejected what it had minified, and took its ethics for its true message, thus superseding it. It is so full of the most valuable instruction on every point that no man can master it without becoming a theologian; and no man can become a theologian in this day, even by its help, without finally rejecting it for something simpler, more in touch with realities, and sounder in its rational processes.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The school should be studied in the *Works* of its several great leaders, Hopkins, the two Edwards, Bellamy, Emmons, Woods, Dwight, etc., and in their numerous monographs. There has been no general genetic history of the school until that of the present writer, *A Genetic History of the New England Theology*, Chicago, 1907; but the *Bibliotheca Sacra* is full of valuable articles upon it, and Professor Park wrote *Memoirs* of Hopkins (Boston, 1852) and Emmons (1861) of the first rank. A Life of Edwards is promised by Rev. Wm. E. Park, which will be of great value. The reader should also consult the literature under the articles on the men named in the text; G. P. Fisher, *Discussions in History and Theology*, New York, 1880; G. N. Boardman, *A Hist. of New England Theology*, ib., 1899; W. Walker, *Ten New England Leaders*, ib., 1901; H. G. Goddard, *Studies in New England Transcendentalism*, ib., 1907; J. W. Riley, *American Philosophy; the early Schools*, ib., 1907.

NEW ICARIA. See COMMUNISM, II., 7.

NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH (NEW CHURCH).

Doctrinal Basis (§ 1).
Origins in Europe and America (§ 2).
Development; Statistics (§ 3).
Publishing Agencies (§ 4).
The Academy (§ 5).
The General Church of the New Jerusalem (§ 6).

1. Doctrinal Basis.

The New Church "signified by the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse," according to Emanuel Swedenborg, and hence called also the New Jerusalem Church and Church of the New Jerusalem, is the body of Christian believers who accept Swedenborg's interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as a divinely given revelation of their spiritual meaning and who believe that in this opening of the divine Word in its interior meaning the Lord is making his second advent to the world; that this advent is accompanied by the universal judgment, overturning, and remaking of the religious beliefs of mankind which were figuratively foretold in Matt. xxiv. as the "end of the world" and in Rev. xxi. as the "passing away of the former things," the "beholding of a new heaven and a new earth," and the "descent from heaven of the holy city, New Jerusalem, to be the tabernacle of God with men." In its largest meaning the New Church, according to Swedenborg, is a new divine dispensation, following the apostolic or Christian as that followed the Jewish, and embraces all of whatever name or tongue who acknowledge the three essentials of the Church which are: (1) the divinity of the Lord, (2) the holiness of the Word, and (3) the life of charity (*Divine Providence*, p. 267). In a restricted sense the New Church consists of those who openly confess the Lord Jesus Christ as revealed in his second coming in the newly opened Word, and unite by the proper rites with the ecclesiastical body organized for the worship of Jesus in his divine humanity as the only God of heaven and earth, believing that in his glorified person is the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (like soul, body, and operation in man) and that he is the redeemer and savior of mankind; and who cooperate for the promulgation of this new Christian knowledge and confession among mankind. They might therefore be distinctly classified as "Jesus-worshipers." For the complete theological system of the New Church see SWEDENBORG, EMANUEL.

2. Origins in Europe and America.

The organization and growth of the New Church are peculiar as they are those of a belief instilled by books without the influence of any personal persuasion or leadership. Swedenborg died in London in the year 1772. He never preached a sermon, and he made no effort to gather about him a band of disciples or followers. He donated his works, about twenty volumes, published in Latin anonymously, to bishops and university librarians. The first to translate complete volumes into English were two esteemed clergymen of the Church of England, Thomas Hartley, rector of Winwich in Northamptonshire, and John Clewes, rector of St. John's in Manchester. The movement toward a church organization began in England with a small body of the receivers of the doctrines who on July 31, 1787, held the first meeting for worship according to the doctrines of the New Church in the house of Thomas Wright in Poultry Road, London. Mr. James Hindmarsh, who had been a Wesleyan preacher and had received the doctrines through his son Robert Hindmarsh the printer, was chosen by lot to officiate at this inaugural meeting in place of a priest, the sacrament of the holy supper was administered to eleven persons, and five others were baptized into the faith of the New Church. In 1788 the "public worship of the Lord in his second coming" was celebrated for the first time at the opening service of a chapel obtained in Great East Cheap, London, by the society adopting the name "The New Church signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation." Here took place, the same year, June 1, the first ordination of ministers for the New Church; James Hindmarsh and Samuel Smith, both former Methodist preachers, being set apart for ordination, and twelve members being chosen by lot to lay their hands upon the candidates. Through James Hindmarsh and his successors are derived all the subsequent ordinations of ministers in the New Church in Great Britain. About the same time circles of readers and believers were formed in Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Skara in Sweden, although no distinct church organization was attempted in that country. Readers and publishers of the doctrines appeared at that time also in Germany, France, and Russia. In America the doctrines were introduced by James Glen, a Scotchman, who in Philadelphia in June, 1784, delivered a public lecture on the doctrines of the New Church, this being their first public proclamation in any place in the world. Books were later sent over by Robert Hindmarsh of London and an edition of the *True Christian Religion* was published in Philadelphia by Francis Bailey in 1789, among the subscribers to which were Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, and other distinguished men. In 1790 Lord Thomas Fairfax, Dr. John J. Cabell, Colonel Robert Carter of Virginia, and Judge John Young of Philadelphia, later of Greensburg, Pa., were instrumental in introducing the doctrines in these states. In 1792 a society was organized in Baltimore and a liturgical worship introduced, the first sermon in America being preached here on April 1 in the court house, by the Rev. James Wilmer, formerly of Christ Church College, Oxford. In the same year Ralph Mather, a convert and lay preacher of Liverpool, arrived in Philadelphia and held meetings for worship there. In 1794 the Rev. William Hill of the Church of England, an ardent disciple of the New Church, went to Boston, published the writings and deposited a set of the *Arcana celestia* in the library of Harvard College, thus planting the seed for the extensive growth of the New Church in Boston and throughout New England. In 1798 the distinctive priesthood of the New Church in America began in the ordination of Ralph Mather and John Hargrove by the church in Baltimore, "ten elders or representatives" laying their hands upon the candidates for ordination. Through John Hargrove are derived the successive ordinations into the priesthood of the New Church in America as in England through James Hindmarsh. In 1802 the Rev. John Hargrove preached a sermon in the rotunda of the capitol at Washington before the Senate and House of Representatives.

3. Development; Statistics.

Societies having sprung up in various places in England, the first "General Conference of the Members of the New Jerusalem Church" was held in London April 13, 1789, at the place of worship in Great East Cheap, London. The attendance included members from Sweden and from America. In this and the annual conferences following a catechism and liturgy were adopted and forms of ordination and rules for the vestments of the ministers were drawn up. With few omissions the conference has met every year from that time to the present. The one hundred and second session was held in London in 1909. The body is now designated as the "General Conference of the New Church." Its *Minutes* for the year 1909 shows 70 societies with a total membership of 6,665, and Sunday-schools numbering 7,907 scholars and 739 teachers. The ministers of the English Conference are classified as ordaining ministers, ordained ministers, recognized leaders, and missionaries. The ordaining ministers number 7, the ordained 38, and the leaders and missionaries 18. The first general convention of the New Jerusalem in America was held in Philadelphia on May 15, 1817. At first a convention of delegates of societies, it has since become a body composed of the several associations of state and territorial organizations of the church which with some isolated societies are represented by delegates. The convention has continued to meet every year with few omissions until the present time. The *Journal* of the 89th session of the general convention of the New Jerusalem in the United States of America, held in 1909, has a list of 14 associations and 6 isolated societies with a total membership of 6,425, and a Sunday-school membership of 3,281. Its roll of ministers embraces: general pastors, who have ordaining powers and preside over associations, 8; pastors and ministers, 95; authorized candidates and preachers, 6. The English conference maintains a theological school for training men for the ministry in the New Church College in Islington, London, with its local branches. The American convention has its theological school at Cambridge, Mass., with commodious grounds and buildings immediately adjoining Harvard University. It maintains an able faculty and in 1909 graduated a class of two and in 1910 a class of one. The church also maintains a preparatory school at Waltham, Mass., and schools for collegiate and advanced studies in Urbana, Ohio, the latter institution having received a university charter from the State of Ohio in 1850. Societies of the New Church exist, outside of the United States and Canada and Great Britain, in Brazil, France, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Australia, Natal, Mauritius, and Mexico.

4. Publishing Agencies.

The publishing activity of the New Church has been quite phenomenal. Book and Tract Societies were shortly after the death of Swedenborg established in London, Manchester, and Birmingham in England, and in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia in America. The Swedenborg Society established in London in 1810 has published editions of Swedenborg's writings in whole or in part in Latin, English, Welsh, Icelandic, Swedish, Danish, Italian, French, German, Russian, Polish, Magyar, Arabic, and Hindi. The works in Italian are deposited in the free libraries throughout Italy and Sicily. Between one and two hundred thousand volumes have been distributed to the Protestant ministers applying for them in England and America, and the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society furnishes all free libraries applying with full sets of the works. Swedenborg's Latin editions have been carefully and elegantly republished, and the original manuscripts preserved in the Royal Academy's library at Stockholm have been reproduced in photolithographed volumes at great expense. The number of titles of Swedenborg's works and of works relating to him and the New Church contained in the *British Museum Catalogue* is over five hundred, and the *Bibliography of Swedenborg* published by the Swedenborg Society (London, 1907) containing titles alone is a volume of 760 pages. The periodical press of the New Church embraces one *Quarterly Review*, two monthly magazines, and a considerable number of monthly and weekly papers published in English, German, Danish, and Swedish. The publishing center in London is at 1 Bloomsbury Street, W.; and in New York at 3 West Twenty-ninth Street. A publishing house also exists in Stuttgart, Germany. The dissemination of the doctrines of the New Church through the press and by means of books on philosophy and literature by those not identified with the religious body itself is so extensive as to indicate an influence of the New Church on modern thought and belief much wider than the limits of its enrolled membership.

The ritual of the New Church follows in general the lines of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, although the doxologies and prayers are all addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ as God instead of through him to another divine person. The following creed or "faith" is found in the Book of Worship of the American Convention:

THE CREED.

We worship the One God, the Lord the Savior, Jesus Christ; in whom is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; whose Humanity is Divine; who for our salvation did come into the world and take our nature upon Him. He endured temptation even to the passion of the cross. He overcame the hells and so delivered man. He glorified His Humanity by uniting it with the Divinity of which it was begotten; so He became the Redeemer of the world, without whom no mortal can be saved. And they are saved who believe in Him and keep the Commandments of His Word. This is His Commandment: That we love one another as He has loved us. Amen.

In accordance with the high degree of sanctity attached to the Word by virtue of the indwelling divine and spiritual meaning beneath its letter, the sacraments are held in the highest veneration: the Lord being "really" although not materially present in the Lord's Supper in the divine good and truth which are his body and blood; and in baptism, there being an actual angelic association formed and an enrolment in heaven effected. New Churchmen do not call themselves "Swedenborgians," believing that this name implies a sect originating in a man's opinions and leadership, whereas the New Church is a divine dispensation of truth of which the man Swedenborg was only the transmitting instrumentality, as the evangelists were the human transmitters of a divine revelation, and not founders of sects to be named after them. FRANK SEWALL.

5. The Academy of the New Church.

The Academy of the New Church is the result of a reformatory movement based upon the labors of Rev. Richard DeCharms (d. 1863), and of Rev. William Henry Benade (d. 1905), for a stricter adherence to the revelation given through Emanuel Swedenborg, and for a greater distinctiveness of the religious and social life in the New Church. After many years of preparatory work the Academy was organized in Philadelphia June 19, 1876, by W. H. Benade, John Pitcairn, and ten others, eminent ministers and laymen of the New Church, on the basis of the following distinctive principles: (1) The acknowledgment of the divine authority of Swedenborg's theological writings as the Word of God in his second coming; (2) the recognition of the spiritually consummated state of the Christian world, and the consequent necessity of the distinctive establishment of the New Church in worship, organization, and life; (3) the government of the church to reside in its priesthood in its three degrees; (4) New Church baptism as the necessary means of entrance into the outward Church; (5) the wine of the holy supper to be administered only in the fermented juice of the grape; (6) marriage to be based on religious principles and on similarity in religion between husband and wife; (7) interference with the birth of offspring in marriage to be condemned as an abomination; (8) the laws revealed in Swedenborg's work on conjugal love concerning the intermediates between marriage and adultery to be acknowledged as laws of order; (9) social life to be based upon similarity of religion; (10) unanimity in essential things to be the guiding principle in the government of the church; (11) legislation in spiritual things to be avoided as unnecessary and hurtful; (12) education of the young in the doctrines of the New Church the chief hope for the establishment of the New Church in the Christian world.

In pursuance of these principles and aims the Academy in 1877 opened a theological school and college for young men in Philadelphia, and, a few years later, a seminary for young ladies and primary schools for children of both sexes. In 1897 all these departments were removed to Bryn Athyn, Pa., fifteen miles northeast of Philadelphia, and there, through the munificence of John Pitcairn, a number of large buildings have been erected and equipped for the educational work of the Academy, the enterprise being liberally endowed by him. The faculty of the schools consists of twenty-five professors and teachers, with Charles E. Doering as the present superintendent. The religious education is under the direct supervision of Bishop Pendleton, who is also the president of the Academy. New Church baptism is an obligatory condition of entrance into the schools. The aims and methods of instruction are unique, the constant purpose being to prepare the pupils for a life of piety, virtue, and usefulness not only in this world but more especially for the eternal life. Religion, therefore, enters as the essential and all-qualifying element in all branches of instruction. The Academy issues an annual *Journal of Education*.

6. The General Church of the New Jerusalem.

The majority of those who sympathized with the aims and principles of the Academy were members of the Pennsylvania Association, which was a component part of the General Convention. This association, in 1883, adopted the name of "The General Church of Pennsylvania" together with an episcopal form of government, and with this body friends of the Academy in other states began to associate themselves. Determined and persistent opposition to the Academy on the part of the leaders of the convention culminated in 1890, when the convention refused to receive the annual report of the General Church of Pennsylvania and attempted to interfere with that autonomy in its internal affairs which had been guaranteed to state associations by the constitution of the general convention. The General Church then severed its connection with the convention, and the majority of its members in 1897 organized anew under the name of The General Church of the New Jerusalem, with Rev. William Frederick Pendleton as its bishop. This church, a year after its organization, counted 300 members, but at present numbers 1,000 members, all of whom have been received by individual application. There are sixteen societies and circles, with twenty-two ministers. Five of the societies maintain local parish schools, conducted according to the principles of the Academy. The bishop is assisted by a consistory and a general council. The council of the clergy and the (lay) executive committee meet annually. There are annual district assemblies, and a general assembly every third year. *New Church Life*, a monthy magazine established in 1881, is the official organ of the General Church; it is published at Bryn Athyn, Pa., and is edited by Rev. Carl Theophilus Odlmer and Rev. Alfred Acton. C. T. ODLMER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the history consult: R. Hindmarsh, *Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church in England and other Parts*, London, 1861; *New Church Almanac*, Boston, 1889 (contains historical account of the denomination). G. Field, *Memoirs, Incidents, and Reminiscences of the Early Hist. of the New Church in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois*, . . . New York, 1879; J. Bayley, *New Church Worthies*, London, 1884; R. Sundelin, *Swedenborgianismens historia i Sverige*, Upsala, 1886; the *Journals of the General Convention, 1817–35*, were reprinted in 3 vols., Boston, 1888; G. H. Briggs, *Hist. of the Rhodes New Church Society, 1797–1902*, London, 1904; C. F. Dole, *The New Church; what, how, why?* New York, 1906.

The principal treatment of the doctrine of the New Jerusalem Church is given in the article Swedenborg (q.v.). Consult further: B. F. Barrett, *Lectures on the New Dispensation*, Philadelphia, 1842; idem, *Catholicity of the New Church*, New York, 1863; A. Clissold, *Creeds of Athanasius, Sabellius, Swedenborg, Compared*, London, 1873; J. Clowes, *Outlines of Swedenborg's Doctrines*, London, 1873; *New Jerusalem Church, Creed of the New Church*, London, 1883; J. Worcester, *Lectures upon the Doctrines of the New Church*, Boston, 1886; T. Parsons, *Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg*, Boston, 1894; J. F. Buss, *What the New Church Teaches*, London, 1897; F. Sewall, *Swedenborg and Modern Idealism*, London, 1902; G. Trobridge, *Foundations of Philosophy*, London, 1904; E. Swift, *Manual of the Doctrines of the New Church*, Boston, n.d.

NEW JERUSALEM, GENERAL CHURCH OF THE. See NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH, § 6.

NEW LIFE CHURCH. See NEW, JOHN FAIR.

NEW LIGHT ANTIBURGHERS. SEE PRESBYTERIANS.

NEW MANICHEANS.

I. In the East.
  Euchites, Predecessors of the Bogomiles (§ 1).
  Bogomile Doctrine of Creation and Salvation (§ 2).
  Bogomile Practises and History (§ 3).
II. In the West.
  Their Diffusion and Names; Cathari, Bulgari, Albigenses (§ 1).
  Forerunners and Foundations (§ 2).
  Albigensian Doctrines (§ 3).
  Doctrines of the Cathari (§ 4).
  Campaigns Against Them (§ 5).

The term "New Manicheans" may conveniently be applied to certain medieval dualistic sects, which both in their dualistic teaching and in their organization and ascetic principles represent a recrudescence of Manicheism (see MANI, MANICHEANS), with which they are historically related. The principal sects falling under this category are: Euchites and Bogomiles of the East, and the Cathari and Albigenses of the West.

I. In the East: The dualistic Bogomiles, who appeared early in the twelfth century in Bulgaria

1. Euchites, Predecessors of the Bogomiles.

and the neighboring districts, arose from the amalgamation of the Paulicians (q.v.) and the Euchites or Messalians (q.v.). Both these earlier sects had wandered, between the eighth and tenth centuries, from Armenia, Mesopotamia, and northern Syria, to Thrace, where they had become absorbed in the Slavic Bulgarians. The dogmatic and ethical dualism evolved in Paulicianism from its Marcionitic basis received from the Euchites an ascetic and orgiastic element. [The *Key of Truth* (Armenian text, Eng. transl., and introduction by F. C. Conybeare, Oxford, 1898), which Conybeare calls " a manual of the Paulician church " and attributes to the early medieval period, contradicts the charge of dualism made by medieval writers against this party. A. H. N.] This was the more easy since an ascetic rigorism, either gnostic or Manichean in origin, had been an important factor in the earlier phases of the Paulician sect. There was also doubtless some intermixture of Persian Manicheism. Paulicianism, deriving its elements partly from Persian Manicheism and partly from Marcionism, brought to the Bulgarian heretic not only the lofty authority of their " apostles " or " perfected," but also the rejection of the Old Testament, an asceticism which commanded to abstain from meat, and a horror of the cross. Euchitism, on the other hand, gave as its ancient Manichean heritage the doctrine of the evil soul generated in man by Satan, to be conquered only by the prayer and intercession of those made perfect in asceticism. All these early elements were overlaid partly by Slavic paganism and partly by the independent speculations of the leaders of the sect. The fully developed system of the Bogomiles of the early twelfth century, therefore, reveals its kinship with the older Gnostic and Manichean dualism only in its simpler basal principles. A prelude to the Bogomilian system is furnished by the doctrines of the Thracian Euchites about 1050, as described by Psellus in " On the Activity of Demons " (ed. F. Boissonade, Nuremberg, 1838; also *MPG*, cxxii.). Their view of God and the universe was one of relative dualism. From the highest God, who ruled over the supramundane regions, emanated two sons, the older, Satanael, controlling the earthly world, and the younger, Christ, the lord of the heavenly world. This dualism, which was regarded as merely transitory, gave rise to three divisions of the Euchites. One honored Satanael and Christ equally; another honored Christ alone, but feared Satanael too much to scorn or blaspheme him; the third reverenced only Satanael as the first-born of the highest God and the creator of the visible world, considering Christ the cause of injurious phenomena in nature. These Euchites, evidently a development of the earlier Messalians, seem to have become amalgamated with the Paulicians of Thrace and Bulgaria toward the end of the eleventh century, thus giving rise to the great sect of the Bogomiles. Their name signifies " friends of God," evidently a special designation of the " perfected " of the sect.

2. Bogomile Doctrine of Creation and Salvation.

The Bogomiles rejected the Mosaic writings, but accepted the Psalter, the " Book of the Sixteen Prophets," four Gospels, the writings of the apostles, and various apocrypha. The Euchite dualism of Satanael and Christ was evolved by them into a cosmogonic drama, which opens with the account of the creation and fall in Genesis, Elohim being interpreted as Satanael. Falling from heaven, this Satanael-Elohim creates the terrestrial world as recorded in Genesis, and forms man of mud, while the moisture falling from the right great toe of this human figure assumes the form of the serpent. Satanael then endeavors to breathe into the lifeless man, but succeeds only in sending breath through the image's toe into the serpent, which thus receives life. In despair Satanael sends a messenger to the highest God to vivify man, promising that man shall then belong equally to the highest God and to Satanael, thus filling the place in the upper world of angels made vacant by the fall of Satanael. God accepts this agreement, but Satanael, seeking to win Adam and Eve for himself alone, enters the serpent and embraces Eve, thus becoming the parent of Cain and his sister Calomena. Adam later begets by Eve Abel and other sons and daughters. After death entered the terrestrial world, however, the highest God deprived the recreant demiurge Satanael of his divine form and creative power, though permitting him for a time to rule the lower world and humanity. Through his tool, Moses, and through the Decalogue, full of contradictions and folly, Satanael deceived countless men, until, for their salvation, God caused the Logos to emanate from himself as his second born son in 5500 A.M. This Logos, or redeeming principle, known now as Michael or " the angel of great counsel," and again as Jesus or Christ descending from heaven, entered the Virgin by her right ear and seemed to assume the body of an earthly man. Really, however, he brought his spiritual body from the higher world, and with this body, though apparently born of the Virgin, he proclaimed the Gospel to mankind. He thus conquered Satanael, who became the powerless Satan. The passion, death, and resurrection were docetic, and he now occupies Satanael's former place at the right hand of God, though at the last (cf. I Cor. xv. 28) he shall return to the Father whence he emanated. The trinitarianism of the Bogomiles is thus Sabellian.

3. Bogomile Practises and History.

The cult and the ethics of the Bogomiles show many parallels with the teachings of the Euchites. A certain amount of reverence must be shown the demons whom the highest God permitted to rule temporarily over the world, lest injury be received from them. Outward conformity with the Church was therefore required. It was also held, in genuine Euchitic fashion, that demons of Satan dwell in all men and abide, after the death of the sinful, in or near their corpses to punish them. From the Bogomiles, on the other hand, these torturing spirits flee a bow-shot away, for in these " friends of God " dwells the Holy Ghost begotten of the Son. The Bogomiles, therefore, did not die but were painlessly freed from the foul raiment of sinful flesh and clad in the garment of Christ—

an ethereal body such as he had on earth. The sacraments of the Church were rejected. Members were received into the sect by a "baptism of the Spirit" for which preparation was made by confession and prayer for seven days. An oath of silence was exacted, and after a further period of probation the candidate was received by the imposition of hands from all the Bogomiles present, the postulant facing the east and the Gospel of John being placed on his head. Sacred images, including the cross, were abhorred; marriage was despised and prayer and the eating of meat were prohibited; fasting was required thrice each week until mid-afternoon; and the saints and fathers of the Church were banned as false prophets. The Bogomilian heresy maintained itself in the Byzantine empire for centuries, though undergoing many modifications. The heresy spread to Asia Minor, for in 1143 at a synod at Constantinople two Cappadocian bishops were deposed for Bogomilianism. The emissaries of the sect were still active in the thirteenth century, nor were the Bogomiles finally extirpated until the fifteenth century (see below).

1. Their Diffusion and Names; Cathari, Bulgari, Albigenses.

II. In the West: The genetic connection of the western New Manicheans with the early Manicheans is much clearer than in the case of the eastern dualistic sects. As early as the time of Augustine and Leo the Great numerous Manichean communities were to be found in North Africa, Spain, France, and Italy, whence they reached Holland and Germany by the beginning of the eleventh century. Manichean dualism had penetrated Northern Gaul in the course of the fourth century, and records show its wide dissemination in Italy in the sixth and seventh centuries. While the Spanish Priscillianists (see PRISCILLIAN) may have exercised some slight influence on the development of New Manicheism in the West, its connection with the eastern Euchites and Bogomiles is indubitable. Certain "Poor men of Christ," burned for heresy on the lower Rhine in the first half of the twelfth century, asserted that their doctrines were held in Greece and elsewhere, a statement confirmed by the similarity of their tenets to those of the Bogomiles. Besides being called Manicheans and Cathari these heretics were also known as Publicani or Popelicani, and (especially in Northern France and Flanders) Bulgari (French Bougres). A large number of Cathari were likewise termed Druguria (or Dugrutia or Dugunthia) from a Thracian district belonging to the Byzantine exarchate of Philippopolis. In Northern Italy they were called Patareni or Paterini (a name transferred from the anti-clerical followers of Ariald and Erlembald), Albanenses (from the city of Alba in Piedmont), Concorrezani (after Concorrezzo near Monza), and Bagnolesi (after Bagnolo near Brescia). Somewhat later the Southern French local designations came into use, such as Albigenses (after Albi in Languedoc), Tolosates, Agennenses, Provençals, and Tisserands or Texerants ("weavers"). The sect was propagated in the West both by the emigration caused by the measures taken by the Commenæ against the Euchites and Bogomiles, and also by their wandering missionaries, who found their way from Bulgaria through Bosnia and Dalmatia to Northern Italy, whence some of them penetrated to Southern France or down the Rhine to the Netherlands. Everywhere they found the land prepared for them, for the remnants of ancient Manichean communities, hidden for centuries, began in the early eleventh century to resist the Church.

2. Forerunners and Foundations.

Before the rise of the Cathari there thus lay a period of preliminary development. About 1000 a certain Leutard attempted to found a sect near Châlons which was clearly influenced by Manicheism; and in 1022 there was discovered at Orléans a sect of the Canon Stephen and the Scolastic Lisoy which likewise taught such tenets as docetism, rejection of baptism, the mass, the veneration of the saints, and the doctrine of good works. A similar sect appeared about the same time in the dioceses of Liège and Arras, founded by an Italian named Gundulf; and in 1030 another body arose at Monteforte near Turin, which, beside the usual doctrines, required communism in property and constant prayer by day and night. They put to death fellow sectaries who were mortally ill, holding that a violent death was the surest path to blessedness. For the pope they substituted another head, though whether this was the Holy Ghost or some secret head of the sect is unknown. They also seem to have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. Similar sects appeared in Northern Germany, as at Goslar, where Henry III. executed certain "Manicheans" about Christmas, 1052. By the second half of the twelfth century New Manicheism had become a power in Flanders, Western and Southern France, and Upper Italy, where its adherents not only boldly proclaimed their dualism but also sought formal organization. In 1152 the Cathari of Flanders were at least tolerated by Archbishop Henry of Reims. Five years later the Cathari held a great council at St. Felix de Caraman near Toulouse, where a "pope," Nicetas or Niquinta, lately come from Constantinople, consecrated several Cathari bishops by the *consolamentum*, or the "baptism of the spirit" by the laying on of hands. Bishops of the sect are henceforth recorded as residing in various cities of Southern France, and the Cathari in Middle and Southern Italy were also divided into "dioceses" until late in the thirteenth century. Bosnia is frequently regarded as the seat of the Cathari "pope," who seems to have been represented by a deputy, especially in Southern France. Each "bishop" was aided by an "elder son" and a "younger son"; and deacons and deaconesses of the Cathari are also mentioned.

3. Albigensian Doctrines.

A harsh dualism was maintained by the Albanenses of Northern Italy and the Albigenses of Southern France. Their distinctive doctrines may be summarized as follows. From all eternity the god of light has ruled over things invisible, and the prince of this world over things visible. Lucifer, the son of the prince (or god) of this world, seduced some of the angels, the creatures of the god of light, to his lower world. The work of redemption, therefore, is to restore to liberty these "lost sheep of the house of Israel," who are commingled with and superficially similar to the carnal (i.e., procreating) creatures of the god of this world. This deity, whose tool was Moses, hindered the work of redemption by his law so far as he could. But after the beneficent influence of the good god on mankind had become apparent in the Psalms and the prophets, Christ, the most perfect heavenly creature and the chief of good angels, completed the work of redemption by proclaiming the truth in an ethereal body, performing marvellous works, and returning to the invisible world of heaven after an apparent death. The Albigenses extended their Docetism (q.v.) to Mary, Joseph, and St. John the Divine. John the Baptist, on the other hand, by his baptism of water, had been the chief agent through whom the prince of this world worked in opposition to the Redeemer. Through the baptism of Jesus by the spirit, which the teachers of truth convey by the laying on of hands, is accomplished the salvation of all who accept this doctrine. Since, however, erring souls can return to their heavenly home only through the church of the Cathari, and since many have died both before and after Christ without knowing of this true church, a transmigration of souls through various forms of men and animals is assumed, perfection coming only with admission to the sect. The Cathari, therefore, enter heaven immediately upon death, but for all others death means only entrance into a new body to continue the atonement yet uncompleted. The Concorrezani, closely followed by the Bagnolesi, modified this extreme dualism, putting at the head of their system the supreme Creator who had formed the worlds of spirit and of matter, but had left the sovereignty of the second to his elder son Lucifer (the gnostic demiurge and the Bogomilian Satanael). Lucifer, originally good but fallen from heaven through pride, is the god of the Old Testament and is to be rejected. The evil one created the bodies of Adam and Eve, but God created their souls. While rejecting the Albigensian metempsychosis and other eschatological doctrines, the Bagnolesi maintained a more or less docetic Christology which was rejected by the majority of the Concorrezani. Both, however, seem to have agreed with the Sabellianism of the Bogomiles, though some were more or less Arians.

4. Doctrines of the Cathari.

The Cathari were more uniform in cult and custom than in doctrine. They regarded as deadly sins the possession of earthly property, association with men of this world, lying, war, the killing of animals (except snake-like creeping creatures), the eating of animal food (except fish, since the latter were not supposed to be produced *ex coitu*), and above all sexual intercourse under any conditions. Admission to the number of the "perfected" was by the laying on of hands (*consolamentum*); and only these "perfected" could give the *consolamentum* to the "faithful" or other members of the sect, or perform any part of the cult. The "perfected," moreover, were required to travel and eat in company with a companion, who might be merely one of the "faithful." Since a single transgression after receiving the *consolamentum* was held to involve loss of salvation, the "faithful" often postponed it as long as possible, while, on the other hand, many of the "perfected," to escape danger of mortal sin, committed suicide, generally by starving themselves to death (the so-called endura, a custom which, found at Monteforte about 1030, seems to have spread from Northern Italy to Southern France, but did not transcend the limits of the Albigenses). Among the peculiar features of the cult of the Cathari, special mention may be made of the restriction of the right to repeat the Lord's Prayer to the "perfected," prayers for the deceased "faithful" who had not received the *consolamentum* and were consequently condemned to metempsychosis, the blessing of bread by the prayer of the "perfected," the breaking of bread or *apparellamentum* (connected with the confession of sins monthly), and the ceremonies attending the *consolamentum* (e.g., the kiss of peace). On the latter occasion the sick especially were wont to give at least a portion of their possessions to the "perfected," whose spiritual duties relieved them of material cares.

5. Campaigns Against Them.

In Southern France neither the secular arm nor the endeavors of the Church, beginning with Gregory IX., could check the growth of the Cathari; in Northern Italy they were counted by thousands, in Florence about 1228 almost a third of the population were Cathari; nor was it until the end of the fourteenth century that the Inquisition succeeded in extirpating the sect. Failing to convert the Cathari by argument, Alexander III. sent a crusading army against them in Languedoc in 1181–82, but with equally scanty results. By the beginning of the thirteenth century nearly all the princes and barons of Southern France had embraced the heresy, and the Roman Catholic Church had become a jest. But with the accession of Innocent III. the state of affairs changed. At first comparatively mild measures were adopted, but on the murder of the legate Peter of Castelnau in 1208, a crusade headed by Arnold of Citeaux was formed against Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, the protector of the Cathari. Making a separate peace with Raymond and thus weakening the Cathari, the crusaders attacked the territories of the Catharist Viscount Roger II. of Beziers, stormed Beziers and Carcassonne, and ravaged the land, which was then given to the commander-in-chief, Count Simon of Montfort. After 1211 Simon invaded the domain of Raymond, which was formally granted him at the fourth Lateran council in 1215. After the death of Simon in 1218, Raymond VI. and his son, Raymond VII., regained their lands, but at the instance of Honorius III., Louis VIII. directed a new crusade against the Albigenses and succeeded, before his death in 1226, in recapturing a part of Toulouse. Finally, in 1229, the peace of Toulouse put an end to the war. The conditions, however, were disastrous to the Albigenses, especially as a permanent inquisition was established, Raymond VII. himself being forced to aid in the extirpation of his former protégés. The Cathari who revolted against him fled at last to the castle of Montsegur, but it was stormed by Raymond's troops, and no less than 200 "perfected" were burned at the stake. Yet even despite this catastrophe the Albigenses stubbornly held out until the middle of the fourteenth century, when they finally disappeared. Their last remnants may perhaps be the Cagots of the Pyrenees, who are marked by red crosses and are avoided with horror as a sort of pariahs, yet recall the "faithful" converted during the Albigenses crusade.

The Cathari survived in northern Spain about as long as in southern France; but in northern France, Flanders, and along the Rhine they were reduced by the Inquisition at a somewhat earlier date. Particularly energetic in their suppression was the Dominican inquisitor Robert, who had himself been for twenty years a member of the sect. During the thirteenth century, however, Cathari or New Manicheans in the strict sense of the term seem to have been few in Germany. New Manicheanism survived longest as a distinct organization in the Balkan peninsula, maintaining its existence as Bogomilianism up to the second half of the fourteenth century in Bulgaria, where smaller individual communities lasted down to modern times. The rigid dualists of Bosnia, the Paterini of the Greek documents, resisted all attempts at conversion and all more energetic measures, remaining the strongest religious body in the land up to the fifteenth century. Their decline began with the conversion of King Stephen Thomash to Roman Catholicism in 1445. His successor, Stephen Thomashevich, issued a decree in 1459 which gave them their choice between conversion and exile. Some forty thousand are said to have migrated to Herzegovina, but with the conquest of this district by the Turks in 1463 the Bosnian Cathari vanished from history. The great majority of them were doubtless compelled to embrace Islam, though some have seen traces of a secret continuation of the sect even in the last decade of the nineteenth century. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Sources for the history of the movement in the East are: Michael Psellus, in *MPG*, cxxii. 537 sqq.; Euthymius Zigabenus, *MPG*, cxxx.; Anna Comnena, in *MPG*, cxxxi. 59 sqq. For the West: Peter the Venerable, in *MPL*, clxxxix. 719; Hugo Rotomagensis, in *MPL*, cxcii. 1255; Egbert, in *MPL*, cxcv. 11; *The Key of Truth*, ed. Conybeare, as mentioned in the text; further sources in *MPL*, clxxxii. 676, ccx. 305, cciv. 775; E. Martène and U. Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, vol. v., Paris, 1717; and C. Duplessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis errorum*, Paris, 1726. Especially valuable is the literature under Inquisition, particularly part of the work of Lea (*Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, vols. i.–ii.), Frederichs, and Frédéricq. On the eastern sects modern discussions are: C. J. Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren*, pp. 175 sqq., Prague, 1876; M. Gaster, *Græco-Slavonic Literature and Folklore*, pp. 15 sqq., London, 1887; Karapet Ter-Mkrttschian, *Die Paulikianer*, Leipsic, 1893. On the western development may be consulted: J. C. Füsslin, *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie der mittleren Zeit*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1770; J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Crusades against the Albigenses in the 13th Century*, London, 1826; S. R. Maitland, *Facts and Documents Relating to the Albigenses and Waldenses*, ib. 1832; U. Zahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1845; C. Schmidt, *Hist. et doctrine de la secte de Cathares*, 2 vols., Paris, 1849; A. Lombard, *Pauliciens, Bulgares et Bons-Hommes en Orient et Occident*, Geneva, 1879; E. Comba, *Storia della riforma in Italia*, vol. i., Florence, 1881; N. Peyrat, *Hist. des Albigeois*, Paris, 1882; F. Tocco, *L'Eresia nel medio evo*, Florence, 1884; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 2 vols., Munich, 1890; V. Canet, *Simon de Montford et la croisade contre les Albigeois*, Lille, 1891; C. Douais, *L'Albigéisme et les frères prêcheurs à Narbonne*, Paris, 1894; P. Alphandéry, *Les Idées morales chez les heterodoxes latins au début du 13. siècle*, ib. 1903; A. Luchaire, *Innocent III. La Croisade des Albigeois 1207–15*, ib. 1905; T. de Causons, *Les Albigeois et l'inquisition*, ib. 1907. To the works on the relation of the inquisition to these sects should be added C. Douais, *Documents pour servir à l'hist. de l'inquisition en Languedoc*, Paris, 1900 sqq.; and P. Flade, *Das römische Inquisitionsverfahren in Deutschland*, Leipsic, 1902.

NEW THOUGHT: An imperfectly nucleated movement having its rise in the closing years of the nineteenth century. It can not be said to have advanced beyond the nebulous stage, nor to have crystallized into a formal philosophy or an organized view of life. At the hands of some of its representatives, New Thought aspires to furnish a thoroughgoing philosophy of life; while others see in it a fragmentary principle or an eclectic and unassimilated synthesis of principles. In the absence of a universally recognized organizing principle, the movement can be characterized only in its main features.

Its Attitude and Diversity.

The atmosphere or mood of New Thought is the spirit of optimism. The confident outlook on life and the spirit of mastery in life are fundamental in all the aspects of the movement. It is never hedonistic search for happiness as a goal, but rather cheerfulness resulting from the recognition that "all things work together for good," or can be made to work together. Thus optimism as an ideal and meliorism as a motive for conduct are the dominant key-notes. But this optimism is only the common temperament of the movement. It is not a groundless optimism, it attempts to give an account of itself; it is a confidence and buoyancy toward life which essays to find its justification in certain principles of thought, a temperament which offers a rational justification. At this point the apparent unity of New Thought practically disappears in the great divergence of theoretical or philosophic explanations offered. As a mood toward life, the term New Thought describes a sort of unitary thought-movement. As a philosophy justifying and directing the mood, New Thought presents little unity, but a great variety of diverse and often mutually contradictory principles. One exponent offers one consideration, another exponent builds upon a totally different consideration. Confusion and eclecticism characterize most of the expositions offered of the doctrine as a whole. Examples of this diversity of emphasis are seen in the shibboleths and captions coined or employed by the movement. "In tune with the Infinite," "I can and I will," "harmony and health," "psychic control," "science of being," "thought force," "suggestion and will," "submission to higher laws," "joy philosophy," "the optimism of faith," "the newer science," are phrases taken almost at random from the current literature of New Thought, illustrating the variety of emphasis employed. The modern emphasis upon the divine immanence is a fruitful principle for some of the theorists. Again, the emphasis is upon psychic control, mental therapeutics, or faith healing. Hypnotism and occultism figure largely in some of the literature; to others the notion of law gives the point of departure, while some attempt to give a natural science grounding to their theory of the universe and life. The philosophic bent of New Thought exponents varies all the way from naturalism to mysticism; and the religious temper, all the way from fervent Christianity to avowed pantheism or implicit atheism. The classification clearly does not fix a man's philosophy. And it is doubtful whether New Thought, as such, can be said to carry any religious implications. It is a philosophy of life rather than a religion, but a philosophy which reflects, in some of its many phases, almost all the newer movements in philosophy, science, psychology, theology, psychical research, and the like.

The Unifying Principle.

Since all the above thought emphases exist in their own right outside the New Thought camp, it is obvious that they do not serve to identify the New Thought movement. None of them, *per se*, are New Thought doctrines, but are only modern conceptions adopted by the latter movement, and employed with various applications. Even optimism is no monopoly of New Thought but a sort of dominant mood. What is the essential unifying principle of New Thought? This inner principle consists chiefly in the insistence upon the power of mind to modify bodily conditions, as also to bring betterment in all conditions of life. New Thought is the affirmation that life can be controlled from the standpoint of mind. It is a form of idealism, with a practical intent, usually with an ethical emphasis, and varying greatly in the place and scope of its application. Life, including physical conditions, may be controlled by the mastery which the mind can achieve. Mind is the world's master. In construing this principle of the supremacy of mind over life, New Thought employs one or more of the doctrines of modern thinking as its point of departure and its rational justification. These several doctrines are not in themselves marks of New Thought; they are simply apologetic efforts to establish the reasonableness of the movement. Thus, e.g., the " immanence of God " opens an avenue for touching the life of God. The discovery of the " laws " of the universe founds a variety of philosophies of coming into " tune with the universe." Psychological knowledge opens up the laws of suggestion and of Psychotherapy (q.v.). Idealism in philosophy translates the utterances of modern science into the service of the mind. Ethical and social sciences furnish the notions of unity and relatedness in personal life, which are employed in manifold ways by New Thought. The modern insistence upon ethical " values " is usually, though not always, employed in the movement. Thus around the standard of New Thought are grouped a great variety of theorists whose points of contact seem to be the principles indicated above—optimism and the mind's control.

Subjectivism and Apriorism.

It follows perhaps inevitably from the above emphasis upon psychic control, that the theorists of the movement are usually characterized by extreme subjectivism which often closely resembles the Transcendentalism (q.v.) of a generation ago. " New Thought makes little use of the inductive method of modern science, but deduces its principles from certain axioms of idealistic philosophy." It should also be pointed out that a critical study of the movement shows great ambiguity and confusion as to the meaning of mental control. Sometimes it is the thought-factor in mind that is appealed to, again it is the will that is central. The psychology of the " mind " involved is seldom given definite and specific expression.

Relations to Christian Science; Extension.

It is apparent that New Thought has a close affinity with Christian Science (see Science, Christian), from which it received its initial impulse, and from which it has recruited a majority of its disciples. But it rejects " Eddyism " as an essential, together with the more dogmatic or sectarian features of the program of Christian Science. It retains much of the spirit and principles of the older movement, while it claims emancipation from the letter and the law of that cult. It insists upon inner and inherent resources rather than external. Unlike Christian Science, however, it recognizes the reality of the material; while affirming that the mind is the place of control. Like Christian Science, New Thought originated in the United States, and in like manner it has spread to England and the continent. The extent and influence of the movement can not be justly estimated because of the indefinite nature of its propaganda. Moreover, all of the doctrines characteristic of New Thought are severally held by a great multitude who disclaim any sympathy with that movement. As a description of a spirit and method, New Thought characterizes many minds. As a technical propaganda or an organized movement, it defines a comparatively small group.

Herbert Alden Youtz.

Bibliography: The following are a few of the works which advocate New-Thought principles: E. H. Anderson, *Psychical Development and Philosophy of the New Thought*, Toledo, O., 1901; C. B. Patterson, *Dominion and Power*, Oscawana-on-Hudson, N. Y., 1901; W. W. Atkinson, *Law of the New Thought*, Chicago, 1902; C. A. Ballough, *Power that Heals and how to Use it*, De Land, Fla., 1902; E. W. Hopkins, *Science of the New Thought*, Bristol, Conn., 1904; J. W. Winkley, *First Lessons in New Thought*, Boston, 1904; Mrs. E. J. Towne, *Life Power and how to Use it*, Holyoke, Mass., 1906; J. Allen, *Path to Prosperity, Way to Peace*, 2 vols., New York, 1907; F. C. Haddock, *Power of Will*, Auburndale, Mass., 1907; S. Leavitt, *Essentials of the Unity of Life*, New York, 1907; B. MacLelland, *Prosperity through Thought Force*, Holyoke, Mass., 1907; J. Fair, *The New Life*, 4 vols., 1908; H. Fletcher, *Optimism, a Real Remedy*, Chicago, 1908; F. C. Haddock, *Personal Atmosphere: Studies in Poise and Power*, Auburndale, Mass., 1908; C. B. Newcomb, *Principles of Psychic Philosophy*, Boston, 1908; Mrs. E. W. Wilcox, *New Thought Common Sense*, Chicago, 1908; H. Wood, *New Old Healing*, Boston, 1908.

NEW YEAR'S CELEBRATION: The Christian Church adopted the Julian year of the Romans. This year begins with Jan. 1, which at the beginning of the Christian era was observed in Rome as a public holiday. The festival was noisy, attended with games and sports, which degenerated into coarse and indecent behavior. From this the

Christian Church held aloof, and penitential sermons were appointed for the day, warning against participation in the heathen feasts. But inasmuch as Christian participation in the feasts of the pagans did not cease, the Church prescribed a three-days' fast at New Year (Second Council of Tours, 567, canon xvii.), and in the decrees of later synods, the festival of Jan. 1 is mentioned among prohibited pagan customs; as late as 1270, in a form of procedure by the inquisitors for hearing persons who were suspected of taking part in idolatry and evil arts, it was prescribed that they be also examined as to whether they had spent Jan. 1 in heathen fashion (cf. J. Hansen, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns*, p. 43, Bonn, 1901). From the fourth century, when the festival of the Nativity was instituted on Dec. 25, the first of January had come to be the "octave of Christmas" when, after Luke ii. 21, the circumcision and naming of Jesus were celebrated (see below), and neither in the missals nor in homilies is there any reference to the beginning of a new year. This was the more natural because in the Church the year opened with Christmas or with Mar. 1, or Mar. 25, or Easter. But since in civil life the year still began with Jan. 1, and as all calendars adhered to this usage, the Church could not continually disregard the same. The matter was first espoused by the inferior clergy, who, deferring to the uneducated, contrived the caricature of a serious festival, in the so-called feast of fools (see FOOLS, FEAST OF). Toward the close of the Middle Ages, the Dominicans introduced the custom of "dispensing New Year from the pulpit," that is, of conveying to their hearers appropriate wishes in the sermon on New-year's day. Luther preached on Jan. 1 of the circumcision of Jesus, and rejected a celebration of the beginning of a new year on that day as a heathen custom. Nowadays the first of January is celebrated in the Evangelical churches as the beginning of a new year. Moreover, the custom was occasionally revived of "dispensing New Year" from the pulpit. In the Roman Catholic Church, the feast of the naming of Jesus has been set, since 1721, for the second Sunday after Epiphany, while Jan. 1 has continued to be the festival of the circumcision. CARL BERTHEAU.

The festival of the circumcision of Christ is observed on Jan. 1 in the Greek, Roman Catholic, and Anglican Churches, and was placed on this day, the eighth after Christmas, with reference to Luke ii. 21. It is a double of the second class and a feast of obligation in the Roman Catholic Church, and a "red-letter day" in the Anglican. The services for the day have no relation to the beginning of the civil year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under FEASTS AND FESTIVALS; also Bingham, *Origines*, XX., i. 3; H. Alt, *Der christliche Cultus*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1843; C. P. Caspari, *Eine Augustin fälschlich beigelegte homilia de sacrilegiis*, pp. 10, 12–13, 33 sqq., 49, Christiania, 1886; E. C. Achelis, *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie*, i. 278 sqq., Leipsic, 1898; *DCA*, ii. 1387–1389.

NEW YORK SABBATH COMMITTEE: An ororganization formed 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 measures to check the growing public desecration of Sunday, and the alarming increase of drunkenness, disorder, and violent crimes on that day. At a conference of prominent citizens 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 city. Norman White, a layman who had taken the chief part in initiating the movement, was made chairman, and to his eminent zeal, wisdom, and perseverance the success of the committee in its earlier years was very largely due; an efficient secretary and executive officer was found in the person of R. S. Cook, who had previously been a secretary of the American Tract Society. The committee, from the beginning, secured the hearty support of the clergy, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. 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 other measures of reform; to avoid impracticable measures; to recognize the controlling power of public sentiment, and to take no step until the way should be prepared for it; to advance one step at a time; to work through the constituted authorities, giving as little prominence as possible to its own agency; and to conduct its work on such broad and just grounds as to secure the cooperation of the widest possible constituency.

The committee undertook, successively, the suppression of the noisy crying of newspapers on Sunday, the Sunday selling of liquor, Sunday theatrical entertainments, noisy processions and parades on Sunday, unnecessary Sunday work on the public streets, and other encroachments upon the rest and quiet of the day, incident to a large city.

To accomplish these reforms, additional legislation was necessary and has been secured from time to time; notably the Sunday theater law, the Sunday processions law, amendments to the excise law, the reenactment of the Sunday statutes in the penal code of 1882, and the like. In recent years vigilant efforts have been required to meet the assaults upon the Sunday laws in the alleged interests of the large foreign-born population. The committee from the beginning has made large use of the public press and especially has issued a series of carefully prepared documents discussing the various aspects of the Sunday question. These documents and occasional fly-leaves, circulars, etc., have been printed in large numbers and widely distributed in English and other languages. Several of them have been reprinted in Europe. Especial pains have been taken to enlist the wage-earning classes in the maintenance of their weekly rest.

The success of the committee from the start was so signal that its influence was felt in inspiring movements in the same direction in other cities.

The secretary and members of the committee have addressed public meetings in behalf of the reform in many of the larger cities of the country. It acted effectively in behalf of the Sabbath during the Civil War, and it was at its instigation that President Lincoln issued his famous Sunday order to the army and navy in 1862. It aided in the closing on Sunday of the national industrial expositions, and secured official recognition of Sunday by the representatives of the United States government at international expositions in Europe.

The committee has accumulated a valuable reference library open to the use of any who may wish to write or speak upon the Sunday question, and conducts a wide correspondence, at home and abroad. It has also been the organ of coöperation with similar movements in Europe and has been represented by its secretary at the important international congresses on Sunday rest which have been held on the continent. During its entire history it has had the service of a general secretary as its executive officer, who has devoted his entire time to its work, writing and editing its numerous publications, holding public conferences, and acting with other friends of the cause in defeating hostile legislation. The first secretary was succeeded by Philip Schaff, who did a most important work in securing the sympathy and cooperation of large numbers of the German population. On his resignation in 1869 W. W. Atterbury was called to the position which he held for upward of thirty years. Upon his resignation because of advanced years, he was elected a member of the committee and its recording secretary. He was succeeded by William S. Hubbell. See Sunday.

NEW ZEALAND: A British colony in the South Pacific Ocean, about 1,000 miles southeast of Australia. It consists of two large islands, North Island with an area of 44,468 square miles, and South or Middle Island with 58,525 square miles; Stewart Island with 665 square miles; and smaller groups and individual islands, the total area being about 104,751 square miles. The colony has been developed from a settlement of adventurers and refugees since 1805, and the first missionaries landed in 1814. In 1839 the islands were declared to be a part of the colony of New South Wales, and in 1840 Wellington, the capital, was founded on North Island. Despite the favorable character of the country, the increase of immigration was relatively slow, the principal obstacle being the wars with the brave aborigines, the Maoris, which began in 1845 and did not cease until 1892. Notwithstanding this, the white population in 1891 was 626,700 and in 1906 888,578, in addition to 47,731 Maoris and 2,570 Chinese of various religions. There is no established church in New Zealand. Ecclesiastical and religious conditions assumed a mixed character in the course of time, and only three Protestant denominations and the Roman Catholic Church report a considerable number of communicants. The Anglican Church is naturally predominant, with a membership of over 368,000 in 1906. The first bishopric was Auckland, founded in 1841, New Zealand having been previously under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Australia (see Australia). In 1895 the Bishop of Auckland became primate of New Zealand. The other dioceses of the province are Christchurch (1856), Nelson (1858), Waiapu (1858), Wellington (1858), Melanesia (1861), and Dunedin (1866).

In consequence of a large immigration from Scotland, the Presbyterian Church gained in importance, so that it numbers over 203,000 adherents. It has shared the fortunes of the Australian Presbyterians with regard to its relations with its foreign fellow believers. The Methodists number 89,000 and, as in the Australian commonwealth, their Wesleyan Union is extremely strong, although the denomination is divided into two large sects. The Congregationalists number 7,000, and the Lutherans, chiefly of German extraction and mostly scattered in the villages, have 4,840 members, while the Baptists, augmented especially by immigration from Australia, have (in 1909) 4,435 communicants. Of the twelve or fifteen sects which are small or unimportant elsewhere in the British Empire, the Plymouth Brethren have almost 7,500 adherents, and the Church of Christ, or Christian Disciples, 6,110. The Salvation Army reports 8,000 members, and the Mormons 270 disciples.

To the Roman Catholic Church belong 127,227 inhabitants of the islands. The province of Wellington was organized in 1887, the city having been the seat of a bishop since 1845. Auckland also formed a diocese after 1848, and Christchurch was made a diocese simultaneously with the elevation of Wellington to an archbishopric; in 1869 the diocese of Dunedin was separated from Wellington.

Among the non-Christians were (1906) 1,867 Jews and 2,430 Buddhists and Confucians. Other forms of faith are represented by smaller numbers of adherents, although 8,521 persons declared themselves to be freethinkers, undenominational, and the like, while 24,325 refused to give any information regarding their religion. The Maoris are reckoned almost without exception among the Christian population. Wilhelm Goetz.

Bibliography: W. Gisborne, *Colony of New Zealand, its History*, London, 1891; *Australian Handbook*, ib. 1902 (includes New Zealand); R. Y. Irvine and O. T. G. Alpers, *Progress of New Zealand in the Century*, ib. 1902; T. F. Martin, *The Position . . . of the Anglican Church in New Zealand*, ib. 1903; R. Horsley, *New Zealand*, ib. 1908; J. Cowan, *The Maoris of New Zealand*, ib. 1910.

NEW, JOHN FAIR: Founder of the Newtian Church; b. in New York City Feb. 12, 1832. He was of Quaker stock and religiously educated. When eighteen years old he began to preach what he called "The New Life Science," which may be summed up in the statement "that sin, sickness, and death are not a necessity of our lives and that if we live a pure holy life as our ensample Jesus did, we shall ascend to the Father as he did." He has been twice around the world in the interest of this faith. Churches have been organized in Philadelphia (May 10, 1907) and Boston (Jan. 22, 1909). Each church has for officers a president, secretary, and treasurer. Dr. New is the head bishop, but it is announced that in 1910 there will be an election of state bishops. In 1909 there were 74 ministers and over 300,000 adherents. Healing is one of the characteristic features of the church. In 1890 the name of the movement was changed from "The New Life Society" to "The Newology Church," in 1907 to "The Newlife Church." It is propagated by leaders who, like the founder, travel, hold meetings, and heal the sick and afflicted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *The Newlifeist Magazine* and the books of John Fair New, of New York.

NEWCOMB, HARVEY: Congregational author and clergyman; 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 of several journals, of which the last was *The Christian Herald*, Pittsburg. From the latter year, until 1840, he wrote Sunday-school books, and from 1840 till his death he was Congregational minister in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania. He is said to have written 178 volumes, most of them for children. He was also the author of *Manners and Customs of the North American Indians* (Pittsburg, 1835), and *A Cyclopedia of Missions* (New York, 1854).

NEWCOME, WILLIAM: Archbishop of Armagh; b. at Abingdon (6 m. s. of Oxford), Berkshire, England, Aug. 10, 1729; d. at Dublin Jan. 11, 1800. He was graduated from Oxford University (Hertford College, M.A., 1753; D.D., 1765); took holy orders, and was appointed bishop of Dromore, Ireland, 1766; transferred to Ossory, 1775, to Waterford and Lismore, 1779, and to the archbishopric of Armagh, 1795. He was possessed of large wealth, which he used in the dignified improvement of cathedral and palace at Armagh. His leisure was spent in Biblical study, the results of which appear in his *Harmony of the Gospels* (in Greek; Dublin, 1778, based upon Le Clerc, new eds., with Eng. transl. of text, London, 1802 and 1827); *An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations; the Expediency of Revising, by Authority, our present Translation, and the Means of Executing such a Revision, [with] a List of the various Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof, in English, from the year 1526 to 1776* (Dublin, 1792). He published revised translations, with notes, of the twelve Minor Prophets (1785), Ezekiel (1788), and of the New Testament (2 vols., printed 1796, but not published until 1809; taken as the basis of the Unitarian Version, London, 1808); also, *Observations on our Lord's Conduct as a Divine Instructor* (2 parts, London, 1782, new ed., Oxford, 1853); and occasional sermons and charges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*, xxiii. 113–114, London, 1815; *DNB*, xl. 322–323.

NEWELL, HARRIET: American missionary; b. at Haverhill, Mass., Oct. 10, 1793; d. on the Isle de France (Mauritius) Nov. 30, 1812. She was a daughter of Moses Atwood and was married to Samuel Newell (q.v.) in 1812, and sailed with him for Calcutta the same year. Not being allowed to remain at Calcutta, they sailed for Mauritius. A daughter born on the journey died, and was buried at sea. Rapid consumption soon set in, and carried the mother off likewise. Mrs. Newell's early death, at the age of nineteen, aroused wide sympathy, and did more, by the interest it stimulated, for missions than, perhaps, a long life would have accomplished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Memoirs* were published by her husband, S. Newell, New York, 1831; and by L. Woods, Boston, 1814.

NEWELL, SAMUEL: American missionary; b. at Durham, Me., July 25, 1785; d. at Bombay, India, Mar. 30, 1821. He graduated at Harvard in 1807, and went to Andover Seminary in 1809. He was one of the four students who presented the petition which contributed so much to the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In 1812 he married Harriet Atwood of Haverhill (see NEWELL, HARRIET); on Feb. 6 was ordained at Salem with Judson, Nott, Rice, and Gordon Hall, and on the 19th sailed with Judson for Calcutta. Not being permitted to disembark, he went to the Isle de France (Mauritius); and in Jan., 1814, he joined Hall and Nott at Bombay. He died of the cholera. He published *The Conversion of the World, or the Claims of Six Hundred Millions* (Andover, 1818), which aroused much interest; and *Life and Writings of Mrs. Harriet Newell* (New York, 1831).

NEWFOUNDLAND: An island of North America; situated to the southeast of Labrador, between the Atlantic Ocean on the east and south and the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the west; forming a colony of Great Britain; area, 40,200 square miles; population, estimated (1905) at 225,533, exclusive of Labrador. The island was discovered by John Cabot in 1497; formally taken possession of by Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1583; settled, however, by the French, and ceded to the English in 1713. The population, concentrated in the southeastern part and mainly engaged in the fisheries, is ninety-seven per cent native born, principally of English, Irish, and Scotch descent. In 1900 thirty-four per cent of the people were Roman Catholics, thirty-three per cent belonged to the Church of England, and twenty-seven per cent were Methodists. A Roman Catholic vicariate established in 1796, with seat at St. Johns, seems to have been discontinued in 1869. The interests of the Anglicans are cared for by a missionary bishop holding mission from the metropolitan see of Canterbury. The schools are wholly denominational; the school funds being proportioned according to the number of pupils of each denomination, and there are three superintendents of public instruction, one for each of the churches named. Education is not compulsory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Hatton and M. Harvey, *Newfoundland, its Hist. and Prospects*, London, 1883; M. F. Howley, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Newfoundland*, Boston, 1888; J. Langtry, *Hist. of the Church in Newfoundland*, London, 1892; C. H. Mockridge, *Bishops of the Church of England in Newfoundland*, ib. 1896; D. W. Prowse, *A Hist. of Newfoundland*, ib. 1900; F. E. Smith, *The Story of Newfoundland*, ib. 1901.

NEWMAN, ALBERT HENRY: Baptist; b. about 10 m. n.w. of Edgefield Court House, S. C., Aug. 25, 1852. He was educated at Mercer University, Macon, Ga. (A.B., 1871), Rochester Theological Seminary (from which he was graduated in 1875), and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (1875–76). He was acting professor of church history (1877–80) and Pettingill professor of church history (1880–81) at Rochester Theological Seminary, and professor of church history in McMaster University, Toronto (1881–1901). Since 1901 he has been professor of the same subject in the theological seminary attached to Baylor University, Waco, Tex., which, as the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, became independent in 1908, and removed to Fort Worth, Tex., in 1910. In 1906 he was professor of church history in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago for the summer term. In theology he is a moderate conservative. He has written *The Baptist Churches in the United States* (New York, 1894); *A History of Anti-Pedobaptism from the Rise of Pedobaptism to A.D. 1609* (Philadelphia, 1897); *Manual of Church History* (2 vols., 1900–03); and *A Century of Baptist Achievement* (1901). He also prepared a new translation, with annotations and an introductory essay on Manicheanism, of the anti-Manichean treatises of Augustine for the fourth volume of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (New York, 1887), translated A. Immer's *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Wittenberg, 1873) under the title *Hermeneutics of the New Testament* (Andover, 1877), and edited *Memoir of Daniel A. McGregor* (Toronto, 1891).

NEWMAN, FRANCIS WILLIAM: Layman, brother of Cardinal Newman; b. in London June 27, 1805; d. at Weston-super-Mare (8 m. s.w. of Bristol), England, Oct. 4, 1897. He attended a private school at Ealing; studied at Worcester College, Oxford (B.A., 1826); was fellow of Balliol, 1826–30, but resigned because unable conscientiously to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, which was then requisite before obtaining the master's degree; he lived and traveled in the East, 1830–33; became classical tutor at Bristol College, 1834; and professor of Latin in Manchester New College (now Manchester College, Oxford), Manchester, 1840; and was professor of Latin in University College, London, 1846–69. Originally he was a man of religious tendencies, but gradually became a free-thinker. He was a voluminous writer on linguistic, mathematical, historical, social, and political, as well as religious subjects. His most important theological works are *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* (London, 1847); *Relation of Free Knowledge to Moral Sentiment* (1847); *The Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations* (1849, 9th ed., 1882); *Phases of Faith; Passages from my own Creed* (1850); *Catholic Union: Essays towards a Church of the Future as the Organization of Philanthropy* (1854); *Defective Morality of the New Testament* (Ramsgate, 1867); *Thoughts on a Free and Comprehensive Christianity* (1868); *Thoughts on the Existence of Evil* (1872); *Theism, Doctrinal and Practical* (London, 1858), reissued as *Hebrew Theism: The Common Basis of Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedism* (1874); *The Two Theisms* (1874); *Life After Death* (1886); and *Miscellanies*, of which vol. ii. consists of *Essays, Tracts, Moral and Religious* (1887).

Bibliography: *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ed. Anne Mozley, 2 vols., London, 1891; *In Memoriam, Emeritus Professor F. W. Newman*, ib. 1897; I. G. Sieveking, *Memoir and Letters of Francis W. Newman*, ib. 1909; *DNB*, Supplement iii. 221–223.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY: English cardinal; b. in London Feb. 21, 1801; d. in Birmingham Aug. 11, 1890. He attended Trinity College, Oxford, 1816–20 (B.A.), remaining there after obtaining his degree to do private tutoring, at the same time preparing himself to enter Oriel, the acknowledged center of Oxford intellectualism, and was elected fellow Apr. 12, 1822. He was ordained deacon June 13, 1824, and soon after became curate of St. Clement's Church, Oxford, preaching his first sermon at Warton, June 23, from Ps. cxxiv. 23: "Man goeth to his work and to his labour until the evening"—nineteen years later he preached his last sermon as an Anglican clergyman from the same text. In March, 1825, he was appointed vice-principal of Alban Hall by Richard Whately, the principal (afterwards archbishop of Dublin), to whose influence Newman declared he owed more than to that of any other man during the formative period of his career. He became vicar of St. Mary's, the university church, in 1828, and in 1831–32 he was one of the select university preachers, marking the close of his public activity at Oxford. In Dec., 1832, Newman and Richard Hurrell Froude visited southern Europe. While in Rome he collaborated with Froude on the *Lyra Apostolica*. In June, 1833, while traveling in an orange-boat from Palermo to Marseilles, the boat was becalmed for a whole week, during which time he wrote his most famous verses: "Lead, kindly light." On his arrival home in July of the same year Keble preached his assize sermon at St. Mary's on national apostasy, which Newman considered the start of the Oxford movement (see Tractarianism).

According to Dean Church "the Oxford movement was the direct result of the searchings of heart and the communings from 1826–33 of Keble, Froude, and Newman. Keble gave the inspiration, Froude the impetus, and Newman did the work." The same author calls Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833) "a book, which for originality and subtlety of thought was something very unlike the usual theological writings of the day." With this publication Newman's fame as an author was assured. Toward the close of the year 1835 Dr. Pusey joined the Oxford movement, becoming (in the eyes of the world at large) its official head. In 1836 Renn Dickson Hampden became regius professor of divinity at Oxford against considerable opposition, which was aroused by the liberalism of his Bampton lectures. Newman took a leading part in the controversy by his *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements* (Oxford, 1836), opening the eyes of many to the meaning of the movement and making friends day by day. There followed a series of works in defense of Anglo-Catholicism, the first, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, Viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism* (1837), occupying him for three years. In 1838 he published *Lectures on Justification* and his tract on Antichrist. These publications were largely responsible for the formation of a school of opinion, which eventually came into collision with the nation and the nation's church. At about this time Newman became editor of the *British Critic*, which was used as the chief organ of Tractarianism, and at this time his influence was already wide. While the view of the Church of England set forth in his *Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837) is the recognized Anglican view, by 1839 he himself began to question its correctness, and his doubts were strengthened by Cardinal Wiseman's article on the "Anglican Claim" in the *Dublin Review* (1839).

During the years in which the Tractarian movement held sway, Newman wrote twenty-four tracts. *Tract 90* he wrote in 1841, the outcome of which was that the movement came under the ban, and Newman's position was no longer tenable. In July of the same year he relinquished the editorship of the *British Critic* to his brother-in-law, Thomas Mozley. The next year he withdrew from Oxford and went to Littlemore, passing three years in seclusion; publishing in February, 1843, in the *Conservative Journal* a retraction of his strictures upon the Church of Rome, and in September of the same year resigning the living of St. Mary's. During the writing of his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845), his doubts respecting the Roman Catholic Church gradually vanished, and he was received into that church on Oct. 9, 1845. This event was of far-reaching importance to the Church of England, and brought about the end of the Oxford movement. Newman left Oxford on Feb. 23, 1846, to go to Oscott, and in October of the same year he went to Rome, where he was ordained priest, and received the doctorate. At the close of the following year he returned to England, commissioned by Pius IX. to introduce the Oratory (see NERI, PHILIP, SAINT) into his mother country, which he established at Alcester Street, Birmingham; and later at Edgebaston. His *Discourses to Mixed Congregations* (1849) is a volume which reveals him at this time at the zenith of his attainments as a preacher. In this same year he assisted the Roman Catholic priests of Bilston during an epidemic of cholera, himself taking the most dangerous posts. In 1851 he established the London Oratory, while in 1850 he had published his *Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Submitting to the Catholic Church.* In October, 1850, the Roman hierarchy of England (also called the Papal Aggression) was restored, producing a violent anti-Catholic agitation. Newman's next work was his *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851). In one of these he so forcibly and in such plain language assailed the depraved nature of an apostate monk named Achilli, used in the anti-Roman agitation, that charges for libel were preferred against him. He pleaded "not guilty," and his charges were in the main proved by witnesses brought for the purpose from Italy, but the jury, under the influence of the charge by the magistrate, brought in a verdict against Newman, and he was fined £100 by Judge Coleridge on Jan. 23, 1853. In 1854 he went to Dublin, as rector of the Catholic University. The only apparent literary result of this experience was his *Idea of a University* (1873). In 1858 he returned to Birmingham, where he proposed, but failed to carry through, the establishment of a branch house of the Oratory at Oxford. In 1859 he established at Edgebaston the school for the sons of well-to-do Roman Catholics. In reply to an adverse criticism (in fact a perverted statement) made by Charles Kingsley in 1864 Newman issued his *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, a work which has been regarded a triumphant vindication of his integrity and honesty of purpose throughout his life. In 1874 he answered an article written by Gladstone for the *Contemporary Review* and also Gladstone's *Vatican Decrees*, by his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, in which he criticized severely the extreme statements of some Roman Catholics in relation to the matter at issue. In 1877 Newman was elected honorary fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and in February, 1878, visited Oxford for the first time in thirty-two years. Soon after Leo XIII. became pope, several leading English Roman Catholic laymen represented to him the great work which Newman had accomplished in England, as a result of which Newman was called to the sacred college. This honor was appreciated the more in that it was unexpected and in that he was exempt from residence at the pontifical court. On May 12, 1879, he was formally created cardinal, with the title of St. George in Velabro. He paid one more visit to Trinity College, Oxford, and preached in St. Aloysius' Church. Thenceforth he made his residence at Edgebaston.

A full list of his books, tracts, and other writings is given in *DNB*, xl. 349–350. An edition of his works is in 36 vols., London, 1868–81.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: As sources use: His own *Apologia pro vita sua*, ut sup.; and *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ed. Anne Mozley, 2 vols., London, 1891. Very useful is the literature on TRACTARIANISM, particularly R. W. Church's *Oxford Movement*, London, 1891. Biographies have been written by: R. H. Hutton, London, 1894; H. J. Jennings, ib., 1882; W. Lockhart, ib., 1891; W. J. H. Meynell, New York, 1891; E. A. Abbott, *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols., London, 1892 (consult also his *Philomythus*, ib. 1891); W. Sanday, *England's Debt to Newman*, London, 1892; A. B. Donaldson, in *Five Great Oxford Leaders*, New York, 1900; A. R. Waller and G. H. S. Barrow, Boston, 1902; A. Whyte, New York, 1902; W. Barry, New York, 1904; E. Cachod, *Newman. Essai de biographie psychologique*, Paris, 1905; J. A. Hutton, *Pilgrims in the Region of Faith*, Cincinnati, 1906; W. J. Williams, *Newman, Pascal, Loisy and the Catholic Church*, London, 1906; W. P. Ward, *Ten Personsal Studies*, New York, 1908; A. Cecil, *Six Oxford Thinkers*, London, 1909. Consult also, H. P. Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey*, 3 vols., London, 1895; the *Trial of G. G. Achilli vs. J. H. Newman*, London, 1852; C. Sarolea, *Cardinal Newman and His Influence on Religious Life and Thought*, New York, 1908.

NEWMAN, JOHN PHILIP: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. in New York Sept. 1, 1826; d. at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., July 5, 1899. He graduated from Cazenovia Seminary, 1848; studied theology, and entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1849; he filled appointments in the Oneida, Troy, and New York conferences, 1848–64, with an interval of a year's travel (1860–61) in the orient; he organized a Methodist Episcopal church in New Orleans, 1864; while there he established three annual conferences, two colleges, and a religious paper; he organized and became pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, 1869; he was chaplain of the United States Senate, 1869–74; inspector of United States consulates in Asia 1874–76; again pastor of the Metropolitan Church, Washington, 1876–79; of the Central Church, New York, 1879–82; of the Madison Avenue Church, New York, 1882–84; and a third time pastor of the Metropolitan Church, Washington, 1885–88; and in 1888 was elected bishop. He won high repute as a pulpit orator and lecturer. He was three times elected to the general conference of his denomination; and in 1881 went to England as delegate to the Methodist ecumenical council. He wrote: *From Dan to Beersheba, or the Land of Promise as it now Appears* (New York, 1864); *The Thrones and Palaces of Babylon and Nineveh, from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean . . .* (1876); *Christianity Triumphant; its Defensive and Aggressive Victories* (1883); *Supremacy of Law* (1890); and *Conversations with Christ* (1900). He was also editor of the New Orleans *Christian Advocate*, 1866–69.

NEWSOM, GEORGE ERNEST: Church of England; b. at Blundellsands (5 m. n. of Liverpool), Lancashire, May 24, 1871. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford (B.A., 1894), and was ordered deacon in 1895 and ordained priest in 1896. After being curate of Cannock from 1895 to 1897, he was vice-principal of King's College, London, from 1897 to 1903. Since 1903 he has been professor of pastoral theology in the same institution. He has also been warden of King's College Hostel and reader in the Temple Church since 1902, and examining chaplain to the bishop of Lichfield since 1905.

NEWTIAN CHURCH. See NEW, JOHN FAIR.

NEWTON, BENJAMIN WILLS: Plymouth Brother; b. at Plymouth 1805; d. at Tunbridge Wells 1898. He was educated at the Plymouth Grammar School, and at Exeter College, Oxford (B.A., 1828), where he read privately with Francis William Newman (q.v.), through whom he became acquainted with John Nelson Darby (q.v.), whom he induced to visit Plymouth. In the "Assembly" of the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.), he labored for seventeen years as a teacher, and contributed to *The Christian Witness* many papers of value. Until 1845 Newton held sway in the Plymouth "gathering," as it was called, but early displayed divergence from Darby's teaching on ministry, justification, the "secret rapture of the saints," etc. Their different attitude on ministry and church government led to a rupture between them in 1845, when Darby started another "meeting" in Plymouth. Newton continued in the original company until 1847. But in the mean time notes of a lecture by Newton on Christ's status as an Israelite, which he seemed to treat in such a way as to impair the Lord's personal sinless relations to God, coming into Darby's hands, were used by his old associate effectively against him, so that his remaining supporters were gradually detached from him as heterodox, with the exception of S. P. Tregelles, who was related to him by marriage. Newton left Plymouth finally at the end of 1847 for residence in London and elsewhere. Thenceforth he ministered and worked in isolation, remaining a layman to the end of his life.

Of his works, which are numerous and well written, the chief are:

Thoughts on the Apocalypse (London, 1844, last ed. 1904); *Remarks on the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus* (1847, in explanation of his views criticized by Darby); *Ancient Truths Respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus* (1857, new ed., 1893); *Aids to Prophetic Enquiry* (1848; 1881); *Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman Empire* (1849; new ed., 1873); *Prophetic System of Elliott and Cumming Considered* (1850); *Doctrines of Popery Considered* (1851; new ed., 1883); *Occasional Papers on Scriptural Subjects* (1851, 1856); *Thoughts on Leviticus* (1852); *Europe and the East* (1855; new ed., 1878); *First and Second Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans Considered* (1856; new ed., 1897); *The Antichrist Future* (1859; new ed., 1900); *Gospel Truths* (1861); *Remarks on Mosaic Cosmogony* (1864); *Judgment of the Court of Arches in Case of Rowland Williams* (1866); *Prophecy of the Lord Jesus as Contained in Matt. xxiv., xxv.* (1879); *Old Testament Saints not Excluded from the Church in Glory* (1887); *Babylon, its future History and Doom* (1890).

E. E. WHITFIELD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. B. Neatby, *History of the Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1902.

NEWTON, JOHN: Church of England; joint author with Cowper of the *Olney Hymns;* b. in London July 24, 1725; d. there Dec. 21, 1807. He was the son of a shipmaster in the Mediterranean service, with whom he sailed until 1742. In 1743 he was impressed into the English naval service, was made midshipman, deserted, was recaptured and reduced to the ranks, exchanged to a ship in the African station, became servant to a slave-trader, and was rescued in 1748, being converted on the way home in a storm at sea. He continued to follow the sea till 1754, meanwhile studying Latin and the Bible. He was surveyor of tides at Liverpool, 1755–60, where he heard Whitefield and Wesley, and studied Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac. In 1763 he was brought to the notice of Lord Dartmouth by Thomas Haweis, through whose influence he was made deacon and priest, 1764, and given the curacy of Olney. In 1767 Cowper settled there, and the result of their very close intimacy was the *Olney Hymns* (London, 1779 and often), which greatly influenced English hymnology. In 1780 he accepted the offer of the benefice of St. Mary Woolnoth with St. Mary Woolchurch, London, where he officiated till his death. Hardly less famous than the *Hymns* was his *Authentic Narrative of Some . . . Particulars in the Life of John Newton* (London, 1764, 9th. ed., 1799; an account of his early life). He wrote also, *Sermons Preached in . . . Olney* (1767); *Omicron: Twenty-six Letters on Religious Subjects* (1774; subsequent editions, in which the number of the letters became forty-one); *Cardiphonia; or, the Utterance of the Heart in the Course of a real Correspondence* (2 vols., 1781); *Letters to a Wife* (2 vols., 1793), and other works. A collected edition of his works was issued by his executors (6 vols., London, 1808; new ed., 12 vols., 1821). He was a strong support of the Evangelicals in the Church of England, and was a friend of the dissenting clergy as well as of the ministry of his own church. One of the questions much debated is whether the influence of the sternly Calvinistic Newton on Cowper was good. It is possible that this Calvinistic trend gave Cowper's works a gloomy cast; on the other hand, it may have been the tonic which he required.

Bibliography: In an edition of Newton's *Works*, Edinburgh, 1827, is a life by R. Cecil; *The Authentic Narrative*, ut sup., is of course a first-hand source, while the *Letters* and *Cardiphonia* contain much that is biographical. Consult *Letters and Conversational Remarks*, ed. J. Campbell, London, 1808; *DNB*, xl. 395–398; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 248–255, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 803–804; and the literature under Cowper, William, particularly the editions by Wright of the *Correspondence*.

NEWTON, RICHARD: Protestant Episcopalian; b. in Liverpool, England, July 25, 1813; d. in Philadelphia May 25, 1887. He accompanied his parents to America in 1823, and received his early training in Philadelphia and in Wilmington, Del.; he graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1836, and from the General Theological Seminary, New York, 1839; was ordained, and became rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, West Chester, Pa., 1839; was rector of St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, 1840–62; of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, 1862–81; and from 1882 of the Church of the Covenant in the same city. He was remarkably successful in his sermons for children and young people, which have been most widely translated.

He was the author of: *The Wonder Case* (6 vols., *Bible Wonders; Nature's Wonders; Leaves from the Tree of Life; Rills from the Fountain of Life; Jewish Tabernacle;* and *Giants and Wonderful Things*, New York, 1856–74); *The Jewel Case* (6 vols., *Best Things; King's Highway; Safe Compass; Bible Blessings; Great Pilot; Bible Jewels;* 1859–1868); *Illustrated Rambles in Bible Lands* (Philadelphia, 1875); *Rays from the Sun of Righteousness* (New York, 1876); *Life of Jesus Christ; for the Young* (in 40 parts, Philadelphia, 1877); *The King in his Beauty* (New York, 1878); *Pebbles from the Brook: Sermons to Children* (1879); *Pearls from the East: Stories and Incidents from Bible History* (Philadelphia, 1881); *Covenant Names and Privileges* (New York, 1882); *Bible Promises: Sermons to Children* (1884); *Bible Portrait Gallery* (Philadelphia, 1885); *Heroes of the Reformation* (1885); *Bible Warnings: Sermons to Children* (New York, 1886); *Bible Animals and the Lessons Taught by them* (1888); *Heath in the Wilderness: Sermons to the People; to which is added the Story of his Life and Ministry by W. W. N.* (1888); *Heroes of the Early Church* (Philadelphia, 1888); *Five Minute Talks for Young People: or, the Way to Success* (1891).

NEWTON, RICHARD HEBER: Protestant Episcopalian, son of the preceding; b. at Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1840. He entered the University of Pennsylvania in 1857 but left at the close of his sophomore year; then entered the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, from which he was graduated in 1863. He was ordered deacon in 1862 and was assistant at St. Paul's, Philadelphia (1862–1863) and the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia (1863–64), and in charge of Trinity Church, Sharon Springs, N. Y. (1864–66), until his ordination to the priesthood in 1866. He was then rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia (1866–69), and of All Souls', New York City (1869–1902). He belongs to the Broad-church party. His larger works are: *The Children's Church* (New York, 1870); *The Morals of Taste* (1873); *Studies of Jesus* (1880); *Womanhood* (1880); *Right and Wrong Uses of the Bible* (1883); *The Book of the Beginnings* (1884); *Philistinism* (1885); *Social Studies* (1886); *Church and Creed* (1891); *Christian Science* (1898); and *Parsifal* (1904).

NEWTON, WILLIAM WILBERFORCE: Protestant Episcopalian, brother of the preceding; b. at Philadelphia, Nov. 4, 1843. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania (B.A., 1865) and the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia (1868). He was assistant at the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia (1868–70), rector of St. Paul's, Brookline, Mass. (1870–75), Trinity, Newark, N. J. (1875–77), St. Paul's, Boston, Mass. (1877–81), and St. Stephen's, Pittsfield, Mass. (1881–1900), chaplain of the English Church at Dinan, Brittany (1903–04), and rector of the Church of the Ascension, Wakefield, R. I. (1905–06). He was editor of *The American Church Sunday School Magazine* (1885–1906). In theology he is a Broad Churchman. Among his publications special mention may be made of his *Gate of the Temple: or, Prayers for Children* (New York, 1875); six volumes of sermons for children (1877–90); *Essays of To-day* (Boston, 1879); *The Voice of St. John* (poems; New York, 1880); *Priest and Man: or, Abelard and Heloisa* (novel; Boston, 1883); *Summer Sermons from a Berkshire Pulpit* (Pittsfield, Mass., 1885); *The Life of Dr. Muhlenberg* (New York, 1890): *A Run through Russia* (Hartford, 1894); and *Philip Mac Gregor* (novel; 1895).

NIBHAZ: The name of one of the two deities or idols mentioned in II Kings xvii. 31 as set up by the Avvites (A. V. Avites), one of the foreign peoples settled by Sargon in the territory of the northern kingdom after the deportation of the Israelites. The reading is questionable, both the Hebrew and the Greek giving variants. Some Hebrew manuscripts read Nibhan (cf. the same reading in *Sanhedrin* 63b), while those which have the ordinary reading point the word differently. Greek texts indicate a goddess, and have the forms *Eblazer*, *Eblaiezer*, *Abaazer*. No deity corresponding to any of these forms is known even in the cuneiform records, the nearest suggestion that comes is from the Mandean, in which there is mention of a demon Nebaz. The passage in *Sanhedrin* (ut sup.) connects the word with *nbḥ*, " to bark," and supposes the idol to have had the form of a dog. But nothing is known of a dog-shaped idol in the region except the dog-headed Anubis of Egypt, and that seems out of the question here. The reading *Nibḥan* seems to have arisen from a mistake in reading the last letter of the original text. Nor is any light shed on the subject by considering the people who set up the idol. Possibly the implied '*Avvah* of II Kings xvii. 31 is the same as the '*Ivvah* of II Kings xviii. 34, xix. 13; Isa. xxxvii. 13. But even then nothing is known of such a place as a Syrian or Babylonian region or city, and consequently there is no knowledge of its deities. Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: J. Selden, *De dis Syris*, London, 1617, Eng. transl., *The Fabulous Gods Denounced in the Bible*, Philadelphia, 1881; C. Iken, *Dissertatio de Nibchaz idolo Avvæorum*, Bremen, 1726; F. Münter, *Die Religion der Babylonier*, pp. 108–110, Copenhagen, 1827; P. Scholz, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebräern*, pp. 399 sqq., Regensburg, 1877; Schrader, *KAT*, p. 484; *EB*, iii. 3405–3406; and the commentaries on the passage.

NICÆA (NICE), COUNCILS OF.

I. The First Council, 325 A.D.
  Character, Membership, and Problems (§ 1).
  The Procedure (§ 2).
  The Symbol (§ 3).
  Other Problems (§ 4).
II. The Second Council, 787 A.D.

1. Character, Membership, and Problems.

I. The First Council, 325 A.D.: The first Council of Nice is conspicuous as the starting point for the great doctrinal controversies of the Church in the fourth and fifth centuries. Here a union between the ecclesiastical potency of the councils and the State was effected, vesting the deliberations of this body with imperial power. Earlier synods had been contented with protection against heretical doctrines; but the Council of Nice is characterized by the further step from a defensive position to positive decisions and minutely elaborated articles of faith. In the Arian controversy lay a great obstacle to the realization of Constantine's idea of a universal empire which was to be attained by aid of uniformity of divine worship. Accordingly for the summer of 325 the bishops of all provinces were summoned to the first ecumenical council at Nice in Bithynia, a place easily accessible to the majority of the bishops, especially those of Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Thrace. The number of members can not be accurately stated; Athanasius counted 318, Eusebius only 250. As a matter of course, the oriental bishops formed the preponderating number; the first rank being held by the three archbishops Alexander of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Macarius of Jerusalem, and by Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Cæsarea. A special prominence attached to this council also because the persecutions had just ended, and it was to be assumed that nearly all of the assembled fathers had stood forth as witnesses of the faith. The occident sent not more than five representatives in equal distribution from the provinces, Marcus of Calabria from Italy, Cecilian of Carthage from Africa, Hosius of Cordova from Spain, Nicasius of Dijon from Gaul, and Domnus of Stridon from the province of the Danube. These ecclesiastical dignitaries of course did not travel alone, but each one with his suite, so that Eusebius speaks of an almost innumerable host of accompanying priests, deacons, and acolytes. Among the assistants it was Athanasius, a young deacon and companion of Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, who distinguished himself as the "most vigorous fighter against the Arians," and similarly Alexander of Constantinople, a presbyter, as representative of his aged bishop. The points to be discussed at the synod were: (1) The Arian question, (2) the celebration of Easter, (3) the Meletian schism, (4) the baptism of heretics, and (5) the status of the lapsed in the persecution under Licinius.

2. The Procedure.

The council was formally opened May 20, in the central structure of the imperial palace, busying itself chiefly with preparatory discussions on the Arian question, in which Arius, with some adherents, especially Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, and Maris of Chalcedon, seems to have been the leading spirit; regular sessions, however, began only on the arrival of the emperor. After prescribing the course of the negotiations he entrusted the mode of procedure to a committee appointed by himself, consisting in all probability of the most prominent participants of that body. It is undoubtedly chiefly owing to this step on the part of Constantine that the council, after being in session for an entire month, promulgated on June 19 the Nicene Creed (see CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED). At first the Arians and the orthodox showed an uncompromising front toward each other. The Arians entrusted the representation of their interests to Eusebius of Cæsarea (q.v.), whose scholarship and flowery speech made a great impression upon the emperor. His reading of the confession of the Arians called forth a storm of resentment among the opponents; two minorities vividly interested in contrary opinions opposed each other, but between them yawned indifference. In their behalf, as well as for his own sake, Eusebius, after he had ceased to represent the Arians, appeared as a mediator; and in asserting that the chief aim to be pursued should be the establishment of the peace of the Church, he at the same time agreed with his exalted protector. He presented a new formula, the baptismal symbol of his own congregation at Cæsarea, by means of which the differing opinions might be reconciled. The emperor, who pursued the purely political intentions of a successful pacification, could desire no more welcome proposition and immediately confirmed it by making it his own. In this way he did not overpower the majority, but most probably met its wishes; for if the orthodox had really been able to count on a preponderating majority, even the predilection of the emperor would not have hindered them from setting up their own confession in the manner of that proposed by Bishop Alexander in his first circular letter. But far from daring such an attempt, the majority (without resistance) complied, asserting their rights only in the form of amending clauses. While such modes of procedure are more characteristic of minorities than of majorities, their use by the latter does not necessarily debar victory, as indeed in this case it did not. All propositions of the orthodox during the remainder of the controversy having been accepted, it is furthermore evident, first: that the Arians of conviction were in the minority; second: that the majority (or deciding body) did not possess, and hence did not assert, convictions of a dogmatic nature. These are, considered in a general way, the presuppositions of the world-important decisions of the Council of Nice.

3. The Symbol.

Examining the symbol in detail, it appears that it contained indeed decisions on the Son of God which might satisfy all members of the council. Even Arius found no reason to oppose it from his standpoint. But for the partisans of Bishop Alexander the definitions were too vague; they rendered them more concise, and if the Nicene Creed be compared with its model, that of Cæsarea, it seems to have originated in some omissions from the second article which was the only one in question. To these omissions corresponded three no less important additions: (1) to designate the Son "that is, of the essence of the Father" was added; (2) another addition reads "begotten, not made"; (3) the most important addition reads "of one substance with the Father." Of the third article only the words "and in the Holy Ghost" were left and then followed immediately the anathemas. Thus the neutral baptismal confession of the congregation of Cæsarea, laid before the council by Eusebius, became the uncompromising anti-Arian symbol of Nice, the text of which is preserved in a letter of Eusebius to his congregation, in Athanasius, and elsewhere. The symbol was finally accepted, although the anti-Arians or Homoousians were in the minority. The emperor was intent upon a decisive settlement of the question; at first he probably had no predilection for either of the conceptions of the two contending parties, but perceiving that the original propositions of Eusebius, which supposedly furthered peace, effected the very opposite, he may involuntarily have considered whether he could not reach his aim more quickly by seeking an agreement with the anti-Arians. Undoubtedly there were not wanting attempts at personal mediation, in the first place on the part of Bishop Hosius of Cordova (q.v.), one of the most decided Homoousians, and at the time of the council the confidant of the emperor in all affairs of the Church. He stands at the head of the lists of participants, and Athanasius ascribes to him the actual success of the symbol. But when it is considered that great men like Eustathius of Antioch, Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, and Marcellus of Ancyra belonged to the anti-Arian party, it does not seem strange that the Homoousians, in spite of being in the minority, gained the final victory. Eusebius of Cæsarea, in spite of his sympathies for Arius, accepted the decisions of the council, subscribing even the condemnatory clauses against Arius. The number of persons of prominence among the opponents was not so considerable; for after the debates, extending over four weeks, there were only two adherents of Arius who remained steadfast, Theonas of Marmarica in Libya, and Secundus of Ptolemais; of the three others upon whom Arius might have counted, Maris of Chalcedon finally subscribed the whole symbol, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice at least its positive part, without the condemnatory clauses against Arius. The emperor now actually fulfilled his threat, according to which everybody who refused to sign had to face exile. Arius, Theonas, Secundus, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis were excommunicated. The works of Arius were confiscated in order to be burnt. But it soon appeared that even force could not silence the disputes, and that under the pressure of such procedure the controversy on the equality of Christ with God assumed unthought-of dimensions; for the Council of Nice had done away with the indifference of the masses to theological distinctions.

4. Other Problems.

After the settlement, on June 19, of the most important subject of discussion, the question of Easter was brought up. According to Duchesne (*Revue des questions historiques*, xxviii. 37), who founds his conclusions (1), on the conciliar letter to the Alexandrians preserved in Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, I., ix. 12; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, I., ix. 12; (2), on the circular letter of Constantine to the bishops after the council, Eusebius, *Vita Constantine*, III., xviii. 19; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, I., x. 3 sqq.; (3), on Athanasius, *De Synodo*, v.; *Epist. ad Afros*, ii.; the oriental churches of Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia adhered to the Jewish reckoning of the fourteenth of Nisan, instead of basing the calculation for Easter on the equinoctial occurrence after the model of Alexandria and Rome. The council assumed the task of regulating these differences in conformity with the usages of the other churches, because the dependence of some congregations on a Jewish peculiarity was offensive. The Council of Nice, however, did not declare the Alexandrine cycle of Easter as alone canonical, but gave the bishop of Alexandria the privilege of announcing annually the date of Easter to the Roman curia. Although the synod undertook the regulation of the dating of Easter, it contented itself with communicating its decision to the different dioceses, instead of establishing a canon; thus inviting opposition even on this point in due season. Then began the proceedings against the Meletian schism, which, on account of the great popularity of the movement, took an extremely mild development and cost its founder only suspension from office, but no degradation. Finally there followed the prescription of twenty canons or rules of discipline: (1) prohibition of self-castration; (2) establishment of a minimum term for catechizing; (3) prohibition of the presence in the house of a cleric of females who might bring him under suspicion; (4) consecration of a bishop in the presence of at least three provincial bishops and confirmation by the metropolitan; (5) provision for two provincial synods to be held annually; (6) exceptional position granted to Alexandria and Rome as episcopal sees; (7) recognition of the honorary rights of the see of Jerusalem; (8) provision for agreement with the Novatians; (9–14) provision for mild procedure against the lapsed during the persecution under Licinius; (15–16) prohibition of the removal of priests; (17) prohibition of usury among the clergy; (18) precedence of bishops and presbyters over deacons in taking the Eucharist; (19) declaration of the invalidity of baptism by heretics; (20) attitude at prayer on Pentecost.

On July 25, 325, the fathers of the council celebrated the emperor's twentieth anniversary and then dispersed. In his valedictory address the emperor again informed his hearers how averse he was to all dogmatic controversy, and in a circular letter he announced the accomplished unity of practise by the whole Church in the matter of the celebration of Easter. But the illusion of victory did not last, the emperor experiencing stroke after stroke of disappointment and misfortune. The continuation of the synod in 327 questioned every result achieved in 325. Arius as well as the friends punished with him and the Meletians regained nearly all rights which they had lost.

(Carl Albrecht Bernoulli.)

II. The Second Council, 787 A.D.: Although image-worship had been finally abolished by the energetic measures of Constantine V., whose iconoclastic tendencies were shared by his son, Leo IV., after the latter's early death, his widow Irene, as regent for her son, began its restoration, moved thereto by personal inclination and political considerations (see Images and Image Worship, II.). When in 784 the imperial secretary Tarasius was appointed successor to the patriarch Paul, he accepted on condition that the intercommunion with the other churches should be reestablished, that is, that the images should be restored. However, as a council claiming to be ecumenical had abolished image-worship, another ecumenical council was necessary for its restoration. Pope Hadrian was invited to participate and gladly accepted. The invitation intended for the oriental patriarchs could not even be delivered to them. The Roman legates were an archbishop and an abbot, each named Peter.

In 786 the council met in the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, but soldiers in collusion with the opposition entered the church and broke up the assembly. The government now resorted to a stratagem. Under the pretext of a campaign, the iconoclastic bodyguard was sent away from the capital, disarmed, and disbanded. The council was again summoned to meet, this time in Nice, since Constantinople was still distrusted, assembling Sept. 24, 787. It numbered about 350 members; 308 bishops or their representatives signed. Tarasius presided, and seven sittings were held in Nice. Proof of the lawfulness of image-worship was drawn from Ex. xxv. 17 sqq.; Num. vii. 89; Heb. ix. 1 sqq.; Ezek. xli., and Gen. xxxi. 34, but especially from a series of passages of the Church Fathers; the authority of the latter was decisive. It was determined that "As the sacred and life-giving cross is everywhere set up as a symbol, so also should the images of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, the holy angels, as well as those of the saints and other pious and holy men be embodied in the manufacture of sacred vessels, tapestries, vestments, etc., and exhibited on the walls of churches, in the homes, and in all conspicuous places, by the roadside and everywhere," to be revered by all who might see them. For the more they are contemplated, the more they move to fervent memory of their prototypes. Therefore, it is proper to accord to them a fervent and reverent adoration, not, however, the veritable worship which, according to our faith, belongs to the Divine Being alone—for the honor accorded to the image passes over to its prototype, and whoever adores the image adores in it the reality of what is there represented.

The clear distinction between the adoration offered to God and that accorded to the images may well be looked upon as a result of the iconoclastic reform. The twenty-two canons drawn up in Constantinople also served ecclesiastical reform. Careful maintenance of the ordinances of the earlier councils, knowledge of the Scriptures on the part of the clergy, and care for Christian conduct are required, and the desire for a renewal of ecclesiastical life is awakened. The papal legates voiced their approval of the restoration of image-worship in no uncertain terms, and the patriarch sent a full account of the proceedings of the council to Hadrian, who caused the same to be translated, which translation Anastasius later replaced with a better one. For a treatment of the opposition view, see Caroline Books. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: I. The collection of sources which supersedes all others is *Patrum Nicænorum nomina . . . sociata opera*, ed. H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, O. Cuntz, *adjecta est tabula geographica*, Leipsic, 1899. The canons are in the collections of Mansi and Labbe, and in Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 376–431, Eng. transl. i. 262–447, and Fr. transl., vol. i., note the material on the Coptic fragments in this transl., i. 1125–1138, on various editions of the canons, pp. 1139–1176, and on canon 6, pp. 1182–1202; an Eng. transl. with voluminous discussion is in J. Chrystal, *Authoritative Christianity*, vol. i., Jersey City, 1891. Consult: J. Kaye, *Some Account of the Council of Nicæa*, London, 1853; B. H. Cowper, *Analecta Nicæna*, London, 1857; E. Revillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textes coptes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1880–99; W. Bright, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*, London, 1892; C. A. Bernoulli, *Das Konzil von Nicäa*, Freiburg, 1896; J. J. Lias, *The Nicene Creed*, London, 1897, new ed., 1910; O. Braun, *De sancta Nicæna synodo*, Münster, 1898; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 622–632, and in general works on the church history of the period; Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. ii.–iv. passim, and in general works on the history of doctrine; consult also the literature on the Constantinopolitan Creed.

II. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 441 sqq., Eng. transl., v. 342–400; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, x. 419 sqq., 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762–85; Schaff, *Church History*, iv. 459–463; literature under Caroline Books; Images And Image Worship, II.

NICÆNO-CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED. See Constantinopolitan Creed.

NICARAGUA. See Central America.

NICCOLLS, SAMUEL JACK: Presbyterian; b. at Greenfield Farm, Westmoreland Co., Pa., Aug. 3, 1838. He was graduated from Jefferson College (now Washington and Jefferson), Cannonsburg, Pa. (A.B., 1857), and Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa. (1860). He was then pastor of Falling Springs Presbyterian Church at Chambersburg, Pa. (1860–64), and since 1864 has been pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, Mo. He was also chaplain of the 126th Pennsylvania Volunteers in 1863, and a member of the committee on the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith in 1890 and 1900. He is likewise president of the board of directors of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, and has written *The Eastern Question in Prophecy* (St. Louis, 1878). He is evangelical in belief and holds the Reformed theology.

NICENE CREED. See Constantinopolitan Creed.

NICEPHORUS: Celebrated Byzantine writer and patriarch of Constantinople; b. in Constantinople c. 758; d. at the monastery Tou Agathou June 2, 829. Of a strictly orthodox family, which had suffered from the earlier iconoclasm, he nevertheless entered the service of the State, became cabinet secretary, and under Irene took part in the synod of 787 as imperial commissioner. He then withdrew to a cloister that he had founded on the Propontis, until he was appointed director of the largest home for the destitute in Constantinople. After the death of Tarasius, although still a layman, he was chosen patriarch by the wish of the emperor (Easter, April 12, 806). The uncanonical choice met with opposition from the strictly clerical party of the Studites, and this opposition was intensified to an open break when Nicephorus, in other respects a very rigid moralist, showed himself compliant to the will of the emperor by reinstating the excommunicated priest Joseph. After the emperor's death (811), Nicephorus cooperated in the removal of Staurakios and in the elevation of the incapable Michael Rhangabe. With Emperor Leo the Armenian, who was raised to the throne by the army in 813, Nicephorus was at first on good terms. When, however, this emperor revived with ever-increasing harshness the policy of the iconoclastic Isaurians, a conflict broke out, which led at the same time to a reconciliation of Nicephorus with the Studites. After vain theological disputes, in December, 814, there followed personal insults. Nicephorus at first replied to his removal from his office by excommunication, but was at last obliged to yield to force, and was taken to one of the cloisters he had founded, Tou Agathou, and later to that called Tou hagiou Theodorou. From there he carried on a literary polemic for the cause of the image-worshippers against the synod of 815; on the occasion of the change of sovereigns, in 820, he at least obtained the promise of toleration. He died revered as a confessor. His remains were solemnly brought back to Constantinople on Mar. 13, 847, and interred in the Church of the Apostles, where they were annually the object of imperial devotion.

Compared with Theodore of Studium, Nicephorus appears as a friend of conciliation, learned in patristics, more inclined to take the defensive than the offensive, and possessed of a comparatively chaste, simple style. He was mild in his ecclesiastical and monastical rules and non-partizan in his historical treatment of the period from 610 to 769 (*Historia syntomos, breviarium*). His tables of universal history (*Chronographikon syntomon*), in passages extended and continued, were in great favor with the Byzantines, and were also circulated in the West in the Latin version of Anastasius. The principal works of Nicephorus are three writings referring to iconoclasm: *Apologeticus minor*, probably composed before 814, an explanatory work for laymen concerning the tradition and the first phase of the iconoclastic movement; *Apologeticus major* with the three *Antirrhetici* against Mamonas-Constantine Copronymus, a complete dogmatics of the belief in images, with an exhaustive discussion and refutation of all objections made in opposing writings, as well as those drawn from the works of the Fathers; the third of these larger works is a refutation of the iconoclastic synod of 815 (ed. Serruys, Paris, 1904). Nicephorus is lacking in originality and follows the path marked out by John of Damascus. His merit is the thoroughness with which he traced the literary and traditional proofs, and his detailed refutations are serviceable for the knowledge they afford of important texts adduced by his opponents and in part drawn from the older church literature.

E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: The " History " was edited by D. Petavius, Paris, 1616, by I. Bekker in *CSHB*, Bonn, 1837, thence taken into *MPG*, c., best ed. by C. de Boor, Leipsic, 1880; the *Chronographikon* was edited by J. Goar, Paris, 1652, by Dindorf for *CSHB*, Bonn, 1829, is in *MPG*, c., and ed. De Boor, Leipsic, 1880. An *Epistola ad Leonem III.* is in *MPG*, cii. 1037–68. On the *Vita* by a pupil of Nicephorus, Ignatius, in *ASB*, March, ii. 704–726, *MPG*, c. 41–160, and in De Boor's ed., ut sup., pp. 139–217, cf. Von Dobschütz in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xviii (1909), 41–105; a lecture on his exile by Theophanes is in *MPG*, c. 160–168; the lives of Theodore the Studite and his correspondence are pertinent, in *MPG*, xcix. 113–328, 988, 1005, 1173, 1317. Consult further: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 71 sqq., 349 sqq., 965–966; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 603 sqq., Hamburg, 1801; G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, i. 113 sqq., London, 1854; J. Hergenröther, *Photius*, i. 261–286, Regensburg, 1867; H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus*, ii. 1, pp. 384–388, Leipsic, 1885; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 295, ib. 1891; C. Thomas, *Theodore von Studion*, pp. 67–138, Osnabrück, 1892; K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt*, pp. 282, 319, Leipsic, 1898; *KL*, ix. 249–259.

NICEPHORUS, CALLISTUS XANTHOPULUS: Church historian of the fourteenth century. During the reigns of the Paleologues there were several writers of the name of Xanthopoulos. Two monks of Mount Athos, Callistus (patriarch 1397 A.D.) and Ignatius his brother, wrote a tractate on ascetics, while Gabriel composed hymns for liturgical use. Theodore attended the Council of Florence (1439) as secretary. But the most celebrated of the name was Callistos or Callistou (i.e., " son of Callistos "), who grew up at Constantinople and was trained, as it seems, by the famous George of Cyprus (patriarch 1283–89) in close relationship with Nicephorus Chumnos, Theodore Metochites, Maximos Planudes, and Michael Gabras, a coterie of classical students who, like the humanists of the fifteenth century, cultivated style and phraseology often at the expense of sense. The Emperor Andronicus was their adored patron, since he supported Greek culture and orthodoxy against the Latins.

Except for a few homilies, prayers, hymns, and commentaries, poems, and epigrams, the authenticity of which needs further investigation, the name of Nicephorus is chiefly connected with his ecclesiastical history in eighteen books, under the acrostic letters: Nikephorou Kallistou (610 A.D.). This work has been severely criticized by most Roman Catholic and Protestant writers, but has received high praise from the great Tübingen master Baur. As de Boor has pointed out, the whole work is nothing but a modernization of an anonymous church history of the tenth century. It is not valuable even for the reconstruction of its older sources (such as the *Hist. eccl.* of Eusebius), because the Byzantine author roughly paraphrases them. Some apocryphal matter is all that possesses interest.

E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: His remains, including the " History," a *Catalogus imperatorum et patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum*, and a *Carmen de excidio Hierosolymitano* are in *MPG*, cxlv.–cxlvii. Consult: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 291–293; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 437–444, Hamburg, 1801; G. J. Voss, *De historicis Græcis*, pp. 367–368, Leipsic, 1838; F. C. Baur, *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, pp. 32 sqq., Tübingen, 1852; C. de Boor, in *ZKG*, vi (1884), 478–494; J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, in *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belge*, xl (1897), 161–178; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xi (1902), 38 sqq.

NICETAS ACOMINATUS: Byzantine historian and theologian; b. at Chonæ (the ancient Colossæ, whence he is often called Choniates); d. at Nicæa after 1210. Rising to high offices of state, he was governor of the province of Philippopolis when Frederick Barbarossa marched through that district in 1189; but on the taking of Constantinople by the Latins in 1203 he fled with many others to Nicæa. The *Historia Byzantina* of Nicetas, in twenty-one books, embraces the period from 1180 to 1205, and is noteworthy for reliability and good judgment. His theological studies found their culmination in his "Treasury of Orthodoxy." This begins with an account of Judaism and Hellenism, followed by a presentation of the chief doctrines of the Church. The fourth book begins the polemics against Simon Magus, and thus prepares the way for the ultimate consideration of many obscure heresies. The latter books are devoted to Islam, the Roman Catholics, and the divergencies of opinion within the Greek Church. The work is, therefore, an indispensable source for a knowledge of the heresies of the twelfth century, though only the first five books (in Latin translation) and a portion of the twentieth book have as yet been published (reprinted in *MPG*, cxxxix. 1101–1144, cxl. 9–281).

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Uspensky wrote an account of Nicetas in Russian, St. Petersburg, 1874; Krummacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 91–92, 281 sqq.; C. Neumann, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber . . . im 12. Jahrhundert*. pp. 103 sqq., Leipsic, 1888.

NICETAS, DAVID: Bishop of Dadybra in Paphlagonia; d. 880. He was one of the most distinguished of the Byzantine panegyrists and devoted himself particularly to the eulogy of the apostles. His productions have little historical basis, however; and his panegyrics on certain saints are equally valueless. His biography of the Patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople, on the other hand, is of distinct historical importance. His works, which also include lengthy comments on the poems of Gregory Nazianzen, are in *MPG*, iv. 682–842, xxxviii. 842–846, cv. 15–582. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Mai, *Patrum nova bibliotheca*, vi. 2, pp. 3–8, 8 vols., Rome, 1852–71; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 747–749, Hamburg, 1801; P. Meyer, in *JPT*, 1886, pp. 386 sqq.; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 167, 679 et passim; *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1900, pp. 268 sqq.

NICETAS PECTORATUS: Greek mystic and polemic author of the eleventh century. He was a monk at Studium and a pupil of Simeon the younger, from whom he received his mystical trend. Here belong a series of his writings, especially the three hundred "Chapters" (ed. Nicodemus Hagiorites, in his *Philokalia*, Venice, 1782, and in *MPG*, cxx. 852–1009). Nicetas likewise wrote a biography of Simeon, edited in Romaic, by Dionysios Zagoraios in his edition of Simeon the younger (1790; 1886), and also collected his teacher's works. He polemized both against the Roman Catholics in his "On Unleavened Bread and Sabbath Fasting and the Marriage of the Clergy" (ed. A. K. Demetracopulos, in his *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica*, pp. 18 sqq., Leipsic, 1866), and against the Armenians and Roman Catholics in "On Leavened and Unleavened Bread" (ed. J. Hergenröther, in his *Monumenta Græca adversus Photium*, pp. 139 sqq., Regensburg, 1869). Nicetas was the author of many other works, twenty-seven of which are enumerated by Demetracopulos (ut sup. pp. 5 sqq.).

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*, pp. 3 sqq., Leipsic, 1898, cf. P. Meyer, in *GGA*, 1898, No. 11, pp. 846 sqq.; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 753 sqq., Hamburg, 1801; A. Mai, *Patrum nova bibliotheca*, vi. 2, pp. 10–13, 8 vols., Rome, 1852–71; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiii. 210, 217–220, 249.

NICETAS OF REMESIANA: Missionary bishop of that city (the modern Turkish Ak and the Servian Bela Palauka, 180 m. n. of Saloniki), where he was born about 345; d. there about 420. The only direct sources concerning him are Gennadius's *De vir. ill.*, xxii. and the twenty-ninth epistle and seventeenth and twenty-seventh *carmen* of Paulinus of Nola, whom Niceta visited in 398 and 402. The objects of his missionary activity were the Bessi, Scyths, Geti, and Dacians, and his diocese accordingly extended to the Don in the north, Pontus in the east, the Ægean in the south, and the boundaries of Dalmatia and Illyria in the west. Despite the vast extent of this diocese, the Gospel struck deep root there; monasteries and nunneries arose, the barbarians learned to praise Christ in Latin, and to live in peace and purity. The importance of Nicetas as a missionary thus rests upon the fact that he seems to have been the first to devote his life to a systematic and successful evangelization of the mountain tribes of the Hæmus. He derives his significance as an author, on the other hand, from his practical defense of the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and from his zealous emphasis upon the creed that he might protect the souls committed to him from all peril of heresy. As an adherent of the Nicene Creed, therefore, he opposed both Arians and Macedonians.

Gennadius ascribes to Nicetas six tractates for the instruction of candidates for baptism. The fifth of these, *De symbolo*, is identical with the extant *Explanatio symboli* (ed. C. P. Caspari, *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota*, pp. 341–360, Christiania, 1883); while the third, *De fide unicæ majestatis* (also mentioned by Cassiodorus) corresponds to the two treatises *De ratione fidei* and *De Spiritus Sancti potentia* (ed., with the *De diversis appellationibus domino nostro Jesu Christo convenientibus*, by A. Mai, *Nova collectio*, vii. 314–332). The remaining tractates mentioned by Gennadius are lost. The *Explanatio symboli* is remarkable as containing for the first time the article of the communion of saints, which, though doubtless existing far earlier, is here introduced apparently to lead his diocese to cling to the Catholic Church and to reject Arianism. It has also been supposed, but without sufficient reason, that Nicetas was the author of the *Te Deum* and the two treatises *De vigiliis servorum Dei* and *De psalmodiæ bono*. (E. HÜMPEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Hümpel, *Niceta, Bischof von Remesiana*, Bonn, 1895 (cf. F. Kattenbusch, in *TLZ*, 1896, pp. 297–303); J. Sickenberger, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, xii (1898), 55–84; A. E. Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana, his Life and Works*, Cambridge, 1905; Braida, in *MPG*, lii. 875–1134; F. Kattenbusch, in *Giessener Universitätsprogramm*, 1892, pp. 34–52; T. Zahn, *Das apostolische Symbolum*, pp. 107–130, Leipsic, 1893; idem, in *NKZ*, 1896, pp. 93 sqq.; G. Morin, in *Revue bénédictine*, xi (1894), part 2; *DCB*, iv. 37.

NICHOLAS: The name of five popes.

Nicholas I.: Pope 858–867. He was a Roman by birth, son of the *defensor* Theodore, and was connected with the Lateran basilica as a subdeacon from the time of Sergius II. (844–47), as a deacon from that of Leo IV. (847–55). His wisdom and eloquence had long been noted, and under Benedict III. he had exercised a great influence on the policy of the Church. When Benedict died (Apr. 7, 858), the Emperor Louis II. hastened to Rome to secure the election of a candidate to his liking, and it is possible that he was responsible for the choice of Nicholas. Consecrated on Apr. 24, he soon won the affection of the people, maintaining a monastic simplicity in his life and devoting himself to works of charity, to well-considered government, and to the erection of new churches. His historical importance, however, lies in the facts that he established a wholly new conception of the dignity and power of the papacy and that he made this theory practically felt throughout the West. Gelasius I., indeed, had given a standard expression to the papal claims, as they had developed in course of time, in the famous decretal *Duo quippe*, asserting that the pope, divinely chosen ruler of the Church, was as such equal in rank to the emperor and independent of him, though in temporal matters his subject, as the emperor was of the Church in spiritual things. But these claims had been of no effect in practise; it was Nicholas who made them effective, and drew their logical consequences. The pope, he asserted, was the absolute ruler of the universal Church, the bishops were his officers, and synods but instruments to express and register the papal will; church law is not law except when approved by the pope, who is the supreme judge, the personal representative of Christ. These far-reaching claims would probably not have found acceptance if the most powerful western church, that of the Frankish empire, had not been prepared for them by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (q.v.). But these were not the source from which Nicholas derived them; it was not until after 864 that he even used this support for them. And he goes even beyond the assertions of the forged decretals, assuming not merely a precedence of etiquette over all secular princes but the power of commanding them as seems good to him. It is not, then, surprising that he regards the emperor as the vassal of St. Peter, and the papal unction, coronation, and confirmation as at least equally essential with the validity of royal descent. In a word, it is not too much to say that Nicholas created the medieval papacy.

He was particularly fortunate in being able to gratify his hierarchical ambition at the same time that he took the part of a champion of oppressed innocence. The first case in which this opportunity was offered him occurred in 860; the innocent victim was the patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople (q.v.), the unjust oppressors were the eastern Emperor Bardas and his intruding candidate Photius (q.v.). Nicholas answered their appeal for support not by confirming the new patriarch but by sending an embassy to investigate the circumstances of his election, at the same time taking occasion to enforce a number of Roman claims in the East. The party of Photius won over the papal legates; with their assent a great council in Constantinople (May, 861) declared for Photius. Ignatius appealed directly to the pope, and thus gave him a new occasion to interfere in Eastern affairs. In a solemn encyclical to the Eastern patriarchs (May 8, 862) he warned them not to acknowledge Photius, and when this method proved ineffective, at a Roman synod in April, 863, "by virtue of the judgment of the Holy Ghost speaking through him," he deposed and excommunicated Photius.

A similar conflict on behalf of oppressed innocence and at the same time of the claims of Rome was that with John, archbishop of Ravenna. Leo IV. had already threatened this violent man and his brother with severe penalties for their ill-treatment of papal subjects; and now the bishops of the Æmilia complained of illegal exactions and other misdeeds on his part. Nicholas saw an opportunity to dispose forever of Ravenna's pretensions to independence; he summoned John three times to appear before him, and excommunicated him in default. John sought help in vain from the emperor, and was finally forced to make submission at a Lateran synod (Nov. 18, 861), renouncing the special prerogatives of his see. Nicholas won a similar victory over the most powerful West-Frankish metropolitan, Hincmar (q.v.) of Reims, and thus succeeded in making effective against the Greeks the support of the Frankish church, which now obeyed him as it had obeyed Charlemagne. In the matter of the matrimonial relations of Lothair he once more masterfully asserted his personality and his principles. The conflict here [which concerned the power to divorce a queen (on false charges) and to marry another woman] was complicated by the fact that it was not only between the Frankish and the Roman conceptions of the power of the papacy but between Frankish and Roman marriage laws; but Nicholas had public opinion on his side, as contending for a sacred principle of morals. All his plans were on a large and impressive scale. He conducted the work of the Roman mission among the Bulgarians with such wisdom, as shown in the famous *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum*, that he deserves a place as a missionary organizer by the side of Gregory the Great (see BULGARIANS, CONVERSION OF THE). In Moravia he did not give the first impulse to the mission, but by winning the support of Cyril and Methodius he secured the dominance of Roman instead of Greek Christianity. On the whole, he reached the goal at which he aimed. When he died (Nov. 13, 867) the pope, not the emperor, was recognized in the West as the head of Christendom. It should also be mentioned that Nicholas was an exception among the early popes for intellectual culture; he was not only a diligent student of the decretals of his predecessors but he knew the code of Justinian and had a respectable acquaintance with the Fathers. This wide reading gave him a high idea of the influence of literature on church life; he was the first prince of the Church who took up seriously the question of establishing a clerical censorship of books. (H. Böhmer.)

Bibliography: The *Epistolæ* are to be found in *MPL*, cxix. 769 sqq., cxxix. 1011–16. Consult: E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches*, ii. 52–217, Leipsic, 1887; H. Lämmer, *Papst Nicholas I. und die byzantinische Staatskirche seiner Zeit*, Berlin, 1857; J. M. F. Frantin, *Le Pape Nicolas I. et le jeune roi Lothaire*, Dijon, 1862; F. Rocquain, *La Papauté au moyen âge*, Paris, 1881; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 1–113, Bonn, 1892; J. Roy, in *Études d'histoire du moyen âge dediés à Gabriel Monod*, pp. 95–105, Paris, 1896; idem, *Saint Nicholas I.*, London, 1901; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 120–155, London, 1895; Creighton, *Popes*, i. 14–15, ii. 330; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 229–267; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 21–56, 119; Platina, *Popes*, i. 227–230; Mann, *Popes*, iii. 1–148; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 533–557.

Nicholas II.: Pope 1058–61. Immediately after the death of Pope Stephen X. (Mar. 29, 1058) the aristocratic party at Rome proceeded to secure the succession in the person of a candidate of their choice; and on April 5 Bishop Giovanni of Velletri was officially enthroned as Benedict X. Realizing that this promotion might reproduce the conditions which had formerly necessitated the interference of Henry III., Hildebrand effected an understanding with Duke Godfrey, whereby Bishop Gerard of Florence was to supplant Benedict X., contrived to alienate a faction of the Romans from Benedict and win them for Gerard, and obtained the assent of the empress of Germany to the proposed election of Bishop Gerard. Accordingly, the cardinals, who had fled from Rome, were convened at Siena, and Bishop Gerard was elected pope in Dec., 1058. In Jan., 1059, Benedict X. was expelled from Rome, and on Jan. 24 Bishop Gerard was enthroned as Nicholas II.

Events having shown that the Normans were not to be driven from southern Italy by force, Nicholas II. came to terms with them peaceably in Aug., 1059. He invested Duke Robert Guiscard with Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily; Prince Richard with Capua, receiving in turn their oaths of allegiance. Robert promised to observe loyalty to the pope, to support the Roman Church in the maintenance of its sovereign prerogatives and possessions, to assist Pope Nicholas in securely and honorably safeguarding the Roman papacy, and lastly, in the event of the death of Nicholas II. or of his successors, to give heed to the admonition of the cardinals and render due aid in electing and installing a pope in keeping with the honor of St. Peter. In the terms of a second oath, and in order to emphasize the relationship of vassal and lord, Robert promised to discharge an annual tribute of twelve *denarii* to the pope for every yoke of oxen. Thus the Normans obtained recognition of the fruits of their policy of conquest, and the right of expectancy to further territorial enlargements, while the pope gained such military support as made him independent alike of the Western and of the Eastern Empire. Thanks to the Normans' assistance Pope Benedict X. was reduced to capitulation at Galera in the autumn, and thus the factional nobility's papacy was annulled. This alliance with the Normans had its complement in an understanding with the Paterenes (q.v.) in northern Italy, the immediate result of which was the subjection of Milan to the papal see.

The effects of these alliances with the Normans and the Paterenes were manifest at the Lateran synod of Nicholas II. in April, 1059. The synod could not profess to represent the Church at large, seeing that hardly any but Italian ecclesiastics were present. Its most important enactment was the adoption of the celebrated law with reference to the papal election which instituted new canons of procedure regarding the occupancy of the papal see (cf. Mirbt, *Quellen*, 2d ed., no. 181, pp. 97 sqq.). This law contains the following provisos: (§ 1) That after a pope's decease, and first in order, the cardinal bishops shall assemble for the sake of advising in regard to who shall be the papal successor. In the next place, that when they have reached an agreement they shall convene the cardinal clerics and, conjointly with these, complete the election, whereupon the rest of the clergy and the people of Rome shall voice their assent in the way of conclusion. (§ 2) Cardinal bishops and cardinal clerics take the lead, in course of the election, being followed by the other participants. (§ 3) The candidate for the papal dignity is to be sought, first of all, among the Roman clergy; but if no suitable choice is here to be found, a candidate may then be selected elsewhere. (§ 5) Rome holds the first rank for place of election. In the supposable contingency that owing to the depravity of evil men, a pure and unadulterated election were out of the question there, the cardinal bishops shall have the right, in conjunction with the cardinal clerics and devout laymen, even though but few in number, to elect the pope at what place they deem proper. (§ 6) In the contingency that, after due election, some stress of war, or any malevolent onset whatsoever, prevents the elected pontiff from being enthroned in the apostolic see in accord with the traditional usage, nevertheless, being once elected, he shall possess plenary ecclesiastical authority as pope. This clause is corroborated by the paragraph on royalty (§ 4): "Withal shall bounden honor and respect be observed toward our beloved son Henry, who is presently king, and of whom the hope is entertained that with God's help he may one day become emperor; even as we have already so granted him approbation as likewise to his successors, who have gained this right (imperial dignity) from this apostolic see." This law aimed first of all to legalize, by canonical process, the course pursued at the elevation of Nicholas II. It was at once the means, however, of permanently committing the papal elections to the sway of a new set of factors; and inasmuch as this purpose was also achieved, it marks a turning-point in the history of pontifical elections.

At the synod of 1059 measures were enacted regarding celibacy, and a law was passed prohibiting lay investiture. At the same time Berengar of Tours retracted his doctrines on the Eucharist. At a new synod in the spring of 1060 a decree was framed against simonists, Benedict X. was solemnly divested of his dignities, and the new election law was ratified. Soon after this synod the cardinal priest Stephen went as papal legate to the German court to allay the disfavor prevalent in that quarter;

but, after waiting five days in vain for an audience, he was obliged to return to Rome without having delivered the pope's message. This abrupt rejection was followed, perhaps not before the early part of 1061, by the German episcopate's adverse declaration respecting the Curia. The exact time and place of this transaction are unknown. Those German prelates then resolved not only to quash the pope's rulings altogether, but even to depose him; but neither political nor ecclesiastical consequences ensued. Nicholas II. died at Florence on July 19 or 27, 1061 (on the former date, cf. Muratori, *Scriptores*, p. 944; for the alternative date, cf. *MGH, Script.*, v [1844], 427). He was not an eminent pope, but his brief pontificate is distinguished by important and fruitful events. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Diplomata, epistolæ, decreta* are in *MPL*, cxliii. 1301–66; Jaffe, *Regesta*, i. 557–566, ii. 750. Consult J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum vitæ*, i. 206 sqq., 738–739, Leipsic, 1862; P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Die Neuordnung der Papstwahl durch Nikolaus II.*, Strasburg, 1879; H. Grauert, *Das Dekret Nikolaus II. von 1059*, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, 1880, pp. 798 sqq.; W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, iii. 13 sqq., Leipsic, 1885; W. Martens, *Die Besitzung des päpstlichen Stuhles unter . . . Heinrich III. und IV.*, Freiburg, 1887; idem, *Gregor VII.*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1894; G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III. und IV.*, i. 91 sqq., 678 sqq., iii. 653 sqq., ib. 1890–1900; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, ib. 1894; L. von Heinemann, *Geschichte der Normannen in Unteritalien und Sicilien*, i. 177 sqq., ib. 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 114–125, London, 1896; A. Clavel, *Le Pape Nicolas II.*, Paris, 1906; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 168 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 296–304; Platina, *Popes*, i. 278–280.

Nicholas III.: Pope 1277–80. Giovanni Gaetani Orsini was a son of the Roman Senator Matteo Rubens. As early as 1244 he was promoted by Innocent IV. to the rank of cardinal deacon of St. Nicholas *in carcere Tulliano*. In 1262 Urban IV. appointed him inquisitor general, and in 1263 protector of the Franciscan Order. He was elected pope Nov. 25, 1277, after the death of John XXI. He compelled Rudolph of Hapsburg to cede the pentapolis and the exarchate of Ravenna to the papal see, and Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, to renounce the regency of Tuscany and the dignity of a Roman senator; and he promulgated the constitution *Fundamenta militantis*, dated July 18, 1278, which thenceforth reserved the senatorial authority and other municipal offices to the citizens of Rome. Thereupon he was himself elected senator for life. He next sought to initiate an understanding between Charles of Anjou and Rudolph of Hapsburg; and he succeeded in bringing a peace to pass, whereby Charles obtained Provence and Forcalquier in fee from the German Empire. Nicholas is supposed to have pursued even still more extensive projects; and Ptolemæus of Lucca relates that he designed to cut up the German Empire into four states: Germany, Arelate or Arles, Tuscany, and Lombardy. On the other hand, he did not succeed in his efforts to restore union with the Greeks, or in his attempts to set a new crusade afoot. His manner of directing the internal affairs of the Church gave occasion for sharp reproaches. Dante consigned him to hell, and accused him, not without warrant, of both nepotism and avarice, and the diversion of church funds to profane objects. He made no decisive ruling in the contest between strict and lax forces within the Franciscan Order; although, in the decretal *Exiit qui seminat* (1279) he considered the main issue as to how far the Minorites might use the things of this world. Nicholas III. died suddenly in his summer residence at Soriano, on Aug. 22, 1280. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: The *Registres*, ed. J. Gay, part i., Paris, 1898; *Mittheilungen aus dem vatikanischen Archiv*, ed. F. Kaltenbrunner, vols. i.–ii., Vienna, 1889-1894; J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta imperii vi., 1273–1313*, Innsbruck, 1898; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1875. Consult: J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, vols. ii.–iv., Innsbruck, 1869–74; F. Heller, *Deutschland und Frankreich in ihren politischen Beziehungen bis zum Tode Rudolfs von Hapsburg*, pp. 72 sqq., Lübeck, 1874; F. Wertsch, *Die Beziehungen Rudolfs von Hapsburg zur römischen Kurie*, Bochum, 1880; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, v. 478–491, London, 1897; A. Huyskens, *Kardinal Napoleon Orsini*, Munich, 1902; A. Demski, *Papst Nikolaus III.*, ib. 1903; *Der Kardinal J. G. Orsini (Papst Nikolaus III.), 1244–77*, Berlin, 1905; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 26–28; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 136–142, 152; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 108–111.

Nicholas IV.: Pope 1288–92. Girolamo of Ascoli, a scrivener's son, had been general of the Franciscan Order from 1274 onward, when Nicholas III. in 1278 created him cardinal designate of St. Pudentiana. In 1281 Martin IV. appointed him cardinal bishop of Præneste, or Palestrina; and on Feb. 22, 1288 he was elected pope. His pontificate exhibits no mark of greatness. He sought to tack his course between the Roman aristocratic families of Orsini and Colonna. In vain did Rudolph of Hapsburg strive to move Nicholas to set some definite term for the imperial coronation; but Charles of Anjou obtained the crown of Naples and Sicily, after duly acknowledging himself a liegeman of the Church. After the fall of Ptolemais, in 1291, Nicholas quite fruitlessly endeavored to organize a general crusade. The fact that under the constitution dated July 18, 1289, he conceded to the cardinals one-half of all revenues accruing to the see of Rome, and also allowed them to take part in the fiscal administration, signified an appreciable strengthening of the college of cardinals at the expense of the papacy. Nicholas IV. died at Rome Apr. 4, 1292.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Les Registres de Nicolas IV.*, ed. E. Langlois, Paris, 1886 sqq.; *Mittheilungen aus dem vatikanischen Archiv*, ed. F. Kaltenbrunner, vol. i., Vienna, 1889; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ii. 1826–1915, Berlin, 1875; and the *Vita* by Bernard of Guido, in Muratori, *Scriptores*, iii. 1, pp. 612–613. Consult further: J. E. Kopp, *Geschichte von der Wiederherstellung und dem Verfall des heiligen römischen Reiches*, ed. Busson, ii. 3, pp. 288 sqq., Berlin, 1871; R. Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem, 1100–1291*, pp. 1003–04, 1029, Innsbruck, 1898; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, v. 508–515, 634, 655, 666, London, 1897; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 37–40; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 173–179, viii. 291; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 118–122; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 207, 287, 411–412.

Nicholas V.: Antipope to John XXII. 1328–30. Pietro Rainalducci of Cordova was one of the Minorites who took the side of Louis the Bavarian in his struggle with the pope. After his coronation Louis, in a public assembly, set Rainalducci on the papal throne May 12, 1328. But already on the 4th of August, after vainly seeking recognition from both princes and peoples, he was obliged to leave Rome with Louis. On the return of the latter to Germany, Nicholas sought refuge in Pisa. In 1330 he craved mercy of John XXII., and made a confession of his sins; but this did not save him from spending the rest of his life in prison. He died Oct. 16, 1333. Nicholas took part in the controversy concerning the right of his order to own property in a work entitled *De controversia paupertatis Christi* (in J. F. Boehmer, *Fontes Rerum Germanicorum*, iv. 517 sqq., Stuttgart, 1868).

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the work of Boehmer named in the text: Kopp, ut sup. under Nicholas IV., vol. v., part 1, Lucerne, 1858; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom.*, ii. 805 sqq., Berlin, 1867; S. Riezler, *Die litterarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Baiern*, Leipsic, 1874; C. Müller, *Der Kampf Ludwigs des Baiern mit der römischen Kurie*, i. 192, Tübingen, 1879; Eubel, *Der Gegenpapst Nikolaus V.*, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, vol. xii., 1891; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 82–86; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 103–111; Creighton, *Papacy*, i. 47.

Nicholas V.: Pope 1447–55. This humanist, Tommaso Parentucelli of Sargana, was made archbishop of Bologna in 1439 by Eugenius IV., who had noted his ability at the Council of Florence in 1439. After he had executed the difficult mission of snatching from the Germans at the Diet of Frankfort all the advantages they had gained at the Council of Basel, the pope raised him to the rank of cardinal. He was therefore able to take part in the conclave at the death of Eugene in the same year, and was himself chosen. His pontificate is equally noteworthy from a political standpoint as from that of the encouragement of art and science. He concluded with the German King Frederic III. in 1448 the Aschaffenburg concordat, which accorded to the pope annats, reservations and the *Menses Papales* (q.v.; also see CONCORDATS, III., 2). He put an end to the schism and celebrated a magnificent jubilee in 1450. He was a man of such wide culture that Æneas Sylvius said of him: "What he does not know is beyond the range of human knowledge." Besides his antiquarian studies he still found time and means to embellish Rome. He reerected its walls in 1451, began the extension of the Vatican Palace, the completion of which was prevented by his death, and founded the Vatican library. He was but little liked by the Romans, as is shown by a conspiracy of Stefano Porcaro against him and even against the existence of the papacy in Rome, which was fortunately discovered (Jan., 1453). The mental depression produced by this was intensified by the terrible news that Constantinople had fallen into the hands of the Turks (1453). He ordered the preaching of a crusade but without success; all he could do was to join the League of Lodi (1454), founded for the defense of Christendom. He died Mar. 24, 1455.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A *Vita* by Manetti is in L. A. Muratori, ut sup. (under Nicholas IV.), iii. 2, pp. 907 sqq.; and one by Georgius was printed Rome, 1742. Consult: Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 2, § 49; Pastor, *Popes*, ii. 3–313; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 1, 110 sqq., Berlin, 1868; Dehio, *Die Bauprojekts Nikolaus V.*, in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, vol. iii., 1880; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. lxviii.; E. Pears, *Destruction of the German Empire and . . . the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks*, London, 1903; Creighton, *Papacy*, ii. 385 sqq., iii. 97 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 235–238; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii. 90, 130, 488, 491; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 235–250.

NICHOLAS OF BASEL. See FRIENDS OF GOD.

NICHOLAS OF BIBRA (NICOLAUS DE BIBERA): A medieval German satirical poet; b. apparently at Geithain (24 m. s.s.e. of Leipsic), Saxony; d., presumably at Bibra (25 m. s.w. of Halle), after 1307. Trithemius, in his *Scriptores ecclesiastici*, mentions an Erfurt theologian and poet of the name, of whom he had seen a work entitled *Occultus*, who had left also a *De cavendo malo* and a volume of letters. Flacius, in his search for material against the papal system, came upon several manuscripts of the *Occultus* and gave some extracts from them in his *Catalogus testium veritatis*. A little further information was given, from a manuscript at Helmstädt, by Leyser in his *Historia poetarum et poematum medii ævi* (Halle, 1721); but no thorough knowledge of Nicholas's work was gained until Höfler published the entire poem (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, xxxvii., 1861, 163–262), from an inferior manuscript at Prague, and Fischer produced a critical edition (Halle, 1870). From this it appeared that the two works mentioned by Trithemius were really the same, and that the author had called himself "Occultus," i.e., anonymous. Nothing is known of him except what can be gathered from his work. He seems to have studied at Padua, to have been four times in Rome, and then to have settled in Erfurt as a cleric, possibly a canon. A document of 1279 describes him as "custos ecclesiæ Byberacensis." His poems, in 2,441 leonine hexameters, seem to have been mainly composed between 1281 and 1283, and put together by himself, with notes, from 1305 to 1307. Flacius was misled by prejudice in including him among the precursors of the Reformation; but Nicholas is a writer from whom much may be learned about the conditions prevailing in Germany, both in Church and State, at the end of the thirteenth century.

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: There is a Germ. transl. of the *Carmen* by Rienäcker in the Year Book of the Royal Academy at Erfurt, new series, vii. 1–101. Consult: O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, ii. 133 sqq., Berlin, 1887; F. X. Wegele, *Friedrich der Freidige*, pp. 366–369, Nördlingen, 1870; Potthast, *Wegweiser*, p. 851.

NICHOLAS OF CUSA. See CUSA, NICHOLAS OF.

NICHOLAS OF HEREFORD (NICHOLAS HERFORD): Lollard, and collaborator with Wyclif in translating the English Bible; d. in the Carthusian monastery at St. Anne's, Coventry, after 1417. Of his early life little is known. He was a student of Queen's College, Oxford, where he was bursar 1374–75, and took his doctorate in 1382. Here he in all probability came under the influence of John Wyclif, and by 1382 was already known and marked as an enemy by the friars. In that year he preached a sermon which, with his previous utterances, led to his suspension, along with that of Wyclif and Philip Repington, from the exercise of public functions. Nicholas was tried before the archbishop of Canterbury in a series of hearings at a provincial synod held at London, and, his answer being unsatisfactory, was excommunicated July 1, 1382. He went to Rome and appealed to the pope, stating there his conclusions; but he was condemned by pope and cardinals and sentenced to life imprisonment. It is thought that only the favor of the pope for English scholars prevented the sentence of Nicholas to the stake. Nicholas escaped from imprisonment during a popular uprising, probably in June, 1385, and returned to England. In 1386 a writ was issued for his apprehension, but he was still at liberty Aug. 10, 1387. Later he was captured and imprisoned, and finally recanted. He was taken under royal protection Dec. 12, 1391, when he was made chancellor of Hereford Cathedral. This post he gave up between 1394 and 1399. In 1397 he became treasurer of Hereford, after 1410 also prebend of Pratum Minus, resigning both offices and retiring to the cloister at Coventry probably in 1417.

To Nicholas of Hereford is due the honor of being a collaborator with Wyclif in the work of translating the Bible into English, the Old Testament being the part assigned to him. The original manuscript, with the first hand corrections interlined, is fortunately preserved in the Bodleian Library (no. 959 [3093]), and there is also a very early copy of this in the same place (MS. *Douci*, 369), made before the corrections were inserted in the original, in which appear the words "explicit translacion Nicholay Herford." Both manuscripts break off in the middle of Baruch iii. 20. This break is usually (and without doubt correctly) explained as resulting from the judicial process against Nicholas and the summons to appear before the synod at London which condemned him. The rest of the Old Testament was by another hand, whose style differs from that of Nicholas. The latter's translation is scholarly, so far as his basal text permitted, but stiffly literal and somewhat stilted, and therefore not so well adapted for popular use as the work of Wyclif on the New Testament. It was worked over and improved in the edition of John Purvey (q.v.). Besides this work there are extant his *Conclusiones* and his *Responsio* at the synod (both in the *Fasciculi zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif*, ed. W. W. Shirley, in *Rolls Series*, pp. 303 sqq., 319 sqq., London, 1858). Other works ascribed to him have perished, there having been numerous orders from the king that his writings be seized together with those of Wyclif.

Bibliography: *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, pp. xliv., 274, 289–329, 515, 517; J. Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, iii. 24–47, 187–189, 279–285, 809, ed. of London, 1855; G. Lechler, *John Wycliffe and his English Precursors*, passim, ib. 1884; G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, passim, ib. 1900; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 21, 22, 24–27, 59, ib. 1908; *DNB*, xl. 418–420; and the literature under Bible Versions, B, IV., Lollards, and Wyclif, John.

NICHOLAS OF METHONE: Bishop of that city (the modern Modon) in Messenia during the reign of Emperor Manuel I. Comnenus (1143–80). There are no trustworthy data concerning his life, and he seems to have died before the synod of 1166. He developed a very extensive literary activity, but only one of his writings was printed before the nineteenth century, and some still await publication. They furnish an insight into the Greek theology of the twelfth century, chiefly polemic writings against the Latins, or dealing with subtle theological questions and apologetics. To the latter he devoted his *Anaptuxis* against Proclus, which, in spite of Dräseke's objection, is almost certainly genuine. Polemical works against the Latins deal largely with the procession of the Holy Spirit. Of treatises against the Latins still unpublished are to be mentioned those on the wafer, the Sabbath fasts, and the primacy of the pope. One treatise, addressed to the Emperor Manuel, treats of the defense of the deposition of Patriarch Kosmas. During the last years of his life Nicholas discusses whether the Trinity or the Son only is the object to whom the sacrifice of the Eucharist is made. He also wrote against the Bogomiles (see New Manicheans) and on the problem of predestination. His theology is not original, leaning principally upon Gregory Nazianzen and Pseudo-Dionysius. God is for him the absolute and unconditioned cause, and in his doctrine of the Trinity and his Christology he follows closely the church doctrine, as he does in his treatment of salvation, not transgressing the limitations of Greek theology. A thoroughgoing investigation of the theology of Nicholas is yet to be undertaken.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: His tract on the Eucharist is printed in *MPL*, cxxxv. 509–514; two other tracts, ed. J. T. Boemel, were issued at Frankfort, 1825–26; another on the procession of the Holy Spirit appeared London, 1859; A. Demetrakopulos edited two tracts, Leipsic, 1865–66; and still another, ed. V. Vasiljevskij, appeared St. Petersburg, 1886. Consult: Ullmann, in *TSK*, 1833, pp. 701–743; J. Dräscke, in *ZKG*, ix (1888), 405–431, 565–590, xviii (1897), 546–571; idem, in *TSK*, lxviii (1895), 589–616; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 85–87, 126 (where further literature is given).

NICHOLAS OF MYRA: Bishop, confessor, and saint; b. perhaps at Patara in Lycia; d. between 345 and 352. There is extant little authentic information concerning him, though the extent to which he is venerated in both orient and occident and the abundance of legends glorifying his memory, rivaling those which circle about St. George, make him one of the favorite saints of the populace. Legend declares that from infancy he fasted twice a week and worked miracles; that after a pilgrimage to Egypt and Palestine he became bishop of Myra in Lycia and as such continued to perform miracles of mercy of various kinds, which persisted even after his death—healing balsam is said to have flowed from his grave, not only soon after his death, but also again after his body had been removed from the orient to Bari in Apulia under Pope Victor III. in 1087. [St. Nicholas was, so to speak, the saint of the people—of citizens, laborers, merchants; he was the protector of the weak, the poor, the captive, of the young, especially of poor orphans. His kindness to children is supposed to be especially manifested at Christmas, when he rewards with gifts those whose conduct has been exemplary. He is most lavishly honored by the dedication to him of churches, those of St. Nicholas being far more numerous than of any other minor saint.] Hence, in art St. Nicholas is represented with the anchor as patron of sailors; or with three loaves of bread, as patron of the bakers' gild; or with three children who, praying, lift up their hands to heaven, as protector and friend of the children; or finally with three balls or purses (the sign of pawnbrokers), as benefactor of the poor. He has been painted by such famous artists as Cimabue, Andrea del Sarto, and Titian. The day of his commemoration in the Roman Church is Dec. 6. For one of the celebrations on his day see BOY-BISHOP. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A considerable literature, dealing with early editions of the sources and with later works more or less founded upon them is in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1491–1492. An early anonymous *Vita* is in L. Surius, *Historiæ seu vitæ sanctorum*, vi. 795–810, Venice, 1581; other early material is collected in *Analecta Bollandiana*, ii (1883), 143–156, iv (1885), 169–192. Later studies of the life or legends are by E. Schnell, Ravensburg, 1886; J. Laroche, Paris, 1893; Mrs. A. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, ii. 57–71, Boston, 1893; J. Praxmarer, Münster, 1894; *DCB*, iv. 41–42.

NICHOLAS OF STRASBURG: The name of two German ecclesiastics.

1. A Dominican; d. after 1329. For a time he was lector in the Dominican monastery at Cologne (*ALKG*, iv. 318). In 1325 he was commissioned by Pope John XXII., to visit the Dominican monasteries in the province of Teutonia and thus became involved in the case against Eckhart (q.v.). But he seems to have retained the favor of the pope, for after Eckhart's condemnation he is still called vicar (*ALKG*, iv. 317, note). He left in manuscript a work *De adventu Christi;* but since Denifle has shown that the first and third parts are almost verbatim reproductions of two treatises of the Dominican John of Paris, it is hardly possible to use the work for a characterization of Nicholas. There remain only the thirteen sermons published by Pfeiffer (pp. 261–305), which were delivered in part before Dominican nuns at Freiburg and the neighboring Adelhausen; the hearers therefore were like those of Eckhart. But there is a great difference in the sermons. Nicholas has not the deeply mystical thoughts in which Eckhart moves as in his element; but he insists upon spirituality and inner truth of the religious life in general. He emphasizes true repentance and conversion which appropriates the merit of Christ—a merit so exceeding great that by it alone is the forgiveness of all guilt given. Like Eckhart, he lays greater stress upon the performance of duty and upon patient bearing of the sufferings sent from God than upon specific works of piety and penances. In the form of question and answer, by examples and parables, in a simple, clear style, he makes his ideas easily intelligible. In popularity he surpasses Eckhart, though he falls short of him in beauty of language.

2. A Carthusian (Nicolaus Kemph de Argentina); b. at Strasburg 1397; d. at Gaming (65 m. w.s.w. of Vienna), Lower Austria, 1497. He studied theology at Vienna under Dinkelsbühl and had also Henry of Langenstein (q.v.) as teacher. In 1440 he entered the monastery at Gaming and joined the Carthusians. For many years he was prior in different monasteries, but retired in 1490 to Gaming. Of his writings, of which Pez mentions thirty-six, the few which have been printed include a *Dialogus de recto studiorum fine ac ordine* (in Pez, iv. 257–492; for the most part translated into German by Rösler, pp. 280–348), a *Tractatus de discretione* (Pez, ix. 379–532), and an *Expositio mystica in canticum canticorum* (xi.–xii.). Nicholas belongs to the mystic theologians of the fifteenth century. He speaks very highly of Jean Gerson, and like him exhorts to earnest study of the Bible (with a recommendation of Nicholas of Lyra). On the whole he follows the tendencies of the more famous and learned Dionysius (see DIONYSIUS THE CARTHUSIAN), who was endowed also with a wider and freer penetration.

S. M. DEUTSCH†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On 1 consult: K. Schmidt, *Johannes Tauler*, pp. 5–6, Hamburg, 1841; F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts*, i. pp. xxii.–xxv., Leipsic, 1845; W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*, ii. 67–69, Leipsic, 1881; Denifle, in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, xxix (1885), 259 sqq.; idem, *Der Plagiator Nikolaus von Strassburg*, in *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, iv (1888), 312–329.

On 2 consult: The biographical notices in B. Pez, *Bibliotheca ascetica*, preface to vols. iv. and xi., 12 vols., Regensburg, 1723–40; N. Paulus, *Der Karthäuser Nikolaus von Strassburg und seine Schrift De recto studiorum fine ac ordine*, in *Der Katholik*, ii (1891), 346 sqq.; A. Rösler, *Der Karthäuser Nikolaus Kemph*, pp. 261 sqq., Freiburg, 1894.

NICHOLAS, WILLIAM: Irish Methodist; b. at Wexford (82 m. s. of Dublin), County Wexford, Dec. 22, 1838. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1879), held numerous pastorates in his denomination in Dublin and Belfast from 1861 to 1895, when he was made president and theological professor in the Methodist College, Belfast, both of which positions he still retains. He is a member of the London Council of the Evangelical Alliance and of the Senate of the Royal University of Ireland. In theology he is a broad evangelical, and has written *Sermons on Jesus the Christ* (Dublin, 1883); *The Case Against Home Rule* (1886); *Newman and Ritualism* (London, 1889); and *Christianity and Socialism* (1893; Fernley Lecture).

NICHOLS, WILLIAM FORD: Protestant Episcopal bishop of California; b. at Lloyd, N. Y., June 9, 1849. He was educated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (A.B., 1870), and Berkeley Divinity School from which he was graduated in 1873. He was ordered deacon in 1873 and priested in 1874. He was curate of Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn. (1873–75), rector of St. James's, West Hartford, Conn. (1875–76), Grace, Newington, Conn. (1876–1877), Christ Church, Hartford, Conn. (1877–87), and St. James's, Philadelphia (1887–90), private secretary to Bishop Williams of Connecticut (1871–76), professor of church history in Berkeley Divinity School (1885–87), and assistant secretary of the House of Bishops (1886). After having declined to be bishop coadjutor of Ohio in 1888, he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of California in 1890, and three years later became bishop of the diocese.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 323, New York, 1895.

NICHOLSON, ISAAC LEA: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Milwaukee; b. at Baltimore, Md., Jan. 18, 1844; d. at Milwaukee, Wis., Oct. 29, 1906.

He was graduated from Dartmouth College (A.B., 1869) and Virginia Theological Seminary (1871), being ordered deacon in the same year and priested in 1872. He was curate of St. Thomas's, Hanover, N. H. (1871–72) and of St. Paul's, Baltimore (1872–1875), and rector of the Church of the Ascension, Westminster, Md. (1875–79), and of St. Mark's, Philadelphia (1879–91). In 1891 he was consecrated bishop of Milwaukee, after having declined the proffered see of Indiana in 1883.

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 335, New York, 1895.

NICHOLSON, WILLIAM RUFUS: Reformed Episcopal; b. in Green County, Miss., Jan. 8, 1822; d. at Philadelphia, Pa., June 7, 1901. He graduated from La Grange College, Ala., 1840; became pastor of the Poydras Street Methodist Episcopal Church, New Orleans, La., 1842; entered the Protestant Episcopal Church, and became rector of St. John's, Cincinnati, O., 1849; of St. Paul's, Boston, 1859; of Trinity Church, Newark, N. J., 1872; he then entered the Reformed Episcopal Church, and took charge of the Second Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, 1874. In 1876 he was consecrated bishop, and later was chosen dean of the Reformed Episcopal Theological Seminary of Philadelphia. He wrote, besides numerous tracts on doctrinal subjects, *The Bearing of Prophecy on Inspiration* in *The Inspired Word*, ed. A. T. Pierson (New York, 1888).

NICLAES (NICLAS), HENDRIK. See Familists.

NICODEMUS, GOSPEL OF. See Apocrypha, B, I., 7.

NICODEMUS (NIKOLAUS) HAGIORITES: Monk in the monastery of Dionysius on Mount Athos; b. on the Island of Naxos 1748; d. at Mount Athos, in the monastery of the Skourtæans above Karyes, 1809. His life passed quietly, except that he was involved in the Kolywa controversy which in the second half of the eighteenth century arose over the question whether the memorial celebrations for the dead should take place on Saturday according to the opinion of the old orthodox or on Sunday. Nicodemus adhered to the orthodox tendency, had to suffer for it, but was finally justified. His importance lies in his extensive literary work. He was not a creative spirit, but reproduced old Greek orthodoxy, putting it in the garb of popular Greek and thus making it the common possession of his church. His principal departments are hagiography, asceticism, mysticism, liturgics, canon law, and practical exegesis. Among his works on hagiography is to be mentioned especially: "Ritual for the Twelve Months of the Year" (3 vols., Venice, 1819; 12 vols., Constantinople, 1841 sqq.; 3 vols., Zakynthos, 1868), a rich source for the study of the worship of saints in the Greek Church. Other works are: "The New Martyrology" (ib., 1799); "The New Choice" (Venice, 1803). He also edited "A Collection of the Divine Utterances and the Inspired Doctrines of the Holy Fathers" (Venice, 1782), a work of Paulos, the founder of the monastery of Euergetis. In the sphere of asceticism and mysticism he published: "Love of Beauty of the Holy Ascetics" (Venice, 1782); "The Invisible Battle" (Venice, 1796); "Spiritual Exercises" (Venice, 1800); "Handbook of Directions" (Vienna, 1801); "The Excellence of Christians" (Venice, 1803). For the use of the Church in the narrower sense he published a "Book of Confession" (1794, 7th ed., 1854) which is still used. But he achieved his highest fame by the compilation of the corpus of Greek canon law, "Rudder of the Intellectual Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church" (Leipsic, 1800 and later editions). In the sphere of exegesis he wrote an interesting commentary on the Catholic Epistles (Venice, 1819) and translated Euthymius Zygabenus' commentary on the Psalms into popular Greek (Constantinople, 1819–21). (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: A sketch of his life is prefixed to the "Ritual," ut sup. Consult further: R. Nicolai, *Geschichte der neugriechischen Litteratur*, Leipsic, 1876; L. Petit, in *Echos d'orient*, 1899, pp. 321 sqq.; A. D. Kyriakos, *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen*, p. 155, Leipsic, 1902.

NICOL, THOMAS: Church of Scotland; b. at Castleton of Kincardine, parish of Fordoun, Kincardineshire, Oct. 21, 1846. He was educated at the universities of Aberdeen (M.A., 1868), Edinburgh (B.D., 1871), and Tübingen (1871), after which he was minister at Kells, Kirkcudbrightshire (1873–79), and Tolbooth Parish, Edinburgh (1879–1899). Since 1899 he has been professor of divinity and Biblical criticism in the University of Aberdeen. He was also editor of the *Church of Scotland Mission Record* from 1886 to 1900, Croall lecturer in 1897–1898, and Baird lecturer in 1907, and has been convener of the Church of Scotland Jewish Mission Committee since 1896. In addition to translating J. T. Beck's *Pastorallehren des Neuen Testaments* (Gütersloh, 1880) in collaboration with J. A. M'Clymont (*Pastoral Theology of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1885), and editing the *Church of Scotland Sabbath School Teachers' Book* (1890), he has written *Recent Explorations in Bible Lands* (1892); *Recent Archæology and the Bible* (Croall lectures; 1898); *The Present Position and Prospects of Biblical Science* (1899); and *The Four Gospels in the Earliest Church History* (1908).

NICOLAI, nî″cō-lai′, **PHILIPP:** German Lutheran theologian and hymn-writer; b. at Mengeringhausen (12 m. n. of Waldeck) Aug. 10, 1556; d. at Hamburg Oct. 26, 1608. In 1575 he visited the University of Erfurt, and subsequently Wittenberg. In the year 1583 he was called as Evangelical preacher to his father's former field of labor at Herdecke, Westphalia; in 1587 to Nieder-Wildungen, and almost immediately to Alt-Wildungen, where he was court preacher to the Lutheran countess of Waldeck, and tutor to her son. Here he became involved in the conflict with encroaching Calvinism, which he opposed with his pen. In 1596 he accepted a call as preacher at Unna, Westphalia, where the Lutherans, after a long struggle with the Calvinists, had gained the supremacy. Here he wrote that notorious book: *Kurzer Bericht von der Calvinisten Gott und ihrer Religion* (1598). The evil reports about his manner of life, scattered abroad by the Calvinists, and the retaliation which he brought upon himself by his unrestrained polemics (followed by deaths in his family during a severe epidemic), reduced him to such a state of distress that he postponed all disputations, and occupied all his time in prayer and meditation, concerning eternal life and the estate of faithful souls in the heavenly paradise. The fruit of these meditations was his *Freudenspiegel des ewigen Lebens, das ist, gründliche Beschreibung des herrlichen Wesens* (Frankfort, 1599). Three spiritual hymns form an appendix to the first edition of *Freudenspiegel.*

Hardly had the epidemic passed, before renewed controversial attacks came forth from the Calvinists, prompting Nicolai to complement his *Freudenspiegel* with *Spiegel des bösen Geistes, der sich in der Calvinisten Büchern regt* (Frankfort, 1599). When forty-four years of age he married the widow of a pastor at Dortmund. He now resolved to avoid all polemics for a season, and occupied himself with a somewhat extensive dogmatic work on the "Mystical Temple of God." In the year 1601 he was elected chief pastor at St. Catherine's Church, Hamburg, where his writings, especially the *Freudenspiegel,* had gained him friends. He preached every Sunday and Thursday to a well-filled church, exercising alike by his words and by his personal acts a devout influence upon his congregation, his colleagues, and all the city. He was revered and praised in wide circles as "another Chrysostom," a godly man and faithful shepherd of souls, a talented writer, and a pillar of the Lutheran Church. He felt especially called upon to preserve and confirm among the Hamburg preachers the peace and confessional unity of the Church, the pure Evangelical doctrine, as grounded in divine Scripture, and witnessed and repeated in the Book of Concord of 1580 and its Apology. A counterpart to his *Freudenspiegel* was the *Theoria vitæ æternæ* (1606) written the year before, during an epidemic at Hamburg. A posthumous work was the polemic *De Antichristo Romano* (Rostock, 1609).

Nicolai is known mainly by four spiritual hymns, produced in 1588–96: (1) "Mag ich Unglück nicht widerstan," a partizan hymn against the Calvinists; (2) "So wünsch ich nun ein gute Nacht," on Ps. xlii.; (3) "Wie schön leucht' uns der Morgenstern," on Ps. xlv. (Eng. transl. by several persons, including Miss Catherine Winkworth, "O Morning Star! how fair and bright"); (4) "Wachet auf! ruft uns die Stimme," on Matt. xxv. (in Eng. by the same translator, "Wake, awake, for night is flying"). Of these four hymns especially the two latter belong to the gems of the Evangelical hymn treasury. Both mark the beginning of a new period of lyric subjectiveness, by their ardent reflection and loving tenderness, which are outwardly facilitated by their poetic and musical rhythm. There is also a rich coloring reflecting the supernatural, such as is still foreign to hymns of the Reformation era. Although circulating widely, and adopted by church hymnals, they were not supplied with melodies equal in sublimity and favor until the appearance of the *Melodeyen-Gesangbuch,* by J. and H. Prätorius, Schneidermann, and Decker (Hamburg, 1604). The three-hundredth anniversary of his death was celebrated throughout northwestern Germany Oct. 26, 1908.

VICTOR SCHULTZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Nicolai's works were edited by Dedeken, 6 vols., Hamburg, 1611–17. Lives have been written by V. Schultze, Mengeringhausen, 1908; L. Curtze, Halle, 1859; R. Rocholl, Berlin, 1860; and R. Eckart, Glückstadt, 1909. Consult further: H. H. Wendt, *Vorlesungen über Philipp Nicolai,* Hamburg, 1859; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns,* pp. 226–227, New York, 1886; V. Schultze, *Waldeckische Reformationsgeschichte,* Leipsic, 1903; Julian, *Hymnology,* pp. 805–807.

Censured by St. John.

NICOLAITANS: A sect mentioned in the Apocalypse of John which had adherents in some of the churches of Asia Minor. The community of Ephesus is praised on account of its opposition to them (ii. 6), while the community of Pergamos is blamed (ii. 14–15) because it suffered such people in its midst. The latter community is reproached with the sin into which the Israelites were once led by Balaam, namely, that of unchastity and of the partaking of meat offered to idols, and also with adopting such teachings (ii. 15, 24). The same sect is certainly alluded to in the address to the "Angel" of the community of Thyatira: "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (ii. 20). Since according to the better reading the text does not give "the wife" but "thy wife" (cf. Zahn), the reference is not to the wife of any one of the community (Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Bousset, etc.), and still less to the priestess of the Chaldean sibyl Tambethe, in Thyatira (Schürer and Völter). It would seem more plausible to understand by "angel," the bishop, and to suppose that his wife was accused (Zahn and others); but that she should be leading such an immoral life in Thyatira without restraint is incredible in view of the praise awarded to the angel of the community. It is much more probable that in these words the weakness of King Ahaz toward his idolatrous wife Jezebel is compared with the weakness of the government of the community toward the Nicolaitans, and that Jezebel is only regarded as a type of the sect. While the Nicolaitans encountered energetic resistance in Ephesus and gained few adherents in Pergamos, in Thyatira they exercised a wide-spread influence. It is probable that their leaders laid claim there to the possession of prophetic inspiration (ii. 20) and to a knowledge of "the depths of Satan" (ii. 24). This probably signifies a dualistic conception, by which evil is referred to the powers of the under-world, thus doing away with human guilt. It is these leaders of the sect, not Jewish teachers (Zahn), disciples of John (Eichhorn), or Judaizers (Ewald, Gebhardt), who are the false apostles mentioned in the address to the church at Ephesus (ii. 2).

The picture thus derived of the Nicolaitans strongly resembles that of the antinomian libertinism in Corinth, as shown in the epistles to the Corinthians. It may be inferred therefore that the former also had its origin in the Gentile Christianity of Paul. However, what was merely a tendency in

Corinth, became here a sect led by agitators. In Corinth also the evil custom prevailed of eating meat sacrificed to idols (I Cor. viii.) and unchastity (I Cor. v. 1 sqq.), in connection with the claim of possessing superior knowledge (I Cor. iv. 6 sqq., v. 2, viii. 1, xv. 12 sqq.). But in Ephesus, from the simple extenuation of these sins by an appeal to Paul's doctrine of freedom in Christ, there arose a teaching combined with dualistic speculations. Thereupon the spiritual pride of the libertines increased to such an extent that their leaders claimed prophetic gifts (ii. 20) and apostolic rank (ii. 2). Nevertheless, the view is unfounded that the Apocalypse of John combats in these passages the apostle Paul and his helpers (Baur, Schwegler, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, etc.); for Paul was no longer living, while all the statements in question refer to a contemporary condition, and the helpers of Paul laid no claim to apostolic rank. Besides this, these very sins are just as sternly condemned by Paul as they are in the Apocalypse; for example, unchastity (I Cor. v. 1 sqq., vi. 12 sqq.), as well as the eating of meat sacrificed to idols (x. 18 sqq.). Paul also refers here to the warning example of Israel's corruption by Balaam (I Cor. x. 8), and in general he peremptorily disposed of the libertinistic tendency (II Cor. vi. 14 sqq., xii. 20, xiii. 10). Another untenable view is that which finds the Montanists in the false apostles, the Balaamites, and the prophetess Jezebel (Rev. ii. 2–14), while the Nicolaitans who differ from these signify Gnostics like the Ophites (Völter). The reproach of unchastity and of eating meat sacrificed to idols is in too great discord with the ascetic morality of the Montanists; and nothing indicates Gnostics of the second century. Equally groundless is the conjecture that the passages mentioning the Nicolaitans were a later interpolation (Völter).

Relation to Paul.

Patristic Data.

What the Church Fathers have to say about the Nicolaitans rather opposes the contention that they first originated in the second century, or indeed that, apart from the Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse, there was any sect of that name in the second century (Neander and others). That the Nicolaitans are not mentioned until the time of Irenæus does not signify that they originated or reappeared during the interval. It is true that in every list of heretics the Nicolaitans are named after Basilides and Satornilus; but the order in the lists of heretics is in no wise chronological (cf. Lipsius, *Quellen der älteren Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 28, 35, 47), and the comparative agreement of these lists is explained by their common dependence upon Irenæus. The latter, however, expressly says (*Hær.*, III., xi. 1) that the Nicolaitans, " long before " Cerinthus, held a similar doctrine and that John wrote his Gospel against both. This shows that he placed the Nicolaitans in apostolic times, and his ranking them after Basilides and Cerinthus is only because of the similarity of their doctrines to those of these heretics. What he relates of the Nicolaitans, however, is almost exclusively derived from the Apocalypse. It is still clearer that everything Tertullian says of them comes from the Apocalypse. His remark (*Hær.*, xxxiii.) that in his time there were also Nicolaitans, only of another kind, called the heresy of Gaius, expressly excludes the idea that there was any contemporary sect of this name. The statements of Hippolytus are founded on those of Irenæus. In all the patristic data concerning the Nicolaitans the only statements to be regarded as based on historical tradition independent of the Apocalypse are the assertion of Irenæus that their teacher was Nicolaos, one of the seven deacons of the primitive community (*Hær.*, I., xxvi. 3), and the statement, probably earlier than Hippolytus, that this Nicolaos had been led into grievous errors through jealousy of his wife. It is possible that this last statement may be mythical, and that even the first is only based on conjecture; since, however, it is assumed in the Apocalypse that the name Nicolaitan was known to its readers, it is at least probable that this name is not derived as a symbolical designation from that of Balaam (" lord " or " conqueror of the people "; Vitringa and Hengstenberg), but from the name of the leader of the sect.

The Bohemian Sect.

In the Middle Ages violations of the rule of celibacy were often designated by the name of the Nicolaitan sect, borrowed from the Apocalypse, but there is absolutely no connection between the Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse and a sect of the same name which arose in Bohemia in the fourteenth century and maintained itself there as well as in Moravia until the seventeenth century. This sect derived its name from the Bohemian peasant Nicklas of Wlasenic (d. 1455), who was imitated by his followers in his rejection of ecclesiastical authority and his claim to an immediate and new revelation. F. SIEFFERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The reader should consult the commentaries on the Apocalypse (see under JOHN THE APOSTLE); and the works on the history of the Apostolic Age, e.g., those by C. von Weizsäcker, 2 vols., London, 1894–95, and A. C. McGiffert, pp. 625–626, New York, 1897. Consult further: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, i. 167 sqq., Leipsic, 1762; E. Burton, *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, Oxford, 1829; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies*, pp. 371–373, Philadelphia, 1874; D. Völter, *Entstehung des Apokalypse*, pp. 10 sqq., Freiburg, 1882; E. Schürer, in *Theologische Abhandlung C. Von Weizsäcker zu 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, pp. 38 sqq., ib. 1892; Seesemann, in *TSK*, lxvi (1893), 47 sqq.; F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1616–18, Paris, 1906; *DB*, iii. 547–548; *EB*, iii. 3410-3412.

NICOLAS DE CLÉMANGES. See CLÉMANGES.

NICOLAS, MICHEL: French Protestant; b. at Nîmes May 22, 1810; d. at Montauban July 28, 1886. After studying theology at Geneva (1827–32) and in Germany (1832–34), he was assistant pastor for a short time in Bordeaux. He was then pastor in Metz from 1835 to 1838, and in 1839 was appointed professor of philosophy at Montauban, a position which he retained until his death. After 1860 he turned from philosophy to theology, especially to introduction and church history. Together with Reuss, Colani, and A. Réville, Nicolas sought to revise the bases of Christian belief with the assistance of historical criticism, and to consider Christianity as a historical magnitude from the standpoint of evolution. In 1861 he published, in the first volume of his *Études critiques sur la Bible*, four essays on the Old Testament in the Graf-Wellhausen spirit, following this in 1863 with a similar series of studies on the New Testament. He had already published a number of translations and independent works on philosophy, and a literary history of his native city and its vicinity, as well as his *Histoire des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siècles antérieures a l'ère chrétienne* (1860); and in his *Les Evangiles apocryphes* (1865) and *Le Symbole des apôtres* (1867) his historical and critical studies found their culmination. His last book was his *Histoire de l'ancienne académie de Montauban (1598–1659) et du Puylaurens (1660–1685)* (1885). He was likewise a close student of Huguenot history, his manuscript collections on this theme filling ten stout volumes; but he is chiefly noteworthy as one of the pioneers in introducing German methods and results to French Protestantism.

(EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A life was written by E. Rabaud, Paris, 1888; and a sketch by E. Stapfer is in the *Études de théologie et d'histoire* published by the Protestant faculty of theology at Paris at the tercentenary of the institution, Paris, 1901.

NICOLAUS CABASILAS. See KABASILAS.

NICOLAUS DE TUDESCHIS. See PANORMITANUS.

NICOLE, PIERRE: Port Royalist; b. at Chartres Oct. 13, 1625; d. at Port Royal Nov. 16, 1695. After receiving from his father a thorough preliminary education, he studied philosophy at the College d'Harcourt and then devoted himself to theology. His intention of continuing his studies at the Sorbonne was frustrated by his connections with Port Royal, where he soon became one of the most important teachers. Here he collaborated on the productions of that school, frequently gathered material for other books (as for the " Provincial Letters " of Pascal), and became intimately associated with Antoine Arnaud and especially with Pascal (q.v.). He accompanied Arnaud in all his wanderings until at last, weary of his unsettled life, he besought the archbishop of Paris for permission to return. He thus brought upon himself the bitter reproaches of the Port Royalists, against whom he sought to defend himself in letters and in an " Apology." In 1676 he endeavored to secure priest's orders, but the bishop of Chartres refused to admit him.

Nicole was a prolific writer. With Arnaud he prepared the famous *Logique de Port-Royal* (Paris, 1659), and also, under the pseudonym of Wendrock, made a Latin translation of Pascal's *Provinciales* (Cologne, 1658). In *La Perpétuité de la foi de l'église catholique touchant l'eucharistie*, or *La Petite Perpétuité* (1664), he endeavored to clear Port Royal of the charge of Calvinism, and this work was followed by *Perpétuité de la foi de l'église catholique sur l'eucharistie*, or *Grande Perpétuité* (3 vols., 1669–76). Apparently in imitation of the " Provincial Letters," he wrote ten *Lettres sur l'hérésie imaginaire*, or *Les Imaginaires* (1664), and eight letters entitled *Les Visionaires* (1665–66)—both published with his *Traité de la foi humaine* (Cologne, 1704). His *Essais de morale* (14 vols., 1671 sqq.) enjoyed among some of his contemporaries, such as Madame de Sévigné, an admiration which they no longer elicit. In his polemics against Calvinism Nicole exceeded all other Jansenists in bitterness, as is evinced by his *Préjugés légitimes contre le calvinisme* (1671), *Prétendus réformés convaincus de schisme* (1684), and *Unité de l'église* (1687). He likewise prepared a series of edifying and instructive works, among which may be mentioned: *Traité sur l'oraison*, or *Traité de la prière* (1679); *Instructions théologiques sur les sacrements* (1700); *Instructions théologiques et morales sur le symbole* (1706); *Instructions théologiques et morales sur l'oraison dominicale, la salutation angélique, la sainte messe et les autres prières de l'église* (1706), and *Instructions théologiques et morales sur la décalogue* (1709). Nicole was neither a deep thinker nor a great character. He was rather a man of vast learning and humanistic spirit, diffident and very averse to controversy. (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His life, by Goujet, is in the last volume of the *Essais de morale*, ut sup. Consult further: J. Besoigne, *Hist. de l'abbaye de Port-Royal*, vol. v., Cologne, 1752; C. Clémencet, *Hist. générale de Port-Royal*, Amsterdam, 1765–67; C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vols. iii.–iv., Paris, 1840–59; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, ix. 634–637.

NICOLL, SIR WILLIAM ROBERTSON: Free Church of Scotland; b. at Lumsden (30 m. n.w. of Aberdeen), Aberdeenshire, Oct. 10, 1851. He was educated at the University of Aberdeen (M.A., 1870) and the Free Church College, Aberdeen, after which he was minister at Dufftown, Banffshire (1874–77), and Kelso, Roxburghshire (1877–85). In 1880 he became the editor of *The Household Library of Exposition*, and in 1885 of *The Expositor*, while since 1886 he has edited *The Foreign Biblical Library, The Theological Educator, The Expositor's Bible, The Expositor's Greek Testament, The British Weekly, The Bookman, Woman at Home, The British Monthly*, and other publications and series. In 1909 he was made a knight. Among his numerous publications special mention may be made of his *Calls to Christ* (London, 1877); *Songs of Rest* (2 series, Edinburgh and London, 1879–85); *The Incarnate Saviour* (Edinburgh, 1881); *The Lamb of God* (1883); *Key of the Grave* (London, 1893); *Ten-Minute Sermons* (1894); *Literary Anecdotes of the Nineteenth Century* (in collaboration with T. J. Wise; 2 vols., 1895–96); *The Return to the Cross* (1897); *The Church's One Foundation: Christ and Recent Criticism* (1901); *Garden of Nuts: Mystical Expositions with an Essay on Christian Mysticism* (1905); *Lamp of Sacrifice* (1906, sermons); *Ian Maclaren: Life of the Rev. John Watson* (1908); and *My Father: an Aberdeenshire Minister, 1812–91* (1908).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. F. Stoddart, *W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor and Preacher*, London, 1903.

NIEBERGALL, nī′′ber-gāl, **FRIEDRICH KARL:** German Protestant; b. at Kirn (40 m. s.w. of Wiesbaden) Mar. 20, 1866. He was educated at the universities of Tübingen, Berlin, and Bonn from 1884 to 1887 (Th. Lic., Giessen, 1902), and after being a pastor in his native city became, in 1903, privat-docent for practical theology, religious psychology, and ethnology at the University of Heidelberg; and in 1908 extraordinary professor of practical theology at Heidelberg. His works include:

Die Gott in Christus (Tübingen, 1899); *Absolutheit des Christentums* (1900); *Ein Pfad zur Gewissheit* (1900); *Wie predigen wir den modernen Menschen?* (2 parts, 1902–06); *Die paulinische Erlösungslehre im Konfirmandenunterricht* (1903); *Die Kasualrede* (Göttingen, 1905); *Hilligenlei und moderne Theologie* (Tübingen, 1906); *Welches ist die beste Religion?* (1906); *Praktische Auslegung des Evangeliums Markus* (1907); *Was ist uns heute die Bibel* (1907); *Mut und Trost fürs geistliche Amt* (1907); *Praktische Auslegung des Neuen Testaments* (2 vols., 1907–09); *Die Bedeutung der Religionspsychologie für die Praxis in Kirche und Schule* (1909); and *Jesus im Unterricht* (1910). He is editor of *Praktisch-theologische Handbibliothek*, to which he also contributes.

NIEDNER, nîd'ner, **CHRISTIAN WILHELM:** German church historian; b. at Oberwinkel, near Waldenburg (12 m. n.w. of Chemnitz), Saxony, Aug. 9, 1797; d. at Berlin Aug. 13, 1865. He studied theology at Leipsic, where he became successively privat-docent (1826), extraordinary professor (1829), and ordinary professor (1838). His *Philosophiæ Hermesii Bonnensis novarum rerum in theologia exordii explicatio et existimatio* (Leipsic, 1838–39), on account of its thoroughness took front rank among the wealth of literature on George Hermes (q.v.). He was interested, not only in church history, but also in the history of philosophy, and his lectures on church history were pervaded by his philosophical spirit. After the death of Professor Illgen (1844) Niedner became president of the historical-theological society founded by the former, and took over also the editorship of the *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie.* In 1846 he published his chief work, the text-book *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Leipsic, 1846, 2d ed., Berlin, 1866), a work wide in scope, and embodying the results of a most thoroughgoing investigation into the stupendous amount of material, but written in a scholastic and ponderous style (cf. Baur, *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, pp. 244 sqq.). His speech at the festival held on the three-hundredth anniversary of the death of Luther gave expression to his free position towards the Reformation. It was published under the title *Vorlesung zur akademischen Gedächtnisfeier* (Leipsic, 1846). The last work published during his Leipsic career was his *De subsistentia* τῷ δείῳ Λόγῳ *apud Philonem tributa* (1848–49). In 1850 he resigned his professorship, and settled in Wittenberg; and in 1859 he was called to the chair of theology at the University of Berlin, where he remained until his death. While in Wittenberg he published in the *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie* two valuable treatises, entitled respectively *Das Recht der Dogmen in Christentum in geschichtlicher Betrachtung* (1851, part iv.), and *Richtungen und Aufgaben der Dogmatik in gegenwärtiger Zeit* (1852, part iv.), the latter being a critical review of the dogmatic writings by J. P. Lange and Martensen. (P. M. Tzschirner†.)

NIELSEN, nîl'sen, **FREDRIK KRISTIAN:** Danish church historian; b. at Aalborg, Denmark, Oct. 30, 1846; d. at Aarhus Mar. 24, 1907. He received his education at the University of Copenhagen (B.A., 1863; candidate in theology, 1870); taught privately till 1873; was in that year made catechist at Our Savior's Church, Copenhagen; and became professor of church history in the University of Copenhagen, 1877, where he taught till 1900, when he resigned to become bishop of Aarhus. He was prolific in the field of church history, and may be regarded as the greatest in that field produced by Scandinavian countries. His leading works are: *Romerkirken i det 19. Hundredaar*, part i., *Pavedömmet* (1876, 2d ed., 1895–98; Germ. transl., 2d ed., Gotha, 1880; Eng. transl., *History of the Papacy in the XIX. Century*, 2 vols., London, 1906); part ii., *Det indre Liv* (1881; Germ. transl., Carlsruhe, 1882); *Statskirke og Frikirke* (1883), treating conditions in Scotland and Switzerland; *Haandbog i Kirkens Historie* (2 vols., 1885–92); *Ledetraad i Kirkens Historie* (2 vols., 1887); *Kirkehistorie* (2 vols., 1900–08). In 1896 he began to issue and edit *Kirkeleksikon for Norden;* and was one of the editors of *Dansk Kirketidende* 1873–82. He stood high in the councils of his church, where his advice was constantly sought, and he was one of the judges at the competitions for professorships in church history at the universities of Lund (1893), Christiania (1897), and Upsala (1898). The language of Nielsen, always plastic in writing, and convincing in delivery, combined with great stores of learning, made his influence deep-felt and far-reaching. His historical methods were genetic and scientific.

John O. Evjen.

NIEMEYER, nî'mai-er, **AUGUST HERMANN:** Professor, chancellor of the university, and director of the Francke institutions in Halle; b. at Halle Sept. 1, 1754; d. there July 7, 1828. He was educated at the Pædagogium of his native city, and after graduation taught at the German and Latin schools on the Francke foundation. In 1777 he began to lecture at the university on Homer, the Greek tragedians, and Horace. In 1779 he was appointed professor extraordinary of theology and inspector of the theological seminary, in 1784 ordinary professor and inspector of the Pædagogium, in 1785 he became assistant director of the Francke institutions and in 1799 a director. In 1792 he was appointed councilor of the consistory and in 1793 prorector of the university. In 1806 Napoleon abolished the University of Halle, and Niemeyer was sent to Paris as hostage. After an exile of six months he was allowed to return, but in the mean time Halle had been separated from Prussia and attached to the kingdom of Westphalia. King Jerome restored the university and appointed Niemeyer its chancellor and perpetual rector (1808). On account of Niemeyer's attachment to the Prussian cause the university was again abolished in 1813. On the reorganization of the institution under Prussian government in 1815, Niemeyer laid down his office as rector, but as chancellor retained the superintendence of the external administration. It is owing to his talents and ability that the institutions founded by Francke continued to prosper. In pedagogics he stood forth for the principle of humanity, and his theological standpoint was that of an honest rationalism of the earlier type. The chief stress of his activity lay in practical theology. Of his works may be mentioned *Charakteristik der Bibel* (5 vols., Halle, 1775–82), an attempt to depict more distinctly the traits of Biblical characters. The first volume contained the characters of the New Testament, the others those of the Old Testament. The Bible served him mainly as material for the knowledge of humanity, and he applied to its characters purely scientific tests. Other theological works are *Homiletik, Pastoralanweisung und Liturgie* (1790); *Populäre und praktische Theologie, oder Materialien des christlichen Volksunterrichts* (1792); *Briefe an christliche Religionslehrer* (2 parts, 1796–99); *Lehrbuch für die oberen Religionsklassen in Gelehrtenschulen* (1801, 15th ed., 1827). His *Gesangbuch für höhere Schulen und Erziehungsanstalten* (1785) contains many of his own songs. Of a devotional character is his *Beschäftigungen der Andacht und des Nachdenkens für Jünglinge* (1787). But of the greatest importance and of permanent scientific value is his *Grundsätze der Erziehung und des Unterrichts* (2 vols., 1799, 8th ed., 1827), the first systematic representation of pedagogics on German soil. (EDGAR HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Jacobs and J. G. Gruber, *A. H. Niemeyer, Zur Erinnerung*, Halle, 1831; W. Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universitäts zu Halle*, 2 vols., ib. 1894; W. Fries, *Die Frankeschen Stiftungen in ihrem zweiten Jahrhundert*, ib. 1898; F. Bosse, *Der Garnisonprediger und Schuldirektor F. A. Junker . . . in seinen Beziehungen zu . . . A. H. Niemeyer*, Brunswick, 1901.

NIEMEYER, HERMANN AGATHON: Son and successor of the preceding; b. at Halle Jan. 5, 1802; d. there Dec. 6, 1851. He studied theology at Halle and Göttingen; in 1826 he became professor of theology in Jena, in 1829 at Halle, where he was called as director of the Francke institutions. He shared his father's theological opinions and, like him, was more eminent as a pedagogue than as a theologian. His principal work is *Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum* (Leipsic, 1840).

(EDGAR HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Fries, *Die Frankeschen Stiftungen in ihrem zweiten Jahrhundert*, pp. 130 sqq., Halle, 1898; A. Schürmann, *Zur Geschichte der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses*, pp. 223 sqq., 247 sqq., ib. 1898; *ADB*, xxiii. 682–687.

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH WILHELM: German philosopher; b. at Röcken (18 m. s.w. of Leipsic) Oct. 15, 1844; d. in Weimar (53 m. s.w. of Leipsic) Aug. 25, 1900. His preparatory education was received at Pforta, and his advanced at the universities of Bonn and Leipsic; he evinced an early maturity, and before passing his examinations he was appointed extraordinary professor of classical philology at Basel on recommendation of Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl, becoming ordinary professor in 1870, and resigning in 1879. He had, meanwhile, in 1876, been attacked by a disease which affected eye and brain, and obtained leave of absence. In search of health he lived for a number of years in various places—in Venice, in Switzerland, Turin, Genoa, and Nizza, going to a sanitarium in Jena, and finally (1888) being pronounced hopelessly insane, remaining thereafter in the care of his devoted sister at Weimar. He was a prolific writer, and his works are exerting an influence on modern thinking in religion and philosophy which seems rather out of proportion to their real and permanent value. The nature of his illness, as well as the fact that he was broken in health at a comparatively early age, prevented his philosophy taking the systematic form which a longer and sounder condition of health would doubtless have brought about. Nietzsche was a protestant against the established order of things, no less against the faith and morals of Christianity than against the idea of the supremacy of the State. His philosophy is that of an individualist, anarchist, and anti-democrat. His doctrine of the "superman" involved the right of the highly endowed to withdraw all rights from the mass in order that, even by treading upon the ordinary populace, he might develop his own personality and put into execution the "will to power." The aphoristic brilliance, vigor, and uncompromising thoroughness with which he pushed his logic to its utmost conclusions have compelled a larger notice of his work than under ordinary circumstances would be conceded to a thinker of his school. It brought him into revolt from his teachers and those whom he once acknowledged as his masters—such as Strauss, Schopenhauer, and Wagner.

His principal writings are: *Die Geburt der Tragedie aus dem Geiste der Musik* (Leipsic, 1872); *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen* (4 parts, 1873–76); *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches. Ein Buch für freie Geister* (3 parts, Chemnitz, 1878–80); *Morgenröthe. Gedanken über moralische Vorurteile* (1881); *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* (1882); *Also sprach Zarathustra* (4 parts, Chemnitz and Leipsic, 1883–1891); *Jenseits von Gut und Böse. Vorspiel zu einer Philosophie der Zukunft* (Leipsic, 1886); *Zur Genealogie der Moral* (1887); *Der Fall Wagner* (1888); *Götzendämmerung, oder Wie man mit dem Hammer philosophiert* (1889). An edition of his *Werke* is in two parts (8 vols., Leipsic, 1895; 7 vols., 1901–04), which contains important works and fragments not published separately; and there are three vols. of his *Briefe* (Berlin and Leipsic, 1900–05). An Eng. transl. of his *Works* has been appearing, to be complete in 11 vols. (London and New York, 1896–1909). Besides this edition, a number of his works have been translated separately, some of them a number of times: *The Case against Wagner* (London, 1899); *Thus Spake Zarathustra: a Book for all or none* (London and New York, 1901, and often); *Dawn of Day* (1903); *Beyond Good and Evil. Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future* (1907); *Human, all too Human: Book for Free Spirits* (Chicago, 1908, London, 1909); *The Birth of Tragedy; or Hellenism and Pessimism* (1909); *The Will to Power: an attempted Transvaluation of all Values* (2 vols., London, 1909); *Thoughts out of Season* (1909).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The authoritative biography is by his sister, Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1895–1904. Consult further: Grace N. Dolson, *Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, New York, 1901; T. Common, *Nietzsche as Critic, Philosopher, Poet and Prophet: Choice Selections from his Works*, London, 1901, New York, 1908; H. L. Mencken, *Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, Boston, 1908; idem, *The Gist of Nietzsche*, ib. 1910; C. A.

Bernoulli, *Franz Overbeck und Friedrich Nietzsche. Eine Freundschaft*, Jena, 1908; J. M. Kennedy, *The Quintessence of Nietzsche*, London, 1909; M. A. Mügge, *Friedrich Nietzsche: his Life and Work*, London and New York, 1909; A. R. Orage, *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism*, New York, 1910.

NIGERIA. See Africa, II.

NIGHTINGALE, FLORENCE: Philanthropist and pioneer in the care of the wounded on the field of battle; b. at Florence, Italy, May 15, 1820; d. at London Aug. 13, 1910. She was the daughter of William Edward Nightingale of Embley Park, Hampshire, England, and in early youth she manifested a love of nature and a tendency to the care of the suffering. During her first season in town, after her presentation, she employed her time in visiting hospitals and like institutions for the purpose of learning the methods used, and next made a tour on the continent to examine conditions there. She took a course of training at the Deaconess Institution at Kaiserswerth, and then at Paris studied the nursing system of the sisters of St. Vincent de Paul. At home she reorganized the Governesses' Sanatorium in Harley Street, London. In 1854 England received reports of the terrible conditions in the Crimea, where the hospital service was comparatively worthless. Miss Nightingale both volunteered and was invited to proceed thither, and started with a staff of nurses on Oct. 24, reaching Scutari Nov. 4, just after the battle of Balaclava. There her enlightened and self-sacrificing labors, in which she spared herself not at all, had the result of reducing the death-rate from forty to two per cent. Although she was herself attacked by fever, she remained at her post, returning only when the British forces evacuated Turkey. She modestly avoided the national reception which was prepared in her honor and returned quietly to her home, but with health greatly affected by her experiences and labors. In recognition of her services £50,000 was raised by popular subscription, and with this she founded the Nightingale home for the training of nurses at St. Thomas's and King's College Hospitals. She continued to do work in the direction of reform of sanitary conditions in the army, anticipating in many respects the most recent prescriptions in respect to asepsis and antisepsis, especially emphasizing the duty of cleanliness. She was continually consulted on matters germane to the health of patients in hospitals and of inmates of institutions of various sorts, and led also in movements to improve the condition of the poor by better sanitation in their homes.

Besides papers read before societies on the subjects in which she was interested, she published *Notes on Matters Affecting the Health, Efficiency, and Hospital Administration of the British Army* (London, 1858); *Notes on Hospitals* (1859); *Notes on Nursing: what it is, and what it is not* (1860, latest ed., 1909; a book the effects of which can not be estimated); *Notes on Nursing for the Labouring Classes* (1861); *Observations on the Sanitary State of the Army in India* (1863); *How People may live and not die in India* (1864); *Introductory Notes on Lying-in Institutions* (1871); *Life or Death in India* (1874); and *Health Teaching in Towns and Villages* (1894).

Bibliography: Sarah A. Tooley, *Life of Florence Nightingale*, 5th ed., London, 1908; C. Shrimpton, *La Guerre de l'orient. L'Armée anglaise et Miss Nightingale*, Paris, 1864; Mme. Marie Monod, *Les Hèroïnes de la charité . . . Miss Florence Nightingale*, ib. 1873; E. F. Pollard, *Florence Nightingale*, London, 1891; W. J. Wintle and F. Witts, *Florence Nightingale and F. E. Willard*, ib. 1906; M. A. Nutting and L. L. Dock, *A Hist. of Nursing*, chaps. iii.–vi., New York, 1907; Mrs. L. E. H. Richards, *Florence Nightingale, the Angel of the Crimea*, ib. 1909.

NIKEL, JOHANNES SIMON: German Roman Catholic; b. at Sohrau (105 m. s.e. of Breslau) Oct. 18, 1863. He was educated at the universities of Breslau (1881–84) and Würzburg (1884–86; Th.D., 1886), and was ordained to the priesthood in 1886. After being a curate at Rosenberg and Königshütte, Upper Silesia (1886–90), he was teacher of religion and professor at the gymnasiums in Leobschütz, Neisse, and Breslau till 1897, when he was appointed associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis at the University of Breslau, and full professor there in 1900. Besides briefer papers and his contributions to the Vienna *Monumenta Judaica*, he has written: *Die Lehre des Alten Testamentes über die Cherubim und Seraphim* (Breslau, 1890); *Die heidnischen Kulturvölker des Altertums und ihre Stellung zu fremden Religionen* (Leobschütz, 1891); *Die soziale Gesetzgebung des deutschen Reiches im verflossenen Jahrzehnt* (Münster, 1892); *Sozialpolitik und soziale Bewegungen im Altertum* (Paderborn, 1892); *Der Monotheismus Israels in der vorexilischen Zeit* (Neisse, 1893); *Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte* (Paderborn, 1895); *Herodot und die Keilschriftforschung* (1896); *Die Wiederherstellung des jüdischen Gemeinwesens nach dem babylonischen Exil* (Freiburg, 1900); *Die Reichsgesetze über die Kranken-, Unfall- und Invalidenversicherung* (1901); *Genesis und Keilschriftforschung* (1903); *Zur Verständigung über "Bibel und Babel"* (Breslau, 1903); and *Das Alte Testament und die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft* (Vienna, 1906). He is the editor of *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* (Münster, 1908 sqq.), and associate editor of *Biblische Zeitfragen* (1908 sqq.), to the latter contributing: *Alte und neue Angriffe auf das Alte Testament* (1908); *Der Ursprung des alttestamentlichen Gottesglaubens* (1908); *Die Glaubenswürdigkeit des Alten Testaments im Lichte der Inspirationslehre* (1908); *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des altorientalische Forschungen*, I. *Die biblische Urgeschichte;* II. *Moses und sein Werk* (1909).

NIKOLAUS VON (DER) FLUE. See Flue.

NIKON, nī′kon: Russian patriarch; b. in a village of the present government of Nijni-Novgorod, 1605; d. Aug. 17, 1681. The Russian church had rendered powerful assistance to the rise of the grand duke of Moscow, and the metropolitan of Moscow was no less prepared to offer spiritual support; but conditions changed when the father of the youthful Czar Michael Romanov, after his deliverance from Polish captivity in 1619, was chosen patriarch. Nikon, the third of his successors, obtained for the leader of the Russian church a substantial independence. His patriarchate marks the only epoch in the history of the Russian church in which a rivalry between the spiritual and secular power existed. In the Jeltovodsky monastery, to which he had fled from a malevolent stepmother, he became familiar with the service of the church. From his twentieth year he had been married and had served as priest, first in a village, then in Moscow. After ten years of matrimony, when death had deprived him of his children, he induced his wife to enter a convent while he himself became monk on an island of the White Sea. Owing to disagreements with his abbot he soon removed to another monastery of which he became abbot in 1643. During a visit to Moscow he made such a deep impression upon the young Czar Alexis, that in 1646 he was appointed archimandrite of the monastery of Nowosspassky in Moscow. In 1649, through the favor of the czar, he was advanced to the position of metropolitan of Novgorod, a position second only to that of the patriarch. In 1652 he became patriarch. He retained his office only six years actually (nominally fourteen years), during which he exercised a deep influence upon the history of the Russian church: namely, by effecting the union of the Minor Russian, the White Russian, and the Greater Russian Churches; by improving the liturgical books and the order of worship; and by promoting the Union of Brest, 1596, between the West Russian domain and Poland. Nikon convened numerous synods to consider formal ritual and practise. In view of the value of forms of worship as mediators of divine life, every change of form in what had been transmitted from the Fathers appeared as a menace to Christianity. Thus there arose the duty of removing every innovation by an energetic reform. In 1654 Nikon called a synod to take notice of numerous innovations and to revise the ritual on the basis of a return to the prescribed forms contained in the old Greek and Slavic books. Pictures painted after the Latin or "Frankish" manner were defaced and broken, so that Nikon was reproached as an iconoclast. He amended the church canon so as to promote his official independence and induced the czar to relinquish the right to appoint abbots and bishops and the privilege of appeal. He established and owned three great and rich monasteries. His influence with the czar was so great that he was called to be his official representative in the absence of that ruler. In fact, he was feared more than the czar himself, but by his severity and arrogance he made many opponents. Nobody, however, dared to attack him openly. It was Nikon himself who brought about his overthrow. He ignored the fact that he owed his power after all to the czar only and to his favor. The martial success of the czar had in the course of time increased his consciousness of power, and the effort to counteract the influence of the patriarch was made by others about the throne. Because of an apparent insult of the czar Nikon resigned his office in 1658 and retired to the monastery of the Resurrection, but the czar did not call him back as he had expected. All his efforts to secure a personal interview were in vain. After the synod of 1660 the question of the election of a new patriarch was discussed. In spite of the most violent opposition of Nikon and his appeal to the pope he was deprived of his office and exiled to the monastery of Therapontius by the White Sea. In 1675 he was removed to the monastery of Cyrillus. Under Czar Theodore he was allowed to return to his own monastery, but on the way thither he died. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: J. V. Bacmeister, *Beyträge zur Lebensgeschichte des Patriarchen Nikon*, Riga, 1788; W. Palmer, *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, vols. i.–iii., 6 vols., London, 1871–76; Philaret, *Geschichte der Kirche Russlands*, ii. 22 sqq., 119 sqq., Frankfort, 1872; Makarij, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, xi. 162 sqq., and vol. xii., St. Petersburg, 1882–83; A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, pp. 563 sqq., New York, 1899; R. Seeberg, *Aus Religion und Geschichte*, p. 332, Leipsic, 1906.

NILES, WILLIAM WOODRUFF: Protestant Episcopalian bishop of New Hampshire; b. at Hatley, P. Q., May 24, 1832. He was educated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (A.B., 1857; tutor 1857–58) and at the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from which he was graduated in 1861. He was ordered deacon in 1861 and advanced to the priesthood in 1862. He was rector of St. Philip's, Wiscasset, Me. (1861–64), professor of Latin in Trinity College (1864–70), and rector of St. John's, Warehouse Point, Conn. (1868–70). In 1870 he was consecrated bishop of New Hampshire. He is a member of the board of managers of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was likewise a member of the committee for revising the Prayer Book and marginal readings in the Bible, and in 1866–67 was editor of *The Churchman*.

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 205, New York, 1895.

NILUS: The name borne by a number of Eastern monks and ecclesiastics.

1. Nilus of Sinai: A pupil and friend of Chrysostom, d. about 430. The Greek *menologium* asserts that he came of a noble family, reached high civil offices, even that of exarch, and made a brilliant marriage, but gave up all his advantages to lead the life of an anchorite on Mount Sinai with his son Theodulus, while his wife and another child entered an Egyptian convent. He was a prolific author. His extant works (*MPG*, lxxix. 81–1280) include numerous letters and shorter compositions, and twelve or fourteen longer treatises dealing either with the Christian life in general or with special ascetic relations and duties. To the former class belong the *Peristeria ad Agathium*, a treatise on the pursuit of virtue and the avoidance of vice, and the *Tractatus de oratione*, the most important of this group; the *Tractatus de octo spiritibus malitiæ*, probably a free adaptation of the similar work of Evagrius Ponticus; *Tractatus ad Eülogium de vitiis quæ opposita sunt virtutibus*, probably spurious; *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus*, regarded as a compilation by a later imitator of Nilus; *Capita xxvii de diversis malignis cogitationibus;* and a homily on Luke xxi. 36. The works pertaining to the monastic life are seven narratives of the killing of some monks of Sinai by the barbarians and the carrying off of his son; a eulogy of the Nitrian hermit Albianus; a eulogy of the ascetic life as the only true continuation of primitive Christianity; a letter of instruction and warning to Magna, a deaconess of Ancyra; and *De monachorum præstantia*, a comparison of the hermit and the cenobite, to the advantage of the former.

The collection of his letters edited by P. Poussin (Paris, 1657) contains 355, that published by Leo Allatius (Rome, 1668) contains 1,061, including brief notes or scraps, but probably not many of them are authentic in their present form. Two series of short ethical and ascetic sentences (*MPG*, lxxix. 1239–62) are also probably not of his immediate composition. The writings of Nilus in general give an edifying picture of the monasticism of his day. But with all his veneration for the monastic life, he recognized its dangers, warning his disciples against pride and idleness and against the injurious consequences of exaggerated asceticism. He puts his wisdom very frequently in the form of proverbs whose rhythm and epigrammatic form are reminiscent of those of the Old Testament. Their content is a remarkable combination of echoes from classical literature and philosophy with Christian ideas and ascetic principles. The latter he does not hesitate to refer directly to the institution of Christ. The Christian " philosopher " must be free from the ties of affection, earthly cares, and the hindrances of the body. The renunciation of worldly goods and sensual desires sets the soul free for direct communion with God and mystical incorporation with Christ. The very height of these ideals makes the contrast all the more striking when he descends to actual conditions, admitting in practise the power of nature, repelling those who are not called to the ascetic life, rebuking the idle vagabonds who wander from place to place, alleviating extreme rigors by salutary counsels, and calling to his aid the force of habit which will ultimately supply a new nature in the place of the old. The letters, assuming that the greater part of them are genuine, show by the variety of the unknown persons to whom they are addressed (men and women, clergy and laity, abbots and monks) how many links still bound a venerated anchorite to the world he had quitted.

2. Nilus of Rossano: A monk of the tenth century; b. (of Greek parents) at Rossano in Calabria, 910. He is also known as Nilus of Gaeta or of Grottaferrata from his later residences. He is said to have lived under the rule of St. Basil in various monasteries of central and southern Italy—for a time in that of St. Alexius at Rome and at Monte Cassino, then principally in the hermitage of Valleluce near Gaeta and near Frascati, where he founded and became the first abbot of the monastery of Grottaferrata. He died Dec. 27, 1005, after a long life of strenuous protest against the corruptions of the time. He was much sought for as a spiritual adviser, and enjoyed the reputation of marked sanctity, attested by the gift of miracles and of prophecy. His name is held in special honor by the monks of St. Basil who still inhabit the same spot; the chapel dedicated to him contains frescoes by Domenichino of scenes in his life, and a representation of him in an altar-piece by Annibale Carracci.

3. Nilus the Archimandrite (surnamed **Doxopatrius**): Notary to the patriarch of Constantinople, protoprœdrus syncellorum, and nomophylax of the Eastern Empire; lived about the middle of the twelfth century. He spent some time in Sicily during the reign of Roger, at whose request he wrote (c. 1143) his *Syntagma de quinque patriarchalibus thronis* (ed. S. le Moyne, in *Varia Sacra*, vol. i., Leyden, 1685; also in *MPG*, cxxxii.), a remarkable historical treatment of the origin and development of the five patriarchates, entirely in the Eastern or anti-Roman interest.

4. Nilus Damylas: An abbot in Crete at the beginning of the fifteenth century and one of the later Byzantine controversialists against Rome. He left a *Typikē paradosis* (not yet published), a rule for a convent of nuns founded by him; and a testament dated 1417 (ed. S. P. Lambros, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1895, pp. 585 sqq.), which contains an interesting list of Byzantine writings.

Mention may be made of Nilus, archbishop of Rhodes (d. after 1379), a dogmatic and hagiographic author, and of Nilus, patriarch of Constantinople 1379–87 (cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 109, 174). For Nilus Kabasilas see KABASILAS, NILUS.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On 1. The results of early editing of the *Opera* are collected in *MPG*, vol. lxxix. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xiv. 189–218; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iv. 435, viii. 205–231; J. Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiæ*, ed. B. Jungmann, ii. 2, pp. 108–126, Innsbruck, 1892; J. Kunze, *Marcus Eremita*, pp. 129 sqq., Leipsic, 1895; O. Zöckler, *Biblische und kirchenhistorische Studien*, iii. 28–34, iv. 43–48, Munich, 1893; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. ii. passim.

2. An early *Vita* is in *ASB*, Sept., vii. 283–343, and in excerpts in *MPG*, iv. 616–618. Consult: G. Minasi, *San Nilo di Calabria*, Naples, 1892; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 195, 198; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 420–424 et passim.

NIMBUS: A symbol used by Christian artists from the fourth century to distinguish representations of the persons of the Trinity, Biblical and saintly personages, and sometimes emperors, kings, and other magnates. It consists of a circular or rectangular illuminated space surrounding the head of the figure, with sometimes a number of lighter stripes or rays going out from the head. This usage has its precedent in several non-Christian religions—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Slavic paganism, and especially the religions of Greece and Rome. The choice of the attribute is somewhat surprising in view of the descriptions of divine and angelic apparitions in the Bible and the apocryphal and patristic literature. God and the angels appear to man there, it is true, amidst light, but also amidst clouds, fire, and lightning (Gen. xv. 17; Ex. iii. 2, xiii. 21, xix. 16, 18; Num. ix. 15, xiv. 14, etc.). In the narrative of the transfiguration of Christ, the radiance of his countenance and the glory in which Moses and Elijah appeared are emphasized (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28); but neither in the New Testament nor in extra-canonical literature is there any indication of a phenomenon analogous to the nimbus. In direct reference to passages like those cited above, primitive Christian and early medieval art depicted God (or the hand of God) amidst clouds at the sacrifice of Isaac and the giving of the law, and in flames at the burning bush, Christ with an aureole and later a mandorla, angels amidst clouds, etc. But at the same time the figures of God and Christ or their emblems, the angels, etc., appeared with even greater frequency with the nimbus, entirely without reference to any scriptural or patristic expressions.

Origin. Early History.

Since pre-Christian art had been accustomed to depict not only gods and heroes but emperors and their families with the nimbus, the question arises from which usage the Christian artists borrowed their own. Without entering into a detailed discussion, it may be observed not only that if the nimbus was borrowed from the usage in regard to gods, it would be difficult to explain why it did not become prevalent before the fourth century, and also why the corona of rays, frequently used for Zeus, Serapis, Dionysius, Apollo, etc., was not adopted. When, on the other hand, it is known that the nimbus, from Constantine on, became one of the most usual tokens of imperial rank (not only for the emperors themselves but for the members of their families), both difficulties are removed by the adoption of the latter theory. Support is added to this conclusion by the fact that in the hundreds of sarcophagus-reliefs originating in Rome and Italy the nimbus is scarcely ever used even in the fifth century, while in the smaller number found at Ravenna, done under Byzantine influence, it occurs comparatively often. The same evidence is afforded by the paintings in the Roman catacombs, which represent Christ with the nimbus where he appears as teacher or lawgiver. The figure of Christ in the apse of Santa Pudenziana at Rome reminds the beholder at once of that of Constantius II. in the chronograph of 354; both figures are seated majestically on a throne covered by a large cushion, and both wear the nimbus—the only difference being in the clothing, the gesture of the right hand, and the object held in the left, a book with Christ and a scepter with the emperor. Evidently the nimbus was merely a token of rank.

Chronological Development.

If the mosaics of the glorified Christ in the two niches at Santa Costanza in Rome are to be considered as old as the others existing in the former mausoleum, they are the oldest examples of the use of the nimbus; but as this is justly disputed, the first place in proved antiquity must be assigned to the enthroned Christ with his symbol the lamb at Santa Pudenziana in Rome, belonging to the last decade of the fourth century. Christ has a circular golden nimbus with a border of green, the lamb one of blue. The nimbus is found even earlier for Christ in pictures in the catacombs, one of which (Garrucci, lxvii. 1), not earlier than the pontificate of Damasus, shows a simple circular nimbus; and the same kind, of a bluish hue, is found on the heads of Peter and Paul, who appear thus for the first time in mosaic in the triumphal arch of San Paolo fuori le Mura, probably belonging to the time of Leo the Great (Garrucci, ccxxxvii.). The mosaics in the nave of Santa Maria Maggiore, which De Rossi and others place in the pontificate of Liberius, are especially significant; here for the first time appears the circular golden nimbus for God, a white one with green border for the three guests of Abraham (Gen. xviii. 2), and a green one for " the captain of the Lord's host " (Josh. v. 13), which last picture places the nimbus for angels in the fourth century. Angels similarly adorned appear several times in the arch of San Paolo, dating from Sixtus III. Mary with the nimbus, oddly enough, does not appear in any designs which can be certainly dated in the fourth century. The symbols of the four evangelists seem to have been finally introduced into Christian art toward the end of this century, and at Santa Pudenziana the evangelists appear still without the nimbus; at San Paolo Mark and John have it, and in several cases only the emblem of Matthew is thus distinguished, presumably as a mark of special dignity. The extension of the nimbus to personages not yet mentioned does not occur till the fifth century. It is found in the case of John the Baptist in the baptistery, and possibly in that of Laurence in the tomb of Galla Placidia, at Ravenna, and thereafter with increasing frequency. When early western art came to an end, with the close of the sixth century at Rome and a hundred years later in the provinces, the use of the nimbus was wide-spread, but not governed by any fixed rules; and thus the Middle Ages revived it, to use it more extensively than ever. In Renaissance art is found a certain aversion to the use of this adjunct.

Form and Variations.

As to form, the earliest Christian examples do not differ essentially from the Greek and Roman; but a characteristic innovation is introduced when the head of Christ, or of his symbol the lamb, is found with the nimbus containing the monogrammatic form ☧ or ⳨ (see Jesus Christ, Monogram of), sometimes flanked by A and Ω, or with a cross. The cross became more and more usual, for the Father and the Holy Spirit as well. It must be remembered, however, that the use of the monogram and cross preceded the nimbus in the order of time, and are found in a few very early instances placed above the head. Different parts of the world show their own preferences in this matter. In the Roman and Italian sarcophagi both the plain and the cruciform nimbus are wanting; those of Gaul show the plain nimbus, but not the monogram or cross; those of Ravenna, on the other hand, frequently use the monogram and the A and Ω. The cross gradually became preferred over the monogram, and in the Middle Ages was the usual distinguishing mark of Christ. The monogram, however, is the older form, possibly belonging to the end of the fourth century, while the cruciform nimbus was an invention of the fifth; and not before the sixth is a rectangular nimbus found, in the majority of cases denoting that the person was still alive at the time of the representation. In Italy and Greece, and later in Germany, God the Father was designated in the less ancient art by a triangular nimbus with rays proceeding from it; and instances occur in Italy of the hexagonal form as an attribute of the cardinal virtues. In the Middle Ages Christian art developed a form of the nimbus which somewhat resembles the pre-Christian corona of rays. The beams of light proceeding from the head of the figure form a sort of sun or sometimes, especially in the case of Christ, a cross. To this form the way led through the kind of nimbus found in Gothic carvings, in which the effect of the disc-shaped frame is heightened by the introduction of rays, so that it was a simple matter to omit the frame altogether. Renaissance art either reduced the nimbus to a faint radiance surrounding the head, or dropped it altogether.

(Nikolaus Müller.)

Bibliography: L. Stephani, in *Mémoires de l'académie des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, 6th ser., ix. 361–500, 1859; F. C. G. Munter, *Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen*, ii. 20 sqq., Altona, 1825; C. C. F. Siegel, *Christlich-kirchliche Alterthümer*, i. 436–437, iii. 301 sqq., 4 vols., Leipsic, 1836–38; A. N. Didron, *Iconographie chrétienne*, pp. 4 sqq., Paris, 1843, Eng. transl., i. 22 sqq., London, 1849; J. A. Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, pp. 435–437, Paris, 1865; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, ii. 496 sqq., Freiburg, 1886; Mrs. A. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, i. 27–28, Boston, 1893; *DCA*, ii. 1398–1402; *KL*, v. 1628–31.

NÎMES, EDICT OF.

Events Leading to the Edict (§ 1).
Religious Policy Underlying the Edict (§ 2).
Anti-Protestant Campaign, 1661–79 (§ 3).
Increasing Harshness, 1679–84 (§ 4).
The Dragonnades (§ 5).
Results to Protestantism and France (§ 6).

1. Events Leading to the Edict.

The Edict of Nantes (q.v.) was a compromise made by Henry IV. of France between the established Roman Catholic religion and the confession of the Protestant minority of his subjects, protecting the latter, as the weaker body, by guaranties. Their most valuable protection, however, lay in their loyalty to the crown, and in its impartial attitude toward the conflicting parties. If the sovereign once took a decided stand on the Roman Catholic side, or if the Protestants assumed a hostile position toward it, the maintenance of the compromise and the continued existence of Protestantism would be at once imperiled. As long as Henry IV. lived, there was little danger of either. He continued in the path of reconciliation, and renewed the sanction of "cities of safety" to the Reformed for another four years from Aug. 1, 1605. But his death in 1610 completely altered the situation. From this moment deliberate attempts were made to undermine the edict, to limit its operation or effect its revocation. Above or below the surface, this conflict went on for seventy-five years. Immediately after Henry's death all the differences which had been latent in the relation of the two parties to each other and of the Protestants to the government became visible. The Protestants justly distrusted the bigoted queen-regent and her like-minded son Louis XIII.; and although the Edict of Nantes was solemnly confirmed on May 22, 1610, open violations of its provisions soon occurred. It was not until in 1620, when Béarn was incorporated with the kingdom and Roman Catholicism was forced on the people of the little mountain state, that they took up arms (1621). The conflict then begun was of a different character from the earlier wars of religion. By no means the whole of French Protestantism took part in it; there was no commanding personality like that of Coligny or Henry of Navarre, and discord prevailed among the nobles of the party. German Protestantism, fighting for its own existence, could send no help, and that which came from England was badly planned and ineffective. The unhappy decisions of the assembly of La Rochelle, organizing the Protestant party on the model of the States-General of the Netherlands (May 10, 1621), gave the government an excuse for treating the Reformed as flagrant rebels. The war, carried on with great severity, was partially favorable to the Huguenots in 1621 and 1622, thanks to the heroic defense of Montauban and Montpellier, but the rising of 1625 and the campaigns between that date and 1628 ended unfavorably with the surrender of La Rochelle. The peace of Alais (June 28, 1629), followed by the Edict of Nîmes (July, 1629), was at once the termination of overt hostilities and the beginning of a new epoch in the history of French Protestantism.

2. Religious Policy Underlying the Edict.

The Edict of Nîmes guaranteed to the vanquished a full pardon for their rebellion, and confirmed that of Nantes in all that concerned freedom of conscience, free exercise of religion, personal security, and civil rights; but it abolished the material guaranties for the preservation of these rights. By its terms the Huguenots ceased to be a political party in the state, and were reduced to a position of dependence on the king's grace. The payments made by Henry IV. and for a time by Louis XIII. to the Protestant ministers were stopped; and the edict emphasized the definite expectation entertained of the reunion of the seceders with the Roman Catholic Church. This continued to be the goal of French ecclesiastical policy, and all means were tried in the effort to attain it. Richelieu was too clear-sighted, at a time when France was just setting out on her career as a world power, to comply with the demand of Rome that he should suppress heresy by force through the simple revocation of the Edict of Nantes, thus rendering desperate a numerous, intelligent, and well-to-do section of the population. He preferred a gradual policy. From the time (Mar. 6, 1631) when the exercise of the Reformed religion was prohibited in Rioux (Saintonge), scarcely a year passed without some locality being deprived of Evangelical worship. In 1633 half the Protestant colleges were transferred to the Roman Catholics; in Metz the Protestants were forbidden (1635) to erect one; in Dijon they were commanded to decorate their houses for the feasts of the Church; the parliament of Bordeaux forbade Reformed parents to compel the attendance of their children at their own worship (1636). After the death of Richelieu and during the rest of the minority of Louis XIV. the same policy was continued, though to a less marked extent, the government fearing that the Huguenots might take the side of the Fronde. But they remained so loyal that Louis XIV. himself was compelled to acknowledge the fact in a decree of May 21, 1652, which granted them some alleviations. The period from 1649 to 1656 was the happiest that they enjoyed. In the latter year persecution began again. In 1659 the holding of a national synod was permitted, with the express declaration that it was to be the last. This ordinance, depriving the Protestants as it did of their supreme court in both doctrine and discipline, was the beginning of the systematic policy of repression of Louis XIV. From the outset of his reign he had the firm intent of annihilating Protestantism in his kingdom; all assurances respecting the validity and maintenance of the Edict of Nantes were mere formalities. He felt that he was on this point in sympathy with the majority of his Roman Catholic subjects; he was supported by his devoted officials, to whom the king's word was law; and the anti-Protestant inclination of king and people was fostered by the clergy.

3. Anti-Protestant Campaign, 1661–79.

Only a brief sketch can be given of the policy of gradual encroachment on the rights of the Reformed Church. The first blow was struck at the permission of public worship, which a commission was appointed (Apr. 15, 1661) to investigate throughout the kingdom. In 1663 140 churches were closed, forty-one in 1664, and sixteen in 1666, and so on year by year, often on the most absurd and arbitrary pretexts, while the erection of new ones was strictly forbidden. Many schools were also closed, or limited to elementary instruction; the higher school at Nîmes was placed in the hands of the Jesuits and the theological faculty suppressed. Every possible facility was offered for conversions to the Roman Catholic faith; the age at which children might declare their conversion was fixed at twelve for girls and fourteen for boys. In towns with a preponderating Protestant population the officials were drawn equally from both religions, but Protestants were never allowed to preside. They were allowed to attend baptisms and weddings only in limited numbers; when they were dying, the priest might come in unbidden to ascertain if they were determined to die in their faith; in places where there was no Evangelical public worship, they could be buried only at daybreak or nightfall, and then only with a limited number of attendants.

4. Increasing Harshness, 1679–1684.

Toward 1680 the position of the Protestants grew markedly worse. The Peace of Nimeguen (1679) had set Louis XIV. free from foreign dangers; and the change which about the same time came over his life in the direction of religious strictness tended to make him more anxious to carry out what he believed to be his duty. The Protestant question had become the most important problem of internal administration, and the king's mood, now that he stood at the height of his power and regarded the defection of his subjects from his faith as a personal injury, tended more and more toward a forcible solution. This tendency was encouraged by the pitiless and violent Louvois and his father the chancellor Le Tellier, as well as by the king's confessor, Père La Chaise. The closing of churches went on with increasing frequency; ordinance after ordinance excluded the Huguenots from a still greater number of public functions. In 1681 the age for the voluntary conversion of children was lowered to seven years. A fever of zeal for the conversion of the Protestants seized the country; the upper classes especially vied with each other in attempting to reclaim their kinsfolk and subordinates; hosts of missionaries preached up and down the land, and houses for the reception and support of converts of both sexes were founded everywhere. Deeds of violence against the Huguenots, too, increased in number. Churches were destroyed and their Bibles burned. Early in 1681, at the suggestion of the intendant Marillac, Louvois began to apply in Poitou the method of quartering soldiers principally upon the Protestants, who might escape the burden altogether for two years by conversion to the State Church. This method was abandoned, nearly nine months later, when emigration had begun to assume alarming proportions and notice had been taken of it in the English Parliament; but meanwhile the Reformed religion had been almost annihilated in the province. Throughout the country, however, the majority of the Huguenots displayed an admirable constancy, in the face alike of violence and seductive invitations such as those given by the national assembly of the clergy in July, 1682. The end was not far off; in the summer of 1683 the two religions came to blows in the Cévennes, the Vivarais, and Dauphiné, and the government put down rebellion without mercy.

5. The Dragonnades.

As early as August, 1684, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was definitely contemplated in government circles, and by the next January the keener-sighted Protestants had begun to familiarize themselves with the idea. Foucault, intendant of Béarn, set the ball rolling when by royal authority he closed the twenty churches of his province without more ado, drove out the pastors, and asked for troops to support the missionaries (Apr. 18, 1685). This was the beginning of the general dragonnades, which struck terror into the hearts of all the Reformed; sixteen thousand had made their submission by the middle of July, and in August Béarn, the former bulwark of Protestantism, could number only three or four hundred professors of the Evangelical faith. On July 7 the method of conversion by military force was extended to the districts of Bordeaux and Montauban; and thence it spread throughout France. Conversions *en masse* were witnessed on a scale hitherto unprecedented—it took only a week to change the faith of Montauban, and Montpellier was converted by Bâville with sixteen companies inside of twenty-four hours. By the autumn Protestantism as an organized religious body had been destroyed; nothing remained but a handful of individuals or scattered families. The time had come for the final blow. If there were practically no Protestants left in France, the Edict of Nantes had lost its *raison d'être* and might as well be revoked. The theologians assembled in the king's presence declared its revocation a religious duty, the procureur-général of the parliament of Paris pronounced the revocation legally unobjectionable. Le Tellier drew up the draft of the new decree, which Louis read and altered in certain points on Oct. 15, signing it at Fontainebleau a day or two later. It was registered in parliament on the 22d, thus attaining full force. According to its terms, the edicts of April and May, 1598, and July, 1629, were declared null and void; all "temples" of the so-called Reformed religion were to be at once destroyed, and Evangelical worship was prohibited, even in private houses; all recalcitrant pastors were to leave the kingdom inside of a fortnight; Evangelical schools were entirely suppressed; children were ordered to be baptized according to the Roman Catholic rite; and emigration was forbidden under severe penalties. This momentous step was applauded by the whole of Roman

Catholic France, even by the finer spirits, such as Fénelon, Massillon, La Fontaine, La Bruyère, and Mme. de Sévigné, while the pope applauded it in a special brief of Nov. 13. Its awful consequences were visible long after.

6. Results to Protestantism and France.

While Louis XIV. and his cohorts of the Roman Catholic Church succeeded in annihilating the Protestant Church as a recognized ecclesiastical body, and while the blood of Protestants flowed like water, nevertheless thousands of Protestants remained faithful, steadfastly worshiping (even if under cover) according to the dictates of conscience. Despite all the persecution, harassings, persistent and malignant oppression, importunities and tortures to which all Protestants, no matter where found, were subjected, the fanatical followers of the Roman Church did not succeed in destroying Protestantism itself. Nor did they succeed in annihilating all the witnesses of the Protestant faith, as is fully attested by the lives and doings of such men as Brousson, Court, and Rabaut (see Court, Antoine; Rabaut, Paul). When in 1787 Louis XVI. issued his edict of toleration, the number of Protestants in the kingdom, estimated in 1660 at 1,600,000 to 1,700,000, was not more than 600,000; and their influence on the national life had been lost. The general level of French piety was lowered by the proportion of lives of compulsory hypocrisy entailed by forced conversions; French theology, with the annihilation of an opposition, lost its seriousness and depth, and the place of the great divines of Louis XIV.'s reign was taken by the courtly abbés of the regency. Even more obvious was the loss to the nation at large by the emigration (estimated at over 300,000 between 1680 and 1700) of so great a number of intelligent and industrious subjects; French commerce and manufacture received a blow from which they have never wholly recovered. Taking also into account the political sequels, such as the suppression of Roman Catholicism in England by the revolution and the placing of William of Orange in a position to make head against France, the year 1685 may safely be called the turning-point in the fortunes of Louis XIV., which began to decline from that time. (Theodor Schott†.)

Bibliography: Consult the literature under Huguenots; Nantes, Edict of, particularly Baird's *Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*. The chief work is still, E. Benoit, *Hist. de l'édit de Nantes*, vols. i.–iii., Delft, 1693–95. Consult further: C. C. de Rulhière, *Eclaircissements historiques sur les causes de la révocation de l'édit de Nantes*, vol. i., Paris, 1788; G. von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, vols. iv.–v., Gotha, 1864–69; E. Stähelin, *Der Uebertritt Heinrichs IV. . . . zur römisch-katholischen Kirche*, Basel, 1865; F. Sander, *Die Huguenotten und das Edikt von Nantes*, Breslau, 1885; T. Schott, *Die Aufhebung des Ediktes von Nantes*, Halle, 1885. A resumé of the material educed by the Bicentennial of the Edict of Nantes is given in *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, 1885, pp. 565 sqq., 609 sqq., 1886, 182 sqq.; C. Tylor, *The Huguenots in the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1892; J. Lemoine, *Mémoires des évêques de France sur la conduite à tenir à l'égard des Réformes*, Paris, 1902; Documents and readings illustrating the period are given in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 349–386; Robinson, *European History*, pp. 268 sqq.

NIMROD: According to Genesis, a son of Cush, a mighty hunter, and a founder of kingdoms. All known of Nimrod is contained in the verses Gen. x. 8–12. It is clear that the recital falls into two parts: verses 8, 10–12, describe Nimrod as the founder of two great kingdoms (verse 11 should read " Out of that land he went forth to Asshur "); verse 9 declares that he was a mighty hunter. The passage therefore probably contains two traditions and shows the hand of an editor, since verse 9 would naturally find its place at the end. While it would be incorrect to attribute the foundation of both a Babylonian and an Assyrian kingdom to any such single personality as Nimrod, it is quite possible that the principal cities of Assyria were established by Babylonian colonists (see Assyria, VI., 3, § 1). The earliest Babylonian and Assyrian cities are correctly named by the writer. After Babylon, Erech (the modern Warka) occupies the first place (see Babylonia, IV., § 5); here Ishtar was worshiped from ancient times, and it is the scene of the Gilgamesh epic (see Babylonia, VIII., 3 § 2). Accad follows, probably Agade (Akkad), the birth-place of Sargon I. (see Babylonia, IV., § 11), although Accad commonly signifies Northern Babylonia. Calneh is perhaps Nippur (see Babylonia, IV., § 11; cf. H. Hilprecht, *Excavations in Bible Lands*, pp. 410 sqq., Philadelphia, 1903). In Assyria, after Nineveh, Rehoboth-Ir (A. V. " the city Rehoboth ") is named, probably meaning " open city." Calah, southeast of Nineveh (see Assyria, IV., § 3), was for a long time the residence of the Assyrian kings. Resen can not easily be identified and the addition, " the same is a great city," is somewhat obscure (see Assyria, IV., § 4). The fact that Asshur, the oldest Assyrian city, is not mentioned, shows that the passage is not very early. Who was this founder of the cities of the Babylonian empire? The Biblical writer seems to have derived the name from *marad*, " to rebel "; the founding of the Babylonian empire is combined with the building of the Tower of Babel as a revolt against God's supremacy. Association of Nimrod with the Gilgamesh of Babylonian legend is doubtful; another hypothesis connects him with the national god of Babylonia, Marduk (J. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 308, Berlin, 1889). An Egyptian or Ethiopian origin based on Nimrod's descent from Cush is unlikely and the better reference is to an Asiatic Cush connected with the Kosshites or Kasshites who settled in Babylonia about 1700 and ruled the land until the twelfth or eleventh century B.C. (see Cush, Cushites).

Nimrod as a hunter was probably an independent figure. Hunting-scenes are often depicted in Babylonian sculptures, both in connection with historical and with mythological personages. This would be significant if it were possible to identify Nimrod with Gilgamesh, for the latter is represented as a great hunter. Gen. vi. 1–4 speaks of " giants . . . men of renown " (see Giants); the similarity of the expression makes it likely that the writer of Gen. x. 9 regarded Nimrod as one of these giants. In this way might be explained the term " before the Lord," as these beings sprang from a divine race and stood nearer to God. Nimrod might be, and indeed was, compared with the Greek hunter Orion who drove the Pleiades before him. (R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: J. Grivel, in *TSBA*, iii (1874), 136 sqq.; P. Haupt, *Nimrodepos*, in *Assyriologische Bibliothek*, III., ii., Leipsic, 1891; A. Jeremias, *Izdubar-Nimrod*, ib., 1891; T. G. Pinches, *The O. T. in the Light of the . . . Records . . . of Assyria and Babylonia*, pp. 127–131, London, 1902; *DB*, iii. 552–553; *EB*, iii. 3417–19; *JE*, ix. 309–311; the later commentaries on the passage; and the literature under Noah.

NINCK, CARL WILHELM THEODOR: German philanthropist; b. at Staffel near Limburg (20 m. e. of Coblenz) May 28, 1834; d. at Hamburg Sept. 17, 1887. He studied at Halle, Erlangen, and Herborn. In 1858 he was chaplain at Westerburg where he created a revival of religious interest that extended to the surrounding neighborhood. In 1865 he was called to Frücht. There he promoted a tract society which he had previously organized at Westerburg and which now became a department of the Evangelical Association of Nassau. Ninck became manager and secretary of this tract society of Nassau, a position he held until 1873. He acted as hospital and field chaplain during the wars of 1866 and 1870–71. For his services in the latter war, especially around Metz and Strasburg, he received the Iron Cross. In 1873 he went to Hamburg to take charge of the Anscharkapelle in St. Michael's parish, established in 1860 for home mission work. Wilhelm Baur had served there from 1865 to 1871 when he was called as court preacher to Berlin. Ninck's great organizing talent and tireless energy found full scope in this field. Impelled from within by an ardent Christian devotion and Evangelical enthusiasm, there was scarcely an interest in domestic missions in which he was not active. He founded the Parish Sisters for the purpose of looking after the poor and sick of the congregation and built a home for them called Bethlehem. This was followed by a series of institutions erected on the heights of Anschar, near Eppendorf, one for morally endangered girls; the Louisenhof, for girls who had gone astray for the first time; a home for retired deaconesses; and other like institutions. He published the *Nachbar*, a religious journal, which attained a circulation of 100,000 copies. He also published the *Kinderfreund* in which he developed a special talent for interesting young people. In 1884 he undertook a journey to Palestine and afterward wrote *Auf biblischen Pfaden* (Hamburg, 1885).

(Carl Bertheau.)

Bibliography: Lives have been written by T. Rottebohm, Hamburg, 1888; F. Cunts, Herborn, 1890; and F. W. H. Koopmann, in *Bilder aus der christlichen Liebesthätigkeit in Hamburg*, p. 85, Berlin (1899?).

NINEVEH. See Assyria, III. and IV.

NINIAN, nin'i-an (**NINIAS**), **SAINT:** The first missionary and monastic bishop of North Britain. Bede relates, as common report in his time, that Ninian was a Briton, received his theological training at Rome, and was consecrated bishop; he established himself near the present Whithorn, in Wigtownshire, on the northern shore of the Solway Firth, and built there a stone church, dedicated to St. Martin of Tours, from which the place was called *Ad Candidam Casam;* after a successful work among the Picts south of the Grampians, he died and was buried in his church. His life by Ailred, abbot of Rievaulx in Yorkshire (1143–66), adds little to our knowledge, but the statement that Ninian heard of the death of St. Martin while building his church may be authentic, and if so fixes the date of Ninian's mission at about 400. It may also be true that Martin furnished masons to build the church. Nothing is said about a monastery founded by Ninian, but a century later Candida Casa, under the name of Rosnat or the Great Monastery, was a famous training-school of the monastic life and in the fourteenth century it was a favorite resort of pilgrims.

Bibliography: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 4; *Life* by Ailred in *Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern*, ed. A. P. Forbes, Edinburgh, 1874; A. P. Forbes, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, pp. 421–425, ib. 1872; J. H. Newman, *Lives of the English Saints*, London, 1845; J. MacKinnon, *Ninian und sein Einfluss auf die Ausbreitung des Christenthums in Nord-Britannien*, Heidelberg, 1891; idem, *Culture in Early Scotland*, book ii., chap. iii., London, 1892; *DNB*, xli. 68–69; *DCB*, iv. 45–46.

NIPPOLD, FRIEDRICH WILHELM FRANZ: German Protestant; b. at Emmerich (60 m. w. of Münster) Sept. 15, 1838. He was educated at the universities of Halle (1856–58), Bonn (1858–60; Ph. D., 1860), Amsterdam, and Leyden (1860), after which he traveled in the East (1861–63). He became privat-docent at the University of Heidelberg in 1865; associate professor there in 1867; full professor at Bern in 1871; and professor of church history at Jena 1884–1907, retiring as emeritus in 1907. Theologically he belongs to the liberal school.

Among his numerous writings, special mention may be made of his *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte seit der Restauration von 1814* (Elberfeld, 1867, 3d ed., 5 vols., 1901–06; Eng. transl. in part, *The Papacy in the 19th Century*, New York, 1900); *Der Jesuiten-Orden von seiner Wiederherstellung bis zur Gegenwart* (Mannheim, 1867); *Aus Gethsemane* (sermons; Elberfeld, 1867); *Christian Carl Josias, Freiherr von Bunsen* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1868–71); *Welche Wege führen nach Rom?* (Heidelberg, 1869); *Ein Blick von Worms auf Jerusalem* (Mannheim, 1869); *Ægyptens Stellung in der Religion und Kultur* (Hamburg, 1869); *Stille Stunden, Aphorismen aus Richard Rothes Nachlass* (Wittenberg, 1872); *Die altkatholische Kirche des Erzbistums Utrecht* (Heidelberg, 1872); *Richard Rothe, ein christliches Lebensbild* (2 vols., 1873–74); *Ursprung, Umfang, Hemmnisse und Aussichten der altkatholischen Bewegung* (Berlin, 1873); *Die gegenwärtige Wiederbelebung des Hexenglaubens* (1875); *Die Gleichnisse Jesu von dem wachsenden Saat, vom grossen Abendmahl und vom sterbenden Weizenkorn* (Bern, 1877); *Die römisch-katholische Kirche im Königreich der Niederlande* (Leipsic, 1877); *Religion und Kirchenpolitik Friedrichs des Grossen* (Berlin, 1879); *Die Theorie der Trennung von Kirche und Staat geschichtlich beleuchtet* (Bern, 1881); *Zur geschichtlichen Würdigung der Religion Jesu* (10 parts, 1884–93); *Die Thümmelschen Religionsprozesse* (2 vols., Halle, 1888); *Tagebuch des Peter von der Heyden, S. J.* (Barmen, 1889); *Die jesuitischen Schriftsteller der Gegenwart in Deutschland* (Leipsic, 1895); *Das Entwicklungsgang des Lebens Jesu* (Hamburg, 1895); *Die internationelle Seite des päpstlichen Politik* (Leipsic, 1895); *Kleine Schriften zur inneren Geschichte des Katholizismus* (2 parts, Jena, 1898–1899); *Das deutsche Christuslied des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipsic, 1902); and *Bischof von Anger, die Berliner Politik und die evangelische Mission* (Berlin, 1905). He has edited, among other works, *Berner Beiträge zur Geschichte der Schweiz* (Bern, 1884); the fifth edition of K. R. Hagenbach's *Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1885–87); R. Rothe's *Gesammelte Reden und Aufsätze* (Elberfeld, 1885); H. von Boyen's *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1889); and A. von Theiner's *Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen* (Barmen, 1891–98).

NIPPUR. See Babylonia, IV., § 9.

NIRVANA. See Buddhism, § 4.

NISAN. See Year.

NISROCH, nis′rec: The name of a deity in whose temple (or perhaps the name of the temple itself), according to II Kings xix. 37 and its parallel Isa. xxxvii. 38, Sennacherib was slain (see Assyria, VI., 3, § 12). The difficulties raised by the passage are three in number: the identity of the deity or the temple, the form of the name, and the place of the occurrence. The Biblical passages distinctly assert that Nisroch was Sennacherib's god; it would therefore be expected that the deity's name would be found in the Assyrian texts. But no such deity is known in Assyria or Babylonia, the nearest approach to the form being the name of the god Nusku (see Assyria, VII., § 6), which in the early alphabet in the form *Nusuk* might easily be misread for *Nisrok*, the form which the name takes in both passages of the Hebrew. In considering the form it is to be noted that the Greek versions in various manuscripts read *Esdrach, Esthrach, Esorach, Asrach, Asarach, Asarak*, and *Nasarach;* the Syriac and Vulgate follow the Hebrew and read, the former *nswrk* and *nsrk*, the latter *Nesroch*. The clear indication of all the Greek forms except one (which may have resulted from a late correction from the Hebrew) is that the reading before the translators lacked the initial N. But the variety of the forms given in the Greek indicates also a great uncertainty of reading in the original which does not promise a ready solution. Most of these forms point to a consonantal base composed of *srḥ*, *'srḥ*, *srk*, or *'srk*, in which the last letter creates great difficulty.

Attempts have been made to derive the word from the name of the god Asshur (see Assyria, I.), and in this one count is that such a derivation might suggest the reappearance of the original N which was assimilated to the following sh, though this is very unlikely. It has been supposed that to the form Asshur was added *Aku*, a Sumerian name for the moon-god. Against this it is to be urged that such a compound as *Asshur-Aku* is otherwise unknown; that the form Eriaku is not a parallel, this form being equal to the Semitic *Ebed-Aku*, " servant of Aku," and not a compound name; moreover, by the time of Sennacherib Asshur as a deity had assumed a majesty so great that composition with another deity, and, above all, a moon-deity, is hardly thinkable. The fact that the moon-god's name Sin is a component in the name of Sennacherib (Pinches, in *DB*, iii. 555) is hardly pertinent. An explanation has also been attempted by deriving the name so as to mean " the eagle god " from a root represented by the Arabic *Nasr* and Assyrian *Nashru*, " eagle, hawk." But no such deity has thus far been discovered in Assyrian environment. The Koran (Surah lxxi.; Palmer's transl., Am. ed., p. 303, cf. preface, p. xii.) knows of an idol Nasr worshiped by antediluvian Arabs, while the word figures on a South Arabian inscription (*ZDMG*, xxix. 600 sqq., 1875, and liii. 100, 1899). But neither of these provides for the Hebrew ending *-ok* or for the Greek *-ach* or *-ak*.

Cheyne proposes to read *Marduk* for the Hebrew *Nisrok* (Isaiah, in *SBOT*, p. 114, 1899), a suggestion favored in Schrader, *KAT*, p. 396. This solution is a possibility, for although the two forms differ in the square character, in the forms in use before the square character came in the two words might easily be mistaken. But the difficulty here is that the Biblical narration clearly implies that Sennacherib met his death in Nineveh, while it is open to serious question whether Marduk ever had a temple or chapel in Nineveh. If it be assumed that the Hebrew writer either did not mean to imply Nineveh as the place of death, or that he left the matter open, Babylon is the likely place of the occurrence if Nisroch be a mistaken reading for Marduk. There is some probability that Sennacherib's return from his Egyptian expedition shortly before his death was in part due to a new rebellion in his Babylonian realm, and an inscription cited by Winckler (in Schrader, *KAT*, p. 85) seems to support this location of the event, which implies that Sennacherib's grandson Asshurbanipal took revenge in Babylon. But the entire construction is exceedingly problematic.

But one other proposal merits consideration. The Greek forms generally are not very remote from the name of the temple in the city of Asshur, which reads E-shara. The guttural at the end of the Greek forms might easily have arisen through a misunderstanding of the pronunciation of the final syllable of the Assyrian name. Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: J. Selden, *De dis Syris*, ii. 10, Amsterdam, 1680; L. Kulenkamp, *De Nisroch idolo*, Bremen, 1747; F. C. Movers, *Religion und Gottheiten der Phönizier*, Bonn, 1841; P. Scholz, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebräern*, pp. 391–393, Regensburg, 1877; J. Meinhold, *Die Jesajaerzählung*, pp. 72–73, Göttingen, 1898; *DB*, iii. 555–556; *EB*, iii. 3424–25.

NITSCHMANN, nich′mān, **DAVID:** Pioneer missionary and first bishop of the Unitas Fratrum; b. at Zauchtenthal (125 m. n.e. of Vienna), Moravia, Dec. 27, 1696; d. at Bethlehem, Pa., Oct. 8, 1772. In consequence of severe persecutions, he fled from his native country to Herrnhut (1727), and became a leader in the evangelistic work of the Moravians. Accompanied by Leonard Dober, he set out afoot for Copenhagen on Aug. 21, 1732, which day constitutes the anniversary of the beginning of Moravian missions. From Copenhagen they sailed to St. Thomas, where they arrived on Dec. 13, and began to preach the Gospel to the negro slaves. Nitschmann returned to Europe in the following year, and on Mar. 13, 1735, was consecrated to the episcopacy by Bishop Daniel Ernst Jablonsky at Berlin. Soon after, the new bishop led a body of Moravians to Georgia. John and Charles Wesley were on board the vessel which bore these immigrants across the Atlantic, and were much impressed by the piety and earnest simplicity of the Brethren. In the course of his life Nitschmann undertook many journeys on land and on sea in the interests of his church and for the spread of the kingdom of God. He labored in Germany, Livonia, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, in Great Britain, and in Georgia, North Carolina, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Bibliography: E. de Schweinitz, *Fathers of the American Moravian Church*, Bethlehem, 1881; J. Taylor Hamilton, *A Hist. of the . . . Moravian Church*, chaps. iii.–xi., ib., 1900.

NITZSCH, nich, **FRIEDRICH AUGUST BERTHOLD:** Son of the following; German Protestant theologian; b. at Bonn Feb. 19, 1832; d. at Kiel Dec. 21, 1898. He studied at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium in Berlin and at the universities of Berlin, Halle, and Bonn, being influenced finally by the work of Ritschl. After passing his theological examination, he taught for a year and a half, became a licentiate in 1858, the subject of his thesis being *Quæstiones Raimundanæ*, dealing with natural theology. In 1859 he became privatdocent at Berlin and was called as professor of systematic theology to Giessen in 1868 and in 1872 to Kiel, where he remained until his death. In his literary activity Nitzsch was occupied chiefly with works on the history of dogma. His *System des Boëthius und die ihm zugeschriebenen theologischen Schriften. Eine kritische Untersuchung* (Berlin, 1860) characterizes the system of Boëthius as eclectic and as a link between scholasticism and ancient philosophy, but as not in harmony with Christianity. Later works were *Augustinus Lehre vom Wunder* (1865) in which he treated Augustine's apologetics; and the mature fruit of his researches in the history of dogma, *Grundriss der christlichen Dogmengeschichte; erster Teil: Die patristische Periode* (Berlin, 1870). The unchangeable result of the development of dogma Nitzsch finds in the thesis that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah and as such has provided for the salvation of the world. Thus the historical character of the kingdom of God is established once for all, the connection with Old-Testament revelation is ensured, and Jesus is proclaimed as the absolute principle of salvation and revelation. In the department of dogmatics Nitzsch wrote *Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik* (1889–92) in which, as well as in contributions to theological journals, he took the part of the so-called mediating theology, and so came into touch with Ritschl and Lipsius.

(A. Titius.)

Bibliography: O. Baumgarten, in *Deutsch-evangelische Blätter*, xxiv. 116–133.

NITZSCH, KARL IMMANUEL: German Protestant, one of the most distinguished representatives, in the nineteenth century, of the mediating theology; b. at Borna (16 m. s.s.e of Leipsic), Saxony, Sept. 21, 1787; d. in Berlin Aug. 21, 1868. His theological training was secured at Wittenberg, where his father, Karl Ludwig Nitzsch (q.v.), was professor; and he became docent in 1810 with the dissertation, *De testamentis duodecim patriarcharum*, and in 1811 was ordained as assistant pastor of the Schlosskirche. In 1817 he was appointed professor in the recently founded seminary at Wittenberg, and in 1822 accepted a call to the University of Bonn. In 1829 he published his *System der christlichen Lehre* (6th ed., Bonn, 1851; Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1849). This work defined his position toward rationalism, supernaturalism, and Schleiermacher. He said himself that he had " learned more from his father, Daub, and Schleiermacher than from any other teachers, but had been obliged to draw back from them all more or less." He differed from Schleiermacher in the doctrine of God's relation to the world, the divine attributes, etc., and 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 Twesten 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 symbolics (*Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Möhlers*, Hamburg, 1835) and made valuable and frequent contributions to the *TSK*, under the editorial care of Ullmann and Umbreit. Most of these dissertations appeared, after the author's death, under the title *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (2 vols., Gotha, 1870). During the Bonn period (1822–47) Nitzsch also acted as university preacher, and took a very active part in ecclesiastical affairs, such as the revision of the Liturgy, and the measures looking to the union of the Lutheran and Reformed communions. In the interest of the union he wrote, among other things, *Urkundenbuch der evangelischen Union* (Bonn, 1853) and *Würdigung der von Dr. Kahnis gegen die evangelische Union und deren theologische 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 *Oberkirchenrath*), and was elected a representative to parliament in 1849. In 1854 he was appointed provost of the Nikolaikirche. The most important literary work of the Berlin period, and of his entire life, was his *Praktische Theologie* (3 vols., Bonn, 1847–67; 2d ed.,. 1859–68). The first book treats of the theory of church life; the second, of the practise at the present time. Besides these various works, volumes of sermons also appeared from his pen, a complete revised edition at Bonn in 1867.

(F. Nitzsch†.)

Bibliography: W. Beyschlag, *Karl Immanuel Nitzsch, eine Lichtgestalt der neueren deutsch-evangelischen Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, 1872.

NITZSCH, KARL LUDWIG: German Protestant; b. at Wittenberg Aug. 6, 1751; d. there Dec. 5, 1831. He studied theology at Wittenberg (1770–1775), and, after acting as private tutor for several years at Brandis near Leipsic, became pastor at Beucha in 1781, pastor and superintendent at Borna in 1785, and cathedral superintendent and consistorial assessor at Zeitz in 1788. In 1790 he became pastor and professor of theology at Wittenberg. Proceeding from Kant, Nitzsch sought to mediate between rationalism and supernaturalism. Revelation, he held, is not the divine communication of a supernatural content foreign to the human spirit, but the promulgation of a divine content which is inherent in man in a latent manner, but suppressed by sensuality and egoism. While he did not deny the supernatural factor of revelation like the rationalists, he was no less opposed to the supernaturalists in regarding the essence of Christian revelation as moral and rational. A revelation that reveals anything not to be grasped by reason is for him no revelation at all. He attributed the character of revelation also to the old covenant, though he considered it only a *revelatio nomothetica* as opposed to, but preparatory to, the *revelatio didactica* of the New Testament. His principal treatises were collected in two volumes, *De revelatione religionis externa eademque publica prolusiones academicæ* (Leipsic, 1808) and *De discrimine revelationis imperatoriæ et didacticæ prolusiones academicæ* (2 parts, Wittenberg, 1830). A short summary of his doctrinal system, as he taught it in his lectures, is given in his treatises, *Ueber das Heil der Welt* (1817); *Ueber das Heil der Kirche* (1821); and *Ueber das Heil der Theologie* (1830). (F. Nitzsch†.)

Bibliography: E. A. D. Hoppe, *Denkmal des verewigten Dr. C. L. Nitzsch*, Halle, 1832; J. C. H. von Zobel, *Das Leben und Wirken der Pastoren und Superintendenten in der . . . Stadt Borna*, pp. 65–72, Borna, 1849.

NO: A name used for the Egyptian city Thebes in Jer. xlvi. 25; Ezek. xxx. 14–16; and Nahum iii. 8, where the Hebrew text has No-Amon, i.e., " No of Amon," the great deity of Thebes (see Amon). The later Greek name (Diospolis) is used by the Septuagint in the passage from Ezekiel. No is a corruption of the Egyptian *nwt*, " the city, capital," found also in the cuneiform inscriptions in the form *Ni-i'* as a name of Thebes. The true Egyptian name was *Wĕset*. Thebes was insignificant during the Old Kingdom (third millennium B. C.), but rose in importance in the Middle Kingdom (after 2000 B.C.), and under the eighteenth dynasty became the capital of Egypt and so remained for centuries. Not until the royal residence was removed to Lower Egypt in the seventh century B.C. did it begin to decline. Under the Ptolemies it took part in several revolts and was repeatedly besieged. It was completely destroyed by Cornelius Gallus, first prefect of Egypt under Augustus. Strabo found on its site in 24 B.C. only isolated villages (*Geog.*, xvii., i. 46). The ruins of Thebes lie on the eastern bank of the Nile near the present Luxor and Karnak, and include the remains of the great temple of Amon; the most magnificent and imposing of the sacred edifices of the Egyptians; on the west bank is the great necropolis of Thebes. (G. Steindorff.)

Bibliography: Among guide-books the best are: Baedeker's *Egypt* (revised by G. Steindorff), Leipsic, 1907; E. A. W. Budge, *Cook's Handbook for Egypt and the Soudan*, London, 1905; Macmillan's *Guide to Egypt and the Sudan*, ib., 1905; Murray's *Handbook for Egypt and the Sudan*, ib., 1907; A. E. P. Weigall, *A Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt.*, ib., 1910. Consult the commentaries on the three passages cited; works on the history and antiquity of Egypt; A. H. Sayce, *The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotos*, London, 1902.

NOAH.

Character of Noah's Age (§ 1).
The Interwoven Hebrew Flood Story (§ 2).
Its Significance and Consequences (§ 3).
Babylonian and Hebrew Accounts Compared (§ 4).
A New Tablet (§ 5).
The Narrative in Relation to History (§ 5).

1. Character of Noah's Age.

Noah, with whose name the memory of the deluge is connected (cf. Isa. liv. 9), was, according to Gen. v. 28 sqq., the son of Lamech, and was the tenth and last of the lineage of Seth. The name means " rest," but Gen. v. 29 connects it with the root *naḥam*, " to comfort." The Biblical recital indicates that Noah lived in a period of moral degeneracy which can be estimated through the so-called commandments of Noah (Gen. ix.), which imply a reign of bloodshed and reckless disregard of life. Sexual conditions also must have degenerated to a degree menacing the very integrity of human nature—this is the meaning of the enigmatic passage Gen. vi. 1 sqq. Hence came the Lord's decision to root out the human race. The limitation of man's life to 120 years merely signifies a respite of that duration until the flood. According to vii. 11, the flood began in Noah's six-hundredth year, therefore the revelation must have been made in his four-hundred and eightieth year; this was, according to the Hebrew chronology, 1,656 years after the creation of man. The Septuagint makes it 2,242 and the Samaritan version 1,307.

2. The Interwoven Hebrew Flood Story.

The account of the flood (Gen. vi. 9, ix. 17) is combined from two different recitals, as is seen in the repetition of the account of Noah's entry into the ark (vii. 7–9 and 13–16a). The first account, marked by the use of the divine name Yahweh, tells of God's command to Noah to enter the ark with his family, and to take with him seven of each kind of clean animals, three pairs and one for sacrifice, and one pair of each kind of unclean animals, since in seven days a forty-days' rain would be sent to destroy all life on the face of the earth. Noah obeys this command (vii. 1–5). After seven days the flood begins (verses 7–10), and lasts forty days and forty nights (verse 12). God shuts Noah in the ark (verse 16b), which is borne on the water for forty days (verse 17). After all living things outside the ark are destroyed (verses 22, 23), the rain ceases (viii. 2b, 3a). Noah sends forth the raven which does not return; then he sends a dove, which comes back, since it does not find a resting-place; seven days later he sends another dove, which returns with an olive-branch; at the end of another seven days he liberates a third dove, which does not return (viii. 6–12). Upon this, Noah uncovers the ark and sees that the earth is dry (13b); he builds an altar and makes a burnt-offering to God of the clean beasts and birds. God accepts this sacrifice and covenants that, in view of man's inborn evil, no such visitation shall again take place. This account is interwoven with another, wherein the divine name Elohim is used. Here is the command to build the ark and to place in it one pair of each kind of animals with the necessary provisions, so as to save them from the coming destruction (vi. 9–22). In Noah's six hundredth year on the seventeenth day of the second month, on which day Noah entered the ark, " were all the fountains of the great deep broken up and the windows of heaven were opened " (Gen. vii. 11). The water rises until the one hundred and fiftieth day and reaches a height of fifteen cubits above the highest mountains, so that all life perishes (vii. 6, 11, 13–16a, 17–21, 23b–24). The waters then subside and, on the seventeenth day of the seventh month, the ark rested on Mount Ararat. On the first of the tenth month, the peaks of the hills are seen; on the first of the first month of the second year, the water has left the earth, and on the twenty-seventh day of the second month, the earth is dry and Noah is commanded to leave the ark (viii. 1, 2a, 3b–5, 13a, 14–18). The account closes with the divine blessing (ix. 1); the conferring of lordship over the animal kingdom—but with the command to abstain from blood (ix. 2–4); the granting of power over the lives of those who kill their fellow men (ix. 5 sqq.) and with the promise that the deluge shall not be repeated (ix. 8–17). The two accounts are in essential agreement. The command to take three pairs of each kind of clean animals and but one of the unclean, may be merely a more exact statement, and the words (vii. 9) " they went in two and two unto Noah in the ark " may signify that there were male and female of each kind (cf. vii. 16). The distinction of clean and unclean is older than the Mosaic law and is found among non-Hebrew peoples (see DIETARY LAWS OF THE HEBREWS, §2). It is also doubtful whether the duration of the flood is differently stated; Noah can scarcely have sent forth the dove immediately at the end of the forty days' rain, since this account also states that the earth was completely covered; therefore, the flood must have lasted longer than sixty-one days (forty of rain and twenty-one of expectancy). According to the Elohistic account, the flood must have begun on the seventeenth day of the month Iyyar and ended on the twenty-seventh of the same month, in the following year.

3. Its Significance and Consequences.

The fundamental truth of this Biblical story is that beneath the present humanity another lies buried, which by its moral perversity, called upon itself a divine judgment; the deluge was universal, not in the sense that it covered all the earth's surface, but in the sense that it affected all mankind. Its extent, therefore, is limited to that part of the earth inhabited by man. The Biblical narrator thinks of Western Asia and perhaps of the Mediterranean countries: he knew nothing of the rest of the world or of mountains loftier than Ararat. Such an immense structure as the ark, 300 cubits long, 50 broad, and 30 high, must have required as long a time for its construction as is mentioned in Gen. vi. 3, especially as Noah had so few helpers. The conduct of animals under the influence of terrifying natural phenomena indicates how it was possible to bring them together in the ark. It is noteworthy that in the Jehovistic narrative appears for the first time an altar and a burnt-offering. The altar is an elevation raised up toward God, and the object of the burnt-offering is that the smoke should bear the sacrifice aloft. The visible signs of the divine presence which appear in Gen. ii, and iii. 24 have vanished and the earth is no longer God's dwelling-place. What the Elohistic accounts tell of God's words to Noah, teaches the relation of the new humanity to the world about it. The rainbow is the promise that no such catastrophe shall recur. The Jews find in Gen. ix. 1 sqq. what are called the seven commandments of Noah, namely (1) to refrain from idolatry, (2) from blasphemy, (3) from murder, (4) from adultery and, (5) from theft, (6) to practise righteousness, and (7) to eat no flesh with blood.

4. Babylonian and Hebrew Accounts Compared.

Of the various deluge legends found in all parts of the world, the most interesting, because of its striking resemblance to the Biblical recital, is the Babylonian legend in cuneiform writing, known since 1872 (see CREATION, BABYLONIAN ACCOUNTS). The account forms the eleventh canto of a great Babylonian epic the hero of which is Gilgamesh, to whom his ancestor Sitnapishtim, the Babylonian Noah, communicates the history of the deluge and of his miraculous preservation. It begins with the decision of the gods to punish mankind. The god Ea reveals the coming deluge to the hero in a dream and commands him to build a ship and rescue himself and his family therein. He obeys, builds the vessel, loads it with silver, gold and " seeds of life " of all kinds, takes in all his family and retainers, as well as the cattle and beasts of the field, and then closes the door of the vessel, on a sign agreed upon with the divinity. Now begins the deluge, so violent that the very gods are terrified. The storm lasts six days and six nights; on the seventh day, there is a respite—the ship steers toward the land of Nisir and is stranded on a mountain there. On the seventh day after this, the hero sends forth a dove, which, however, returns; a swallow also comes back, but a raven remains outside. Thereupon, he lets (all) go to the four winds, erects an altar on the top of the mountain and offers a sacrifice, the odor of which is greedily inhaled by the gods. Only the god Bel is wrathful that his intention to destroy all mankind has been frustrated; he is, however, pacified by Ea. Upon this, Bel enters the ship, blesses Sitnapishtim and his wife and declares that both, from this time, shall be reckoned among the gods, and that Sitnapishtim shall live afar off at the mouth of the stream. " Thither they bore me," says Sitnapishtim, " and in a far-off place at the mouth of the river, they set me down." This recital closely resembles that of the Bible both in the Elohistic and in the Jehovistic version. In the Babylonian tale, however, the ethical idea is not prominent, while the Biblical account is distinguished by its sternly moral quality. The cuneiform recital is also narrowly Babylonian in its geography, while the Biblical account treats of localities outside of Israel. The land of Nisir in the Babylonian recital may be sought farther south in the region east of the Tigris, beyond the lower Zab. How can the similarities of the two accounts be explained? The hypothesis that both the Biblical versions were first written during the Exile with a knowledge of the Babylonian legend, is untenable. For the Jehovistic writing is unquestionably pre-exilic and even if the priest codex which contains the Elohistic account was edited during the Exile, it must be conceded that its pictures of primitive times are not invented, but drawn from older sources. The hypothesis must also be rejected that the account was transmitted to Palestine about the middle of the second millennium B.C. With all their resemblances, the two accounts differ fundamentally, both in spirit and substance, and it should therefore be assumed that they represent two independent traditions of the same event —the Biblical recital having been brought into Palestine by the Hebrews in their migration from the East.

[Prof. Hermann Vollrat Hilprecht of the Univer-

5. A New Tablet.

sity of Pennsylvania has communicated what he regards as a new version of the Babylonian deluge story (*Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, series D., vol. v., fasc. 1: *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, Philadelphia, 1910). The text is on a tablet of unbaked clay, is 2⅜ inches long and 2¾ inches wide, is by Dr. Hilprecht dated between 2137 and 2005 B.C., and was found in what he calls "Tablet Hill" at Nippur. The writing on one side is entirely lost, on the other there are remains of fourteen lines, no one of which, however, is complete. Provisional restoration and, upon that basis, translation of the text is furnished by the discoverer as given below, also by Prof. Fritz Hommel of Munich. As thus made out, the fragment is in closer accord with the Biblical account (Gen. vi–viii.) than anything thus far known from Babylonian sources. The question of date, and of the restoration and translations proposed are not settled, there being a disposition among Assyriologists to regard the conclusions reached as at least subject to revision.

Hilprecht's translation is as follows:

1 ....thee,
2 [the confines of heaven and earth] I will loosen,
3 [a deluge I will make, and] it shall sweep away all men together;
4 [but seek thou lif]e before the deluge cometh forth;
5 [for over all living beings], as many as there are, I will bring overthrow, destruction, annihilation.
6 ....build a great ship and
7 ....total height shall be its structure.
8 ....it shall be a houseboat carrying what has been saved of life.
9 ....with a strong deck cover (it).
10 ....[The ship] which thou shalt make,
11 ....[into it bri]ng the beast of the field, the bird of the heavens,
12 ....[and the creeping things, two of everything] instead of a number,
13 ....and the family....
14 ....and(?)....

Hommel's rendering is as follows:

2 [The springs of the deep] will I open,
3 [A flood will I send], which will affect all mankind at once.
4 [But seek thou deliverance], before the flood breaks forth,
5 [for over all living beings], however many they are, will I bring annihilation, destruction, and ruin.
6 [Take wood and pitch] and build a large ship!
7 [....cubits] be its complete height.
8 ....a houseboat shall it be, containing those who preserve their life.
9 ....with a strong roofing cover it.
10 [....the ship] which thou makest,
11 [take into it....] the animals of the field, the birds of the air
12 [and the reptiles, two of each] instead of their (whole) number,
13 ....and the family of the....

G. W. G.]

6. The Narrative in Relation to History.

The Jehovistic passage, ix. 18–27, reports that Noah planted a vineyard (ix. 20) after the flood; wine is a product of the ground as changed by the waters. Overcome by indulgence in this unknown beverage, he is derided by his son Ham; the other sons show filial piety. This difference in the behavior of his sons determines the curse and the blessing that Noah pronounces: what Ham has done to his father Ham's younger son Canaan will do to him. The blessing bestowed on Shem takes the form of thanks to Yahweh, Shem's god, for the gift of such a son. The use of this divine name signifies that the descendants of Shem will stand in a peculiarly intimate relation to Yahweh. After the words "God shall enlarge Japheth," a corresponding distinction for Shem should be expected and God is best taken as the subject of the following verb, giving the reading: "God shall dwell in the tents of Shem"—Japheth's blessing gives him the wide earth for his domain, but if he wish to see how God comes to man, he must look toward Shem. This distinction presupposes a separation of races, and Gen. xi. explains how this came to pass. History fulfilled the words of the patriarch: Canaan was rooted out by Israel; the Persians, Macedonians, and Romans of Japheth's race conquered the Phenicians of Canaan's progeny and the Egyptians, while the Semitic races either shared the same fate or, like the Africans of to-day, groan under the yoke of slavery. Another view regards these verses as containing a personification of the races of a later time, as a *vaticinium ex eventu;* in this case, however, it would be difficult to understand why the hatred of the Israelites against Canaanites should find an expression in a recital of Ham's misbehavior. According to the Masoretic text, the flood occurred in the year of the world 1656. This chronology is disputed. Where the Bible counts 4000 years from the creation to the time of Christ, Assyriologists and Egyptologists believe they can show that, about the beginning of the fourth millennium B.C., a developed civilization existed in Egypt and Babylonia. In the Biblical narrative, but 365 years intervene between the deluge and Abraham's migration to Canaan, a period insufficient to explain the growth of complicated conditions. It is therefore asserted that this period must be extended. But difficulties intervene. The genealogies and figures are definitely ordered. May not some arbitrary system have been employed? Since 2666 years are said to have elapsed from the creation to the Exodus and this figure is two-thirds of 4000, the number 1656 has been regarded as originating in a system wherein 4000 years are supposed to elapse before the coming of the Messiah. In this connection it may be noted that in Matt. i., a like number of names are given for each of the three periods into which the genealogy is divided. It has also been conjectured that the long lives of the patriarchs signify epochs of antediluvian history, designated by their chief representatives. See TIME, BIBLICAL RECKONING OF.

Ezek. xiv. 14 names Daniel and Job with Noah as just men in the midst of a perverse generation. The New Testament alludes to Noah and the flood (Matt. xxiv. 37 sqq.; I Peter iii. 20; II Peter ii. 5, iii. 6; Heb. xi. 7). Noah appears here as an "heir of the righteousness which is by faith" who saves his family from destruction and is therefore a "preacher of righteousness." (W. VOLCK†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Above all should be consulted the latest commentaries on Genesis; much of the literature under the articles ASSYRIA; BABYLONIA; CREATION, BABYLONIAN ACCOUNTS; and NIMROD contain discussions pertinent to part of the text. The recent extended discus-

sion in Germany over *Bibel und Babel* is rich in material on both sides. Consult further: T. Nöldeke, in *Im Neuen Reiche*, 1872, pp. 247–259; K. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, Giessen, 1883; E. Süss, *Die Sintfluth*, Leipsic, 1883; R. Andree, *Die Flutsagen*, Brunswick, 1891; H. E. Ryle, *Early Narratives of Genesis*, London, 1892 (a very useful book, with which should be used A. R. Gordon, below); J. Prestwich, *On Certain Phenomena Belonging to the Close of the Last Geological Period, and on their Bearing upon the Tradition of the Flood*, ib. 1895; T. Pfeil, *Bemerkungen zum biblischen Fluthbericht*, pp. 10 sqq., Dorpat, 1895; L. Duparc, *Le Déluge biblique*, Paris, 1898; M. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 493–508, Boston, 1898; idem, in *ZA*, 1899, pp. 288–301; H. G. Mitchell, *The World before Abraham*, pp. 84–90, 194–227, Boston, 1901; P. Carus, in *The Monist*, July, 1901; G. F. Wright, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April–July, 1901; idem, in *McClure's Magazine*, Aug., Sept., 1901; H. Zimmern, *Biblische und babylonische Urgeschichte*, pp. 32 sqq., Leipsic, 1903; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1661–67; A. Jeremias, *Das A. T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, Leipsic, 1906; P. Jensen, *Das Gilgameshepos in der Weltliteratur*, vol. i., Strasburg, 1906; A. R. Gordon, *The Early Traditions of Genesis*, Edinburgh, 1907 (profound and scholarly; contains transls. of Berosus and Babylonian documents); *Expository Times*, May, 1910, pp. 364–369; Schrader, pp. 545 sqq.; *DB*, ii. 16–23; *EB*, i. 1055–66; *JE*, v. 410–415.

NOAILLES, nō″ɑi′, **LOUIS ANTOINE DE:** Cardinal archbishop of Paris, second son of the Duke de Noailles; b. at the castle of Teisières, near Aurillac (269 m. s. of Paris), May 27, 1651; d. at Paris May 4, 1729. He was early destined for an ecclesiastical career. After holding the rich abbey of Aubrac, he became bishop of Cahors in 1679 and of Châlons in 1680, while in 1695 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Paris. On the outbreak of the Quietistic controversy he acted as mediator between Bossuet and Fénélon. In 1700, on Louis XIV.'s nomination, he was made a cardinal. While bishop of Châlons he had sanctioned the *Réflexions morales* with which Quesnel accompanied his edition of the New Testament in 1693; and this afterward embarrassed him, all the more when in 1696, by the condemnation of the *Exposition de la foi*, a Jansenistic treatise of the Abbé de Barcos, he seemed to take an opposite ground. When pressure was put upon him to revoke his approval of the *Réflexions morales* he hesitated a long time. Finally he joined the bishops who protested against the bull *Unigenitus* (q.v.) and encouraged open opposition to it in his diocese. For a good while he was the leader of the party friendly to the Jansenists, but weakened later, agreed to a compromise in 1720, and on Oct. 11, 1728, submitted unreservedly to the *Unigenitus*, dying a broken man a few months later. See JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM.

(K. KLÜPFEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. B. Denis, *Mémoires anecdotes de la cour et du clergé de France*, London, 1712; *A True Account of All that has Passed between the Court of Rome and Cardinal de Noailles in Relation to the Constitution* (*Unigenitus*), ib. 1828; *Anecdotes ou mémoires secrets sur la constitution Unigenitus*, Utrecht, 1730; L. F. de Bausset, *Hist. de Fénelon*, Paris, 1808, Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1810; A. Schill, *Die Constitution Unigenitus*, Freiburg, 1876; Reich, *Documents*, pp. 386 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 406–414.

NOBLE, SAMUEL: Swedenborgian; b. in London Mar. 4, 1779; d. there Aug. 27, 1853. In 1810 he was one of the founders of the London society for publishing the works of Swedenborg, and, in 1812, of *The Intellectual Repository and New Jerusalem Magazine*, being its chief editor and contributor. In 1820 he left his profession of engraving to enter the Swedenborgian ministry in London. He issued two noticeable original books, issued as lectures: *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures Asserted* (London, 1825); and *An Appeal in Behalf of the Doctrines of the Eternal World and State, and of the Doctrines . . . held by the Body of Christians* . . . (1826); a translation of Swedenborg's *Heaven and Hell;* and other works expository of Swedenborgian doctrine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Memoir* by W. Bruce affixed to the 3d and later editions of the *Appeal; DNB*, xli., 84–85.

NOCELLA, nō-chel′ɑ, **CARLO:** Cardinal; b. at Rome Nov. 26, 1826; d. there July 22, 1908. He was educated at the Roman Seminary, where he taught until 1866, after which he was sub-secretary of briefs until 1884. He was then appointed prothonotary and was secretary of briefs to persons of royal ranks until 1892, and after being consistorial secretary for seven years (1892–99), was consecrated titular patriarch of Constantinople. In 1903 he was created cardinal priest of San Calisto.

NOCTURN. See BREVIARY; CANONICAL HOURS; LITURGY.

NOEL, BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY: English Baptist, brother of the first earl of Gainsborough; b. at Leightmount, Scotland, July 16, 1798; d. at Stanmore (11 m. n.w. of St. Paul's, London) Jan. 19, 1873. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge (M.A., 1821); began the study of law, but changed his intention, took orders, and became minister of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, London. There he manifested an interest in home and foreign missions, in elementary education, in the welfare of the poor as affected by the Corn Laws, and in the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.). The issue of the Gorham Case (q.v.), together with his Evangelicalism, caused him to change his ecclesiastical affiliations, and he was rebaptized by immersion, Aug. 9, 1849. He became minister of John Street Chapel the following September, remaining there till his retirement in 1868. His publications were numerous, some of them controversial, some notes of travel, and numerous sermons and lectures. Among them may be noted: *A Plea for the Poor* (London, 1841; on the Corn Laws); *Doctrine of the Word of God respecting Union among Christians* (1844); *Essay on the Union of Church and State* (1848); *The Messiah* (1848; five sermons); *Notes of a Tour in Switzerland* (1848); *Essay on Christian Baptism* (1849); and *Notes of a Tour in the Valleys of Piedmont* (1855). He was also a writer of hymns—" We give ourselves to thee " is by him—and compiled *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns for Congregational and Social Worship* (1838), and *Hymns about Jesus* (1868).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xli. 81–90; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 809.

NOELDEKE, nōl′de-ke, **THEODOR:** German Orientalist; b. at Harburg (6 m. s. of Hamburg), Prussia, Mar. 2, 1836. He studied at the universities of Göttingen, Vienna, Leyden, and Berlin, became privat-docent at Göttingen in 1861, associate professor of theology at Kiel in 1864, and full professor in 1868. From 1872 until his retirement in 1906 he was professor of Semitic philology at the University of Strasburg. He is one of the most distinguished of living Semitic scholars, and has written:

Geschichte des Qorâns (Göttingen, 1860); *Das Leben Muhammed's* (Hanover, 1863); *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der alten Araber* (1864); *Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan* (Leipsic, 1868); *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur* (1868); *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel, 1869); *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle, 1874); *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (Leipsic, 1880); *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte* (1887); *Die semitischen Sprachen* (1887); *Orientalische Skizzen* (Berlin, 1892; Eng. transl., *Sketches from Eastern History*, London, 1892); *Das altiranische Nationalepos* (Strasburg, 1896); *Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch* (Vienna, 1896); and *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasburg, 1904). He has likewise edited a portion of the "Annals" of al-Tabari and translated a part of his writings under the title *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden* (Leyden, 1879), and has also edited and translated the Arabic poems of 'Urva ibn Alvard (Göttingen, 1863); *Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum* (in collaboration with A. Müller; Berlin, 1890); and the five Mu'allaqat (3 parts, Vienna, 1899–1901).

Bibliography: *Orientalische Studien. Theodor Nöldeke zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet . . . .*, ed. C. Bezold, 2 vols., Giessen, 1906 (a *Festgruss*).

NOERDLINGEN, HEINRICH VON. See Henry of Noerdlingen.

NOESGEN, nʊs′gen, **KARL FRIEDRICH:** German Lutheran; b. at Halberstadt (28 m. s.e. of Magdeburg) Mar. 31, 1835. He studied at the universities of Halle and Berlin (1854–57), after which he was vicar at Schloppe, West Prussia (1859–61), prison-chaplain at Graudenz, West Prussia (1861–73), and pastor at Klein Furra, Saxony (1873–83). Since 1883 he has been professor of New-Testament exegesis at the University of Rostock. He has been a member of the committee for theological examinations in Mecklenburg-Schwerin since 1888, a member of the higher ecclesiastical court of Mecklenburg-Strelitz since 1893, and a consistorial counselor since 1901. In theology he is an orthodox Lutheran. He has written: *Christus der Menschen- und Gottessohn* (Gotha, 1869); *Kommentar über die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1882); *Die Evangelien nach Matthäus, Markus und Lukas* in H. Strack and O. Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zum Neuen Testamente* (Munich, 1886); *Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Offenbarung* (2 vols., 1891–93); *Die Genugsamkeit und Vielseitigkeit des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Gütersloh, 1896); *Symbolik oder confessionelle Principienlehre* (1897); *Die Aussagen des Neuen Testaments über den Pentateuch* (Berlin, 1898; Eng. transl., *The New Testament and the Pentateuch*, London, 1902); *Geschichte der Lehre vom heiligen Geist* (Gütersloh, 1899); *Der Schriftbeweis für die evangelische Rechtfertigungslehre* (Halle, 1901); *Das Eigenartige des Christentum als Religion* (1902); *Das Wesen und Wirken des heiligen Geistes* (2 vols., Berlin, 1905–07); and *Die Liebe, ein unmittelbares Moment des christlichen Seelenlebens, Eine biblisch-theologische Erörterung* (Schwerin, 1906).

NOESSELT, nüs′selt, **JOHANN AUGUST:** German theologian; b. at Halle May 2, 1734; d. there March 11, 1807. He studied at the University of Halle, where he became privat-docent in 1757, extraordinary professor in 1760, and full professor of theology in 1764. He published: *Vertheidigung der Wahrheit und Göttlichkeit der christlichen Religion* (Halle, 1766; 3d ed., 1783); and *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen* (2 vols., 1785).

Bibliography: A biography was written by A. H. Niemeyer, 2 parts, Halle, 1809.

NOETUS. See Monarchianism, V., 3.

NOLASCO, nō″lās″cō′, **SAINT PETER:** Founder of the Order of Mercy (in full, "of our Lady of Mercy for the Redemption of Captives"); b. at Le Mas des Saintes Puelles, near Castelnaudery in Languedoc, 1189; d. at Valencia Dec. 24, 1256. He early showed an inclination to a strict ascetic life, but for a time followed the knightly career to which his noble birth seemed to have destined him, following Simon de Montfort in his campaigns against the Albigenses and their supporter Peter II. of Aragon. After the great victory of Muret (1213), in which Peter fell and his son James was taken prisoner, Count Simon entrusted him with the guardianship of the young prince. In Barcelona, where he spent some time in the execution of this duty, he saw and heard much of the sufferings of Christian captives in the hands of the Moors in North Africa and Spain. He decided to found an order for their deliverance; and a vision of the Virgin which appeared on the same night to him, to his confessor Raymond of Peñaforte, and to the young King James, seemed a sure sign of the divine favor. On Aug. 10, 1228, Peter and the associates whom he had secured took the three usual monastic vows, and a fourth pledging them to give up not only all their property but if necessary their own liberty for the redemption of Christian captives in the hands of the infidels. The order was originally more knightly than monastic; it was in a sense a revival of a congregation which had existed in Catalonia since 1192 for the care of the sick and prisoners. The seven knights and six priests who were the first to take the vows were joined by thirteen more knights from Peter's home in the south of France. King James gave them as a dwelling a portion of the royal palace at Barcelona with the adjoining chapel of St. Eulalia, until in 1232 a large convent, also dedicated to St. Eulalia, patroness of Barcelona, was erected for them. The papal confirmation was secured in 1230 from Gregory IX., and repeated in 1235, with the addition of the rule of St. Augustine to the original constitution. The first general chapter was held at Barcelona in 1237. Though it was then laid down that the priestly members should be in the majority, the process of changing it from a knightly to a monastic order was not completed until the election in 1317 of the first priestly general, Raymond Albert. The original habit was white, bearing the arms of Aragon, with a white scapular; inside the house the priests were distinguished by an additional hood. The discipline of the order was one of military strictness, including frequent flagellation.

The new order grew in membership, possessions, and influence. Instead of sending money, the plan was soon adopted of despatching members to Moorish territory who should seek out oppressed Christians. The founder, with one companion, undertook the first mission of this kind, liberating as many as four hundred captives in Valencia and Granada. His chief assistant was Raymond Nonatus, who, after suffering grievous tortures in Algiers and winning the name of a miracle-worker and seer, was made a cardinal by Gregory IX., but died on his way to Rome in 1240. Peter now made a journey to Africa, but returned after many perils to Spain, where, as well as in Southern France, he labored for some time to build up the order. In 1249 age and infirmity determined him to resign the generalship. He was canonized by Urban VIII. in 1628. The order continued to possess considerable importance in Spain until it lost the greater part of its possessions there in the revolution of 1820. It had a large membership also in Southern France, Italy, Sicily, and Spanish America. At present it is divided into four European and six American provinces, with about 450 members. The general has resided in Rome since the revolutionary movement drove him from Madrid in 1835. A female branch established by Antonio Belasco in 1568 is now almost extinct. A third order was founded at Barcelona in 1265, but never attained much importance. An attempt was made about 1600 to establish a reformed or discalced branch after the analogy of the Carmelites and Franciscans; Gregory XV. confirmed it as a separate congregation in 1621, and before long it numbered twenty houses. In 1725 Benedict XIII. formally recognized the whole order as belonging to the class of mendicant orders and entitled to all their indults and privileges.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Lives of Nolasco are found in *ASB*, Jan., ii. 981–990; by Estevan de los Morales, Valladolid, 1629; in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xix. 5–9; in P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, iii. 1, pp. 236–239; and in *KL*, ix. 1927. Literature on the order is given in M. Gmelin, *Die Litteratur zur Geschichte der Orden S. Trinitatis . . .* , Carlsruhe, 1870; Gari y Siumell, *Bibliotheca Mercedaria*, Barcelona, 1875; and by Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 212–218. Consult also: H. de Grammont, in *Revue historique*, vols. xxv.–xxvii.; C. A. Kneller, in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, li. 272 sqq., 357 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 1927 sqq.

NOMINALISM. See Scholasticism.

NOMINATIO REGIA: The right of the sovereign to nominate to an ecclesiastical position. As early as the fifth century (the Merovingian period) the Frankish kings exerted a potent influence in the filling of the episcopal seats, while under the Carolingians and German emperors this developed into a veritable right of nomination, so that only in a few bishoprics were the ancient electoral rights of the clergy and people preserved, and this solely by special imperial privileges. It was not until the concordat of Worms, in 1122, which ended the dispute regarding Investiture (q.v.), that the ancient electoral rights of the German bishoprics were reestablished, the emperor merely retaining the privilege of being present at the election and of according to the elected bishop the investiture, before his consecration. Contrary to this rule, however, the popes, who in the mean time had attained a decisive influence in the filling of the episcopal seats, granted to many princes the right to nominate the bishops in their own lands, partly by means of concordats and partly by special indult (concession). At present this so-called *nominatio regia* exists (with few exceptions) in Austria, Bavaria, and (until the recent separation of Church and State) also in France, as well as in the Roman Catholic states of Central and South America. It, like the election by the cathedral chapter, constitutes merely a presentation, although it involves a consideration of the requisite canonical qualifications, and the nominee acquires the right to administer the episcopal jurisdiction only through the papal confirmation, which in this case is called *institutio canonica*. E. Sehling.

NOMINATION, RIGHT OF ALTERNATIVE (*Jus variandi*). The right of a lay Roman Catholic patron in Germany and Austria to bring forward another candidate for nomination by the properly authorized superior ecclesiastic, within the legal limit of time following a prior nomination. The ecclesiastical patron is not permitted to exercise this right, and only in a case where he has unwittingly nominated an improper person is he allowed a fresh nomination. The superior ecclesiastic has the privilege of selecting from among the candidates the one that he shall consider the most suitable (so-called cumulative alternative).

It is questioned whether the patron has the right of multiple nomination. The common law does not contain any decision thereupon. It does not interfere with ecclesiastical interests; on the contrary, it favors them, inasmuch as it allows the bishop a greater number of persons to choose from, and hence the canonists are in favor of multiple alternation, rather than against it. E. Sehling.

NOMOCANONS: The name given in the Eastern Church to ecclesiastical rules. *Nomoi*, on the other hand, designates secular and especially imperial laws. The Greek canons were at first arranged chronologically, in special collections, but were later disposed systematically for practical convenience, under fifty titles, among others by Johannes Scholasticus. The secular regulations and rules were also assembled in various collections, partly official and partly private, especially in the codex of Justinian, the collection of *Novellæ*, later in the Basilicans. With the great number of imperial regulations, the necessity soon became apparent of making a special collection of those concerning ecclesiastical matters. Soon after the death of Justinian a systematical arrangement and combination was begun of both canons and those *nomoi* which concerned ecclesiastical affairs and the name Nomocanon was used for this collection. Not long after the death of Johannes Scholasticus, such a collection was made from his codification in fifty chapters, from the above-mentioned selection of *Novellæ* in eighty-seven chapters, and from other sources, and this was later elaborated, augmented, and perfected. Of much greater importance and diffusion was another nomocanon of fourteen titles, which was for a long time ascribed to the patriarch Photius. The original collection belongs to the seventh century. In 883, the work was completed, but not by Photius, to whom it was ascribed in accordance with a statement of Balsamon. At the great Synod of Constantinople 920, it was declared binding for the whole church. In the eleventh century, this nomocanon was again revised and augmented. The most important commentary on the nomocanon was composed by Theodore Balsamon, between 1169 and 1177. Although this nomocanon stood in high regard and was spread far and wide, the necessity was soon felt for a more convenient arrangement of the contents; the *Syntagma*, by Mattheus Blastares, in 1335, answered this requirement, and it may be counted among the nomocanons, although it does not bear that name. It consists of 303 titles which are arranged alphabetically, according to the substantives of their rubrics; as a rule first come the canonical regulations and after these the *nomoi;* however, under some titles, there are only *kanones*, under others, only *nomoi*. This work (printed in W. Beveridge, *Synodicon*, vol. ii., part ii., Oxford, 1672) has been widely circulated in the orient and was, with the nomocanon of fourteen titles, the general handbook of the clergy. The large number of manuscripts, even of recent times, proves that both works preserved their reputation among the Greeks even under the Turkish rule. Another nomocanon was much in use according to numerous existing copies; this was compiled in 1561 by Manuel Malaxos, a notary of Thebes.

In the Russian Church there is in use, even down to modern times, a frequently published collection, employed also in the secular courts and bearing the name *Kormitshaia Kniga*, " Book for the Steersman "; among other regulations it contains also a nomocanon of fourteen titles. The first compilation of this collection is to be referred to the labors of the Servian Archbishop Sava, of the beginning of the thirteenth century. From Servia the collection went to Bulgaria, and thence to Russia at the request of the Metropolitan Cyril II., where it was recognized as an official collection in a synod held at Wladimir in 1274. In 1630 it appeared for the first time in print.

Besides the *Kormitshaia*, use was made in the Servian Church of the alphabetical *Syntagma* of Blastares, and this is employed also in Bulgaria. In Russia, in the nineteenth century, a further collection was formed known as the *Kniga pravil;* this was used in connection with the *Kormitshaia*, and in Servia, in addition to the latter, a private edition is used, the *Zbornik* (Zara, 1884; 2d ed., Neusatz, 1886), which contains also the nomocanon of fourteen titles.

In Moldavia as well as in Wallachia, these old collections were formerly in general use, especially the *Syntagma* of Blastares, until, in the first part of the seventeenth century, the Moldavians formed their own canonical codification in their own language. The first of these (1632) is a translation of the nomocanon of Manuel Malaxos. Another codification appeared in 1652, and is called *Pravila cea mare* or *Indreptarea legji*. This collection, of which Peter Dobra, 1772, made a Latin translation, constituted the official collection of the Greco-Oriental Rumanian Church.

Besides the above-mentioned works there are many collections under the names *Nomocanones*, *Kanonaria*, *Nomima*, which contain canons only, and not, as do the above, both canonical and secular rules. To the former belong, among others, the *Nomocanon Doxopatris* and the collection of Nicodemus and Agapius (1793) called *Pedalion*, " The Rudder," which at the present time forms the collection in official use in the Oriental Church. (E. SEHLING.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. B. Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Græcorum historia et monumenta*, ii. 368 sqq., 416 sqq., 2 vols., Rome, 1864–68; G. Voellus and H. Justel, *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*, ii. 603–660, Paris, 1661; C. E. Zachariä, *Historiæ juris Græco-Romani delineatio*, Heidelberg, 1839; J. Hergenröther, in *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, new series, xvii (1870), 208 sqq.; N. Milas, *Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche*, p. 173, Zara, 1897.

NON-ADORANTS. See DAVIDIS, FRANCISCUS, §§ 4–5.

NON-CONFORMISTS: A term applied to the 2,000 clergymen who, in 1662, after the Restoration, left the Church of England rather than submit to the Act of Uniformity (q.v.) which required assent to the Book of Common Prayer. Later it came to apply to the Protestant dissenters and in general to those who at any period in English history, since the establishment of Protestantism, have refused to conform to the doctrines and practises of the established Church. In the place of Puritanism before the Restoration now came, after the Restoration, political non-conformity, which has its seat principally among the middle or lower-middle classes, the yeomanry of former times. The Act of Uniformity was followed by other repressive measures: in 1664, the Conventicle Act (q.v.) declaring it 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 assembled; in 1665, the Five-Mile Act (q.v.) intended to banish the ministers from their friends; and, in 1673, the Test Act (q.v.), incapacitating 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.

In an effort to unite the opposition to the established Church, the Roman Catholic King James II. suspended, by a Declaration of Liberty of Conscience in 1687, the execution of all penal laws in ecclesiastical matters and all tests and oaths. As a result ministers were released from jails and restored. The Toleration Act of 1689, under William III., secured to Protestant dissenters a legal existence together with freedom of worship and government under the condition of self-support. This act did not repeal the penal statutes, which were, however, no longer enforced. The benefits conferred by it were much curtailed by the Occasional Communion Act, at the accession of Queen Anne, which excluded from civil office those non-conformists who had qualified under the Test Act (q.v.); and by the Schism Bill, which restricted the work of education to certificated churchmen. These restrictions were removed under George III., and the Test Act was repealed in 1743. The non-conformists have since enjoyed religious liberty, but the agitation has continued, having for its end ecclesiastical disestablishment. In 1836, the dissenters were allowed marriage by their own ministers and rites, and the tithes were commuted into rent charges, though in the latter form they are yet a source of bitter offense. Registration of births, deaths, and marriages was transferred from Church to State and a charter given to the free University of London, imposing no religious tests. Along educational lines, the great universities were thrown open to young non-conformists in 1871, and a system of state schools established which rendered non-conformists independent of the established Church for primary education; and their latest agitation was the unsuccessful Education Bill in 1906, providing for optional religious education in all state schools. In 1880 non-conformists secured the enactment of the Burial Laws Amendment by virtue of which dissenting ministers may conduct funerals in churchyards and in the consecrated parts of cemeteries, but the customary fees must still be paid to the clergy of the established Church. Though divided by distinctions of sect, yet as a compact, aggressive body, they hold the balance of power, outnumber the adherents of the Church of England, and stand as the representatives of liberality in doctrine as well as in polity. The chief organization through which non-conformity is to work cooperatively for the promotion of dissenters' rights and religious liberty are the "General Body of Protestant Ministers of the Three Denominations" (Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist) constituted in 1727 and still meeting annually; the "Liberation Society"; and the "Free Church Council." See LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature under CONGREGATIONALISTS; PURITANS; and LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS, is pertinent; A. S. Dyer, *Sketches of English Nonconformity*, London, 1881; T. Price, *Hist. of Protestant Nonconformity in England*, 2 vols., London, 1836–38; J. A. James, *Protestant Nonconformity*, ib., 1849; T. Coleman, *The 2,000 Confessors of 1662*, ib., 1860; idem, *The English Confessors after the Reformation to the Days of the Commonwealth*, ib., 1862; R. Vaughan, *English Nonconformity*, ib., 1862; T. Rees, *Protestant Nonconformity in Wales*, ib., 1883; J. Hammond, *English Nonconformity*, ib., 1893; C. S. Horne, *Nonconformity in the 19th Century*, ib., 1905.

NON-JURORS: The name originally applied to those members of the Church of England who refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689, on the ground that they were bound by their oaths to James II. Their number included the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of Bath and Wells, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich, Peterborough, and Worcester, and about 400 of the clergy. Five bishops were deprived of their sees in 1691, having died in the mean time. The name came to apply to the separate organization which was formed, congregations belonging to which continued to exist until the death of the last bishop, Boothe, in 1805, though the importance of the movement ceased with the death of Bishop Hickes in 1715. 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Lathbury, *Hist. of the Nonjurors*, London, 1862; J. Cosin, *The Names of the . . . Nonjurors . . . , their Places of Abode; the Parishes where their Lands lay, . . . ,* ed. E. E. Estcourt and J. O. Payne, London, 1885; Miss A. Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops Imprisoned in 1688*, London, 1866; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, chap. xiii., London, 1903; J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors, Their Lives, Principles and Writings*, ib., 1902; and the literature under KEN, THOMAS; LAW, WILLIAM; SANCROFT, WILLIAM.

NON-RESIDENCE: The term applied to the absenteeism of a cleric from his sphere of duty, while he enjoys the emoluments though his duties are performed by a deputy or substitute. In an early period the cause of non-residence seems to have been the pursuit of ambitious schemes or of personal interests; afterward the usual cause was plurality of offices in the same person's possession. The matter was dealt with in synods and councils from Sardica (344) to Trent (1545-63). The older legislation sought to suppress the evil by limiting the term during which a bishop was allowed to be absent from his see. The Council of Trent adopted amore effective measure, forfeiture of revenues. In the Church of England, non-residence caused by plurality of offices was at times very frequent. The legislation in 1 and 2 Vict., cap. 106, treats the question in a way similar to that of the Council of Trent.

NONE: The service for the ninth hour in the Breviary (q.v.), recited normally at 3 P.M., though frequently earlier, even before the community mass in monastic houses during Lent. Its structure is the same as that of Terce and Sext (qq.v.).

NONNA: Wife of Gregory Nazianzen. See GREGORY NAZIANZEN.

NONNOS, nū'nōs, OF PANOPOLIS: A Greek poet of Upper Egypt who flourished c. 400. He is mentioned by Agathias (*Hist.*, iv. 23; ed. B. G. Niebuhr in *CSHB*, p. 257, Bonn, 1828) as the author of the *Dionysiaka* and by Eudocia in the *Violarium* (ed. J. Flach, p. 514, no. 725, Leipsic, 1880) as the author of an epic "Paraphrase of the Gospel of John." Both of these works have been preserved. It has been suggested by Dräseke that the two poems were not by the same author, but the similarity of style and the prosody seem to support the traditional view. The date of Nonnos is uncertain, but the style of his poems points to the beginning of the fifth century. A Nonnos is mentioned as the father of Sosena of Synesius (*Epist.*, xliii., p. 181 of Paris ed., 1631) which would place him in the same period. He seems to have been converted to Christianity after writing the *Dionysiaka* which contains heathen ideas. The Paraphrase shows a decline in imaginative power and prosodic strictness. It has not come down entire, a lacuna of some fifty verses occurring in all known manuscripts. The surviving work consists of about 3,750 hexameters, divided in the printed editions into twenty-one chapters to correspond with the chapter divisions of the Gospel. The poet follows the course of the Gospel sentence by sentence, so that it is often easy to tell what words of the original he has preserved in his rendering. He supplements the simple account of the Evangelist with fancies of his own, not always in the best taste.

The first printed edition of Nonnos is an Aldine of the year 1501. It may be found in the university library at Leipsic and at Vienna. The Aldine text was copied in numerous editions. The edition by

Secerius (Hagenau, 1527) is prefaced with a letter by Melanchthon to the Abbot Friedrich of St. Aegidien at Nuremberg commending the "very learned poems of Nonnos on John's Gospel in place of many a prolix commentary." The latest and best edition is that of A. Scheindler (Leipsic, 1881). Of especial value is the "Paraphrase" toward the reconstruction of the text of the Johannine Gospel. Hermann Köchly, foremost in the use of the Paraphrase for textual criticism, is of the opinion that Nonnos had a briefer text of the Gospel than those now critically studied by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Buttmann—and is inclined to regard that as the original (*Opuscula philologica*, vol. i., *Opuscula Latina*, ed. G. Kinkel, pp. 421–426, Leipsic, 1881). Scheindler, in the main, accepted Köchly's views, though not in all details. Lately Friedrich Blass (in his edition of John's Gospel, Leipsic, 1902) and Ralph Janssen have gone into the subject. Blass is of the opinion that the text which Nonnos used agreed in many points with codex *Syrus Sinaiticus*, with codex D., the Latin witnesses, and with Chrysostom. Janssen has issued *Das Johannes-Evangelium, nach der Paraphrase des Nonnos Panopolitanus mit einem ausführlichen kritischen Apparat* (Leipsic, 1903), which is an attempt to reproduce the original text of the Fourth Gospel from Nonnos. Both Blass and Janssen agree upon the fact of a shorter original text of the Gospel, having obtained additional evidence unknown to Köchly.

(CARL BERTHEAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, viii. 601–612, Hamburg, 1802; A. Pauly, *Real-Encyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften*, v. 692 sqq., Stuttgart, 1848; G. Bernhardy, *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 45, 374 sqq., 393–394, Halle, 1867; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 10, 655.

NOPH, nof: A city of Egypt, mentioned by several prophets (Isa. xix. 13; Jer. ii. 16, xliv. 1, xlvi.14, 19; Ezek. xxx. 13, 16) of the eighth to the sixth centuries. It is in the Septuagint correctly identified with Memphis. The name is a corruption from the Egyptian name of the town *Men-nufer*, *Menfer*, (Coptic *Menfe*, in the cuneiform inscriptions, *Mempi*). The ruins of Noph at Memphis are located on the western bank of the Nile, somewhat south of Cairo, in the neighborhood of the villages Mitrahine and Bedraschên. Here are also the ruins of the chief temple of Noph which was consecrated to the local god Ptah. According to tradition, the town was founded by the first historical king, Menes, and was influential under the old kingdom (third millennium B.C.). Even at the time of Augustus, Memphis was yet a large and populous town, but seems to have lost its importance in the Byzantine period and to have decayed completely after the foundation of Cairo under the Arabic rule. (G. STEINDORFF.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Ægypten*, ii. 1, 6 parts, Berlin, 1849–59; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, ii. 324–326, London, 1878 (gives history); A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, ib., 1894.

NORBERT, NORBERTINES. See PRÆMONSTRATENSIANS.

NORRIS, JOHN: English clergyman, usually mentioned in connection with the Cambridge Platonists (q.v.); b. at Collingbourne-Kingston (14 m. n.e. of Salisbury), Wiltshire, 1657; d. at Bemerton (2 m. w.n.w. of Salisbury), Wiltshire, 1711. He was educated at Winchester School and Exeter College, Oxford (B.A., 1680), and was later appointed a fellow of All Souls' (M.A., 1684). From 1692 until his death he was rector of Bemerton, the parish earlier held by George Herbert. Though an Oxford man, and thus, one might suppose, under the dominion of Aristotle, he early devoted himself to the study of Plato, and kept up a correspondence with More on metaphysical problems. In fact, it was he who handed on the tradition of idealism to Berkeley in the next generation. As a Platonist, he was naturally in opposition to the method of Locke, with whom he found himself in conflict also as the principal English disciple of Malebranche. His *Essay towards the Theory of an Ideal and Intelligible World* (2 vols., London, 1701–04), represents this side of his teaching, though his most popular work was the *Miscellanies* (Oxford, 1687), poems, essays, letters, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature under CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS, A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 583–586, London, 1820; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 810; *DNB*, xli. 132–134.

NORTH AFRICAN CHURCH.

Region and Population (§ 1).
Entrance and Growth of Christianity (§ 2).
Organization of Christianity (§ 3).
Schism, Doctrines, and Persecutions (§ 4).
Final Conflicts with Heathenism; Fall under Islam (§ 5).

1. Region and Population.

Grouped with the Mediterranean countries by reason of its position, boundary, and peculiarity of population, North Africa became the theater of a political, religious, and economic development which quite early brought this country into relations with the Roman Empire, and, in turn, with the Roman Church. Bounded north and west by the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean; south and east by the Sahara and the Libyan Desert; separated from the rest of Africa, the region comprising modern Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli appears like a land by itself. Hence it was called Lesser Africa, while among the Arabs it bore the designation Djezirat el Maghreb, "Island of the West." The term *Atlantide* points to the Atlas range and its bearings upon the structure of the country and the character of its soil. On the west, this range ultimately subsides into the plain of the Bagradas, chief stream of North Africa; thus also affording the principal channel of entrance for external civilizations. The population shows three component elements: the Berbers, a term commonly applied to the native races; the Phenician invasion, which spread especially over the coast regions, founding also many small town-communities within the country; and the Roman colonization, as to the brilliant results of which more than one African Pompeii affords knowledge.

Christianity must have reached Africa in the first century; in Tertullian's time the Christians were already quite numerous. In the way of entrance gates, besides Carthage, other coast towns were also available, and expansion or propagation in the interior was facilitated by the military roads,

2. Entrance and Growth of Christianity.

penetrating the entire district. Possibly Roman soldiers and officials were largely the pioneers of Christianity, a suggestion favored by the strong military element in the church language of Africa. Though Tertullian names but four towns besides Carthage with Christian congregations (Hadrumetum, Thysdrus, Lambäsis, headquarters of the third legion, and Uthina), there were Christians by that time also in Mauretania. But the Christian element must have grown very considerably from that period until 249, seeing that Cyprian (*Epist.*, lxxiii. 3) speaks of "so many thousand heretics." With reference to the source, every indication points to Rome. North Africa furnished a peculiarly productive soil for Christianity. Under the expansion of the great landed Roman estates, the sometime free cultivators lapsed more and more into the condition of bondmen; thus forming, together with the slaves, the great body among whom the Gospel found willing acceptance, from whom also those hordes were subsequently recruited, who, as wandering monastics, made common cause with the Donatists. The religious elements already on the ground were opposed by Christianity. Tertullian and Cyprian discountenanced the veneration accorded to the Berber princes. Still greater danger came from the Punic religion, stained as it was by bloody human sacrifices and immoral rites. In relation to the Punic religion, again, there manifested itself the great adaptability of Roman paganism: Phenician Baal becomes Roman Saturn; Astarte (Tanit) became "The Great Goddess," "Celestial Diana," "Great Goddess Virgin Celestial." The Punic language maintained itself long beside the Latin; but the Bible was translated into neither the Punic nor the Berber tongue. Indeed, by using the Latin language Christianity rendered the Romans an important auxiliary service in colonization.

3. Organization of Christianity.

The gradual spread of Christianity over North Africa, advancing from Africa Proconsularis across Numidia, was closely attended with the formation of numerous congregations; and just as their political connection lay with Rome, so did their ecclesiastical organization reflect the like influence. Six provinces were formed in the reign of Diocletian; Proconsularis (Zeugitana), Byzacium (Byzacena), Numidia, Tripolis, Mauretania Sitifensis, and Mauretania Cæsareensis, and with these the contemporary church provinces coincided. At the head of each stood the primate, a rank held by the eldest bishop of the province, who bore the designation *senex*, except in Proconsularis, where the primate was constantly associated with Carthage, the metropolitan see. The Christians endured many troubles from the Arian Vandals, at Carthage and in the Proconsularis, who sequestrated churches and possessions. Another factor of influence on the state of the church was the spread of the Moors, who during the Vandal period recaptured a large part of the earlier Roman possessions. The number of congregations under direct episcopal control was considerable. Of such there were, in Augustine's time, at least 500, although the installation of bishops in the country districts and smaller towns was forbidden. The great number of bishops has been explained by the Africans' municipal bent and by the many rural towns. On the large landed estates, besides, even the separate "castles" sometimes had bishops of their own. It is possible also that, owing to the conflict between Catholics and Donatists, in many places rival bishops were set up. Where there was no bishop, the congregation was led by a presbyter, assisted by a deacon. For better ecclesiastical cure, Carthage came to be divided into regions, after the precedent of Rome. The organization and scope of episcopal power involve the adjunct of that ecclesiastical "penitentiary" which began with Tertullian and reached its termination under Cyprian. As defender of the primitive Christian theory of morality, and as Montanist, Tertullian opposed the innovation that was introduced at Rome by Calixtus, whereby sins of lewdness, previously classed with idolatry and murder as mortal sins, were reckoned with pardonable sins. In Cyprian there arose for the North African Church a bishop who, on the one hand, compatibly with Rome, both terminated the influence of the remaining clergy and of the congregation, as "reinforcing" the bishop's, but on the other hand stoutly and successfully guarded, in opposition to Rome, the independence of the African Church, and himself became practically, if not legally, the primate of the Church in North Africa. This was owing alike to his towering personality, and to the importance accruing to the bishop of the capital of the country. Contributing to this end were the general synods, which were held over and above the provincial synods, the latter embracing either single, or several collective, provinces. Peculiar to the Church of North Africa are the *seniores plebis* ("elders of the people"), who may be regarded as a sort of congregational leaders. They are distinguished, on the one side, from clerics; but, on the other side, they are designated as *ecclesiastici veri*, "men of the Church."

4. Schism, Doctrines, and Persecutions.

The tranquil development of church affairs was disturbed by many divisions and sects, which found a favorable soil in North Africa. The Montanists (see MONTANISM) and Manicheans (q.v.) won to their cause the two principal theologians of the country, the Montanists gaining Cyprian, and the Manicheans, for a time, Augustine. It was Donatism, however, which inflicted the deepest wounds upon the African Church, and the Donatist movement not only produced a Numidian national Church, but also spread over the other provinces. For more than a century after the year 312, this great schism divided the North African Church into two camps, at times of nearly equal strength. The significance of the North African Church in relation to the development of Christian doctrine is best ascertained from the writings of Tertullian, on whom Cyprian depends, and from St. Augustine's works. There were also such active apologists as Arnobius and Lactantius. Some insight into the moral status is afforded by Tertullian (*De spectaculis; De pœnitentia*, and *De pudicitia*) and Cyprian (*Ad Donatum; De habitu virginum*); as also by St. Augustine's "Confessions." A valuable contribution as to the status of cloisters in the several provincial churches is furnished by the "Life" of Fulgentius of Ruspe (q.v.). The tolerance accorded by the Roman government to foreign religions advantaged the Christians of North Africa until the edict of Emperor Marcus Aurelius, in 177, produced the first victims of persecution in the case of Namphamo and companions; while not long afterward (180), the Scilitan martyrs succumbed to the same doom. Of particular note, again, was the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas (see PERPETUA), in the time of Septimius Severus. The operations of the Decian persecution are known through Cyprian's *De lapsis*, and through the history of the penance dispute (see LAPSI); while of the final persecution under Diocletian there are reminders in the allusion in an inscription to the "days of offering" [of sacrifice to pagan gods]. After conclusion of peace between the Roman government and the Christian Church, an enhanced zeal for building set in on all sides, as is shown by the many ruins of ecclesiastical edifices.

5. Final Conflicts with Heathenism; Fall under Islam.

Christianity and paganism now began to change parts. From the year 341, the laws against heathen worship were multiplied. The temples were closed and their assets called in. A decree of the year 399 forbids the destruction of those temples that were no longer used for the worship of idols. A council at Carthage in the year 401 resolves that the emperors shall extirpate idolatry, and demolish, or cause to be demolished, such temples as possess no artistic value. Altars and images of the gods were deposited in museums. A number of these, with the inscription *Translata de sordentibus locis*, "removed from ignominious places," are now in the museum at Cæsarea in Mauretania. In the towns, paganism still derived a temporary support from certain municipal offices with associated priestly functions; yet these, too, were gradually divested of their priestly coloring. After Tertullian, the controversial antagonism of heathenism, as also of the Christian sects, was especially espoused by Augustine. But North Africa never became a thoroughly Christian country. This was prevented by the native tribes, which were continually making new incursions and threatening the civilized power of the country. When, once more, the Byzantine dominion undertook a final Christian propaganda, there was a vast territory at hand for the purpose. Yet with all the conquests achieved by Christianity in North Africa, heathenism was not completely extirpated, and survived not only the Roman and Vandal periods, but also the Byzantine era, only to collapse in a common fate with Christianity before Islam; which effected the conquest of the country in the years 647–717, together with the annihilation of the North African Church.

(A. SCHWARZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: As sources, besides the works of the Church Fathers indicated in the text, consult: *Codex canonum ecclesiæ Africanæ*, ed. H. Justel, Paris, 1614; *Notitia dignitatum*, ed. E. Böcking, 3 parts, Bonn, 1839–40. Consult further: O. Meltzer, *Geschichte der Carthager*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1872–96; J. Lloyd, *The North African Church*, London, 1880; C. J. Tissot, *Geographie comparée de la province romaine d'Afrique*, 2 vols., Paris, 1884–88; A. C. Pallu de Lessert, *Les Fastes de la Numidie*, ib. 1888; idem, *Fastes des provinces africanes*, 2 vols., ib. 1896; G. Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme*, 2 vols., ib. 1891; idem, *L'Afrique romaine*, ib., 1895; R. Cagnat, *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique et l'occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs*, ib. 1892; A. Schwarze, *Untersuchungen über die äussere Entwickelung der afrikanischen Kirche*, Göttingen, 1892; A. Toulotte, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 4 vols., Paris, 1892–94; E. Le Blant, *Les Persécutions et les martyrs aux premiers siècles de notre ère*, ib. 1893; P. Monveaux, *Étude sur la littérature latine d'Afrique*, ib. 1894; C. Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine. Histoire de la domination byzantine en Afrique*, ib. 1896; P. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'empire romain de Néron à Théodose*, ib., 1897; F. Ferrere, *La Situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine depuis la fin du iv. siècle jusqu'à 429*, ib., 1897; L. R. Holme, *The Extinction of the Christian Churches in North Africa*, London, 1898; A. Schulten, *Das römische Afrika*, Leipsic, 1899; F. Wieland, *Ein Ausflug ins altchristliche Afrika*, Vienna, 1900; L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Wandalen*, Leipsic, 1901; P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 2 vols., Paris, 1901–02; A. Graham, *Roman Africa. An Outline of the History of the Roman Occupation of North Africa*, London, 1902; A. Harnack, *Die Mission und die Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten 3 Jahrhunderten*, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1906, Eng. transl., *The Expansion of Christianity*, 2 vols., London, 1908; H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, 2 vols., Paris, 1904. Much of the literature under AUGUSTINE; CYPRIAN; DONATISM; and TERTULLIAN is pertinent.

NORTH AMERICA. See CANADA; MEXICO; UNITED STATES.

NORTH, BROWNLOW: Evangelist of the Free Church of Scotland; b. at Chelsea (a suburb of London) Jan. 6, 1810; d. at Tullichewan Castle (15 m. n.w. of Glasgow) Nov. 9, 1875. He was a grandson of Brownlow North, bishop of Winchester, and a grandnephew of Lord North. He studied at Eaton, and at Magdalen College, Oxford, and graduated from the university in 1842, with a view to holy orders, but was refused ordination. He had no settled occupation, 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 Nov., 1854, when, as he was visiting at Dallas Moors, Scotland, his whole spiritual nature underwent a radical change. For months he read nothing but the Bible, meanwhile conducting religious meetings. His success as an evangelist was rapid, and during later years he visited every important town in Scotland and some places in England. In 1859 the Free Church of Scotland formally recognized him as an evangelist. He took part in the great revivals of Ireland in 1859 and Scotland in 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. Moody Stuart, *Brownlow North, Records and Recollections*, London, 1879.

NORTH, FRANK MASON: Methodist Episcopalian; b. in New York City Mar. 3, 1850. He was educated at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. (A.B. 1872), after which he held pastorates at Florida, N. Y. (1873–74), Amenia, N. Y. (1874–1877), Cold Spring, N. Y. (1877–78), Church of the Saviour, New York City (1879–81), White Plains, N. Y. (1882–83), Calvary Church, New York City (1884–86), and Middletown, Conn. (1887–91). Since 1892 he has been corresponding secretary of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and also editor of *The Christian City*. He is noted for an extended activity in the direction of church federation and in the work of the Evangelical Alliance, as well as in philanthropic enterprises.

NORTON, ANDREWS: American Unitarian; b. at Hingham, Mass., Dec. 31, 1786; d. at Newport, R. I., Sept. 18, 1853. He passed in 1801 from the Derby Academy at Hingham to Harvard, where he was graduated in 1804. He then studied theology and preached for a short time during 1809 at Augusta, Me.; in Oct., 1809, he became tutor in Bowdoin College, and in 1811 tutor of mathematics at Harvard for a few months. Theology in New England was then in a very excited condition. In 1812 he published *The General Repository*, a liberal theological journal. It was too scholarly and perhaps too bold for the public and lived only two years. In 1813 he became librarian of Harvard College and lecturer on Biblical criticism and hermeneutics. In 1814 he published the writings of his deceased friend, Charles Eliot. When the Harvard Divinity School was founded in 1819 Norton was elected professor of Biblical literature; he filled that chair until 1830 and took an active part in all university matters.

After giving up the professorship he occupied himself without rest in literary and theological researches. In 1833 he issued *A Statement of Reasons for not Believing the Doctrine of Trinitarians Concerning the Nature of God and the Person of Christ* (Cambridge, 11th ed., 1876). In 1833 and 1834, with his friend Charles Folsom, he edited *The Select Journal of Foreign Periodical Literature*. In 1819 he had begun his most important work, *The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels* (3 vols., Boston, 1837–44; 2d ed., 1846; summary in one volume, 1867). Norton published also several addresses, including a *Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity* (Cambridge, 1839), a refutation of Strauss's views, many valuable articles in the *North American Review*, the *Christian Examiner*, and the *Christian Disciple*, and several hymns of no mean merit. He collected a few of his shorter writings in *Tracts Concerning Christianity* (Cambridge, 1852). C. E. Norton edited his unfinished *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels* (Boston, 1855).

Although he was one of the leaders of the liberal school of theology, he was opposed to the name "Unitarian" and to the founding of the "Unitarian Association." His book upon the genuineness of the Gospels is the chief work upon that subject in the nineteenth century in the English language, but the theological position of its author was largely a bar to its acceptance in several orthodox circles. He attacked Strauss with vigor as a Judas. He was with his whole heart and in all relations of life a Christian, and he devoted himself to the most unwearying study of the Scriptures, but by no means lost sight of other interests. He did much to open the treasures of foreign literatures to his countrymen. CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. H. Allen, in *American Church History Series*, x. 207–209, New York, 1894.

NORTON, JOHN: Puritan and Pilgrim divine; b. at Bishop Stratford (11 m. n. e. of Hertford), Hertfordshire, England, May 9, 1606; d. at Boston, Mass., Apr. 5, 1663. He was educated at Cambridge (B. A., 1627); became tutor in the grammar-school at Stratford, and curate; his dislike for ceremonies led him to embrace Puritanism, and in 1635 he emigrated to America, preaching thereafter at Plymouth, and at Ipswich after 1636. He was appointed to write an answer to the questions on church government of William Appolonius of Middleberg, Holland, which resulted in his *Responsio ad totam quæstionum syllogen* (London, 1648). He was influential in the Cambridge Synod of 1646 which drew up the Cambridge Platform. In 1652, on the death of John Cotton, he was called to Boston, but not installed till 1656. He was a violent opponent of the Quakers, and by appointment of the Massachusetts council wrote against them his *Heart of New England Rent at the Blasphemies of the Present Generation* ("Cambridge in New England," 1659). He was also directed by the General Court of Massachusetts to refute William Pynchon's *Meritorious Price of our Redemption* (1650), which resulted in his *Discussion of That Great Point in Divinity, the Sufferings of Christ* (1653). Besides the works already named, he wrote: *A Brief . . .Treatise containing the Doctrine of Godlinesse* (London, 1647); *The Orthodox Evangelical* (1654); *Abel Being Dead Yet Speaketh, or the Life and Death of Mr. John Cotton* (1658; reprinted, with memoir, New York, 1842); *a Brief Catechism Containing the Doctrine of Godliness* ("Cambridge, New England," 1660, new ed., 1666); and the posthumously published *Three Choice and Profitable Sermons* ("Cambridge, New England," 1664). His unpublished manuscript, *Body of Divinity*, is in the keeping of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. W. Maclure, in *Lives of the Chief Fathers of New England*, ii. 175–248, Boston, 1870; J. B. Felt, *Eccl. Hist. of New England*, vol. i., passim, Boston, 1855; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 54–59, New York, 1859; W. Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, New York, 1893; idem, in *American Church History Series*, iii. 174, 177, 216; F. H. Foster, *Genetic Hist. of the New England Theology*, Chicago, 1907; *DNB*, xli. 214–215.

NORTON, THOMAS. See STERNHOLD, THOMAS.

NORWAY: The northernmost country of Europe (capital Christiania), bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean, on the east by Sweden, on the south by the Skager Rack, and on the west by the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean; area, 124,129 square miles; population (1900) 2,239,880.

Early Christian Conversion.

After the futile attempts of King Hakon the Good (d. 961) to introduce Christianity into Norway, the two Kings Olav Tryggvesson (995–1000) and Olav Haraldson, surnamed the Holy (1015–1030), finally succeeded in establishing the new religion. Prior to this, Norway was under the control of the Vikings (or bands of warriors, who would invade neighboring countries, plundering and burning or otherwise destroying what they could not carry away), who held sway for 200 years. It was while on these crusades into the different adjacent countries that these Viking bands came in touch with Christianity, the leaders just mentioned being baptized, the first in England, the second in Normandy. Both of them set themselves the task of Christianizing their mother country, to which end they brought back with them bishops and priests from England who preached to the people, exhorting them to embrace Christianity, while the kings supported the preachers by using force wherever opposition showed itself against the new movement. Among these bishops, who thus became the real founders of the new faith, the Anglo-Saxon Sigurd, who accompanied Olav Tryggvesson, has been named by some historians the "Apostle of Norway," while his nephew, Grimkjell, figured as missionary bishop under Olav the Holy, rendering his king efficient service in establishing the new faith after the pattern of the Anglo-Saxon Church. While engaged in battle against his own rebellious people, King Olav Haraldson fell near Stikklestad (July 29, 1030); and there resulted a thoroughgoing change in the minds of the people. Within a short time, the people came to regard the fallen king as a great saint, at whose grave mighty miracles were supposed to occur, and whose self-sacrifice immortalized itself with a glorious halo.

Church History in the Middle Ages and the Reformation.

Of the history of the Church of Norway in the middle ages, little more is worthy of mention than that it was identical with that of the other European countries of that time; the most important event of this period being that Norway, like Jutland, lost its independence, becoming in 1536 a province of Denmark. Thus it became self-evident, that when Denmark decided in the same year to introduce the Reformation, this applied also to Norway; although the people themselves were but little prepared for such a thoroughgoing spiritual revolution, the old order was abolished. The last Roman Catholic archbishop had to flee before the Danish authorities. Such bishops as remained were unfrocked, monasteries were destroyed, and the vested lands together with all other property of the bishoprics and monasteries were confiscated. Only the priests were allowed to remain to preach after their accustomed manner, until such time as Protestant ministers could be educated to replace them. The real work of evangelizing the country was left in the hands of Protestant officialdom, called superintendents at first, and later bishops, whose duty it was to establish the new church discipline and provide the congregations with Evangelical pastors. In every diocesan city a seminary was established for the education of ministers where theology and humanism were taught in the conciliatory spirit of Melanchthon. Among the bishops of the time of the Reformation were several very thorough men: such as Torbjören Olafsön Bratt of Drontheim, who studied two years at Wittenberg and for a time was a member of Luther's household; Geble Pederson of Bergen, a fine and pious figure and prominent schoolman; Jens Nilsön of Oslo, a thorough disciplinarian and humanist; and Jorgen Erichsön of Stavanger, the most prominent personality identified with the Protestantism of the sixteenth century. The latter, an imperious but sane advocate of church order, earned for himself the title "Norway's Luther," by his strong, clear, ardent, Evangelical sermons. At the close of the Reformation century, the organization of the Protestant Church was fully established. Every parish was presided over by an evangelically trained minister, and from every pulpit Lutheran doctrine was proclaimed. In spite of this, the people, with but few happy exceptions, were but little imbued with the spirit of the Gospel until Pietism relieved the period of slow growth under orthodoxy.

The Evangelical Lutheran Organization and Statistics.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church is the official or State Church of Norway, acknowledged as such in the constitution. While separation from the State Church is tolerated, it is obligatory upon all whose position bears any relation to the State Church to be members of the same; such are the king and his ministers, theological professors in the universities, religious teachers in the public schools, ministers, bishops, and the like. Otherwise, any one is at liberty to separate from the established church without any material sacrifice; but all members of the State Church are required to have their children baptized and instructed in its confession of faith. The Norwegian parliament (Storthing) makes all the laws of the church. The king is the highest ecclesiastical potentate, who operates through his council or the minister of public worship and instruction. These also administer with constitutional accountability the properties of the church, which amount to 30,000,000 crowns ($8,040,000). According to the last census (1900), 2,187,200 of the entire population were accounted members of the State Church; there were 10,286 Methodists, 5,674 Baptists, 1,969 Roman Catholics under a vicar apostolic, 501 Mormons, 175 Quakers, and 642 Jews. For administration of the State Church, the country is divided into six chapters or bishoprics, whose administrators are appointed by the king. The ministerium of each chapter has the right of representation. Each bishopric is again subdivided into provost districts whose heads are called provosts, and who are elected by the clergy, but appointed by the king. The provost is an intermediary between the bishop and the clergy, but is at the same time pastor of a congregation. All appointments in the individual congregations are made by the king. Besides a chief pastor in the larger congregations, there are resident chaplains. All incomes are fixed by the act of 1897. The bishop of Christiania is *primus inter pares* and receives the highest salary. There is a rule without exception that no one can be appointed in the State Church without an official examination in theology at the University of Norway. The children who belong to the State Church receive their religious instruction in the public schools, which are entirely independent of the Church. The bishop has oversight of the training of religious teachers, the proper administration of the affairs of the parishes by the pastors, and the spiritual progress of the congregations; and he is required to visit in person each parish once in three years; the necessary traveling expenses being paid by the exchequer. In every diocese there is an official who with the bishop directs all material interests. Norway also takes a lively interest in home and foreign missions, whose administration is in the hands of private societies not controlled by the State. The principal missionary society has its headquarters in Stavanger, and supports missionaries in Zululand, China, and, principally, Madagascar. It has about 80 workers in the field, while its schools are attended by 48,000 children, and its churches number 62,000 communicants.

(A. C. BANG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des norwegischen Stammes zum Christenthum*, 2 vols., Munich, 1856; J. B. Pratt, *Letters on the Scandinavian Churches*, London, 1865; P. Zorn, *Staat und Kirche in Norwegen*, Munich, 1875; L. Dane, *Nordens Helgener*, Christiania, 1881; A. C. Bang, *Udsigt over den norske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen*, Christiania, 1883; idem, *Udsigt over den norske Kirkes Historie under Katholicismen*, ib. 1887; idem, *Kirkehistoriske Smaastykker*, ib. 1890; idem, *Den norske Kirkes Historie, 1536-1600*, ib. 1895; idem, *Den Norske Kirkes Geistlighed i Reformations-Aarhundredet 1536-1600*, ib. 1897; H. Boyeson, *The Story of Norway*, London, 1886; G. F. Maclear, *Apostles of Mediaeval Europe*, pp. 172-200, ib., 1888; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der Neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 431 sqq., Berlin, 1901; L. H. S. Dietrichson, *Omrids af den kirkelige Kunstarkæologi*, Christiania, 1902; T. W. Willson, *Hist. of the Church and State in Norway, 10th–16th Century*, London, 1903; H. G. Heggtveit, *Den Norske Kirke i det nittende Aarhundrede*, Christiania, 1905; W. S. Monroe, *In Viking Land: Norway, its Peoples, its Fjords, and its Fjelds*, London, 1908; J. V. Kvam, *Den norske Kirkes Biskoper efter Reformationen*, Christiania, 1910; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, p. 861.

NORWICH: Capital of Norfolk, England, and, since 1091, the seat of a bishop. It is situated on the Wensum, and has a population of 111,728 (1901). The cathedral, prevailingly Norman, was begun in 1096 by Herbert Losinga, who transferred thither the bishopric from Thetford. After a fire in the thirteenth century it was rebuilt, and additions were made till the fifteenth century. The bishopric was founded at Dunwich, 630, the bishopric of Elmham was founded in 673, which latter seems after c. 850 to have superseded Dunwich, while the seat was located at Thetford in 1070, and was transferred as above to Norwich.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Historical Handbook to Norwich Cathedral*, London, 1890; W. Lefroy, *Norwich Cathedral*, ib., 1897; C. H. B. Quennell, *The Cathedral Church of Norwich*, ib. 1898.

NOTES OF THE CHURCH: A term employed to embrace certain fundamental characteristics of the Church to which appeal may be made either in controversy or teaching. Some of those earliest asserted are: the antiquity of the Church and its priority to heretical communities (Tertullian, *Hær.*, xii., xx.); the unity of the teachings of the Church and apostolic succession (Irenæus, *Hær.*, passim); ecumenical consent, the name Catholic, and the continued existence of the Church from the times of the apostles (Augustine and Jerome, passim). Bellarmine increased the number of the notes of the Church to fifteen, including such points as the continuance of miracles and prophecy and the unhappy end of those opposed to the Church. Luther assigned to this category the true and uncorrupted preaching of the Gospel, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the keys, a legitimate ministry, and service in the vernacular (*De ecclesiæ notis*, *Opera*, ed. 1550, vii. 147). Calvin ("Institutes," IV., i. 10) gives only truth of doctrine and correct administration of the sacraments. The Anglican view, while not altogether concordant as set forth by different divines, acknowledges as notes antiquity, continuous duration through the ages, apostolic succession in the bishopric, interunion of members and their union with Christ, and sanctity of doctrine. Perhaps the most fundamental and acknowledged are those of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed—"One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, part ii., London, 1667–68; R. Field, *Of the Church*, II., i. 5, new ed., ib., 1847; W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, i. 17–21, ib., 1838.

NOTKER, not'ker: The name borne by several monks of St. Gall.

1. **Notker Balbulus:** Librarian and guest-master at St. Gall, and for a time master of the school; b. c. 840; d. at St. Gall Apr. 6, 912. He is thought to have been the teacher and adviser mentioned in the "Book of Forms" of Solomon III., bishop of Constance, and in this case would be also the author of the *Notatio* on Biblical expositors. He certainly compiled the martyrology which bears his name; but his fame rests chiefly on the sequences composed by him. The impressive antiphon *Media vita* (translated in the burial service of the Anglican Prayer-book) was incorrectly ascribed to him in the later Middle Ages. Recent investigation, on the other hand, has confirmed the old theory that he was the author of the remarkable book on Charlemagne attributed to "a monk of St. Gall" for which the impulse was given by a visit of the Emperor Charles III. to the abbey in 883; and he also made a continuation of the chronicle of Erchambert. Modern discoveries have notably enlarged the circle of his known works, and incited a recent German writer, Von Winterfeld, to claim for him the title of the greatest poet of the Middle Ages. He was considered a saint as early as the eleventh century, but his formal canonization did not take place until 1513.

2. **Notker Medicus (Piperis Granum):** Cellarer and guest-master at St. Gall; d. Nov. 12, 975. He was summoned to the court of Otto I. to exercise his medical skill, and left a considerable name also as a painter, a poet, and a teacher. Otto I. and II. on their visit to the abbey in 972 showed him great honor, and he seems to have acted as a notary for Otto I. at the court at Quedlinburg in drawing up the deed of immunity for the abbey.

3. Nephew of the above; became abbot of St. Gall in 971 on the resignation of Purchard I., and di d Dec. 15, 975.

4. Provost of St. Gall, employed as imperial chaplain in Italy in 969, and bishop of Liége from 972 until his death Apr. 10, 1008. He held an important place in the politics of his time, especially in Lorraine under Otto III. and Henry II.

(G. MEYER VON KNONAU.)

5. **Notker Labeo:** Later known as Teutonicus from his services as a translator; b. about 950 of a noble German family; d. at St. Gall June 29, 1022. He entered the abbey of St. Gall as a boy. Here, as his works and the testimony of his contemporaries amply show, he acquired a remarkably good education, and ultimately became head of the abbey school, retaining this post until his death. His life was unmarked by external excitement, and therefore all the more diligently devoted to his literary labors. Of these an account is given by his pupil

Eckehard IV. in his *Liber benedictionum*, and by himself in a letter addressed to Bishop Hugo of Sitten (998–1017). From Eckehard it appears that Notker translated into German the book of Job and the Psalms and the *Moralia* of Gregory the Great. According to his own letter, in order to facilitate the exposition of the sacred writings, he undertook "a thing well-nigh unheard-of," the translation of Latin works into German. First he tried his hand with two works of Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiæ* and *De sancta trinitate;* then he turned to poetry, and rendered the *Disticha* of Cato, Vergil's "Bucolics" and Terence's *Andria*. Next followed some prose works in the province of the liberal arts, the *Nuptiæ philologiæ et Mercurii* of Marcianus Capella, the *De categoriis* and *De interpretatione* of Aristotle, and the *Principia arithmeticæ* (a work now unknown). Then he returned to the Scriptures, first translating the whole Psalter with comments from Augustine and going on to Job, which, according to Eckehard, he finished on the day of his death (see Bible Versions, B, VII., § 1). Of these there are now extant Boethius's *De consolatione*, the Marcianus Capella, the Aristotle, and the Psalter, to which last are appended the Scriptural canticles, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds. There are also extant several small original Latin works of Notker's, including one on rhetoric and a short treatise *De partibus logicæ*, and two short German works usually classed together under the title *De musica*. His work as a translator is marked by a thorough understanding of his task and a remarkable success in finding the right German words for the most difficult abstract expressions.

(G. Holz.)

Bibliography: On 1. The *Vita* by Eckehard with commentary is in *ASB*, April, i. 576–596, with the *Processus canonizationis*, pp. 596–604; G. Meyer von Knonau, in *Mittheilungen der antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Zürich*, xix. 4 (1877); E. Dümmler, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xxv. 197–220, Göttingen, 1885; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 59, 254–257, ii. 479, i (1893), 60, 187, 272–274, 395, ii. 509; Z. Schwalm and P. von Winterfeld, in *NA*, xxvii. 740 sqq. On 2. P. Piper, *Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule*, Freiburg, 1882; J. Kelle, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*, i. 232 sqq., Berlin, 1892; R. Kögel, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*, i. 2, pp. 598 sqq., Strasburg, 1897.

NOTT, ELIPHALET: American clergyman and educator; b. at Ashford, Conn., June 25, 1773; d. at Schenectady, N. Y., Jan. 29, 1866. His parents, who were farmers, died while he was still a boy. He studied the languages and mathematics, and taught school. He entered Brown University in 1790, and was licensed to preach in 1795. He was pastor and teacher at Cherry Valley, N. Y., in 1796–97, and pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Albany, N. Y., in 1798–1804. In 1804 he was elected to the presidency of Union College, an office which he filled for more than sixty-two years, 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. He paid much attention to natural science, especially to the laws of heat; and obtained about thirty patents for inventions in that department, one of which was the first stove for burning anthracite coal. As an educator he was practical, unconventional, and greatly beloved. On the platform, he advocated temperance, opposed slavery, and always figured as an earnest exponent of civil and religious liberty. He was original, scholarly, and impressive as a preacher and is considered one of the greatest pulpit orators of his time. His eulogy on the death of Alexander Hamilton, delivered at Albany, July 29, 1804, remains a classic. He published *Councils to Young Men* (New York, 1810); *Lectures on Temperance* (Albany, 1847); and the *Resurrection of Christ* (New York, 1872).

Bibliography: C. van Santvoord and T. Lewis, *Memoir of Eliphalet Nott*, New York, 1876.

NOURRY. See Le Nourry.

NOURSE, EDWARD EVERETT: Congregationalist; b. at Bayfield, Wis., Dec. 24, 1863. He was educated at Macalester College, St. Paul (1886–1887), Lake Forest College (1884–86, 1887–88; B.A., 1888), Hartford Theological Seminary (grad., 1891; fellow, 1893–94), and the University of Jena (1894–1895), and was ordained by the presbytery of Chippewa, Wis., in 1893. From 1895 to 1898 he was pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Berlin, Conn.; since 1898 he has been connected with Hartford Theological Seminary, as instructor (1898–90), associate professor of Biblical theology (1900–05), and professor of Biblical history and theology (since 1905). He has likewise been a lecturer at Mount Holyoke College since 1901 and at the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy since 1904. In theology he is a liberal conservative. Besides contributing articles on New-Testament topics to the *New International Encyclopædia* (New York, 1902–1906), and in addition to his activity as associate editor of *A Standard Dictionary of the Bible* (1909), he has written *Genesis and the Religious Development of Israel* (Hartford, 1906).

NOVATIAN, NOVATIANISM.

I. The Sources of Knowledge.
  The Works of Novatian (§ 1).
  Contemporary and Later Notices (§ 2).
II. Novatian and the Schism.
  Events Leading to the Schism (§ 1).
  Novatian's Person and Position (§ 2).
  Cornelius and Novatian as Rival Bishops (§ 3).
  Success of the Catholic Party (§ 4).
III. The Theoretical Basis of the Schism.
  Catholic Position as to the Lapsed (§ 1).
  The Novatian Position (§ 2).
  Criticism of These Positions (§ 3).
IV. Later History.

The most notable ecclesiastical formation of the third century, apart from Manicheism, which rests on a non-Christian basis, is that of Novatianism. Unlike the later Donatism, it is connected with the development of the Catholic theology not only by its primary doctrinal assumptions but also through its ecumenical diffusion from Spain to Syria in the centuries from the third to the fifth. The name "Novatian sect" thus insufficiently designates it from the name of one of its principal leaders—founder he can scarcely be called—without connoting its principles, its expansion, and its importance. Its history is that of a schism in the territory of Catholicism, turning upon the question of the authority, extent, and result of the Church's power of the keys. So far as is known, it never developed any peculiar heretical system, but remained distinguished from the recognized Christianity on this one point alone, thus affording a phenomenon almost unique in the history of Western Christendom, although the Jansenist Church offers a parallel to a certain extent.

1. The Works of Novatian.

I. Sources of Knowledge: Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, lxx.) enumerates seven works of Novatian: *De pascha*, *De sabbato*, *De circumcisione*, *De sacerdote*, *De oratione* (not *ordinatione*, as sometimes read), *De cibis judaicis*, *De instantia*, *De Attalo*, "and many others, besides a large work on the Trinity, a sort of epitome of the work of Tertullian, attributed by many ignorant people to Cyprian." Of these works none are extant except *De cibis judaicis*, written in the form of a letter and preserved under the name of Tertullian, and *De trinitate*. Novatian's authorship of the last-named was denied in the fourth century, by those who were unwilling to give the credit to a heretic, while for analogous reasons the Macedonians of Constantinople, who appealed to a passage in it, ascribed it to Cyprian. Rufinus thought it was written by Tertullian; but Jerome is probably right. It is evidently the production of a Roman Christian, formed in the school of Irenæus and Tertullian, at a time when the Marcionites were still dangerous, when Monarchian views had been fully developed, and when Sabellius had already been cast out. Its authenticity is still further demonstrated by a comparison with his letters discussed below. The *De cibis judaicis* (and therefore also the *De sabbato* and *De circumcisione*) must have been written after the schism; but no allusion to it is to be found in the *De trinitate*, to which Novatian probably owed the reputation as a theologian which he enjoyed before he adopted a schismatic attitude. In it, with clear logic and in excellent style, he develops a popular philosophy on the nature of God and confesses the true Godhead and manhood of Christ in opposition to the Marcionites and Monarchians. His Christology is that of Tertullian, though coming a stage nearer to the Nicene by the assertion that the Father is always the Father. The work has no little historical importance; the security of its precise dogmatic formulæ allowed the Latins to meet the Greeks on equal terms in the Christological controversy. The two letters of Novatian which he addressed to the Church of Carthage, during the vacancy of the see, at the request of the Roman clergy (preserved among Cyprian's letters, xxx. and xxxvi.), short as they are, give testimony both to his ability as a writer and to his theological position. Jerome speaks of a collection of his letters, which may have included all the small treatises named above, as well as the epistles addressed by him to the bishops of various churches after his own elevation to the episcopate. In recent times critical study has assigned to Novatian with great probability the pseudo-Cyprianic treatises *De spectaculis*, *De bono pudicitiæ*, *Quod idola dii non sint*, *De laude martyrii*, and *Adversus Judæos*. The two first named were written after the schism; the author is at the time separated from his flock, as Novatian was when he wrote *De cibis judaicis;* he is a bishop; his flock is no clearly distinguished local community but a special association which considers itself marked by unusual sanctity. *De laude martyrii*, on the other hand, was written before the schism, at the beginning of the Decian persecution. The date of the *Adversus Judæos* can not be determined. An attempt has been made, though with doubtful success, to enroll among Novatian's writings the twenty pseudo-Origenistic treatises discovered by Batiffol and published Paris, 1900; the most that can safely be said is that their author made frequent use of Novatian's work, as he did also of that of Tertullian and Origen.

2. Contemporary and Later Notices.

The most valuable source for the origin of the schism is the collection of Cyprian's letters, especially those of Cyprian himself and Cornelius (*Epist.*, xliv., xlv., xlix., lii.-lv., lix., lx., lxviii., lxix., lxxiii.), together with the Roman collection of letters, dating from the middle of the third century, used by Eusebius, and another of which he made some use, the *Epistolæ Dionysii Alexandrini*. Another important contemporary authority is the pseudo-Cyprianic *Ad Novatianum*, which probably belongs to Pope Sixtus II. and dates from 257–258. In the use of these early documents it must be borne in mind that scarcely anything has come down from the opposite camp, and that the official correspondence of ecclesiastics had already begun to assume the diplomatic adroitness of statement and the ornate rhetoric of the contemporaneous secular diplomacy. The wide spread of the Novatian community in the East stirred the orthodox bishops from the beginning of the fourth century to a vigorous polemic. Eusebius of Emesa wrote a special treatise against them, now lost, and Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, and Chrysostom took notice of them. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., xlii.-VII., viii.) is of value. Socrates paid so much attention to the spread of their churches in the East that he was suspected of a secret sympathy with their views, and he undoubtedly had personal relations with some of them. Sozomen adds little, but Isidore of Pelusium deals with them in two letters (cccxxxviii.-ix.). Even as late as the close of the sixth century, Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, the friend of Gregory the Great, found it necessary to combat their views in an extended treatise. The sect is mentioned in a number of imperial decrees of the fourth and fifth centuries. In the West the schism decayed sooner than in the East, and there is little original polemical material. The author of the pseudo-Augustinian treatise *Contra Novatianum*, a contemporary of Damasus, is evidence for a temporary though short progress of the sect in Rome. Some personal knowledge is shown by Pacianus of Barcelona in his letters directed against the Novatian Sympronianus, author of an exposition of the schismatic doctrine. There are a few scattered notices in Hilary, Ambrose, Rufinus, the *Catalogus Liberianus*, the letters of Innocent I., Celestine I., and Leo I., and in Vincent of Lerins; and Augustine has several noteworthy references to the sect. But a glance over the whole Western literature shows that from the middle of the fourth century there was little certain knowledge of the origin of the schism or of the personal history of Novatian.

1. Events Leading to the Schism.

II. Novatian and the Schism: Up to about 220 the penalty for idolatry, adultery and fornication, and murder was definitive excommunication, any hope of restoration being left to the mercy of God in the next world.* The strictness of this rule was first broken through in regard to sins of the flesh by the special powers conceded to the confessors, and then by a decree of Pope Calixtus recognizing the possibility of restoration in the case of these sins, which gave rise to the schism of Hippolytus. As this schism was extinct by 250, it seems reasonable to suppose that the successors of Calixtus were more severe than he. There was no such mitigation so early in the case of apostasy (see Lapsed); and the question was not a specially practical one between 220 and 250. Roman and Carthaginian documents of the years following the latter date render it probable that there was a difference of opinion at Rome in the pontificate of Fabian as to the treatment of grievous sinners, but not sharp enough to lead to a schism. The Decian persecution made so many apostates, however, that a continuance of the earlier severe treatment of the lapsed seemed a sweeping cruelty, and might threaten the very existence of some churches. The growth of dogmatic teaching as to the indispensability of union with the Church and of priestly sacraments had its effect in the almost universal establishment, about 250, of the rule that penitent *lapsi* might be absolved when in danger of death. This, however, did not suffice to remove the difficulties; but before further measures could be taken, a decided opposition arose which once more called in question the propriety of the milder practise.

2. Novatian's Person and Position.

From the scanty and partially unreliable accounts of Novatian's life which are extant, the attempt must be made to sift out some facts. He seems to have received clinical baptism in a severe illness, without subsequent confirmation, at a time when the validity of such baptism was not universally recognized. He was nevertheless later ordained priest by the Roman bishop (probably Fabian), apparently in the face of a protest from all the clergy and many laymen. The fact of his ordination, as well as the evidence of his enemies, goes to show that he enjoyed a great reputation not only for learning and eloquence but also for virtue. His opponent Cornelius accuses him, indeed, of shutting himself up in his house at the outbreak of the persecution and refusing the appeals of the deacons to come to the help of his brethren; but the story is incredible in the form in which it is told, and may have grown out of the singular fact that he was passed over (perhaps as a learned man, a "philosopher") when other Roman presbyters were arrested. After the death of Fabian early in the persecution, there was a vacancy of almost fifteen months in the see, during which the administration was in the hands of the college of presbyters, assisted by the deacons, although the confessors had great influence. For the period of the vacancy there is valuable information in the letters in Cyprian's collection, especially viii., xxx., xxxvi., of which the two latter are certainly from Novatian's hand. In the eighth, the Roman clergy give an account of their practise, distinctly expressing an exception to be made in favor of such of the lapsed as are in danger of death; and in reply Cyprian now for the first time accepts this principle. The remainder are to be kept under the discipline and observation of the Church, that the way to recovery may remain open by a valiant confession of their faith on a renewal of the persecution. In the thirtieth letter, which gives a clearer idea of Novatian's character than all the accounts of him by others, the practise adopted by Cyprian is expressly approved, and with all the severity called for against the *libellatici* the possibility of the restoration of the *lapsi* is not distinctly excluded. Their case is to be dealt with by a great council to be held after the restoration of tranquillity, until which time they are to do fitting penance. This middle course has been decided upon by the Roman clergy in consultation with some neighboring bishops and others present in Rome; but no definite innovation in practise is to be introduced before the election of a new bishop. The same attitude, not radically opposed to innovations, is displayed in the thirty-sixth letter, also written by Novatian in the name of the clergy of Rome, supporting Cyprian in his conflict with the lax presbyters and confessors. The letters exchanged by Cyprian at this time with the Roman confessors Moses, Maximus, and others, exhibit the same spirit of harmony both between Carthage and Rome and in Rome itself. Thus up to the end of the winter of 250–251 there is no trace of the approach of a schism in Rome.

3. Cornelius and Novatian as Rival Bishops.

In March, 251, after the cessation of the persecution, the Roman presbyter Cornelius was elected bishop by the majority, apparently according to the rules and in the presence of sixteen bishops, though it is said against his will. But the minority, including several presbyters (according to Eusebius, five, with some of the most respected confessors), refused to accept the choice, set up Novatian as their bishop, and had him consecrated by three Italian bishops. It is noteworthy that at the beginning of the struggle no theoretical ground seems to have been alleged for the opposition, which centered around the personality of Cornelius. Novatian was undoubtedly the most prominent of the Roman clergy and the natural candidate; Cornelius does not seem to have been specially distinguished, and his conduct in the persecution was apparently not free from suspicion; if the charge that Cornelius had been a *libellaticus* was untrue, he had undoubtedly maintained communion with certain bishops who had offered sacrifice. In the whole correspondence between Cornelius and Cyprian (*Epist.*, xliv.–liii.) there is no mention of a theoretical difference with Novatian; and the letter from Dionysius of Alexandria to Novatian shows that the latter did not regard a reconciliation with the majority as hopeless, but rather that he had been forced into an attitude of opposition. All goes to show that an accommodation as to theory might have been reached but for the irreconcilable antagonism of the two dominant personalities.

---

* This statement seems stronger than the facts warrant. The rise of Montanism with its rigorous disciplinary rules presupposes much laxity in many of the churches in Asia Minor and elsewhere. There is in the New Testament no evidence that perpetual excommunication was the inevitable penalty of the sins named. A. H. N.

4. Success of the Catholic Party.

It was fortunate for the cause of Cornelius that in the same spring of 251 Cyprian found it necessary, on account of the declared schism of Felicissimus, to yield so far as to admit the possibility of the restoration of the lapsed, which settled the question which side he should take in the Roman controversy, though his support of Cornelius was not hearty. A few African bishops were even more cautious, but the great majority took the side of Cornelius at a synod in Rome attended (according to Eusebius) by sixty bishops. This gathering excommunicated Novatian and proclaimed the "medicine of penance" for all the lapsed. Novatian attempted by encyclical letters and personal embassies to win support for his cause and to discredit Cornelius. In Carthage Cyprian did not even allow the envoys a public hearing; but in the East they had a less discouraging reception from Fabius of Antioch and a number of synods. In May a large synod was held at Carthage, at which Cyprian and his followers secured the adoption of a *via media* (cf. *Epist.*, lv.). Absolute right to restoration was still conceded only to the dying among the lapsed; but it was admitted that the long and thorough penance laid upon them might dispose the divine mercy to forgiveness and make it possible for them to attain an earthly reconciliation. A more important advance was the sharp distinction between *libellatici* and *sacrificati*, allowing absolution before death to the former, and thus approaching fairly close to the position of the Roman synod under Cornelius. In the same spring a zealous leader of the schismatical party at Carthage, Novatus, came to Rome and threw himself into the cause of Novatian; Cyprian even makes him responsible for the schism, but this is surely an exaggeration. The close alliance between Cornelius and Cyprian thus gained a further motive. Before the end of 251 Cornelius was able to announce to his African brother that the glorious confessors Maximus and his associates had returned to the unity of the Church (Moses had already died in prison). This was a severe blow to the cause of Novatian; but he did not give up the fight. Cornelius notifies Cyprian (*Epist.*, l.) that a second embassy is on its way to Carthage, including Novatus. They succeeded in establishing a schismatic community there, as bishop of which another Maximus was chosen. The Catholic party issued victorious from its conflicts with both its antagonists, but only at the cost of considerable concessions. In *Epist.* lvi. Cyprian declares himself personally ready to receive the lapsed after three years' penance, but refers the actual decision to a provincial synod. This, which met in May, 253, decided (under the pressure of another imminent persecution, that of Gallus) to grant restoration at once to all the penitent *lapsi*. The persecution did not amount to much, after all; but it was used to give a good many the opportunity to justify their restoration by confession in the face of it, and to give Cornelius, on account of his banishment, the influential position of a confessor. Nothing more is heard of Novatian himself in the official correspondence. Throughout the decade 250–260 a number of bishops still refused to agree to the laxer practise, and some of them (e.g. Marcianus of Arles) supported Novatian without leaving the Church. In the East the death of Fabius of Antioch was timely for the Catholic cause. In the largely attended synod of Antioch, where some bishops strongly favored the strict practise and recognized Novatian as a bishop, the milder view prevailed; and by the end of 253 most, if not all, of the eastern churches had returned to unity—though the danger of schism extended through Egypt, Armenia, Pontus, Bithynia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, and Arabia, as far as Mesopotamia. In Rome it appears that Stephen had taken a somewhat severer attitude, in order to win back the schismatics; he was still refusing absolution to the most extreme cases of apostasy, allowing the offenders to continue doing penance with no definite promise of restoration. His successor Sixtus, however, granted them reconciliation in 257, calling forth a new and violent attack from Novatian and his party, to which he replied in his treatise *Ad Novatianum.*

III. The Theoretical Basis of the Schism: At the beginning of the controversy (250–251) there was no question of the case of death nor of the *sacrificati*, still less of the effect of due penance. Both parties agreed that apostasy did not necessarily involve eternal damnation, but that even a *sacrificatus* might win the divine pardon. The con-

1. Catholic Position as to the Lapsed.

flict thus narrows down to a question as to the justifiable extent and efficacy of the Church's power of the keys. Cyprian furnished the theory for the dominant party, although it was carried to its full extent only in the West, and even there not until after Augustine. For a time men were content with the general statements that schism was to be avoided at all hazards; that Scripture enjoined charity and mercy; that the Church ought not to abandon the *lapsi* to the world and to heresy and schism; that the admission of succor in danger of death had its logical consequences, since many who were supposed to be dying recovered; that the Church, by allowing the lapsed to reinstate themselves through confession of the faith, showed that it regarded them as not wholly dead members. It was further alleged that it was unjust to require penance without holding out the possibility of absolution. Against the charge of laxity, appeal was made to the rigid investigation of individual cases, to the distinction between the treatment of *libellatici* and *sacrificati*, to the long period of penance, to the refusal of absolution to those who waited for the approach of death to begin it. These motives, however, are not for Cyprian the decisive ones. He places the greatest emphasis upon the doctrine that salvation is only for those who die in communion with the Church, and that thus they must be lost who are finally and forever excluded from it. If the Church has the power of binding in the last instance, while its absolution is only a condition *sine* *qua non* of salvation, but does not certainly involve the final judgment of God, the attempt to separate the wheat and tares on earth must be an invasion of the divine prerogatives. The Church is no longer the fellowship of the saints and the elect, but the indispensable institution from which that fellowship proceeds. Its indispensability consists in the sacraments which it dispenses, including absolution, which, however, do not guarantee salvation. As a moral institution also it is indispensable, since all the virtues gain value in God's sight only in and through it. The performance of these functions presupposes an organization and is attached to the priesthood, as summed up in the episcopate, which in its unity guarantees the authenticity of the Church.

2. The Novatian Position.

When, on the other hand, Novatian and his party asserted that it was both the right and the duty of the Church to cut off grievous sinners finally (though apparently Novatian himself did not push this to the extreme), when they denied that it had the power of absolving those guilty of idolatry and left them to the immediate judgment of God, it was evident that his conception of the Church, its absolution, and its priesthood was, or in course of time became, entirely different from that of his opponents. His thesis that God alone can forgive sins does not empty the conception of the Church of all significance, but assures the strictly religious meaning of it, restricting the extension of the Church in favor of its intensive force. If the Church, as the community of the baptized who have received God's pardon, is really the communion of saints and of salvation, it can not tolerate the unholy among its members without losing its character. A good idea of Novatian's attitude is to be obtained from the pseudo-Augustinian treatise *Quæstiones veteris et novi testamenti*, although there may be a few traces of later development in it. The Church is the body of Christ, and must be kept holy as he is holy. Through baptism, in which all sins are forgiven, each individual becomes a member of Christ, and all together compose the body. For all sins after baptism there is penance and forgiveness in the Church, except for idolatry (and possibly fornication); for these, as in the strict sense sins against God, there is no forgiveness on earth. Apostasy is the sin against the Holy Ghost, received by the Christian in baptism and lost by this sin, since there is only one baptism. The Church can not take back those who have thus sinned against God; logically, it has no power to forgive such a sin. It is bound to preach and these sinners to practise penance, as to the duty of which there is no limitation in Scripture. The abstract possibility exists that God will forgive these sinners, since all things are possible with him; but nothing can be certainly predicated as to this. The Catholic Church, by restoring those who have fallen into idolatry (and fornication) completely destroys the constitution of the Church; since all make up the one body, the holy are contaminated by the evil, and the body perishes. Though it may retain the correct *traditio* and *professio*, its members have lost their hold on salvation and their right to the Christian name, which belongs only to a pure Church and is thus found only among the followers of Novatian.

3. Criticism of these Positions.

The historical judgment of Novatian's movement will depend on the point of view, whether it is that of primitive antiquity or of the requirements of the time. Unquestionably the schismatics preserved valuable relics of ancient tradition. The idea that the Church is a fellowship of saints and of certain salvation is primitive, although its representatives in the third century did not draw the full consequences of it. But they refused to identify the constitutional attributes of the Church with the religious, or confuse actuality with possibility; they maintained the old conception of baptism as a gift and an unconditional obligation. It was, however, both unjust and unmerciful to inflict severer penalties on the *libellatici* than on other grievous sinners. The boast of being a community of saints was one which at that time could not be made without gross self-deception or the rending asunder of the Christendom of the day. The only means of purification which the Novatianists employed was at the time quite inadequate to reform the Church. Since their doctrine and every-day life did not differ essentially from those of the Church, their penitential discipline is seen to be an archaic survival of doubtful benefit, and their rejection of the Catholic sacraments (in the practise of rebaptism) revolutionary. Aside from unedifying personal conflicts, the bishops carried through the great change of attitude with wisdom, caution, and relative strictness. It was best for the Christendom of c. 250 that the Church should be regarded as an institution to train souls for eternal happiness, supplied with means of grace and practical penalties, and that the distinction between repentance and ecclesiastical penance should be abandoned. There was need of a line of action based on the circumstances of the moment, and of a close adherence to the bishops as pillars of the Church. It was not the least important result of the crises provoked by the Decian persecution that they forced the bishops of the various national churches to stand together and finally placed full jurisdiction in their hands. Nothing before or after contributed so much as these crises to the establishment of the imperial Church of later days.*

IV. Later History: For the western Church the controversy was not ended by the exclusion of the party of Novatian. The primitive survivals still to be found in Cyprian, which may be summed up in the formula that the requirements made by the Novatianists of all Christians were to be applied to the clergy, were the cause, in consequence of the persecution of Diocletian, of a terrible disturbance in Africa—the Donatist schism (see DONATISM). In Rome, also, there was a renewal of conflict over penitential discipline, of which unfortunately little is known (see MARCELLUS), and the Luciferian schism here (see Lucifer of Calaris and the Luciferians), as well as that of Meletius (see Meletius of Antioch and the Meletian Schism) in the East. The Novatian organization was consolidated in the two generations after Decius, and received many additions from Montanist communities. Apart from the primary question of discipline, the principal differentia, at least in Phrygia (where Montanist influence was strong), was the prohibition of second marriages. In the fourth and fifth centuries there were communities of "Cathari" in every province of the Empire, especially in the East. At the beginning of the fifth there were a number of Novatian churches in Rome, with a bishop; they did not fuse with the Donatists, but were usually regarded by the Catholics as on the same plane. In the time of Cyril they had a number of churches in Alexandria under a bishop (Theopemptus); in Constantinople the list of their bishops is preserved from 325 to 439. The first of this series, Acesius, was present at the Council of Nicæa on Constantine's summons, and accepted its decisions; the constant adherence of all the members of the sect to the *homoousion* shows the influence of Novatian's work *De trinitate*. The council adopted a conciliatory attitude toward them, treating them as schismatics but not as heretics, and acknowledging the validity of their baptisms and ordinations. Constantine allowed them to retain their churches and cemeteries; but ten years later he changed his policy, placed them on the same plane as the Marcionites and Valentinians, forbade their public worship, took their churches from them, and ordered the destruction of their books. They suffered severely in the persecution of the orthodox by Constantius, which drew them closer to the Nicene Catholics. Julian's policy was to their advantage, but under Valens they were again united in suffering with the Catholics, and in the provinces the persecution lasted until the accession of Theodosius, who took them under his protection. In Constantinople they remained unmolested until the middle of the fifth century. In Rome, Honorius included them in his edict of 412 against heretics, and at Alexandria Cyril closed their churches and expelled their bishop. Innocent I. was the first pope to take strong measures against them, followed by Celestine I., who suppressed their public worship. In the East, however, their organization maintained its existence as late as the seventh century. (A. Harnack.)

---

* There is room for difference of opinion as to whether the line of development indicated in the closing sentences of the paragraph above was really "best," and whether the more rigorous discipline of the Novatianists would not have been better. A. H. N.

Bibliography: The sources are indicated in the text. The best edition of the *Opera* of Novatian is by J. Jackson, London, 1728, cf. *MPL*. iii.; a recent ed. of the *De trinitate* is by W. Y. Tausset, Cambridge, 1909; Eng. transl., with introduction, of *De trinitate* and *De cibis Judaicis* in *ANF*, v. 611–650; and a new transl. of the *De trinitate* was published New York, 1909. The discussions of the literature ascribed to Novatian are indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiv. 223–225. Consult further: Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 652, ii. 2 pp. 61–62 et passim (very full); idem, *Dogma*, i.–v., consult index; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, ii. 185–288, 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762–85; H. Grégoire, *Hist. des sectes religieuses*, 5 vols., Paris, 1828; R. A. Lipsius, *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, Leipsic, 1875; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1884–86; C. T. Cruttwell, *Literary Hist. of Early Christianity*, 2 vols., London, 1893; Wehofer, in *Ephemeris Salonitana*, 1894, pp. 13 sqq.; Quarry, in *Hermathena*, x (1897), 36 sqq.; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, ii. 559 sqq., Freiburg, 1903; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 237–248; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 196–197, 570, 849–853; and in general the works on the church history and doctrinal history of the period.

NOWACK, nō″vāc′, WILHELM GUSTAV HERMANN: German Lutheran; b. at Berlin Mar. 3, 1850. He was educated at the University of Berlin (Ph.D., Halle, 1872; Th. Lic., Berlin, 1873), and became privat-docent there in 1875, and extraordinary professor in 1880. He was also supply at St. Gertrud's, Berlin (1876–77), and pastor at the orphan asylum at Rummelsburg, an eastern suburb of Berlin (1877–81). Since 1881 he has been professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Hebrew at the University of Strasburg. He is also a canon of St. Thomas, Strasburg, a member of the supreme consistory, and an overseer of the Protestant gymnasium at Strasburg, as well as a member of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft and of the Strasburg Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft. In theology he is an adherent of the historical critical school. He has written: *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik* (Göttingen, 1875); *Die assyrisch-babylonischen Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (Berlin, 1878); *Der Prophet Hosea erklärt* (1880); *Die sozialen Probleme in Israel und deren Bedeutung für die religiöse Entwickelung dieses Volkes* (Strasburg, 1892); *Hebräische Archäologie* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1894); *Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der assyrischen Zeit* (Tübingen, 1902); and *Textausgabe der kleineren Propheten* in Kittel's Bible (1906). He has prepared the second edition of E. Bertheau and F. Hitzig's commentaries on Proverbs and Ecclesiastes for the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (Leipsic, 1883); the third edition of H. Hupfeld's commentary on the Psalms (2 vols., Gotha, 1888); and Amos and Hosea for *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher* (Tübingen, 1908). Since 1892 he has been the editor-in-chief of the *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, to which he has contributed the volumes on the Minor Prophets (Göttingen, 1897; 2d ed., 1903), Judges and Ruth (1900), and Samuel (1902).

NOWELL nō′el (NOWEL, NOEL), ALEXANDER: Dean of St. Paul's and preacher of the Elizabethan period; b. at Read Hall, Whalley (37 m. n.e. of Liverpool), County of Lancaster, 1507 or 1508; d. at London Feb. 13, 1601 or 1602. He was educated at Middleton, near Manchester, and at Brasenose College, Oxford, which he entered at thirteen. He was the "chamber-fellow" of Foxe the martyrologist, and was made bachelor of arts in 1536 and master in 1540. In 1543 he was appointed master of Westminster School, London, he being the second incumbent of that position; was licensed to preach in 1550, 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 Strasburg and Frankfort, 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; and 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 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 lower house of the convocation of Canterbury, and presided over those sessions which revised and settled the Articles of Religion. In 1565 he had a controversy with Thomas Dorman, who attacked John Jewel's *Apology*. His services were in great demand on all public occasions and he was chosen to make the first public announcement from the pulpit of the destruction of the Armada before the lord-mayor, aldermen, and others. Nowell is the author of one or more catechisms, which were "approved and allowed" by the clergy of convocation. 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. R. Churton holds to the latter view. In 1571 a catechism by Nowell was printed in Latin; it was appointed to be read at Oxford in 1578 and studied at Cambridge in 1589. This was called *The Large Catechism* followed by Nowell with *The Middle Catechism* and *The Short Catechism*. The translation of the large catechism was published by Thomas Norton (Brasenose College, Oxford, 1750; latest ed., G. E. Corrie, with an appendix containing sermon of Nowell preached before Parliament, 1563, London, 1853). It is, therefore, probable that Nowell was the author of the first part of the catechism now in use in the Church of England, published in 1549. It was prescribed by Archbishop Parker of Canterbury to be taught; and it heads a list of books for the extirpation of heresy which the University of Oxford prescribed in 1579.

Bibliography: R. Churton, *The Life of A. Nowell*, Oxford, 1809; J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, new ed., ib. 1824; idem, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vols. ii.–iii., London, 1721; *DNB*, xli. 243–250, where copious references to literature are found.

NOYES, neiz, GEORGE RAPALL: Unitarian; b. at Newburyport, Mass., Mar. 6, 1798; d. at Cambridge, Mass., June 3, 1868. He was graduated at Harvard College, 1818, studied theology there, and was licensed in 1822. He was pastor at Brookfield and Petersham, Mass., and from 1840 till his death Hancock professor of Hebrew and 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); Psalms (Boston, 1831); Prophets (3 vols., 1833–1837); Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles (1846); the New Testament (from Tischendorf's text, 7th and 8th editions, 1868).

NOYES, JOHN HUMPHREY. See Communism, II., 8.

NUELSEN, JOHN LOUIS: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Zurich, Switzerland, Jan. 19, 1867; came to the United States in 1886 and graduated at Drew Theological Seminary, 1890; became pastor of a German Methodist Episcopal Church in Sedalia, Mo., 1890; professor of ancient languages, St. Paul's College, Mo., 1890; professor of exegetical theology, Central Wesleyan Seminary, 1894, and of the same in the Nast Theological Seminary, Berea, O., 1899, was elected bishop May 19, 1908. Since 1897 he has edited the *Deutsch-amerikanische Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (Berea, O.); and has written, *Die Bedeutung des Evangeliums Johannes für die christliche Lehre* (Berlin, 1903); *Das Leben Jesu in Wortlaut der vier Evangelien* (New York, 1904); *John Wesley, ausgewählte Predigten* (1905); *Luther, the Leader* (1906); and *Kurzgefasste Geschichte des Methodismus* (1907).

NUERNBERGER, nurn-bār′ger, AUGUSTIN: German Roman Catholic; b. at Habelschwerdt (60 m. s.s.w. of Breslau) Jan. 6, 1854; d. at Breslau Apr. 20, 1910. He was educated at the universities of Breslau and Prague, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1879. He was then curate of the Anima at Rome till 1881, after which he was a gymnasial teacher at Neisse and Breslau until 1884. He became privat-docent at the University of Breslau in 1892, associate professor of church history in 1894, and professor of the history of dogma, patristics, and the history of ecclesiastical organization in 1901. He wrote: *Aus der literarischen Hinterlassenschaft des heiligen Bonifatius und des heiligen Burchardus* (Neisse, 1888); *Ueber eine ungedruckte Kanonensammlung aus dem achten Jahrhundert* (Mainz, 1890); *De Sancti Bonifatii Germaniæ apostoli vitis codicum manuscriptorum ope denuo edendis* (Breslau, 1892); *Vita Sancti Bonifatii auctore Wilibaldo* (1895); *Die Namen Vynfreth-Bonifatius* (1896); *Zur Kirchengeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (3 vols., 1897–1900); *Die römische Synode vom Jahr 743* (Mainz, 1898); *Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte des Pater A. Faulhabers* (1900); *Das Epitaph des Pater A. Faulhabers* (Habelschwerdt, 1902); and *Zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät Breslau* (Breslau, 1904).

NUMBERS. See Hexateuch.

NUMBERS, SACRED: The numbers and computations, as well as the few technical expressions, found in the Bible show familiarity with the four basal operations of arithmetic and an elementary knowledge of fractions. Hebrew words like *saphar*, "count," *mispar*, "number," *pakadh*, "enroll," *manah*, "determine numerically," *minyan*, "number," *rosh*, "sum," *gara'*, "subtract," *ha'odeph*, "the remainder," are examples of evidences of this knowledge. Instances of addition are found in Num. i., xxvi.; of subtraction in Gen. xviii. 28 sqq.; of multiplication in Lev. xxv. 8; Num. vii. 88; of division, Num. xxxi. 26 sqq. More complicated operations are indicated in Lev. xxv. 50 sqq., xxvii. 18, 23. Fractions like one-third, one-fourth, one-fifth, one-sixth, one-, two-, and three-tenths occur, while in Zech. xiii. 8 two-thirds, in Gen. xlvii. 24 four-fifths, and Neh. xi. 1 nine-tenths are found. A decimal system is implied in the powers of ten so frequently used or implied. The employment of the letters of

Hebrew Knowledge of Computation.

the alphabet as numbers was known in times before the Ptolemies, and among the Jews it is proved by Maccabean coins. In earlier times the Hebrews used the system of the Babylonians, which was employed also by Assyrians and in the West, even in Egypt, and extended eastward into India. From the foregoing it follows that the derivation, attempted by many exegetes, of critically suspected numbers from written numbers indicated by letters is to be accepted with the greatest caution, since such changes could have arisen only in a period after the text was fixed. Corrections of numbers like those of the Chronicler, looking to the systematic substitution of lower numbers, is useless, since those numbers are in the texture of the Chronicler's work.

Symbolism of Numbers in General.

Among diverse peoples certain numbers were employed in such a way that the question is raised whether originally a symbolic meaning was not inherent. This question is raised in interest when there is noted the frequent employment of a number in connection with sacred things. From the notice of the last fact, the inference has been drawn that under all much-used numbers a symbolical meaning lay hidden; to this supposition strength was given by the early endeavor in Jewish circles to give a significance to words through the numerical value of the component letters (as when the 318 of Gen. xiv. 14 is connected with Eliezer, or the eighty-five priests of I Sam. xxii. 18 is connected with the Hebrew for " priests," or the 603,000 Hebrews of Num. i. 46 is brought into relations with the Hebrew for " Children of Israel "). This method of exegesis received strength from the idea taken over from Greek philosophy, that numbers and numerical relations are fundamental in the universe, and there arose not only a Jewish but a Christian Cabala (see CABALA), followers of which yet exist. Although the disciples of the cabalistic school differ from each other so much in methods and results, while they attempt to obtain access to " deeper meanings," new arbitrary arrangements are continually " discovered " to which significance is given. K. C. W. F. Bähr gave an impulse to this sort of research in his *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus* (2 vols., Heidelberg, 1837–39), followed by Kurtz (in *TSK*, 1844, pp. 315 sqq.), Kliefoth (in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1862, pp. 1 sqq., 341 sqq., 509 sqq.), and Kliefoth's pupil Lämmert, who yet could not agree with his master. Are there, then, in the Bible numbers used unmistakably in a symbolical sense? If so, they must have been intelligible not only to the author, but to the reader. At least the numbers seven, twelve, ten, and three are used symbolically in the Bible. This use is based upon two standards, arithmetical and historical. The former is the general ground which has led diverse nations to use these numbers in the same symbolical manner. Natural facts have strengthened the usage, as when seven is related to the moon's periods and twelve to the ratio of the moon's course to the sun's. Three had significance as the simplest group of units, seven as a double group with a central point, twelve as four times the group of three and also as the first number divisible by four numbers, ten as the basis of decimals. These qualities explain the wide use of these numbers as sacred. While all cases can not be explained on the ground of derivation from Babylonia, the wide influence of that region upon culture and religion in the pre-Christian world, especially upon the Old Testament and thus upon the New Testament and consequently later upon Christian peoples, is now fully recognized, and this is in some cases traced backward to the early pre-Semitic civilization of Babylonia. It seems probable that the emphasis upon certain numbers originated in the religious field, and that thence the symbolic significance spread to other domains. Especially is this true of the number seven, the word for which in Sumerian the Semitic Babylonians translated by a word meaning " completeness." The coincidence of this number with natural phenomena, as the length of a moon's phase, would emphasize the number's supposed qualities (see WEEK). Further, the employment of sacred numbers in the Old Testament shows more or less consciousness of an original idea of this sort; sometimes, however, this employment is secondary in its reference. The use of these numbers in sacred connections influenced their employment in other relations. To the relations of sacred import were added also historical relations; sometimes the latter are first in mind.

Seven, Three, and Four.

Some numbers usually convey certain definite ideas. Thus three recalls deity, four the world or mankind, five half of completion, ten full completion, twelve the people of God. If it be asserted that three has significance for the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, that four recalls the quarters of the earth or the winds, and so on, this may be granted; but if it be claimed that, whenever these and like numbers appear with a semblance of significance, a concealed and mystical reference to the assumed symbolical meaning is present, this is a cabalistic eisegesis against which protest is a pressing duty. On seven see SEVEN, THE SACRED NUMBER. To the evidence there furnished may be added Zech. iii. 9, iv. 10, where the seven eyes connote divine omniscience and forethought, and iv. 2 sqq., where the seven lamps symbolize the divine fulness of light. Similar ideas of completeness are involved in Isa. xxx. 26; Dan. iii. 19; Deut. xxviii. 7, 25. Seven-day periods are frequent (see WEEK). Multiples of seven are numerous: twice seven, Lev. xii. 5; thrice fourteen, Matt. i. 17; ten times seven, Deut. x. 22; Ex. xxiv. 1; Num. xi. 16, 24; Luke x. 1; Gen. l. 3; Dan. ix. 2; eleven times seven, Judges vii. 14; Ezra viii. 35; and seven multiplied by multiples of ten is of common occurrence. Next to seven three occurs often, and seems to derive its significance from its arithmetical qualities as something absolute—the beginning, middle, and end. In this Babylonian conceptions seem to meet and greet Roman and Greek ideas. But that the number three in the Old Testament has significance for the doctrine of the Trinity must be rejected. Gen. xviii. 2 sqq. speaks not of an appearance of Yahweh in triple form, but of his theophany accompanied by two companions. The threefold blessing of Num. vi. 24 sqq. and the trisagion of Isa. vi. 3 are merely a kind of superlative. A support for the doctrine of the Trinity used to be found in the ethnic triads; but it is to be remembered that the great triads of Babylonia and Egypt came out of a threefold division of the universe, with which the doctrine of the Trinity has nothing to do. To what the conspicuous prominence of the number three is due will probably remain a basis of debate. Examples of its use are: II Cor. xii. 2, the third heaven; Exod. iii. 14, the threefold feast; Dan. vi. 10, three daily seasons of prayer; Gen. xl. 10 sqq., three-day period; three-month period, Exod. ii. 2; triple salutation, I Sam. xx. 41. In many other relations three appears; cf. Judges vii. 16; Deut. xix. 7; Josh. xviii. 4; Job. ii. 11; I John v. 7. Multiples of three are to be noted, as in the ten times three of the month, the thirty shekels of Exod. xxi. 32; in the 300 of Gen. xlv. 22 and other passages; in the 3,000 of I Macc. (frequently); in the 3,600 of II Chron. ii. 1; and in the 30,000 so often appearing, as in Josh. viii. 3. The relations of the number four to the universe at large appear often; cf. Gen. ii. 10; Jer. xlix. 36; Dan. vii. 2, viii. 8; Zech. ii., vi. 1 sqq.; Ezek. i. 5 sqq.; Rev. iv. 6, vii. 1; Ezek. xiv. 21; Judges xi 40. Multiples of four figure largely: so forty, Gen. xxv. 20; Josh. xiv. 7; Ex. xvi. 35, expressing a generation; Acts xiii. 21, vii. 30; Judges iv. 3 (where twenty is the half of forty); Gen. vii. 4 sqq. Forty days is a very common period of time in the Old Testament; Jonah iii. 4; Acts i. 3. Indeed, forty enters into other computations, as where it is combined with twelve to indicate a certain period (I Kings vi. 1; upon which the commentaries should be consulted, giving hints as to variations of this computation). So 400 appears as a round number: Gen. xv. 13; Judges xxi. 12, often; 4,000 is also known, I Sam. iv. 2; Matt. xv. 38; Acts xxi. 38; 40,000 occurs in Judges v. 8; II Sam. x. 18; and 400,000 in Judges xx. 2, 17.

The Numbers Five to Twelve.

The number five appears as the half of ten; cf. I Kings vii. 39, 49; Matt. xxv. 2; also as a round number, I Sam. xvii. 40, xxi. 3; Isa. xix. 18; I Cor. xiv. 19. Five also is of importance in penalties and the like, as in Ex. xxii. 1; Num. iii. 47, xviii. 16; the same idea is found in Gen. xliii. 34, xlv. 22; one-fifth also makes its appearance in legislative directions, as in Lev. v. 16, xxii. 14, and often; while multiples of five appear in the regulations of Lev. xxvii. respecting the vow; cf. fifteen in Hos. iii. 2. Multiples of five are employed: in measures, Gen. vi. 15; Ezek. xl. 15; in compensation, Deut. xxii. 29; frequently in matters regarding population or the army (e.g., Ex. xviii. 21; Deut. i. 15); periods of fifty days or years are to be noted (Lev. xxiii. 16, xxv. 10–11), in this case the motive is seven times seven plus one. Higher multiples used are 500, 5,000, and 500,000. The number six is seldom employed as symbolical. The six years of Ex. xxi. 2 correspond to the six work-days of the week (Ex. xx. 9); the six steps of Solomon's throne are related to the twelve lions (I Kings x. 19); further instances are the six wings of the seraphim (Isa. vi. 2); the reed of six cubits (Ezek. xl. 5); cf. also one-sixth in Ezek. xlv. 13. Multiples of six are 60, 600, 6,000, and 600,000. The number eight occurs generally as the next number to seven, as in the case of circumcision (Gen. xvii. 12), in offerings (Ex. xxii. 29 sqq.; Num. vi. 10), and in feasts (Lev. xxiii. 36). Nine, as the square of three, might be expected frequently, but is rare, and generally signifies ten minus one (Neh. xi. 1; Luke xvii. 17), occurring as ninety-nine (100 minus one; Matt. xviii. 12). Round numbers in multiples of nine are 900 and 9,000. The number ten is naturally of frequent occurrence: as a basal measure for the Temple (I Kings vi. 3), as the number of the commandments, as denoting the number of vessels, etc., in the Temple (I Kings vii. 27–38); in the ritual frequently (e.g., Ex. xii. 3), including the tenth (see Tithes). The use of the powers of ten is of course common. Thus 100 as a round number and as a multiplier is used (Eccles. vi. 3; Gen. xxvi. 12; Matt. xiii. 8); so 1,000 (Ex. xx. 6; Matt. xiii. 8); and 10,000 (Judges iv. 6 sqq.; I Sam. xv. 4; Matt. xviii. 24); as well as 100,000 (I Kings xx. 29); and such passages as Dan. vii. 10; Rev. v. 11 show the use of this number to suggest large ideas. Other uses are shown in Lev. xxvi. 26; Neh. v. 11; Lev. xxvi. 8; Judges xx. 10, etc., in which various proportions that involve the number are employed. In Matt. xx. 6 sqq. the number eleven is used symbolically. The common use of the number twelve is somewhat remarkable, whether that is influenced by its being the product of three and four or the sum of five and seven or the number of the months and the zodiacal signs—certainly of the last there are no signs among the Hebrews, where the use most general refers to the number of tribes. Naturally the multiples of twelve appear also in relation to the tribes; 12,000 (Num. xxxi. 5), 24,000 (Num. xxv. 9), 144,000 (Rev. vii. 4). There is room for question whether the number seventy (ut sup.) is a round number for seventy-two; this is familiar through the use of that term for the translators (six times twelve) of the Old Testament into Greek. One usage worthy of notice here is poetic, in which a lower and a higher number are conjoined for rhetorical heightening of effect (Isa. xvii. 6; Amos. i. 3 sqq.; Micah v. 5; Prov. xxx. 15 sqq., notable; Eccl. xi. 2). On the mystical numbers in Dan. viii. 14, xii. 11; Rev. xiii. 18–19 consult the commentaries. (E. Kautzsch†.)

Bibliography: Isidore of Seville, *De numeris*, in *MPL*, lxxxi.; K. C. W. F. Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, i. 119–208, Heidelberg, 1837; C. Auber, *Hist. et théorie du symbolisme religieux*, i. 97–155, Paris, 1870; R. Hirzel, in *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* (1885), 1 sqq.; S. Kraus, in *ZATW*, xix. 1 (1899), 1 sqq., and part 2, pp. 38 sqq.; H. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des N. T.*, pp. 43–44, 81, Göttingen, 1903; W. H. Roscher, in *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, xxi. 4 (1903), xxiv. 1 (1904), xxvi. 1 (1907), xxvii. 4 (1909); A. Jeremias, *Das A. T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 56 sqq., Leipsic, 1906; E. Mahler, in *ZDMG*, lx (1906), 834 sqq.; B. Stade, in *ZATW*, xxvi (1906), 124 sqq.; E. König, in *ZDMG*, lxi (1907), 474 sqq.; Schrader, *KAT*, ii. 614 sqq.; E. W. Hopkins, *Oriental Studies of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia*, pp. 141 sqq.; H. G. Wood, *Ideal Metrology in Nature, Art, Religion, and History*, Dorchester, Mass., 1908; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii. columns 1677–97; *DB*, iii. 560–567; *EB*, iii. 3434–3439; *JE*, ix. 348–350; the literature under Cabala and the commentaries on the Biblical passages.

NUN: A word applied in modern English to the members of cloistered female religious orders. In late and medieval Latin the cognate form is found in both masculine and feminine forms (*nonnus* and *nonna*), explained by Forcellini as applied to elders in token of respect. In this sense the modern Italian retains the words *nonno* and *nonna* for "grandfather" and "grandmother." Jerome coordinates the terms *casta et nonna*, Arnobius *sanctus et nonnus*. The word *nonnus* in this sense was used in monastic phraseology, as in the Rule of St. Benedict, chap. lxiii., which forbids the monks to call each other simply by their names, requiring the prefix of *frater* from the elder to the younger and *nonnus* from the younger to the elder. This usage has long been obsolete, while the feminine form has passed into the vernacular of several modern languages in the sense given at the beginning of this article. See MONASTICISM. (A. HAUCK.)

NUNCIO. SEE LEGATES AND NUNCIOS, PAPAL.

NUREMBERG LEAGUE. See FRANKFORT RESPITE.

NUREMBERG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF: A temporary settlement of the difficulties between the Roman Catholic and Protestant states of the empire, agreed upon at Nuremberg in 1532. The dangerous position in which the Protestants had been left by the decisions of the Diet of Augsburg (Nov. 19, 1530) forced them to renew their efforts to form an alliance for mutual protection. The jurists succeeded in persuading Luther and the elector that if the emperor did not keep his oath to them they were justified in taking measures for self-defense; and soon after Christmas, 1530, the Schmalkald League came into existence (see PHILIP THE MAGNANIMOUS). By the expiration of the time of grace allowed to the Protestants (Apr. 15, 1531) their position had notably improved; and the Turks were threatening to attack not merely Hungary but the Austrian crown-lands. Ferdinand advised his brother the emperor to come to some compromise with the Protestants so as to win their support against this danger. The league was attaining an unexpected degree of solidarity, and the Roman Catholic states were disquieted by rumors of warlike preparations on their part. Clement VII. himself was considering the possibility, if there were no other means of warding off the peril of the Turks on one side and of a general council on the other, of conceding to the Protestants the marriage of the clergy and communion in both kinds.

The first step toward agreement was taken when the emperor ordained (July 8, 1531), in a decree not immediately published, that the action of the Reichskammergericht in the cases before it growing out of the decision of the Diet of Augsburg should be suspended until the next diet. Further negotiations throughout the autumn of 1531 came to nothing. The Protestant leaders decided not to appear at the Diet of Regensburg (Apr., 1532) but to meet simultaneously at Schweinfurt and begin then a serious effort to reach an agreement. The negotiations progressed very slowly, the Leaguers clinging to the advantage they had gained, and Ferdinand so convinced of his ultimate success that his representatives scarcely ventured to communicate to him the proposals of the other side. When the diet met, the Roman Catholic states, turning a deaf ear to the Protestant demands, called for the execution of the Augsburg Recess and its maintenance until the assembling of a council. The emperor saw nothing to do but to act without them and make peace at all costs; and Luther on his side strongly urged the securing of essentials by the abandonment of opposition on such points as the dispute over the validity of Ferdinand's election. The sultan was now actually carrying his threats into execution, and some of the Protestant states were moved by patriotism and fear of the reproach that they were standing idly by to witness the destruction of Christendom into mobilizing for the emperor's support.

After tedious negotiations, an agreement was reached on July 23, and the Peace of Nuremberg was promulgated on Aug. 3. The emperor, in his own name, guaranteed to the Evangelicals the maintenance of the *status quo* until the meeting of a council, or, if this should not take place within a year, until the next diet. It was not an absolute guaranty of the quashing of the suits before the Reichskammergericht, but a private "assurance" on the part of the emperor, which was still further weakened by the requirement that a formal application should be made in each case. In a word, it was rather a truce than a peace; but it signified, after all, a considerable victory for the Evangelicals. The Augsburg Recess, on which the Roman party in the diet had so strongly insisted, was annulled; the legal status of the Protestant churches was assured at least for the time; and Luther was right in his contention that it secured quite sufficient advantages even for those who should in future become Protestants, although they were not expressly included in its operations. Under its protection, the Reformation made great progress in the next few years, and it remained a useful point of departure for later negotiations. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, p. 641, Berlin, 1890; H. Baumgarten, *Geschichte Karls V.*, iii. 638 sqq., Stuttgart, 1892; O. Winckelmann, *Der schmalkaldische Bund 1530–32 und der Nürnberger Religionsfriede*, Strasburg, 1892; J. Ficker, in *ZKG*, xii. 582 sqq.; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, v. 326 sqq., St. Louis, Mo., 1903; *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 218, 221, 232, London and New York, 1904.

NYSTROEM, JOHAN ERIK: General Baptist; b. at Stockholm Sept. 8, 1842. He was graduated at the University of Upsala, 1866; was teacher of languages in the New Elementary School of Stockholm, 1867; in Greek and Hebrew in the Baptist Seminary there, 1867–72; secretary of the Swedish Evangelical Alliance, 1872–78; and missionary to the Jews at Beirut, Syria, 1878–81. In 1872 he traveled in aid of the Baptist building-fund, through Germany, England, and Scotland; and in 1885 was elected a member of the Swedish Parliament for three years. He is the translator of B. E. Nicholl's *Help to the Reading of the Bible* (1866); and of Merle d'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation in the Time* *of Calvin* (1874–77) and is the author (in Swedish) of "Bible Dictionary" (1868) and "Library of Biblical Antiquities" (1874).

NYVALL, DAVID: Lutheran; b. at Vall, in the parish of Karlskoga, Värmland, Sweden, Jan. 19, 1863. He was educated at the gymnasium of Gäfle, the University of Upsala (1882–84), and the Carolingian Medical Institute, Stockholm (1884–1885). Leaving Sweden for the United States, he was instructor in a private school in Minneapolis, Minn. (1886–87), pastor of the Swedish Evangelical mission church, Sioux City, Ia. (1887–88), instructor in the Swedish department of the Chicago Theological Seminary (1888–90), instructor and principal of a private school in Minneapolis and assistant editor of the weekly *Veckobladet* (1890–91), president of the same school when enlarged and taken under the control of the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant (1891–94), and president of the North Park College, Chicago (the new Covenant school), and instructor in New Testament, Swedish, and other subjects in the same institution (1894–1905). Since 1905 he has been president of Walden College, McPherson, Kan. He has also been secretary of the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant (1896–1903). In theology he is an orthodox Lutheran. He has written: *Versi och Saga* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1890), poems; *Minnesblad* (Chicago, 1892), six addresses to the young; *Medsols* (1898), three patriotic addresses to the young; *Söken Guds Rike* (1901), addresses to the young; *Skogsdrillar* (1901), poems; and *My Business* (McPherson, Kan., 1905), eight addresses to the young.

O

OATES, TITUS: The inventor of the famous Popish Plot; b. at Oakham (9 m. s.e. of Melton Mowbray) about 1649; d. at London July 12 or 13, 1705. The son of a Baptist clergyman, he studied at Merchant Taylors' school and at Cambridge, took orders in the Church of England; was a chaplain in the navy; and entered the Roman Catholic Church with the pretense, it is claimed, of obtaining the secrets of the Jesuits; he tarried 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 John Richard 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 good 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 of 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 had the matter brought to the notice of the king, who probably smiled at it; and made public affidavit to the alleged facts before Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, justice of the peace, deposing to a narrative consisting of forty-three articles, soon after increased to eighty-one, the majority of which were palpably invented. The excitement over the revelations was intense. Lord Shaftesbury, who had just been released from prison, for political reasons fell in with the popular feeling, and exclaimed, "Let the treasurer cry as loud as he pleases against Popery, I will cry a note louder." The popular agitation was increased to frenzy by the murder of Godfrey, which was construed into an attempt to stifle the plot. The two houses of Parliament instituted an investigation of the matter and concurred in the opinion that a plot existed. Five peers, including Arundel and Bellasys, were sent to the Tower. Patrols guarded the streets; chains were drawn across them, and the houses supplied with arms. Parliament at the end of the year (1678) passed a bill excluding Roman Catholics from both houses, which was left unrepealed for a century and a half. The excitement was beginning to subside, when one Bedloe, stimulated by the reward which had been offered, appeared on the scene, and again aroused the national frenzy to its former intensity by more circumstantial and irritating 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 1,200 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, in 1684. Oates was condemned to pay a fine of 100,000 pounds, and sent to prison. On the accession of the duke to the throne in 1685, Oates was tried and convicted of perjury and was sentenced to be put in the pillory annually, be whipped from Oldgate to Newgate, and from thence to Tyburn, to pay a heavy fine, to be stripped of his canonical habits, and to be imprisoned for life. Taken back again to prison, he recovered from the exceedingly severe whipping. After the accession of William and Mary, the conviction of Oates was declared to have been illegal (1689), and he was not only pardoned, but granted an annual pension of five pounds a week, which was suspended at the instance of Queen Mary in 1693, but restored and increased, in 1698, to 300 pounds per annum.

Bibliography: The best modern book is J. Pollock, *The Popish Plot*, London, 1903. Consult further: *The Discovery of the Popish Plot*, London, 1679; T. Knox, *The Tryal of T. Knox and J. Lane for a Conspiracy to Defame . . . Dr. Oates*, ib. 1680; C. M. Clode, *Titus Oates and the Merchant Taylors' Company*, ib. 1890. A large literature of contemporaneous writers is indicated in the *British Museum Catalogue* under "Oates, Titus."

OATH.

- I. Hebrew Usage.
  - Two Forms of Swearing (§ 1).
  - Methods of Attestation (§ 2).
- II. In the Church.
  - New-Testament Teaching (§ 1).
  - Protestant Position (§ 2).
- III. In Canon Law.
  - The General Conditions (§ 1).
  - Judgment in Swearing (§ 2).
  - Justice in the Object (§ 3).
  - Customary Formulas (§ 4).

The oath is an asseveration, an appeal to something held sacred, in support of the truthfulness of a statement or of sincerity in making a promise or vow. Arising out of the relationship between God and man, its binding force is not due to any legal ordinance, but to the same circumstances as those out of which religion itself springs. Its use is, in general, the discovery of truth in the administration of justice and the ensuring of the fulfilment of moral obligations. For the ethnic and primitive background, see Ordeal.

I. Hebrew Usage: Apart from its use in legal procedure (see Law, Hebrew, Civil and Criminal), the oath was frequent among the Hebrews. Swearing by Yahweh was not at all irreligious (Deut. vi. 13, x. 20); Yahweh himself swears by his life (Gen. xxii. 16). But swearing by other gods was idolatry (Jer. v. 7, xii. 16; Amos viii. 14), and false-swearing is abuse of the name of God (Exod. xx. 7; cf. Matt. v. 33).

1. Two Forms of Swearing.

Oaths were of two kinds. One confirmed a declaration: "as Yahweh liveth" (Judg. viii. 19), or "Yahweh is witness betwixt me and thee" (Gen. xxxi. 50). The sense in which these forms of swearing were used is shown by the oft-recurring phrase: "God do so and more also" (I Sam. xiv. 44); it was a conditional imprecation. Connected with this custom of swearing by Yahweh is the other one of swearing by the life of the king or of the addressed person, "as thy soul liveth" (I Sam. l. 26). By this the addressed person is placed beside Yahweh or put in Yahweh's place as witness and avenger; cf. the cases where one swears at the same time by the life of God and by that of a man (e.g., I Sam. xx. 3). In the other form of swearing, he who interrogates "adjures" the interrogated in such a manner that he pronounces a conditional curse, hence the phrase "to lay an oath upon one" "to cause him to swear" (I Kings viii. 31), or "to make one swear" "to take an oath of one" (Ezek. xvii. 13). The interrogated then makes his declaration under this conditional curse, he accepts the oath (cf. Matt. xxvi. 63). The fear of later Judaism to pronounce the name of Yahweh on the one hand, and the prevailing custom of using the oath in every-day affairs on the other hand (Ecclus. xxiii. 9 sqq.), brought it about that, in place of the name of God, something sanctified to him, or something that stood in relation to him, was employed. At the time of Christ it was customary to swear by heaven, by the angels, by the earth, by Jerusalem, by the temple and its vessels, by the altar, by the sacrifice, and by one's head (Matt. v. 34 sqq., xxiii. 16–22; Jas. v. 12; Josephus, *War*, II., xvi. 4). Pharisaic casuistry regarded these oaths not as binding as an oath by God himself, and differentiated among oaths according to the degree of sanctity of the adjured objects (cf. Matt. xxiii. 16 sqq. and the commentators on that passage).

2. Methods of Attestation.

As to the external forms, the Hebrew terms for swearing point to the original employment of seven sacred things. The sanctity of the number seven is very ancient and wide-spread (see Numbers, Sacred; Seven, the Sacred Number). Herodotus (iii. 8) tells that the Arabs in making covenants sprinkled seven stones with the blood of those making the covenant (see also Homer, *Iliad*, xix. 243). Comparing Gen. xxi. 31 with Gen. xv. 10 and Jer. xxxiv. 18, it appears that in solemnly attested promises the attestation was a sacrifice consisting of seven animals (see Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, pp. 480 sqq.). Another ancient custom is less intelligible. In the history of the patriarchs (Gen. xxiv. 2, xlvii. 29) it is told that he that swore put the hand under the thigh (the seat of generative power) of him that demanded the oath. It is possible that by this was conveyed the idea that the oath concerned also the descendants (see Dillmann on the passage), and also that there is here a remainder from phallic worship in which the genital organs were a symbol of deity. The practise was probably derived from the Canaanites and its significance lost in historical times (see Holzinger on Gen. xxiv. 2). The simplest ceremony of swearing is the uplifting of the right hand or of both hands to heaven (Gen. xiv. 22), a ceremony which in historical time was very general, so that from it a designation for "swearing" is taken: "to lift the hand" is as much as "to swear" (Ex. vi. 8; Num. xiv. 30). In later Judaism it was customary to touch the *Tefillin* ("phylacteries") when taking the oath.

I. Benzinger.

II. In the Church: The appeal made in the oath is usually to the Divine Being as the holy and righteous, who demands truthfulness and condemns and punishes lying. As God, by whom men swear, is the Almighty in whose power men are, so men declare by oath that their statements are made with a full consciousness of what God is and demands, fully aware that in case of an untruth they come under the judgment of this God, that they even invoke it. Men swear thus (Heb. vi. 16) by God as their superior and ruler.

1. New-Testament Teaching.

The importance of the oath can be inferred from its simplest form like "I swear by God," or "God is my witness," "God knows it" (Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; Gal. i. 20; I Thess. ii. 5; II Cor. i. 23); Paul calls upon God by his soul (II Cor. i. 23), which is known to God and places itself under his judgment. James (v. 12) declares against the use of the oath, and a similar prohibition is given in the words of Jesus (Matt. v. 33–37). The passage has been differently interpreted; but it can be construed only in one way without destroying its logical articulation. 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. As swearing falsely is prohibited in the Old Testament because the name of God is thereby profaned (Lev. xix. 12), the hallowing of God's name (Matt. vi. 9) is to be extended, according to Jesus' intention, to entire abstinence from the use of the oath. And when, in his enumeration of the various formulas of oaths, Jesus omits the direct appeal to God, he could do so without being misunderstood, partly because his condemnation of all the usual indirect formulas involved a still severer condemnation of the direct one; partly because the latter was very little used among the Jews on account of their reluctance to pronounce the name of God. This reluctance is also the reason why a tender and candid Christian conscience shrinks from using the name of God in making its statements. If, however, the passage quoted be interpreted as a definite prohibition of swearing, it comes into conflict with other New-Testament passages. The words of Paul (referred to above) have certainly the character of the oath. And when Jesus condescended to answer the question of the high priest (Matt. xxvi. 63), though it was counted in the formulas employed when oaths were taken in the courts, he allowed his own words to assume the same character; moreover, the passage Heb. vi. 16 could never have been written if swearing had been absolutely prohibited among the first Christians. This contradiction is to be solved in the same way as the contradictions between the prohibitions of the Sermon on the Mount—not to be angry, not to revile. Only when issuing from the lower egotistical affections and impulses of human nature are anger, reproach, and swearing forbidden, that is to say, under circumstances which, for instance, would make an oath profane swearing. It is quite otherwise when the same act is performed for the sake of high ethical interests, as, for instance, when the civil authorities demand an oath in order to reach the truth and to make justice safe.

2. Protestant Position.

It was in this way that the doctrine of the New Testament concerning oaths was conceived by the Reformers and the large Protestant communities (cf. *Augsburg Confession*, xvi.; Luther's Larger Catechism; Geneva Catechism; Heidelberg Catechism; Thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Church). The canon law of the Roman Church, following Jerome, demands that the oath be taken in accordance with Jer. iv. 2 (Vulgate): "in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness"; the same is found also in the Anglican articles. Modern Protestant ethicists, while in the main agreeing with the confession of the Church, differ somewhat in that they regard the oath partly as an evil necessary on account of the moral condition of the human race; partly—and in this case the oath is justified—as an expression of devout sentiment; they refer the words in the Sermon on the Mount mainly to "frivolous formulas of swearing." On the whole it must be acknowledged that swearing, whatever be the circumstances and conditions, "cometh of evil" (Matt. v. 37). It presupposes a distrust which rules human society and a lack of conscientiousness in Christendom. A really Christian morality ruling the community everywhere would make the oath superfluous and give place to the simple "yea, yea" and "nay, nay" (cf. on this point especially the works on ethics by Wuttke, Palmer, Schmidt, Luthardt, Kübel). Considering the holiness and justice of God, the form of an oath should be as simple as possible. The mere invocation of God as witness should be sufficient, all else should be prohibited; a form like "so help me God to my everlasting salvation" is objectionable (see Wuttke). Objectionable also are all oaths attached to promises, because they express more than was intended by the swearer. The claim that the oath which a Christian takes should always fully express faith in God as revealed in Christ, is unfounded. That atheists should neither be forced nor allowed to swear is a matter of course, a conclusion which is founded on the nature and object of the oath. (J. Köstlin†.)

III. In Canon Law: The subject receives treatment in canon law principally in *Decretum Gratiani*, causa XXII.; in the collection of decretals of Gregory IX., II., xxiv.; the *Liber Sextus;* the Clementines; and the decretal of Innocent III., c. xxvi., X., *de jurejurando.*

1. The General Conditions.

Only by way of intimation, it is true, but still plainly enough, the canon law defines an oath as an asseveration with at least silent appeal to God as the omniscient witness not only to the words and works but to the thoughts and intents of man. The canon law also distinguishes between the right and the wrong uses of the oath, following the Vulgate of Jerome on Jer. iv. 2, which reads: "And thou shalt swear: The Lord lives! In truth, judgment, and in justice"; it demands that the oath shall have these three "attendants," viz., truth (in the mind), judgment (in swearing), and justice (in the object). By the first it means the sincerity of the intention in the case of the assertive oath to speak the truth, in the case of the promissory oath to fulfil the promise. By the second it means the proper understanding of what an oath is. By the third, justice in the object, it means that it is an oath which the swearer can rightfully take. All of which is in harmony with the teaching of Innocent III.: "Thou art able to swear without wrongdoing if thy oath has these three accompaniments of which the prophet [Jeremiah] speaks when he says: 'Thou shalt swear the Lord liveth, in truth and judgment and justice.'" It is correct but not directly derived from the canon law to say that the object of the oath and the purpose of its use should be consonant with the divine character. The development of the general legal doctrine of the oath must then proceed along these lines.

The correct consequences from the first condition, *judicium in jurante* ("the judgment in swearing"), involve notice of the following hindrances or disqualifications to taking oaths: (1) the person is under age. The canon law only expressly forbids that any one who is not of the age of reason should be forced to take an oath (XXII., v. 14), but in practise this has rightly been construed as forbidding such an oath under all circumstances. Later

2. Judgment in Swearing.

laws have extended the term of responsibility in oath-taking. The German law puts it at sixteen. (2) The person taking the oath is to be of sound mind and sober. The canon law is very explicit on this point: only one who is *jejunus*, "fasting," can properly take a solemn oath (XXII., v. 16), consequently such an oath was, as a rule, taken only before noon. (3) That the person have not committed perjury. The condition of *judicium in jurante* logically obliges that the oath must not be taken by those who are without any knowledge of God. Of practical importance is it to know whether the person is only pretending to be an atheist in order to avoid being put under oath—as frequently happens—but even where the person is self-deceived into thinking that he is an atheist or only shams atheism there is a manifest impropriety in administering the oath as it borders on blasphemy to compel a person who professes to be an atheist to call upon God as his witness that he is speaking the truth.

3. Justice in the Object.

From the second condition, *justitia in objecto*, "the justice in the object," the canon law omitted to deduce the right consequences. Yet the canon law compels by legislation such oaths as are intended to establish the plea of nullity only in case it affords protection to the oath-taker, as a wife in giving consent to the transfer of title to her dower, or a daughter renouncing her inheritance; indeed Boniface VIII. would compel the secular judges to treat as valid what according to the common law was null because it had been sworn to. The glossator Martinus induced the Emperor Frederick I. to rule according to this principle that an oath not otherwise invalid could not be nullified by a person taking it who nevertheless had no right to take it (*Authentica* "*Sacramenta puberum*" on L. 2 C. *adv. vend.*; cf. F. C. von Savigny, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, iv. 162–170, Heidelberg, 1834–51). It is plainly a desecration of the oath that the canon law made a tool of it to vitiate rather than to promote worthy purposes intended by the civil law. And it thereby, aside from the injury often done indirectly to a third party, gives occasion to a very frequent misuse of the oath, whereby from the religious standpoint it can be allowed only when later legislation withdraws entirely from the promissory oath its legal efficacy and makes it only of accessory importance, even as it has according to Roman law. But this is to deprive it of all legal obligation, whereas the proper object of the oath was to increase this obligation. From the definition of an oath as a promise given to God the canon law draws the inference that in respect to every promissory oath the Church as the organ of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was to decide: (1) Whether the oath was binding, and here first of all comes in the interpretation of the oath, for if it should turn out that the oath was intended to effect a sinful purpose then it was not only not binding but it was perjury and as such must be punished by church penalties; and (2) in case it is binding, at least toward God, it was for the spiritual judges to decide whether it should be carried out or whether the Church acting in the place of God should release the person from his oath (*relaxio juramenti* or *absolutio a juramento* in the Evangelical sense). The connection in which this theory of *relaxio juramenti* stands with the fundamentally false mediating position between God and the individual which the Roman Church on all occasions arrogates to itself is easy to understand, and it is no less easy to perceive that it must have as its consequence that the pope has the right to release from the oath of allegiance whenever, in his judgment, the magisterial rights have been forfeited. But on the Protestant side there should be just as little doubt that the theory and its consequences are to be rejected as absolutely worthless, as if forsooth the competency of the Church to decide matters of right depended on the binding power of an oath. It is a lamentable confusion of ideas that formerly the *relaxio juramenti* was counted among the episcopal rights of the sovereign (cf. J. H. Böhmer, *Jus ecclesiasticum Protestantium*, 5 vols., Halle, 1720–63). All that the Church can properly do in relation to oaths is to appeal to the conscience, according to the Word of God. The decision of troubles arising from legal matters the Church can only leave to the courts whether such matters be sworn to or not, and the courts on their part can not enforce obligations which are without standing in the civil law. Here should be clearly brought out that the efficacy which the canon law gives to the promissory oath as distinguished from what it has in civil law is to be contrasted with the importance which in truth attaches to it when the parties to the oath do not stand on equal footing to the law so that contracts between them involve moral and not legal duties and claims. Here of course the community of objective religion supplants the community of objective rights. Before any international law could be recognized there was an impulse of the deepest and truest quality for contracts between peoples who were strangers to one another, and between individuals of such nations, which contracts were sealed with oaths so that they might have the greatest possible force.

From the demand for *veritas in mente*, "truth in the mind," flows first of all the inadmissibility and inefficacy of mental reservation in the case of oaths; and further that an oath which had been extorted or which rested on vital error had the importance of a true, proof-bringing and binding oath, although canon law does not unconditionally concede this point respecting the promissory oath.

In respect to its form the idea is excluded that an oath is an appeal to any other than God. Nothing further is necessary to express this intention to call God to witness than the use of the words "I swear."

In order to surround the oath-taking with due solemnity, as where it is given in courts and in public offices, certain formulas have come into use, which partly rest upon the idea that bodily contact with an object considered by the swearer to be sacred, as a copy of the Gospels or a reliquary, has a tendency to excite a stronger religious feeling. So arose the formula of the solemn "bodily" oath: "So help me God and his holy Gospel" (or "Word"), with the addition in some formulas,

4. Customary Formulas.

"and all saints." But inasmuch as the addition just mentioned was rejected by Protestants, section 107 of the Imperial Recess of 1555 ordered that in the imperial courts it should be dropped and Roman Catholics and Protestants alike be sworn on their calling upon God and the Holy Gospel merely. There is an old custom which excepts the clergy, later at least bishops, from touching the Gospels. These laid their hands on their breasts when taking an oath, just as in former days German women did when swearing. In still later times the so-called "bodily oath" was taken not by touching any sacred object but by raising two or three fingers or by touching the judge's staff, or by merely raising the hand. Finally, it is proper to remark here that solemn oaths should be administered only in apartments suitably furnished and in as orderly associations as possible. It is true that it has been urged that the greater care surrounding the administration of the oaths, so often now missing, should be taken the more the sad increase of perjury is noticed. Yet one should not be blind to the fact that the carrying-out of these desires would encounter great, indeed, almost insurmountable difficulties, particularly in this that the execution of the best legal and magisterial arrangements depends on the capacity and willingness of the persons charged with carrying them out. And such considerations make the diminution of the number of oaths as much as possible very desirable, and recent legislation has this object. But it is an error to think that for these considerations an oath should not be administered when the matter in dispute is "trifling." This is to make the amount of money involved the criterion of the importance of the matter, and to overlook the ideal of the law which strives to do justice entirely irrespective of the pecuniary value of the point involved.

(E. Sehling.)

Bibliography: For general, historical and illustrative material consult: R. Hirzel, *Der Eid, ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte*, Leipsic, 1902; W. Lockhart, *On Oaths*, Edinburgh, 1882; F. Friedmann, *Ueber die Schwurgerichte*, Berlin, 1886; J. Lafforgue, *Du serment en droit remain*, Toulouse, 1888; L. Ott, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss des griechischen Eides*, Leipsic, 1896; C. Ford, *On Oaths*, London, 1903 (a standard legal authority).

On I. consult: J. Happel, *Der Eid im A. T.*, Leipsic, 1873; Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, pp. 164 sqq., 461–462; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 262 sqq.; *DB*, iii. 575–577; *EB*, iii. 3451–3454; and the works on O. T. theology. On II., consult for the N. T.: *DCG*, ii. 254–256; and the works on N. T. theology, as well as *DB* and *EB* ut sup. For usage in the Church see III. below, and consult: M. D. Conway, *The Oath and its Ethics*, London, 1881; G. Freudenstein, *Rechtsbelehrung in Schwurgerichts-Verfahren von Frankreich, England und Deutschland*, Minden, 1883; I. M. Capes, in *Fortnightly Review*, v (1866). On III. consult: C. F. Stäudlin, *Geschichte der Vorstellungen und Lehren vom Eide*, Göttingen, 1824; K. F. Göschel, *Der Eid nach Principe, Begriffe und Gebrauche*, Berlin, 1837; F. G. L. Strippelmann, *Der Gerichtseid*, Cassel, 1855. A valuable literature is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 785.

OBADIAH, ō″ba-dai′ā: Author of the book which occupies the fourth place among the Minor Prophets. The name means "worshiper of Yahweh." His book contains no allusion either to his descent, his birth-place, or his fortunes; not even the name of his father is given. That he was a Judean is an inference from the contents of his prophecy.

Regarding the date of his writing there is great divergence of opinion: some interpreters consider it the earliest prophetic book in the Old Testament while others place it among the latest. Hofmann, Delitzsch, Keil, Nägelsbach, Vaihinger, and Orelli believe that Obadiah prophesied under Joram (851–844); Jäger, Caspari, Hävernik, and Hengstenberg refer him to the time of Jeroboam II. and Uzziah (c. 750), while many earlier and later exegetes, in agreement with Aben Ezra and Luther, find in this prophesy a distinct allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar and see in Obadiah a contemporary of Jeremiah (c. 580).

The latest criticism questions the unity of the book and considers that it consists of an original writing (verses 1–9) inspired by the revolt of the Edomites under Joram, which was later expanded by the addition of vs. 10–21, written after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, although there may be traces of the original writing in verses 15–21. It is according to this view uncertain whether the name Obadiah refers to the original or the later writer. This theory is based on the fact that in Jeremiah's oracle against Edom there are a series of most remarkable resemblances between Jeremiah and Obadiah (Ob. 1 = Jer. xlix. 14; Ob. 2 = Jer. xlix. 15; Ob. 3a = Jer. xlix. 16a; Ob. 4 = Jer. xlix. 16b; Ob. 5 = Jer. xlix. 9; Ob. 6 = Jer. xlix. 10a; Ob. 8 = Jer. xlix. 7; Ob. 9a = Jer. xlix. 22b), a fact which indicates that Jeremiah was familiar with and imitated Obadiah's prophesy, not vice versa. The conclusion that, as Jeremiah's allusions are only to the first nine verses, he knew nothing of verses 10–21, does not follow, since Jeremiah had no inducement to use such passages as Ob. 17 and 19–21 in a prophesy against Edom. However, the principal argument is derived from the supposed allusion to the destruction of the Judean nation by the Chaldeans. But both the passages in question say nothing of the destruction of Jersualem; they speak only of its capture and pillage, of wild orgies of the victors on the sacred mountain, of the carrying-off of the prisoners and of the conquered Judean army, and of misfortune and suffering. Moreover, a clearer designation of the Chaldeans would be expected. The enemies of Jerusalem are vaguely and generally named, while Edom's malicious participation in the attack upon Israel is emphasized. Finally, there is no trace of the deportation of the people to Babylonia. The "captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad" (verse 20) probably signifies that a portion of the Judeans came into the hands of the Phenicians and were sold to the Lydians in Asia Minor. *Sparda* is mentioned in the inscriptions of Darius (cf. F. Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften*, pp. 4, 46, 54, Leipsic, 1881) in connection with Yauna (cf. Javan, Isa. lxvi. 19; Ezek. xxvii. 13), and this may mean Sardis, which is *Svarda* in the native language. Joel iii. 6 accuses the Phenicians of delivering Judeans to the *Yewanim* (A. V. "Grecians"). Verse 10 treats of an attack upon Jerusalem as a past happening, and probably refers to what is narrated in II Chron. xxi. 16, 17, which says that Arabs and Philistines advanced against Joram, king of Judah, and carried off prisoners and a great booty. This event is alluded to by Joel (iii. 6) and Amos (i. 6, 9) when they reproach the Philistines with having sold Judean prisoners to Edom and Javan.

If this view be accepted there is no reason to doubt the unity of the writing. The visions fall easily into three sections. The first, 1–9, contains the announcement to the Edomites of the divine judgment; the second (verses 10–16) describes the crime that caused this judgment; the third (verses 17–24) recounts the restoration of down-trodden Israel who shall possess both his own land and that of his enemies and shall regain the lost members of his race who have been dragged away to captivity.

The words "as the Lord hath said," Joel ii. 32 (expressly referring to Ob. 17), clearly shows which was the earlier prophet. If, then, Joel belongs to the time of Joash, Obadiah's activity must be placed in the reign of Joram.* Thus Obadiah appears to be the oldest prophet whose writings are preserved in the canon; his position among the other minor prophets proves nothing against this, since the order is not governed by chronological considerations. (W. Volck†.)

Bibliography: The best commentary for the English reader is by G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve*, in *Expositor's Commentary*, ii. 163 sqq., London, 1898. Other treatments are found in the commentaries on the Minor Prophets of H. Ewald, Eng. transl., ii. 277 sqq., 5 vols., London, 1876–81; C. F. Keil, Edinburgh, 1888; F. W. Farrar, pp. 175 sqq., London, 1890; C. von Orelli, New York, 1893; J. Wellhausen, Berlin, 1898; K. Marti, in *Kurzer Handkommentar zum A. T.*, Tübingen, 1904; and E. B. Pusey, new ed., vol. iii., London, 1906. Other commentaries are by C. P. Caspari, Leipsic, 1842; W. Seydel, ib. 1869; F. Hitzig, ib. 1881; T. T. Perowne, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1889; P. J. Bachmann, Halle, 1892; N. Peters, Paderborn, 1892; W. Nowack, in *Handkommentar zum A. T.*, Göttingen, 1897; and J. Fischer, Regensburg, 1909. Questions of introduction are discussed in the works on Biblical Introduction (q.v.); in the prefaces to most of the commentaries; by Vaihinger, in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des A. T.*, i (1867), 488 sqq.; G. A. Peckham, *An Introduction to the Study of Obadiah*, Chicago, 1910; in *DB*, iii. 577–580; *EB*, iii. 3455–62; and *JE*, ix. 369–370.

OBBENITES. See Mennonites, VIII., § 2.

OBEDIENCE.

I. In Ethics and Religion.
II. In Ecclesiastical Usage.

I. In Ethics and Religion: Ethically obedience is the subordination of one's own will to that of another. By the very fact of his dependence on God, man's behavior must be one of obedience toward God; from the very beginning, sin, according to Scripture, is disobedience. Blessing or cursing, in the destinies of God's people, is made conditional upon obedience to God's command (Deut. xxviii.). The fundamental virtue of the Old-Testament heroes from Abraham to Nehemiah is obedience (cf. I Sam. xv. 22). The work of Christ in the New Testament is above all a discharge of obedience (Phil. ii. 8), defined by orthodox dogmatists as *obedientia activa et passiva*. Hence, too, the Christian's behavior must consist of obedience (Rom. i. 5, v. 19; I Pet. i. 22). God can require us to accept the message of salvation obediently. Ethically regarded, faith is obedience, unbelief is disobedience. Christian ethics distinguishes between servile and free obedience. The latter is harmony of the heart and will with the divine command in love. Its prototype is the perfect subordination of the son to the father, which we realize in the imitation of Jesus under perfect submission to the Father's will.

In the relations between man and man, obedience is required of children, servants, and subjects, with due consideration, however, of the will of God (Acts v. 29). The morality of children is essentially the discharge of obedience (cf. the example of Jesus, Luke ii. 49). This educates man to become a moral personality, and fits him for the right use of freedom. The requirements proper to the Old Testament have been embodied by the New Testament in the "house tables" (Eph. v. 22 sqq.; Col. iii. 18 sqq.; I Pet. ii. 13 sqq.) of Christian conduct, wherein a subordination of the wife is required analogous to the subordination of the congregation to Christ its head. The service of servants is in this respect lightened, in that they are permitted to account themselves as servants of Christ. Allegiance to the State carries with it the obligation to render obedience to the ethical order (law and right) enforced by the State. In case of conflict between God's requirement and that of society, the Christian must suffer, in the last resort, as a disobedient subject.

Obedience is a signal means for the development of power. Every kind of social organization, every kind of discipline, rests on obedience. Hence, too, the discharge of obedience plays so great a part not only in military service, but also in the Roman Catholic orders. Arnold Rüegg.

II. In Ecclesiastical Usage: In Roman Catholic church law obedience is the submission which is due from those in lower grades to their superiors. The organization of the Church rests upon the correlation of authority and obedience. Before the Reformation the idea of obedience developed from that of feudalism. All Christendom stood in the attitude of obedience toward the pope, as vice-regent of Christ upon earth. In consequence of the Reformation a large part of the Latin church fell from its former allegiance. Within the Church the bishop commanded the obedience of all the clergy of the diocese, even of the exempt (see Exemption). In early times at their consecration the bishops swore obedience to the metropolitan, but after the pope reserved for himself the right of consecration, to him alone was the oath sworn. The formula, which is very ancient and taken from a real oath of allegiance, is prescribed by an injunction of Pius IV. issued Nov. 13, 1564, which runs as follows: "I acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the chief of the apostles, and the vicar of Christ." From this vow of obedience toward the pope, to which must be added the creed, should be carefully distinguished the oath of obedience to the bishop, which was sworn to at the consecration to the priesthood. A special oath of obedience on the part of the lower orders of the Church toward the bishop is met with only occasionally through force of custom or local regulations. The regulars also swear obedience to their superiors, and in their case the oath means complete submission to the superiors, relinquishing all private desires. The order of the Jesuits and the related orders and congregations exact an oath which is quite peculiar to themselves. See OATH. E. SEHLING.

---

* Many modern critics place Joel in the Greek age (Driver, *Introduction*, chap. vi., § 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On obedience in the ethical sense consult the principal works cited under ETHICS. For the ecclesiastical usage consult: G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 171 sqq., Regensburg, 1857; *KL*, ix. 583–586; and in general the treatises on Roman Catholic ecclesiastical law.

OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST: A conception sometimes employed in treating the doctrine of the Atonement (q.v.). This obedience to the will of the Father is represented as active, referring to the works of Christ; or as passive, referring to his suffering (cf. W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ii. 430, New York, 1889; C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, iii. 143, ib. 1872).

OBER-AMMERGAU, ō″ber-ām′mer-gau: A village of 1,200 inhabitants in Upper Bavaria, forty-six miles southwest 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 the following 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 Ammerthalers took every precaution to protect their valley from the dread contagion, but without avail. A native of Ammerthal, who worked during the summer in Eschelohe [an infected place] as a day-laborer, evaded the quarantine, and entered the valley by a secret path, in order to celebrate among his family an annual church festival. He carried the infection with him, and on the second day after his arrival he was a corpse. In three weeks eighty-four of the small community were carried off; and the mourning and terrified survivors, despairing of human succor, made their supplication to God, and registered a solemn vow, that if he heard their cry, and removed the plague, they would represent every ten years, 'for thankful remembrance and edifying contemplation, and by the help of the Almighty, the sufferings of Jesus, the Savior 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 fulfilment 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 downward" (M. MacColl, *Ober-Ammergau Passion Play*, pp. viii., 42–43, London, 1880).

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, which seats 4,500. 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. The present play is modelled upon the Greek drama, and therefore the chorus is an integral part of it. It comprehends the events of our Lord's life from Palm Sunday to Easter. The text is mainly Scriptural; every word attributed to our Lord or to his disciples, friends and foes, during the week referred to, being interwoven in the play. The principal players are persons of local consequence and of high character; and the villagers themselves and the peasants around regard the Passion Play as a solemn religious rite. It is therefore fitly 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, sceneries, and stage properties. The number of players is said to be about 600, 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 performances last from eight to five, with an intermission of an hour and a half. They are given on Sundays and Fridays, and in some weeks on Mondays, from the middle of May to the end of September.

The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play has been suffered to pursue a nearly untroubled course. Permission to give it, which has always been readily granted, has to be obtained from the king of Bavaria. 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 throng of visitors numbers thousands, are religiously devoted to charitable purposes after the payment of a small sum to the players. The charges of admission are very moderate, ranging from one to eight marks (twenty-five cents to two dollars). Altogether the Passion Play is a curious, and in its way a unique, relic of the piety of the Middle Ages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Translations of the text are: *The Passion Play Translated*, London, 1890; *The Passion Play of Ober-Ammergau*, ib. 1900. Consult: H. Rommel, *De Passiespelen van Oberammergau*, Brugge, 1881; J. A. Daisenberger, *Text des Oberammergauer Passionspieles*, Munich, 1890; F. W. Farrar, *The Passion Play*, London, 1890; K. Trautmann, *Oberammergau und seine Passionsspiel*, Bamberg, 1890; F. Feldigl, *Ober-Ammergau und seine Passionspiel in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, Partenkirchen, 1900; W. T. Stead, *The Story that Transformed the World. Passion Play at Ober-Ammergau*, London, 1891; Lady I. Burton, *The Passion-Play at Ober-Ammergau*, ib. 1900; H. Diemer, *Oberammergau und seine Passionsspiele*, Munich, 1900; J. Krauskopf, *A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion Play*, Philadelphia, 1901; A. G. Hay, *Ober-Ammergau and its Great Passion Drama of 1900*, London, 1902; E. H. Day, *Ober-Ammergau and the Passion Play; a practical and historical Handbook*, Milwaukee, 1910; J. H. Short, *Oberammergau*, New York, 1910.

OBERLIN, ō′ber-lin, **JEAN FRÉDÉRIC:** Lutheran philanthropist; b. at Strasburg Aug. 31, 1740; d. at Waldersbach (29 m. s.w. of Strasburg)

June 2, 1826. Brought up in a pious home, at fifteen he began the study of theology, in which he took his bachelor's degree at the University of Strasburg in 1758. Until 1767 he supported himself by teaching, when he was appointed pastor at Waldersbach, the principal parish in the rough mountainous district of Steinthal (Fr., Ban-de-la-Roche), on the boundary between Alsace and Lorraine. Oberlin entered upon his labors with energy and self-denial, in the face of great difficulties, arising from the poverty and ignorance of the population, and from the criticisms of his predecessor. His first care was to provide for the spread of education, erecting schools in Waldersbach and other villages, and making one of the earliest attempts at the training and instruction of very small children. The construction of roads and bridges, the encouragement of a better system of agriculture, the teaching of trades, and the establishment of stores, loan associations, savings-banks, and agricultural societies with the awarding of prizes marked his efforts for promoting the good of the community. Even the smallest economic reform assumed for him the character of a Christian work. The establishment of factories through his influence not only provided a means of livelihood for the people, but soon doubled their numbers. But these activities did not make him neglect the more directly spiritual work. He was a preacher of the greatest earnestness and simplicity, and indefatigable in visiting the scattered members of his flock. In 1781 he founded, on an impulse received from the life of Zinzendorf, a Société chrétienne, the members of which pledged themselves to strive for perfect sanctification and to exercise mutual oversight and discipline, but two years later he found it best to disband the association. It is not surprising, in view of his remarkable courage and enterprise, that he should at times have gone into ill-advised ventures; but he was never accused of narrowness or sectarian prejudice. He invited Roman Catholics and Calvinists to his communion, and was pleased to call himself Catholic-Evangelical pastor. He greeted the outbreak of the French Revolution with enthusiasm. The declaration of the rights of man seemed to his imagination the beginning of the kingdom of God on earth, and in republican virtues and fraternity he saw the truest earthly realization of the spirit of Christianity. On July 14, 1790, he assembled all his people around an " altar of the fatherland " on an open hill-top to celebrate a patriotic festival. On Aug. 5, 1792, he held a special service in honor of the volunteers for the war with Austria, among whom was his eldest son. By order of the committee of safety, on Nov. 23, 1793, he made his profession of faith, declaring that he approved wholly of the abolition of empty ceremonies and unfruitful dogmas and that he recognized no other task than that of making his fellow citizens enlightened, worthy men and good patriots. Even the reign of terror could not shake his belief in the republic. When the National Assembly prohibited public worship and ecclesiastical rites, he changed his services into club-meetings, opened by singing, followed by the catechizing of the younger members on the rights of man and the duties of citizens, an address and a prayer. The women and children then left the church, various members of the club rose in their turn to deliver discourses, and the most recent political events were discussed. The communion he celebrated from time to time in his own house with his family and guests, after the ordinary meal in the manner of the *agape*. In spite of his submission to the revolutionary laws, he awakened the suspicion of the authorities, and on July 28, 1794, was summoned to Schlettstadt and imprisoned, after rough treatment from the mob. A few days later Robespierre fell and the time of trial was over.

His services were now widely recognized. The National Assembly itself thanked him formally for his services to education, and the imperial authorities showed him many favors. When the allied armies entered France, Czar Alexander issued a special letter of protection for him and his flock. In 1818 he received the gold medal of the Royal Agricultural Society, and a year later the cross of the Legion of Honor. His reputation as a faithful witness to the Gospel now won him influence far and wide, and all those who were dissatisfied with the prevalent rationalism brought into the Church by the Revolution looked hopefully toward his leadership. The evening of his life, clouded though it was by the famine of 1816–17 and the death of a promising son, was calm and peaceful, leaving the memory of a man who combined in a remarkable degree the most varied endeavors to promote the general welfare of humanity with deep mystical devotion, and bore testimony to the power of the love of Christ at a time when it was growing cold in many hearts. His work for the education of small children was imitated first in Scotland and then elsewhere. His name is preserved in America by the town and college of Oberlin, O., founded by two former missionaries in 1832 under the inspiration of his biography. (K. HACKENSCHMIDT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Among the very numerous biographies which have been written may be mentioned those by: Mme. Felicie (Tourette), Strasburg, 1824; H. Legrand, ib. 1826; S. Atkins, London, 1829; E. Stober, Strasburg, 1831; L. Spach, ib. 1866; F. Bernard, Paris, 1867; F. W. Bodemann, Stuttgart, 1879; Josephine E. Butler, London, 1882; Mme. G. Desmoulin, Paris, 1884; Mme. E. Rörich, ib. 1890; G. H. von Schubert, Nuremberg, 1890; C. Leenhard, Montauban, 1896; O. Stein, Halle, 1899; K. Hackenschmidt, Strassburg, 1902; and *Four Great Philanthropists: Lord Shaftesbury, George Peabody, John Howard, J. F. Oberlin*, London, 1896.

OBLATES: A monastic term applied to children bound over to a monastery, to be brought up as monks. The Benedictine Rule (chap. lix.) prescribes that if any noble offers his son to a monastery, if the boy is a minor he shall be offered with a petition, the accompanying gift and his hand being wrapped in the altar-cloth. The origin of the institution is obscure, but it is certainly much older than the Benedictine Rule. The provisions in the longer rule ascribed to St. Basil do not correspond to later usage; but Jerome and Salvian are acquainted with it. It was first completely abandoned by the mendicant orders. (A. HAUCK.)

OBLATIONS: In early times the faithful presented at the assembly for common worship gifts kind. From these were taken the elements of bread and wine required for use in the holy communion. Other gifts were distributed according to need. Justin Martyr (q.v.) in his description of the Sunday worship of Christians says, "When our prayer is ended, bread is brought and wine and water, and the president offers both prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each and a reception of what has been blessed, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons; and they who are well-to-do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want" (*Apol.*, i. 67; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, i. 186). A general term for such offerings was "oblations." In process of time, and as gifts of money were gradually substituted for offerings in kind, the word came to be used in a more restricted sense: (1) for the bread and wine, before or after consecration; (2) for any gifts besides money, or perhaps for gifts of money for religious purposes (and particularly for the support of the clergy) other than alms for the poor. There is some debate as to the exact force of the word in connection with alms, in the Prayer for the Church in the existing Anglican Prayer Book and in the preceding rubric of the American Book (cf. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 321). The formal presentation of gifts of bread and wine, though not used for the sacrament, at Milan is a survival of the old custom of offerings in kind, as is perhaps the use of *pain beni*, "blessed bread," in some parts of France and Switzerland. According to the rule of the first English Prayer Book (1549) the bread and wine for the communion were to be paid for by the parishioners in turn, instead of themselves providing the elements. They are now provided at the charge of the parish. The presentation of alms at the time of the eucharist had become almost extinct in the West—not entirely, as the "mass-penny" testifies—when it was revived in the first English Prayer Book. It is fitting that along with prayers, alms (in the widest sense) should go up before God. In the great central act of worship mankind offers him in the elements of bread and wine and in money representatives of the gifts which he has bestowed, as an acknowledgment that all things come of him, and in order that they may be used for the accomplishment of his purposes. Of these natural gifts the bread and wine thus offered in acknowledgment of God's sovereignty are blessed by him for higher purposes, and returned to the givers as the means whereby they receive the spiritual food of the Lord's body and blood for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul. A. C. A. Hall.

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, V., iv. 1–3, VIII., vi. 22, XII., ii.–iv.; F. Berlendis, *De oblationibus*, Venice, 1743 (Italian ed., 1736); L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: its Origin and Evolution*, pp. 84, 173, 204, etc., London, 1904; J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, passim (consult Index), New York, 1908; *KL*, ix. 626–630.

OBLIGATION. See Duty.

O'BRYAN, WILLIAM. See Bible Christians; Methodists, I., 8.

OBSERVANTISTS. See Francis, Saint, of Assisi, and the Franciscan Order.

OCCAM (OCKHAM), WILLIAM OF.

- I. Life.
- II. Works.
  - Philosophical and Theological Writings (§ 1).
  - Works on Church and State (§ 2).
- III. Occam's Position.
  - His Nominalism (§ 1).
  - Doctrine of the Church and Criticism (§ 2).
  - Doctrine of God, Salvation and Sin (§ 3).
  - Doctrine of Christ and the Sacraments (§ 4).
  - Church and State (§ 5).
- IV. Survey of Occam's Position.

I. Life: William of Occam, the Franciscan schoolman, nominalist, and "*doctor invincibilis*," was born at Occam (whence he took his name; 22 m. s.w. of St. Paul's, London) c. 1280; d. in Munich Apr. 10, 1349 (1347 ? 1350 ?). Of his early life little is certainly known. From the scanty data, it may be gathered that he entered the Franciscan order at an early age, took his bachelor's degree at Oxford, and his master's at Paris, where he taught from a date between 1315 and 1320. The tradition that he was a pupil of Duns Scotus is probably correct. That he returned to England and taught at Oxford is an assumption for which there is no evidence; in any case it is with Paris that his principal teaching activity is connected; his doctrines had taken such hold there by 1339 that the philosophical faculty felt obliged to issue a warning against them. By that time he himself had left Paris; the great controversy on the question of poverty which so deeply agitated his order determined the later course of his life. He threw all his strength into the defense of the ideal of absolute poverty. But it was not long before their common ground of opposition to the pope drew the extreme Franciscans together with the Emperor Louis the Bavarian, the opponent of John XXII. At the chapter of the order in Perugia, Occam and Bonagratia were the chief supporters of the general, Michael of Cesena, in his strict views, and afterward the former spent some time in the dioceses of Ferrara and Bologna, urging the absolute poverty of Christ and the apostles as a necessary ideal. In December, 1323, he was summoned with some others to appear before the pope at Avignon, and was imprisoned there for over four years. On May 25, 1328, together with Michael of Cesena and Bonagratia, he made his escape and fled to Italy. Deposed and excommunicated, they made common cause with the emperor, who was then in Italy. In 1329 a general chapter held in Paris deposed Michael of Cesena from his office, and two years later he and his adherents were expelled from the order. Occam became one of the emperor's principal advisers and literary defenders. The political ideas which he had already represented in Paris were now developed and adapted to the circumstances of the time. In stepping outside the range of pure theology, he never forgot that he was a theologian; that John XXII. was a heretic and no true pope, that the poverty of Christ and the apostles was an article of faith, were as much a part of his fixed belief as that the State and the rights of the emperor were independent of pope and Church. After the unfortunate issue of Louis' visit to Rome, the Franciscans followed him to Munich (Feb., 1330) and took up their abode in a neighboring house of the order, where most of the political writings of Occam were composed. In 1342 Michael of Cesena died, transmitting the seal of the order and his claims to its headship to Occam. The death of Louis (Oct. 11, 1347) and of some of the Munich group, the reconciliation of others and of the new Emperor Charles IV. with the papacy, left Occam increasingly alone, until the time came when he was the only one of the old leaders left. He was once more cited in 1349 before the papal tribunal, but the negotiations came to naught with his refusal to admit that Louis was a heretic and schismatic. Clement VI. demanded that the order should take action. A chapter held in Whitsuntide, 1349, asserted that but few brothers remained who had supported Michael of Cesena and Louis; that " William the Englishman," who was prominent among these, had sent back the seal of the order to the general, and that he and the others, while they could not conveniently appear in Rome, petitioned for release from their excommunication. The pope offered to grant this request (June 8, 1349) on condition of their subscribing a formula which was somewhat less stringent than that which had been usual since John XXII. Trithemius, Wadding, and others assert that Occam signed this and was absolved; but there is no documentary evidence to this effect, and Jacobus de Marchia says expressly that the three principal leaders " remained excommunicated heretics." This is more probably the case, whether Occam remained inflexible or death intervened too soon to allow his acceptance of the terms of peace. The date of his death is uncertain; he was undoubtedly alive in the spring of 1349, and thus the date given on his monument (of later construction) in the former Franciscan chapel at Munich—Apr. 10, 1347—can not be right. The day and month may be accepted; the year will be either 1350, or more probably 1349, which would account for the double tradition as to the fact, on the theory that he had announced his readiness to make submission, but died before it could be accomplished.

1. Philosophical and Theological Writings.

II. Works: There is no complete edition of the works of Occam, which is a token of the disfavor into which he fell by his rebellious attitude, although the numerous manuscripts and early printed editions testify to the interest which was felt in his writings. Under the head of philosophical works may be named the *Expositio aurea et admodum utilis super totam artem veterem*, which, in the form of commentaries on Aristotle and Porphyry, contains Occam's logic, epistemology, and metaphysic; *Summa logices; Quæstiones in octo libros physicorum; Summulæ in libros physicorum;* and two or three works still unprinted, mentioned by Little. The principal theological work is *Quæstiones et decisiones in quatuor libros sententiarum;* the first book is much fuller than the other three and is frequently found in manuscripts independent of them, thus making it likely that Occam published it separately in the first place, during his teaching life at Oxford or Paris, and later did the other three on a smaller scale, perhaps from mere notes of lectures. Other theological treatises are the *Centiloquium theologicum*, " embracing almost the whole of speculative theology under one hundred conclusions," which gives a piquant collection of instances of what rational theology might consider possible; *Quodlibeta septem*, dealing with the principal problems of philosophy and theology, based probably on the disputations with which he began his Paris teaching; *De sacramento altaris* and *De corpore Christi*, two parts of one work, which was used to supply theoretical support for Luther's eucharistic doctrine; *De prædestinatione et futuris contingentibus*.

2. Works on Church and State.

The *Opus nonaginta dierum*, so called from the time spent in its composition (probably in 1330, certainly before 1333), is a defense of the doctrine of poverty as the true perfection, in answer to the bull *Quia vir reprobus* of John XXII. The *Tractatus de dogmatibus Johannis XXII. papæ* (1333) controverts the pope's assertion that the saints will not see the beatific vision until after the day of judgment; *Epistola ad fratres minores in capitulo apud Assisium congregatos* (1334) is of special interest from the light which it throws upon its author's character; *Opusculum adversus errores Johannis XXII.* was written shortly after John's death, early in 1335; the *Compendium errorum Johannis XXII. papæ*, written under Benedict XII., and *Defensorium contra Johannem XXII.*, written under Clement VI. (though not certainly by Occam), take a similar line. The *Tractatus ostendens quod Benedictus papa XII. nonnullos Johannis XXII. hæreses amplexus est et defendit*, arising out of the political situation of the latter half of 1337, rebukes the pope as a heretic and an enemy of the emperor and the king of England, and proves that Louis has the right to take up arms against him. *Octo quæstiones super potestate et dignitate papali* (latter half of 1339) answers various questions apparently submitted by Louis as to points in controversy between the temporal and spiritual powers. The largest and most important general discussion of the theoretical questions at issue is the *Dialogus inter magistrum et discipulum de imperatorum et pontificum potestate*, written between 1341 and 1343. In its present form the work is far from complete; it was intended to be a thorough investigation of the whole controversy between the empire and the papacy, and at the same time to show conclusively that John XXII. was a heretic, in opposing whom both Louis and the extreme Franciscans were abundantly justified. The first division deals with the distinction between Catholic and heretical doctrine, proves that popes may be and have been heretical, admitting the same possibility of error in general councils, and contends that princes and laymen may and should, when spiritual tribunals fail, sit in judgment on a heretical pope. The second part is incomplete, and of the nine treatises promised for the third, only two seem to have been written, those dealing with the power of the pope and clergy and with the authority and rights of the emperor. External reasons probably determined the publication of the work in its incomplete form, and the impulse to take it up again was lacking later. Wadding names a number of other works as Occam's but it is impossible in the present state of knowledge to determine whether they exist, and if so whether they are genuine or perhaps parts of those already known.

III. Occam's Position: A complete critical edition of Occam is much to be desired. He was not only one of the most wide-awake scholars of the Middle Ages but a personality of striking consistency and boldness. His life was a tragedy; he was not able to procure the triumph of his most cherished ideals—he was bereft of one friend after another, and the vacillating policy of the emperor was little consolation to him. And yet the lonely friar was one of the mighty forces of his time. His historical importance rests on three achievements in particular; he carried the banner of nominalism to victory in the philosophy of his age; he encouraged the critical spirit in regard to traditional dogma, and taught men how to use it as a counterpoise to ecclesiastical positivism; and he struck out a new line of thought as to the relations of temporal and spiritual authority of Church and State.

1. His Nominalism.

The great revival of philosophical and theological study which the thirteenth century witnessed was conditioned by the influence of Aristotle. The theory of the universe propounded by the Stagirite had to be reconciled with the traditional Platonic-Augustinian realism. This Thomas Aquinas undertook to do, following Aristotle as closely as possible. Duns Scotus, on the other hand, attempted to maintain the ancient realism, while supporting it by modern or Aristotelian methods. Interests and tendencies, however, came up in his work which drove his disciples away from his position. The growth of empirical research and psychological analysis on one side, together with the new activity of the reason in the epistemological field, and on the other the recognition of the fact that the specific and the particular was the end of nature, led to results widely divergent from those of Scotus. Here was Occam's work ready to his hand. He was the leader of the nominalists, the founder of the "modern" school. Science has to do, he maintains, only with propositions, not with things as such, since the object of science is not what is but what is known. Things, too, are always singular, while science has to do with general concepts, which as such exist only in the human mind. Scotus had deduced the objective existence of universals from the concepts originated under the operation of the objects. Occam, on the other hand, asserts that "no universal is a substance existing outside of the mind," and proves it by a variety of keen logical reasons. He rejects even the milder forms of philosophic universalism, such as the theory that the universal is something in particulars which is distinguished from them not *realiter* but only *formaliter*. In fine, he considers the universal without qualification as an "intention" of the mind, a symbol representing conventionally several objects. In respect of the theory of cognition, where Duns Scotus had placed between the perceiving subject and the object perceived a "sensible species" and an "intelligible species," Occam considers these as superfluous machinery. Objects call forth sense-impressions in us, which are transmuted by the active intellect into mental images; these are thus a product of the intellect, not *species* which flow from the object into the *intellectus possibilis*. The reality of these images is thus, in the modern use of the terms, not objective but subjective. This is true not merely of the "terms of first intention" formed directly from sense-impression, but also of the "terms of second intention," i.e., the abstract terms which take note of common attributes, or universals. These latter correspond to a tendency of the human mind, which can not perceive individuals without at the same time attempting to form a general concept. A white object simultaneously suggests abstract whiteness; an extended, related, enduring object forces the conception of extension, relation, duration. The result of this line of reasoning is the absolute subjectivity of all concepts and universals and the limitation of knowledge to the mind and its concepts—although these are real entities because of their subjective existence in the mind, reproducing the actual according to the constitution of the mind. Thus Occam is really the pioneer of modern epistemology. The mysterious universals with their species in the sense of objective realities are abolished. Objects work upon the senses of men, and out of these operations the active intellect frames its concepts, including the so-called universals, which, while they are in themselves subjective, yet correspond to objective realities. By the statement that science has nothing to do directly with things, but only with concepts of them, the theory of knowledge assumes vital import for the progress of science, and a new method of scientific cognition is made available. Of course this increases the difficulty of the task of theology; but Occam was essentially of a critical and negative temperament, of great critical acumen but (especially in the religious province) by no means equally great in constructive ability. He had not the broad general conception of religion which guided his master Scotus through all his perilous attempts to criticize the old evidences and bring up new ones; where he shows its power at all, it is usually simply borrowed from Scotus.

2. Doctrine of the Church and Criticism.

According to his attitude toward the dogmas of the Church, it appears that "authority, reason, and experience" are the sources of religious knowledge. A scientific proof of dogma is impossible. This he shows by the method of evolving a number of propositions which on ecclesiastical principles ought to be possible, but actually contradict the doctrine of the Church. The instances are frequently rather startling; but it would be quite misleading to understand them in the sense of anti-ecclesiastical unbelief or frivolous skepticism. Occam's purpose is to show that reason is useless as a foundation of ecclesiastical dogma. The infidel can " attain all the knowledge, whether simple or complex, which the believer can have "; the difference is in the possession of faith. The act of belief depends on the *fides infusa*, and proceeds from the cooperation of this with the *fides acquisita* derived from instruction, Bible-reading, and intelligent meditation on various truths. Theology is not thus in the strict sense a science; it is not a form of natural metaphysical cognition, but a special mode of cognition effected by the operation of the infused " habit " of faith. In the application of these principles to the faith of the church of his day, Occam accepts and even enhances the ecclesiastical positivism of Scotus. The faith of the Church must be accepted *in toto*, either explicitly or implicitly. Reason may question the doctrines or ordinances of the Church, but the Christian as a Christian accepts them. The more critical activity awoke, the more need there was for this counterbalancing thought. The legal conception of the Church finds expression here; he who wishes to belong to it must subject himself to its laws, whether or not he is personally convinced of their justice. Here again there is need of the miraculous *fides infusa;* but this is itself an article of faith which is learned only by authority, not " by reason, by experience, or by logic." So it comes back to the point that a man must accept the teachings of the Church because he wishes to belong to it. The authority of the Church's teaching was essentially based, for Occam, on that of the Bible. This in itself was nothing new, as all the scholastics (following Augustine) had regarded church doctrine as the formulated expression of Scriptural truth. The novelty here is that Occam is driven by the party conflicts of his day into acknowledging that the authorities of the day may diverge from Scriptural teaching, and thus he comes to a more consciously strict application of the principle of Scriptural infallibility. Popes and councils may err, but the written word is sure. " A Christian is not bound to believe, as necessary to salvation, anything which is neither contained in the Bible nor may be plainly and of necessity inferred from what is contained there." It is true that he does not realize how far this principle might lead —how far it was one day going to lead Luther; nor does he seem disposed to apply it except where the necessities of his own position, as in the controversy on poverty, forced him to it. In practise, throughout his whole dogmatic system, the authority of the Fathers and of the Roman Catholic Church stands out as coequal with that of the Scripture, and in fact has the last word; the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is not expressly taught in Scripture, is unquestioningly accepted on that authority. In spite of this, a special place must be given him in the history of the principle of Scriptural faith.

3. Doctrine of God, Salvation and Sin.

Space forbids more than a cursory glance at the individual doctrines held by him; but this is less to be regretted since his strength lies in the critical rather than the positive, in which he is generally influenced by Scotus. In regard to the nature and attributes of God, he applies a critical solvent to the principal proof given for his existence by Scotus, showing that the reality of God as the *infinitus intensive* can as little be demonstrated from *efficientia, causalitas, eminentia,* as from the divine knowledge of the infinite or from the simplicity of his nature. Nevertheless he considers the recognition of God to proceed from the idea of causality, if not by strict syllogistic deduction, yet " by authority and reason." And in the same sort of way the infinity of God is confirmed. As to his unbounded power and absolute will, Occam distinguishes *potentia absoluta* and *potentia ordinata,* the two being, however, only different modes of considering a power which is essentially one; in practise it is always *ordinata,* the absolute power being merely the hypothetical possibility of God's doing anything whatever which does not involve a contradiction in terms. The absolute freedom of God is the characteristic trait in the theology of Occam. The entire scheme of salvation planned by the *voluntas ordinata* is based on no inner necessity, but is determined by the fact that it pleased God, as a matter of fact, to do thus and no otherwise. The distinction of the two aspects of the divine power comes in here; the merits of the saints, e.g., are accepted as valid only because it pleases God to accept them—but since it has pleased God to establish this system, merit is absolutely necessary. God and his grace do all, yet only in such a way that the cooperation of man is required. The freedom of the human will can not be, strictly speaking, demonstrated, but is recognized as true by experience. Sin consists in the violation of the will of God. By it, however, no " real " change takes place in the soul. Sin consists in individual acts; it does not take away freedom nor weaken the soul, but simply destroys the future good, the reward, ordained by God for those who do his will. Since there is no fundamental connection between sin and punishment, God could by his absolute power forgive sin and infuse grace even without repentance. In the same connection appears the relation of original sin to original righteousness. The latter is " an absolute something superadded to man as he is in a state of nature "; the former is " a certain lack of the righteousness which he ought to have." Thus original sin is the result of the divine ordinance; God wills to consider the offender against his law as unworthy of acceptance, together with all his posterity. This explains his view of the immaculate conception of Mary. As a member of the human race, she would have been in the first instant of her conception a debtor to original righteousness; but it is not inconceivable that God should have chosen to renounce the exaction of that righteousness from her and refused to impute its absence as a fault. By a subtle train of reasoning he concludes that she was not even for an instant in original sin.

In his Christology, Occam holds firmly to the hypostatic union, while distinguishing sharply between the two natures. As with Duns Scotus, so here the union consists in a " relation," the human nature being assumed by the divine. The special result of Christ's work is to be seen in the institu-

4. Doctrine of Christ and the Sacraments.

tion and operation of the sacraments. The operation is described in a manner usual in Franciscan theology; grace does not reside in them, but they are signs that God, in accordance with his institution, will accompany their administration with his grace. Grace is taken in a twofold sense, an infused quality of the mind by which man is enabled to act according to God's will, and divine acceptation, "the gratuitous will of God." Following Scotus again, Occam is conscious of strong objections to the doctrine of the necessity of an infused "habit" of grace; and it is quite clear that the retention of it in his system is due merely to submission to authority. Under the head of the sacraments, his fullest treatment is given to the Eucharist, where he follows the consubstantiation theory which after Scotus was becoming common. Neither Scripture nor reason contradicts the possibility of the substance of bread, not merely the accidents, remaining together with the substance of the body of Christ; nor is transubstantiation taught in Scripture. He goes at considerable length into the question of the possibility of the presence of Christ in the sacrament. For him as a nominalist, quantity is a thing which has no existence in itself, but only the *res quanta*. Now quantity can increase or diminish, and thus a thing may be without quantity, like a mathematical point; this is the manner in which the body of Christ exists in the sacrament of the altar. In this way he comes to agree with Thomas Aquinas, that the body of Christ is present "after the manner of substance, not after that of quantity" (*Summa*, III., lxxvi. 1); the criticism of Duns Scotus, that a substance without attributes is unthinkable, is avoided by the assertion that quantity is not an essential property of substance. While to some extent he prepared the way for Luther's teaching on the Lord's Supper, the difference between his doctrine of ubiquity and Luther's must not be overlooked. As to the sacrament of penance, like most of the later scholastics, Occam lays most stress on the absolution. Since, as shown above, sin effects no "real" change in the soul, its destruction consists in the non-imputation of guilt. This might have been brought about, had God so willed, by an internal act of repentance on the part of a sinner having proper dispositions. Sin being an act of the will, the detestation of it by the same will is the appropriate means for its destruction, and in fact necessary, contrary to the view of Scotus that God gives his grace to the sinner through the sacrament without either attrition or contrition. But the essence of the sacrament, according to Occam, lies in the deliverance of the sinner from the guilt of sin by God through the agency of the priest.

5. Church and State.

In the important questions as to the external organization of the Church and its relation to the State, two principal motives guided Occam to his conclusions. Accusing John XXII. of attempting to subjugate or destroy the empire and to prove erroneous and illicit the thorough-going poverty of the Franciscans, he met him by attempting on the one hand to make a sharp distinction between the Church and the world, and on the other by showing the limitations and errors of the official ecclesiastical authorities. Like Marsilius of Padua, he contends that the papal power extends only to spiritual things. The apostles were subject to the secular authorities of their time and were far from claiming any temporal jurisdiction. Even the necessity of the papacy may be called in question; and if so, much less is there any necessary dependence of the emperor on the pope. The choice of the electors makes an emperor, who needs no papal confirmation. The relation of pope and emperor is discussed not only from the standpoint of the historic civil law, but from that of natural law as well. The idea of natural law had come down from the ancients to both canonists and civilians, as a criterion of the justice of positive enactments; the popes had employed it often enough against civil rulers, and now it was turned against themselves. The trouble with this criterion, however, was that it was too elastic; it could be stretched to include the most revolutionary conclusions in both Church and State. Occam undoubtedly believed in the logical validity of his critical statements; but a complete overturning of the ecclesiastical organism was as far from his temperament as the creation of a new system of Scriptural theology. He never strove for anything more than a certain amelioration of existing conditions within the circle of the system, and his most reasonable demands went to pieces on the positivism of the nominalist. He was anything but timid; but he went on criticizing and constructing, and then doubting once more both his critical and his constructive work.

IV. Survey of Occam's Position: The foregoing review of Occam's theological and constitutional opinions shows how on the one hand the newer criticism of traditional doctrines and ordinances was becoming ever more minute and more difficult to deal with, and on the other the ecclesiastical positivism was hardening into more inflexible formulas. In Occam's hands theology became increasingly skeptical, negative, and unfruitful. He really dug the grave of scholasticism, which perished of the accumulation of dialectical subtlety and negation. The further it got away from active church life, the more dreary and unprofitable did its speculations appear, until an imperative demand arose for a theology that should be practical and alive, Augustinian and Scriptural. But nominalism won an external victory. Occam's doctrine remained the "modern" theology up to the time of Luther. The "last of the scholastics," Gabriel Biel (q.v.), had nothing better to offer his disciples than a *Collectorium ex Occamo;* and after Gregory of Rimini had combined Occam's nominalism with the Augustinian teaching on sin and grace, the name of the English friar stood high with those who looked for a "modern" scientific theology. Luther calls him "my dear master," and proclaims with pride "I am of the Occamist faction." As a philosopher, he won a decided victory, even over his greater teacher Scotus, and became the pioneer of modern epistemology; as a theologian he enforced the critical method of Scotus on generations to follow; and as a constitutionalist he furnished a leaven in his ideas on Church and State and on the supreme authority of Scripture which was destined to work mightily on a later age. Both on the negative and on the positive side, he stands in a direct relation to the greatest event of the succeeding age, the Reformation. It has been shown above that he was no forerunner of Luther as a Reformer; but he was one of the factors without which the Reformation would have been impossible.

(R. Seeberg.)

Bibliography: Sources for a life are: John of Viktring, in J. F. Böhmer, *Fontes rerum Germanicarum*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1843; John of Winterthur, *Chronica*, ed. G. von Wyss, in *Archiv für schweizerische Geschichte*, vol. xi., Zurich, 1856; N. Glassberger, *Chronicon*, in *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. ii., Quaracchi, 1887; L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, ed. Fonseca, vols. vii.–viii., Rome, 1733; H. Denifle, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. ii., part i., Paris, 1890. Consult: P. Feret, *La Faculté de théologie de Paris au moyen âge*, pp. 339 sqq., Paris, 1896; W. L. G. F. v. Eberstein, *Natürliche Theologie der Scholastiker*, Leipsic, 1803; K. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, iii. 327–420, Leipsic, 1867; S. Riezler, *Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwigs des Baiern*, Leipsic, 1874; J. E. Erdmann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, i. 423–434, Berlin, 1878, Eng. transl. vol. i., London, 1893; C. Müller, *Der Kampf Ludwigs des Baiern mit der römischen Curie*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1879–80; B. Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, ii. 2, pp. 356–430, Paris, 1880; A. G. Little, *Grey Friars of Oxford*, pp. 225–234, Oxford, 1892; M. de Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, pp. 349–364, Louvain, 1900; G. Hoffmann, *Die Lehre der fides implicita*, pp. 153 sqq., Leipsic, 1903; F. Kropatscheck, in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, iv. i., Gütersloh, 1900; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 691, 719, and 2, pp. 188 sqq. et passim; *DNB*, xli. 357–362; *ADB*, xxiv. 122 sqq.; Harnack, *Dogma*, vol. vi. passim; and, in general, works on the history of the period and of philosophy.

OCCASIONALISM. See Malebranche, Nicolas.

OCCOM (OCCUM), SAMSON: Converted Indian, and Presbyterian missionary among the Indians; b. at Mohegan, New London County, Conn., about 1723; d. at New Stockbridge, N. Y., July 14, 1792. Converted to Christianity and expressing the desire to become a religious teacher in his tribe, he attended the Indian school of Eleazer Wheelock at Lebanon for four years. In 1748 he taught at New London, but soon went to Montauk, L. I., where he was first teacher and then preacher to the Indians for ten years. Ordained in 1759, he went two years later on a mission to the Oneidas, and, in 1766, to England with Nathaniel Wheelock to procure funds for Moor's Indian charity school. While there, he preached between 300 and 400 sermons and obtained more than £100,000 of which George III. subscribed £200. This school, later transferred to New Hampshire, became the nucleus that developed into Dartmouth College. In 1786 he removed to Oneida, N. Y., and resided with the Stockbridge Indians. He was the author of several hymns, the best known of which is "Awaked by Sinai's awful sound." His account of the Montauk Indians of Long Island (1761) is reprinted in the *Massachusetts Historical Society's Collections*, x. 106–111.

Bibliography: W. de L. Love, *Samson Occom and the Indians of New England*, Boston, 1900; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, iii. 192–195; New York, 1858; E. H. Gillett, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Church*, i. 161, 368, 388, Philadelphia, 1864; C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 324–325, New York, 1885.

OCHINO, ō-kī′-nō, BERNARDINO: Italian Reformer; b. at Siena in 1487; d. at Austerlitz (12 m. e.s.e. of Brunn) in 1564. [His father's name was Domenico Tommasini, and Ochino took his name from the street (Oca) on which his father dwelt.] Persuaded by Savanarola's call to repentance, and believing that the surest road to salvation was by way of fasting, repetition of prayers, continence, vigils, and the like, Ochino first turned to the Franciscan Observants and afterward to the Capuchins, as the most austere order in which to realize his purpose. Convinced, in consequence of his inner experience, that the certainty of salvation is not to be earned by one's own performances, he relinquished past relations, and fled from Italy in 1542, after he had twice been elected vicar-general of his order. At Naples, through the Spanish nobleman Juan de Valdés (q.v.), he was approached by the combined religious views of the mystics and the Reformation. He there became firmly convinced of the voidness of ecclesiastical mediations for salvation; and in the company about Valdés, which comprised Pietro Martire Vermigli (q.v.), Marcantonio Flaminio, Pietro Carnesecchi, Mario Galeota, besides highly endowed women, such as Vittoria Colonna, Costanza d'Avalos, and the Duchess Giulia Gonzaga, he applied himself to the purely Biblical doctrine of salvation. Thus there arose an irreconcilable conflict between his convictions and the demands of his office; and this came to an open climax in the spring of 1542, when Ochino, at Venice, intervened from the pulpit in behalf of a friend who had been treated unjustly by the Inquisition. The papal nuncio forbade him to preach; then he was summoned to Rome, where the Inquisition (q.v.) had just been reorganized. On his way to Rome his adversaries' intentions dawned upon him, and instead of death or prison, he chose voluntary exile. First he found refuge at Geneva, where he proclaimed the word of God from 1542–1544, to the local Italians, some of whom were likewise religious refugees. Then, called to Augsburg, by way of Basel, he found himself again compelled to flight, when the imperial troops forced the city to surrender (1547). The emperor demanded him to be delivered up, but the council suffered him to escape by night. By way of Zurich he returned to Basel, followed by his family from Geneva; and from Basel, in November, 1547, in response to Cranmer's invitation, he continued as far as England, where, under Edward VI., a very favorable tide had set in for Protestantism. During the years of his exile Ochino reached his countrymen with his pen. A series of religious tracts, an open letter to the council of his native city, answers to the attacks of Roman Catholic writers, besides works of edification and an exposition of the epistle to the Romans, had been published previously. There now appeared a caustic tract against the papacy, *Tragedy or Dialogue of the Uniuste Usurped Primacie of the Bishop of Rome* (London, 1549, reprint, 1899). This, dedicated to the young king, presents the argument that the papacy owes its existence to none but the devil himself. With the reaction under Queen Mary, 1553, Ochino left England and went to Zurich as pastor of some Evangelical refugees who had fled from Locarno. Eventually, however, from Zurich, too, he was expelled by a narrow zeal, which charged that he sanctioned polygamy and assailed the Trinity. This was a hard accusation, and not without formal occasion, yet substantially refuted not only by his "Apology" of the year 1563, but still more by the whole course of his life. Ochino sought final refuge in Poland; yet thence he was expelled by the edict of Aug. 7, 1564, against foreign heretics. And so from Poland he wandered over to Moravia, where, at Slackov (Austerlitz) he was to lay down his weary life. Looking back, he says, "I had much to endure, but this no apostle and disciple of Christ is spared. However, that I was enabled to endure all is proof that the Lord manifested his power in me." K. Benrath.

Bibliography: There is no collected edition of his works. Some of his sermons were frequently translated into English, London, 1550, 1580, as was his *Dialogo del Purgatoris*, ib. 1657. Consult: K. Benrath, *Bernardino Ochino*, Brunswick, 1892, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., London, 1876; C. Carmichel Beron, *Essai sur B. Ochino*, Paris, 1855; T. McCrie, *Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy*, Philadelphia, 1856; G. Buchsenschutz, *Étude sur la vie et les œuvres de B. Ochino*, Strasburg, 1871; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., col. 1733; *DNB*, xli. 350 sqq.

OCTAVE: A term in Roman Catholic liturgics denoting the celebration throughout an entire week of certain great festivals, and also the eighth day, or conclusion of the festival, which has a higher rank than the others. Like the festivals themselves, the octaves differ in dignity. Those of Easter and Pentecost are of such high rank that neither the celebration of saints' days nor votive masses are permitted within them; those of Christmas and Corpus Christi allow the observance of saints' days but not of votive masses; other octaves permit both. Each day of the octave has part of the service proper to itself, while the eighth approximates more closely to that of the feast. The original institution of octaves is of historical interest as showing the inclination of the early Church to perpetuate the liturgical institutions of Israel, according to which the Passover was celebrated for seven days (or eight, including the day of preparation), the first and last being of special importance, while the Feast of Tabernacles lasted for eight.

(E. Ranke†.)

Bibliography: Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1735–37.

ODD ORDER BRETHREN. See Dunkers, III.

ODES OF SOLOMON. See Solomon, Odes of.

ODILO: Fifth Abbot of Cluny. See Cluny, Abbey and Congregation of, § 3.

ODLAND, ŏd′lŭnd, **SIGURD VILHELM:** Norwegian theologian; b. at Bergen, Norway, Dec. 5, 1857. He was graduated at the University of Christiania (B.A., 1875; candidate in theology, 1879; Th.D., 1879); was appointed professor of theology there (1894), his special field being New-Testament exegesis and isagogics. He achieved celebrity by his opposition to the liberal theology which in recent years has exerted marked influence in Norway. His prominence in this respect became marked in the "professor controversy" which reached its culmination in the appointment (1906) of Johannes Ording (q.v.) to the chair of systematic theology in the university vacated by Petersen. When the appointment was made, Odland carried out his declared intention of resigning if a member of the faculty was permitted to teach anticonfessional doctrine. With the help of clergy and laity he was able to create a new faculty, confessional as well as scientific in type, independent of the university.

Odland has always been interested in practical church work, became in 1885 a member of the board of directors of Lutherstiftelsen, and its president after it had become the "Norwegian Lutheran Society for Home Missions." In 1893 he was an editor of *Luth. Ugeskrift*, and since 1900 of *Luthersk Kirketidende*. He was also a member of the committee for the revision of the Norwegian translation of the New Testament (1896–1905). Among his works may be mentioned: *Kristofer Janson og det Nye Testamente* (1886); *Kristofer Janson om solsagn og evangelierne* (1894), directed against the only Norwegian Unitarian preacher of any fame in America; *Jakobs Brev, indledet og fortolket* (1889); *Apostolatets Begreb og Oprindelse* (1897).

John O. Evjen.

ODO (ODA): Archbishop of Canterbury; d. at Canterbury June 2, 959. He was possibly the son of a Dane in the army of Inguar (Ivar) which conquered the north of England in 867, and in early life embraced Christianity against the will of his father. He was adopted by the Saxon noble Æthelhelm, who had him baptized and educated; he showed such aptitude that he was early admitted to the priesthood. He secured the favor of King Æthelstan, who had him made bishop of Ramsbury in 927, and also employed him in a diplomatic mission. In 942 King Edmund offered to make him archbishop, but he declined on the ground that he was not a monk, and that the see should be held by a member of an order. He was induced to take the cowl, after which he was elevated to the see. He immediately occupied himself in the repair of the cathedral, the condition of which was almost ruinous. His occupation of the see was marked by strenuous efforts for the upbuilding of morals and care for the discipline of the cloisters. He was incessant in laboring for the betterment of treatment of the lower classes by nobles and the rich, for the performance of their duties by the clergy, and for observance by monks of the rules of the orders. He was especially interested in preventing marriages regarded as unlawful, especially of nuns and of near of kin; and he made it his duty to see that material provision was made for the benefit of the wife in case she were left a widow. He inspired Frithegode to write the metrical "Life of Wilfrid," for which he furnished the prose preface. He left behind him a reputation as a holy man of great influence, the protector of the weak, and, in the pursuit of this aim, regarded not at all the rank of those concerned.

Bibliography: The *Vita*, attributed to Osbern, really by Eadmer, is, with comment, in *ASB*, July, ii. 63–73; *ASM*, v. 288–296; H. Wharton, *Anglia sacra*, ii. 78–87, London, 1691; J. Langebek, *Script. rer. Danicarum*, ii. 401–411, 9 vols., Copenhagen, 1772–1878; *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, in *Rolls Series*, i. 399–475, London, 1879; and *MPL*, cxxxiii. 931–944. Consult T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials Relating to the Hist. of Great Britain and Ireland*, in *Rolls Series*, no. 26, i. 2, p. 566, nos. 1148–51, London, 1862; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, i. 428–433, ib. 1842; T. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. i., 1860; *DNB*, xli. 421–423, where references are made to scattering notices.

ODO: Second abbot of Cluny. See Cluny, Abbey and Congregation of, § 2.

ŒCOLAMPADIUS, ec′o-lam-pē′di-us, AND THE REFORMATION IN BASEL.

Life of Œcolampadius till 1522 (§ 1).
Beginnings of the Reformation in Basel (§ 2).
Early Work of Œcolampadius There (§ 3).
Final Success in 1529 (§ 4).
Controversy over the Lord's Supper (§ 5).
Closing Work of Œcolampadius (§ 6).

Johannes Œcolampadius (Johann Heussgen, Hussgen, Hauschein, in the South German dialect equivalent to "candlestick," whence the grecized form of his name) was born at Weinsberg (25 m. n. of Stuttgart), in the Palatinate, 1482; d. at Basel Nov. 24, 1531.

1. Life of Œcolampadius till 1522.

He began his studies in Heilbronn and continued them in Bologna, where he devoted himself to jurisprudence. But his aversion to law induced him to leave Bologna and study theology at Heidelberg (1499), where he occupied himself with the study of Thomas Aquinas, of the mystics, such as Richard of St. Victor, and of later theologians like Gerson. His inherent mysticism was thus intensified, and he remained a pious and loyal Romanist. In 1503 he took his bachelor's degree and soon afterward became tutor of the younger sons of the Elector Philip the Upright in Heidelberg. But the life of the court displeased him and he longed to return to the study of theology. The facts of his life from 1503 to 1512 are still veiled in obscurity. It is known only that he departed from the court of the elector and accepted a prebend at Weinsberg. A prebend was established there by the council Apr. 8, 1510, confirmed by the bishop June 9, meanwhile Œcolampadius had been presented, Apr. 3, by Duke Ulrich (*Blätter fur württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, 1895, p. 40). The same year he was in Stuttgart to hear Reuchlin and published at Freiburg some sermons which he had preached in Weinsberg. Then he went to Tübingen, where he became intimate with Melanchthon. In 1514 he seems to have returned to Heidelberg, where he associated with Brenz and Capito. In 1515 he was called to Basel as preacher by Bishop Christoph of Utenheim, where he met Erasmus and assisted him in the publication of his Greek New Testament. They formed an intimate friendship, and Erasmus exercised a considerable influence upon the young preacher. In 1516 Œcolampadius lectured at the University of Basel on Obadiah, Ephesians, and the "Sentences" of Lombard. But after a short time he returned to Weinsberg to attend to his prebend and at the same time pursued private studies at Heidelberg. In 1518 he was again in Basel assisting Erasmus in the second edition of his New Testament. At this time he pursued the study of Greek grammar and of Jerome's translation of the Bible, lecturing at the same time at the university. In December, 1518, he received a call as preacher to the principal church in Augsburg, where the first events of the Reformation had made a deep impression upon the citizens. Œcolampadius found himself greatly oppressed by these excitements and would have liked to return to his studies; but he remained loyal to his position, especially after it had become clear to him that Luther spoke the truth. Luther's sermons on the Ten Commandments and his theses decided Œcolampadius to adopt the new teachings. But in 1520 he suddenly startled his friends by entering the monastery of Altenmünster near Augsburg, in which action he was following out his natural leaning toward mysticism and his deep-rooted sympathy with the ideals of monastic life. In a treatise of 1515 he had exalted those who from love of perfection renounce marriage and in Basel had given offense to his humanistic friends by his predilection for the mysterious elements in the Roman cult and for the ascetic life. But on entering the monastery, he reserved to himself the right to live according to the word of God and to leave if he found it necessary. In fact, his dissatisfaction with the old conditions increased. In his sermon on the Lord's Supper he gave up the doctrine of transubstantiation; the sacrifice of the mass was for him only a memorial, not a repetition of the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross; he also defended the administration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds; while the institution of confession he tried to save by its transformation in the Evangelical sense. His treatises and sermons became continually more Evangelical, and he openly expressed his admiration for Luther. He left the monastery in 1522 and accepted in April from Franz von Sickingen (q.v.) the position of chaplain at the castle of Ebernburg. There he took his first step as a Reformer by reading mass in German and preaching on week-days in the same language, affirming that the Church must be reformed on the basis of the Word of God. But he did not feel at ease in Ebernburg and in November, 1522, gladly accepted an invitation of Cratander to come to Basel, where the work of his life was awaiting him.

Œcolampadius was not the originator of the Reformation in Basel. On his arrival at Basel the fundamental basis of the old order had already been shaken.

2. Beginnings of the Reformation in Basel.

But it was his special merit that by his powerful and impressive sermons, by his moderation and considerateness, and especially by his spiritual clearness and determination the reformatory movement of Basel, which at this time was strongly intermingled with political motives, was transformed into a religious movement. When Basel joined the Swiss federation (1501), the example of the Swiss democracies induced the citizens to change their political conditions. So far the city had been ruled exclusively by the nobility. After their democratic reforms, the citizens shook off the secular power of the bishop, and after these political changes there was no obstacle to the free development of the Reformation. Capito was the first who was active for the cause in Basel, beginning with the overthrow of the order of pericopes. Unfortunately he left Basel in 1519, but he left results. In Wilhelm Röubli, preacher at St. Alban's, there appeared a Reformer of a different type, who in 1521 began to preach against the mass, purgatory, worship of saints, and other abuses of the Roman Church, and with success to hold before the people Christ crucified. On Corpus Christi he ordered a Bible to be carried before the procession, with the inscription, " The Bible, that is true holiness, everything else is dead men's bones." Thereupon the priests accused him before the bishop, who, because of the excitement, referred the matter to the council, while the populace vehemently demanded the acquittal of the preacher. The council in great alarm yielded, but, owing to the intrigues of the clergy, Röubli was banished in 1522, though not till he had inflamed the souls of the people and opened their hearts to the Evangelical truth. After him, the sermons of Johann Lüthard of the Franciscan monastery and of Wolff Wissenburg, preacher at the hospital, exercised a lasting influence. Hence, when Œcolampadius came to Basel, he found it already the center of an Evangelical movement from which proceeded a great mass of literature.

In Œcolampadius the movement received a leader. He was at first without a position, but toward the end of 1522 he became unsalaried vicar to Antonius Zanker, preacher at St. Martin's. In 1523 the council made him and Konrad Pellican (q.v.) lecturers on Holy Scripture at the university; but the anti-Evangelical university did not recognize them, and they were compelled to lecture outside of the academic halls. The university had become more and more the stronghold of the old religion and even Erasmus was cold and indifferent. But clergy and laity thronged to hear the lectures of Œcolampadius. Luther was greatly elated over his success, but at this time Œcolampadius came into terms of friendship with Zwingli, who was much nearer to him than Luther, and the natural consequence was his dependence upon Zwingli. At the end of 1522 the university made an effort to end the crisis, and a debate was proposed which did not eventuate. At the instigation of Zwingli a disputation was held in Zurich which greatly furthered the cause of the Reformed in the whole of Switzerland. Œcolampadius felt so strengthened that he, too, in 1523 drew up four theses for a public disputation and defended them in the presence of large crowds. His first sermons so swayed the people that, soon after he entered his position, various ceremonies were omitted, priests married, and the people with the clergy split into two sharply opposed parties. The majority of the town clergy attacked Œcolampadius violently, but the council took a favorable attitude. In 1523 it issued its first reformatory mandate, " the first document of the supremacy of the State over the Church in Basel," which ordered the free preaching of the Gospel, but did not involve express assent to the Reformation. In 1524 a disputation took place, dealing with the marriage of priests, which was publicly defended by Stephen Stör, a secular priest, who had married. Œcolampadius took part, but held that celibacy had advantages in that an unmarried priest could better devote himself to his duties. The Reformed again won the victory. About the same time another disputation took place at the instigation of Farel, who had reached Basel as a fugitive. This disputation was also opposed by the university, and its success added new strength to the Evangelical party. Œcolampadius now became preacher at St. Martin's. The German language was used in baptism, the Lord's Supper was administered in both kinds, and all unprofitable ceremonies were abolished. In 1526 German church song was introduced. In 1525 the Catholic estates of Switzerland made an energetic effort to suppress the Reformation by sending messengers to Basel to invoke the aid of the city against the Reformation in Zurich, but the councilors refused, appealing to their relations with the federation. Thus peace was secured for several years, and the Swiss Reformation was saved. But the rebellion of the peasants inspired the defenders of the old faith with new hopes. Protests were raised against the radical reforms of Œcolampadius, even from the side of the Reformed, and the council, alarmed by these protests, asked the opinion of Erasmus. The latter advised them to refer the matter to the pope. The rebellious peasants had occupied the Sundgau, Alsace, Breisgau, the Black Forest, and a part of the canton of Basel, and marched before the very doors of Basel. Thanks to the unanimous attitude of its population, the city was saved, and a treaty was made with the peasants. Roman Catholics held the reformation of Œcolampadius chargeable for these events, and he was made responsible for the radicalism of the Anabaptists who greatly embarrassed the political-ecclesiastical movement in Basel.

3. Early Work of Œcolampadius There.

In the beginning, Œcolampadius like Zwingli had many points of contact with them, especially as many of them had been zealous and able adherents of the Reformation. He tried to deal with them in a friendly way. For a time he went even so far as to consider the baptism of children an open question, but after a private disputation with the Anabaptists at his residence in Aug., 1525, he advocated the traditional doctrine. The controversy on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper also penetrated to Basel. Originally Œcolampadius agreed with Carlstadt (q.v.) on this doctrine, incurring thereby the displeasure not only of the Romanists, but also of the council. The works of Carlstadt were forbidden, and dissensions arose among the clergy so that Zwingli had to admonish them to live in concord. For the defense of his standpoint Œcolampadius published in Aug., 1525, his treatise *De genuina verborum Domini " hoc est corpus meum " . . . expositio*. This moderate treatise led to no agreement, but rather sharpened the contrast, and the literary dispute assumed a

4. Final Success in 1529.

violent character. Œcolampadius called Luther the Saxon idol. A commission consisting of Erasmus, Bär (Ursus), Cantiuncula, and Amerbach, instituted by the council to examine the book of Œcolampadius, rejected it, while the volume aroused opposition outside of Basel. Œcolampadius remained firm in spite of continual attacks by the newly elected Bishop Marius and of gains by the Roman party in the Swiss federation. The Catholic estates of Switzerland aimed a blow at the Reformed by the announcement of a disputation to be held at Baden, a few miles from Basel. It had been prepared in such a way that the victory of the Catholics seemed secure. Zwingli was not present, and Haller of Bern did not speak convincingly, and all seemed to depend upon Œcolampadius who was in daily communication with Zwingli. At the end of the disputation ten voted for Œcolampadius and eighty-two for Eck. But the victory of the Romanists was only apparent, and their hopes of suppressing the Reformation were not fulfilled; the Council of Basel did not give up the established reforms, and even made further changes, decreeing in 1527 that participation in the mass should be left to each individual. But the impatient populace had no sympathy with the slow procedure of the council and demanded the formal introduction of the Reformation. Its introduction in Bern in 1528 greatly excited the Basel population, and on Good Friday and Easter Monday they invaded the churches and destroyed the pictures. The culprits were imprisoned, but the people peremptorily demanded their release. The council ordered the removal of the pictures, but the friends of the Reformation were not satisfied with this action; they wished a uniform regulation of all religious affairs. At Christmas, 1528, there occurred a new insurrection of the citizens. The Roman Catholics armed themselves, and the Reformed also prepared for defense. Œcolampadius dreaded the outbreak of a civil war and asked Zwingli to mediate. Ambassadors went from Zurich, Bern, Schaffhausen, Mühlhausen, and Strasburg in order to settle the disputes and hinder the shedding of blood. The Roman Catholics sent also their envoys. The ambassadors of Zurich and Bern proposed a disputation to take place on Whitsunday, 1529. This proposition was unanimously adopted at a convention of over 3,000 citizens on Jan. 6, 1529. But when the council, contrary to its former attitude, continued to place obstacles in the way of the Reformation, a general uprising of the people occurred in February, 1529. They vehemently demanded the removal of the Romanist members of the council and of their friends among the clergy. The council at first hesitated, but when the threatening attitude of the people increased, it complied with their demands. On the next day the populace stormed the churches and monasteries and destroyed the pictures. Under the pressure of these events the council ordered the removal of all pictures and the abolition of the mass. Erasmus, Glareanus, Bär, and many citizens left the city. On Feb. 14, 1529, the first Evangelical church service was held in the cathedral and thus the Reformation at Basel was at last firmly established. Simon Grynæus and Sebastian Münster were called to the university. Œcolampadius was chosen antistes of the clergy and first preacher of the cathedral and in 1531 resumed his lectures. But his chief activity consisted in the regulation of church and school affairs. With his cooperation there appeared on Apr. 1, 1529, the new church order, the constitution of the Reformed Church of Basel.

5. Controversy over the Lord's Supper.

The reformatory movement of Basel was fortunately completed before the crisis in the fierce struggles concerning the Lord's Supper. In conformity with his treatise of 1525 Œcolampadius stood for the so-called tropical interpretation, with the single modification that he did not look for the trope in the copula *est* like Zwingli, but in the term *corpus*, which he explained as *figura corporis*, "the figure or sign of my body"; and he rejected the assumption of a corporeal participation on the basis of John vi. He was severely attacked for his symbolical conception by Luther, Brenz, and Pirkheimer. Luther wrote against him and Zwingli his polemical treatise, *Dass die Worte Christi . . . noch feststehen, wider die Schwarmgeister* (1527), in which both are designated as irretrievably lost and accused of the sin against the Holy Ghost. The vehement invectives and irritation of spirit between the adversaries seemed to leave little hope of harmony. But the Colloquy of Marburg in Oct., 1529, showed that there was a great and general desire for peace. Œcolampadius especially showed himself obliging and reconcilable. He had zealously aided Butzer's efforts for union, and he manifested the same spirit in the negotiations at Marburg. While an agreement seemed likely on all other points, Luther was irreconcilable on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Zwingli and Œcolampadius made many concessions; they even conceded that for the believers Christ is really present and consumed in the Lord's Supper, but they could not consent to Luther's additional sentence that he is eaten with the mouth and present in his body. The colloquy of Marburg did not end the eucharistic controversies. Luther continued his literary assaults. But still Œcolampadius did not give up hope of a final union. On Sept. 4, 1530, there took place a conference between Capito, Zwingli, and Megander at Zurich for the purpose of drawing up a confession in which they attempted a still closer approach to the Lutheran doctrine. The new formula of union emphasized the real and sacramental presence in the Lord's Supper "for the pure spirit, but not united in the bread or with the bread." Under the pressure of the hostile attitude of the emperor Luther showed himself at last willing to enter an alliance with the Swiss, but this time it was Zwingli who opposed the union on the basis of the new formula which seemed to him too vague and ambiguous, and he was not willing to curtail the truth at the price of political union. Once more, in 1531, Œcolampadius made an effort at reconciliation by advocating the joining of the Schmalkald League and the acceptation of the Tetrapolitana, but Bern and Zurich refused. Thus all sincere efforts for union on the part of Œcolampadius were without success; only the bond with the theologians of Strasburg had become closer. The chief merit of Œcolampadius in these controversies lies in the fact that as a theologian he defended bravely and with good reasons the doctrine of Zwingli. It was reserved for Calvin to accomplish the union not so much of the disputing parties as of the two essential factors in both theories.

6. Closing Work of Œcolampadius.

After the disputation of Baden (1526) Œcolampadius stood alongside of Zwingli as a leader of the Evangelicals in Switzerland and was entrusted with the leadership of their ecclesiastical affairs. In 1531 he introduced the new Reformed church order in Ulm. In the mean time his fame had spread abroad. The oppressed Waldenses of France sent their ambassadors to confer with him. His opinion was asked concerning the divorce of Henry VIII. Negotiations with the Anabaptists and Antitrinitarians embittered the last years of his life, and under his grave responsibilities his health broke down at a comparatively early age. The proper relation between State and Church became a burning question for the new Church since it had been reproached by the Anabaptists on account of lack of discipline. Deviating from Zwingli's theory of state supervision, Œcolampadius introduced the ecclesiastical ban with the execution of which he charged the clergy and subsequently a special board consisting of members of the council and of clergymen. He tried to introduce this institution in all Reformed churches at a convention in Aarau (1530), but Bern and Strasburg as well as Zwingli were decidedly opposed to it. The introduction of the measure in Basel aroused popular opposition, but Œcolampadius did not desist from his plan. Its rigorous execution and the inconsiderate procedure against men of different opinions occasioned many a bitter comment. Tradition regards Œcolampadius as the most lenient among the Swiss Reformers. This impression was probably called forth by his efforts for union, but in reality he was firm, his rigor at times bordering on intolerance. It must not be forgotten, however, that the time of the Reformation needed sternness of character to hold with firm grip the results achieved and to subject the liberated people to the discipline of the Gospel so that the Reformation might not degenerate into a revolution. In this respect Œcolampadius manifested no mediating attitude.

(W. Hadorn.)

Bibliography: Among the sources to be noted are: *Joannis Œcolampadii et Huld. Zwinglii Epistolæ*, Basel, 1536 (contains Capito's biography); *Wurstitens Basler Chronik*, ed. R. Hotz, Basel, 1883; *Basler Chroniken von Hyff und Carpentarius*, ed. W. Vischer and A. Stern, Leipsic, 1872; *Epistolæ doctorum virorum* (ed. T. Bibliander?), n.p., 1548 (contains the *Vitæ* by S. Grynæus and W. Capito immediately after the preface). Modern accounts of the life and writings are by: S. Hess, Zurich, 1791; J. J. Herzog, 2 vols., Basel, 1843; K. R. Hagenbach, Elberfeld, 1859 (treats also O. Myconius); an anonymous *J. Œcolampadius, Reformator von Basel*, Basel, 1863; cf. Beza, *Icones*, in the transl. of C. G. McCrie, pp. 107–111, London, 1906; A. Burckhard, in *Bilder aus der Geschichte Basels*, vol. iii., Basel, 1879; Fehleisen, Weinsberg, 1882; T. Burckhardt-Biedermann, in *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweitz*, x (1893). Further illustrative matter will be found in W. Vischer, *Geschichte der Universität Basel*, Basel, 1860; A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs*, 9 vols., Paris, 1878–97; M. Usteri, in *TSK*, lvi (1883), 155–174; T. Burckhardt-Biedermann, *Bonifatius Amerbach und die Reformation*, Basel, 1898; W. Walker, *The Reformation*, New York, 1900; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii. passim, ib. 1904; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. vii. passim; and in general, works on the history of the Reformation in Switzerland.

ŒCONOMUS, ec″o-no′mus, **CONSTANTINUS**: Prominent Greek theologian; b. (according to some authorities) at Tcharitchena (60 m. s.w. of Salonika) Sept. 8, 1780; d. in Athens Mar. 20, 1857. He was educated at first by his father, who was econome (vicar-general) of the diocese of Elasson in Thessaly, and then at Ampelacia by Zeses Cabras, a physician who had studied at Jena. He was ordained at an early age, and succeeded his father as econome of Elasson. There he published his first literary work, a short defense of his Bishop Joannicius. Having taken part in an unsuccessful rising against Ali Pasha, he was obliged to become a fugitive, and, after taking refuge in a monastery under the protection of the Patriarch Gregory V., obtained from him a position in the well-known high school at Smyrna. There he worked with marked success under Constantinus Cumas, later author of the great historical work *Historiai tōn anthrōpinōn praxeōn* (Vienna, 1838), and acquired considerable fame as a preacher. A permanent memorial of his activity there is preserved in what may be called his most important theological work, the *Catēchēsis, ē orthodoxos didaskalia tēs christianikēs pisteos*, printed in Vienna. It is a recasting of the catechism of Platon, but so thoroughly recast as to be substantially an independent work. A striking characteristic of it is the way in which the author gives expression, as far as is possible to an "orthodox" theologian, to the Pauline interpretation of the Gospel. The great opposition of sin and grace dominates him and leads to remarkably helpful conclusions.

His stay in Smyrna was unfortunately cut short by the jealousy of the friends and supporters of the Evangelical school in Smyrna. He was summoned to Constantinople as chief econome of the patriarchal see, and had a wide field of usefulness as a preacher in the center of "orthodox" Christianity. But once more his work was interrupted, this time by the outbreak of the Greek war for freedom. He escaped to Odessa, where he delivered a notable funeral sermon over the body of his patron the Patriarch Gregory, who had fallen a victim to the fury of the Turks (published with five other orations under the title of *Logoi ekklēsiastikoi*, Berlin, 1833).

His fame as preacher, orator in the cause of Christian freedom, and scholar attracted the notice of the czar, who summoned him to St. Petersburg. There he had leisure to complete his great philological works, *Dokimion peri plēsiestatēs suggeneias tēs Slabono-Rōssikes glōssēs pros tēn Hellēnikēn* (3 vols., St. Petersburg, 1828) and *Peri tēs gnēsias prophoras tēs hellēnikēs glōssēs* (1830), and increased his renown as a preacher. The Patriarch Constantius renewed his former appointment as chief econome, and he was made an assessor of the clerical academy in St. Petersburg, a member of the Royal Academy of Science, and a corresponding member of the Berlin Academy of Science. Partly, perhaps, as a consequence of his worldly success, a change was noticed in his attitude which exposed him to the charge of having abandoned his former ideals of Evangelical truth, scholarly impartiality, and devotion to his native land. The liberal and noble principles of his earlier life still appear, it is true, in the *Schedion ekklēsiastikēs akadēmias* which he published in 1828; but two years later he sent a ***Psēphisma synodikon*** to the ecumenical patriarch which became the basis of the *tomos* directed against the independence of the Greek Church by the Synod of 1850. In 1834, on an income provided by the czar, he settled down in Nauplia to a life of learned leisure, exposed, on the part of some of his countrymen, to the suspicion of being an agent of the patriarch and of Russia. Intercourse with the West since the middle of the eighteenth century had brought a new current into Greek church life, which showed itself especially in the spirit of historical criticism represented by such men as Corais and Theoklitos Pharmakides (q. v.). Œconomus put himself at the head of an opposition to this movement, and was the real moving spirit in a periodical established in 1835 under the title of *Hē euangelikē salpinx* ("The Gospel Trumpet"), which blew sharp blasts against "modernism." The same tendency appeared in his own works of this later period. The controversy as to the authenticity of the Apostolic Canons, on which the "orthodox" system was based, led him to write *Peri tōn triōn hieratikōn tēs ekklēsias bathmōn epistolimaia diatribē* (Nauplia, 1835). Another apparently unimportant controversy grew out of the question whether the Zacharias of Matt. xxiii. 35 was the father of the Baptist; it involved, however, the question of the authority of the apocryphal gospels, and easily led to a discussion of the justification for the cultus of the virgin. Of wider interest was the campaign which he undertook against translations of the Bible into modern Greek, with a corresponding overestimate of the value of the Septuagint; his principal work on this subject was the *Peri tōn ó hermeneutōn tēs palaias theias graphēs* (4 vols., Athens, 1834 sqq.). Besides the Bible versions that came from England, the "Trumpet" attacked also the foreign schools in Greece, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, and secured the imprisonment of Theophilus Kaïres (q. v.), the head of a flourishing school at Andros, who was teaching a thoroughly rationalistic form of Christianity. The principal work in which Œconomus set forth the conflicts of the latter half of his life is the *Triakontaetēris ekklēsiastikē*, covering the period from 1821 to 1852, a mine of information on the history of the Greek Church in the period, although not entirely completed. A number of other interesting works, some of a valuable scholarly character without controversial bearing, are collected in the *Sozomena ekklēsiastika syngrammata* published by his son Sophocles (3 vols., Athens, 1864–67). (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: G. F. Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, vols. iii.–iv., Gotha, 1878–79, *TSK*, xiv (1841), 7–53, C. Tischendorf, in appendix to *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, Apr. 10, 1857; R. Nicolai, *Geschichte der neugriechischen Litteratur*, Leipsic, 1876; A. D. Kyriakos, *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen*, ed. E. Rausch, ib. 1902. Other literature, in Greek, is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiv. 299.

ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS. See Councils and Synods, § 3.

ŒCUMENIUS, ec′ʊ-mee′nî-ʊs: The supposed author of a commentary in the form of a catena on the Acts, the epistles of St. Paul (including Hebrews), and the Catholic epistles, together with a brief exposition of the Apocalypse. According to a tenth- or eleventh-century manuscript, he was bishop of Tricca in Thessaly; he seems to have flourished about the end of the tenth century; the commentary on the Apocalypse is closely dependent, even to verbal agreement for a large part, on the much older one of Andrew of Cæsarea, while the manuscript authority for those on the other books goes back about half a century beyond the lifetime of Theophylact, who expounded the same books. The commentary on Revelation seems really not to belong to Œcumenius. As to the relation between him and Theophylact (q.v.), the close similarity of the treatment of the Catholic epistles still allows those which bear the name of Œcumenius to be designated as the older, while the text of those on the Pauline epistles differs more decidedly, and the differences offer puzzling problems. Œcumenius sometimes but not invariably gives the names of his sources, among whom Photius is the most frequently used. The whole question is complicated by the fact that the name of Œcumenius appears among these sources, as well as by the wide variance in the manuscripts, many of which differ from the printed text of both Œcumenius and Theophylact. In fact, the riddles connected with the former's name can not be solved until further investigation has been made of the whole field of Catenæ (q.v., § 7). (O. Zöckler †.)

Bibliography: The works named were edited in Greek by Donatus, Verona, 1532; in Latin by J. Hentenius, Antwerp, 1545; in Greek and Latin by F. Morel, 2 vols., Paris, 1631; the Catena on the Apocalypse by J. A. Cramer, Oxford, 1840; cf. *MPG*, cxviii.–cxix. Consult: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, viii. 692–696, Hamburg, 1802; *KL*, ix. 708–711; F. Overbeck, in *ZWT*, vii (1864), 192–201; J. Hergenröther, *Photius*, iii. 70 sqq., Regensburg, 1869; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 131–133; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., col. 1747.

OEDER, ō′der, **GEORG LUDWIG:** Protestant exegete and Biblical critic; b. at Schopfloch near Dinkelsbühl (56 m. n.e. of Stuttgart) Jan. 28, 1694; d. at Feuchtwangen (6 m. n. of Dinkelsbühl) Apr. 24, 1760. He received his education at Jena, taking his degree of master in theology in 1714; became the assistant of his father, who was pastor at Schopfloch; was later professor at the gymnasium at Heilbronn, whence he passed to the Ansbach gymnasium in a similar capacity, becoming director in 1730; in 1737 he reentered the ministry as pastor at Feuchtwangen. His writings are very numerous, deal mostly with the Scriptures, and are semi-rationalistic in tone, anticipating in some respects the work of later advanced criticism. Among his works mention may be made of *Disputatio de lege sub Christi adventum cessante* (Jena, 1715); *Disputatio de Bileamo veniam eundi non obtinente ad Num. xxii. 20* (1715), these two reedited in *Observationes sacræ ad varia eaque difficiliora Scripturæ sacræ loca* (1715–16); *Syntagma observationum sacrarum* (Ansbach, 1729; a collection of short papers); *Programma de pane angelorum ad Psalm. xxxviii. 25* (1731); *De Scopo Evangelii Johannis* (Leipsic, 1732); *Conjecturarum de difficilioribus Sacræ Scripturæ locis centuria* (1733); *Disputatio de raptu non Pauli apostoli, sed alterius cujusdam in paradisum . . . ad II Cor. xii. 1, 9* (1737); and above all, his *Freie Untersuchung über einige Bücher des Alten Testaments* (ed. G. I. L. Vogel, 1771), which created a great sensation.

Bibliography: *Grosses Universallexikon*, xxv. 539–543, Leipsic, 1740; J. D. Michaelis, *Orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek*, ii. 44, iii. 1–58, vi. 24–154, 35 parts, Frankfort, 1771–91; E. F. K. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, i. 109–111, Göttingen, 1797; *ADB*, xxiv. 147; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1747–48.

OEHLER, û'-ler, GUSTAV FRIEDRICH VON: German Lutheran theologian; b. at Ebingen (43 m. s.s.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, June 10, 1812; d. at Tübingen Feb. 19, 1872. He early showed a remarkable aptitude for languages, and pursued his studies at Tübingen under Schmid and Steudel, and later at Berlin under the orientalists Bopp, Petermann, and Schott. In 1834 he became a teacher in the missionary institute at Basel, and in 1837 went to Tübingen as repetent. During this period he edited, by request of the family, Steudel's theological lectures on the Old Testament (Berlin, 1840). In 1840 he was made professor at the seminary and pastor at Schönthal in Württemberg. Here he published in 1845 *Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, and the same year received calls to Marburg and Breslau, and accepted the latter. At Breslau, Oehler took sides against the union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, then being agitated, and declared himself in favor of confessional Lutheranism. In 1846 he refused a call to Rostock, but in 1852 returned to Tübingen to fill the position of *ephorus* (director of the seminary), lately made vacant by Wilhelm Hoffmann's transition to Berlin, and as professor of Old-Testament theology at the university.

At Tübingen, as at Breslau, Oehler developed a wonderful industry and a most conscientious performance of the duties of his professorship. He lectured on the theology of the Old Testament, on Isaiah, Job, the Psalms, Messianic prophecy, the Minor Prophets, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Christian symbolics. 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 to the Old Testament, which was due largely to Schleiermacher. He laid his foundations in exact philological investigations. His conception of the Old Testament was that of a progressive and growing revelation toward the standard of the New Testament. 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.

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 the Herzog *Realencyklopädie*. His *Gesammelte Seminarreden* (Tübingen, 1872), and his *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (2 vols., 1873–74; Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1874–75, New York, 1883) were edited by his son. The latter work was long considered the best in its department, but is now superseded by later works, such as those of Schultz and Dillmann. His *Lehrbuch der Symbolik* (1876) was prepared for print by Johann Delitzsch.

Bibliography: *Worte der Erinnerung an Gustav Friedrich von Oehler*, Tübingen, 1872; Joseph Knapp, *Gustav Friedrich Oehler, ein Lebensbild*, Tübingen, 1876.

OESTERLEY, WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL: Church of England; b. at Calcutta July 13, 1866. He received his education at Brighton College and at Jesus College, Cambridge (B.A., 1889; M.A., 1893; B.D., 1902; D.D., 1908); became curate at Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, 1891, and at St. Botolph, Colchester, 1895; secretary of Parochial Missions to the Jews at Home and Abroad, 1897; secretary and sub-warden of the Society of Sacred Study, London, 1908; warden of the International Society of the Apocrypha, 1908; and examiner in the Hebrew and Greek Testaments for the University of London, 1909. He is the author of *St. Francis of Assisi: Lessons from a noble Life, in six Addresses* (London, 1901); *Walks in Jewry* (1901); *Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of Amos* (1902); *Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets* (Oxford, 1904); *Codex Taurinensis* (*Y*) (1906); *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (London, 1907); *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea* (1908); *Our Bible Text* (1909); *The Doctrine of the Last Things; Jewish and Christian* (1909); *The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation* (1910); *The Psalms in the Jewish Church* (1910); and contributed Philemon and James to the *Expositor's Greek Testament* (1910), and Ecclesiasticus to the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (1910); and has been editor of *Church and Synagogue* since 1897.

OETINGER, û'ting-er, FRIEDRICH CHRISTOPH: Theologian and theosophist of Württemberg; b. in Göppingen May 6, 1702; d. in Murrhardt Feb. 10, 1782. His is the most characteristic figure in the ecclesiastical history of Württemberg during the eighteenth century. After five years' study in the University of Tübingen (1722–27) and a year of travel (1729–30), he was private teacher in Tübingen (1731–38), with an interval devoted to another journey (1733–37), during which time he came into close contact with the Moravians and Zinzendorf, later, however, breaking with them. He was pastor in three places: Hirsau, near Calw, 1738–43, Schnaitheim, 1743–46, and Walddorf, 1746–52; dean in Weinsberg, 1752–59, and Herrenberg, 1759–66; while at the close of his active career he was prelate in Murrhardt (1766–82). In his choice of a profession, his aim to be in the immediate service of God decided him in favor of theology and against jurisprudence. At the university, the theology and theosophy of Jacob Böhme (q.v.) gained with him the ascendency over the rationalistic philosophy of Christian Wolff (q. v.); at the same time he was also a student of the Biblical scholar Johann Albrecht Bengel (q. v.). The study of the natural sciences constituted a fourth element of Oetinger's intellectual life. All this formed the foundation of his later philosophy which found succinct expression in his *Theologia ex idea vitæ deducta* (Frankfort, 1765), his only systematic work.

In his pastoral work he came face to face with the low standard of the religious life of his people, which stimulated him to a systematic regulation of his activities as pastor, catechist, and guardian of souls (cf. his *Etwas Ganzes vom Evangelio*, Tübingen, 1739; on Isa. xl.-lxvi.), disclosing new and popular, yet thorough, methods for the exposition of the Gospels and the instruction of youth. In his third pastorate at Walddorf he displayed a comprehensive activity both pastoral and literary. Here he devoted his whole energy to the investigation and fostering of the general sense of truth. Besides two important works on this theme (*Inquisitio in sensum communem*, Heilbronn, 1753; *Sittenlehre Salomons*, Tübingen, 1758), he wrote here the systematic work noted above and found time to pursue the study of chemistry. In Weinsberg his homiletic activity became especially pronounced, as is shown by his *Reden nach dem allgemeinen Wahrheitsgefühl* (Heerbrand, 1759). To his great regret his successful activity provoked an often unworthy opposition. His *Biblisch-emblematisches Wörterbuch* (Frankfort, 1778), still valuable, belongs to this period. The zenith of his literary activity was reached in Herrenberg, stimulated by his researches in natural science and the prophecies of Swedenborg, though he was later repelled by Swedenborg's rationalistic tendencies. The remainder of his literary work in Herrenberg is devoted to problems of the higher philosophy, of theosophy, and of prophecy. During his incumbency at Murrhardt he allowed himself scarcely any repose. Besides several volumes of sermons, there is an aftermath of shorter writings from this period. It was characteristic that he closed his literary career with the *Versuch einer Auflösung der 177 Fragen aus Jacob Böhme*, a proof that the disciple had remained faithful to his master. Only in his last years did the pen fall from his hand. His imposing figure, in the fulness of manhood and the dignity of old age, is surrounded by a multitude of legends, the historical value of which can not yet be determined; yet they possess a special significance, because they serve to show how far his religious personality towered above that of his contemporaries.

The permanent effects of Oetinger's activity are shown by the fruits of his endeavors in the field of speculative theology and theosophy; Schelling, Rothe, Auberlen, Hamburger have all learned from him, the two latter taking up the thread where he dropped it. Oetinger lives on in the circles of Pietism by dint of his powerful sermons as well among the cultured as among simple peasants, who love to nourish themselves with the strong meat of his doctrine. His *Werke* were edited by K. C. E. Ehmann, 11 vols., Stuttgart, 1858–63.

(J. Herzog.)

Bibliography: Of first importance is Oetinger's *Selbstbiographie*, ed. J. Hamberger, Stuttgart, 1849; and next is J. Herzog, *F. C. Oetinger; Lebens- und Charakterbild*, 1902. Consult further: C. A. Auberlen, *Die Theosophie F. C. Oetingers*, Tübingen, 1847; K. C. E. Ehmann, *F. C. Oetingers Leben und Briefe*, Tübingen, 1864; F. Reiff, *Bengel und seine Schule*, Heidelberg, 1882; O. von Wächter, *Bengel und Oetinger*, Gütersloh, 1886; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxviii., cols. 1753-54.

OETTLI, ŭt'li, SAMUEL: German Lutheran; b. at St. Gall (40 m. n.e. of Zurich) July 29, 1846. He was educated at the universities of Basel, Göttingen, and Zurich (1866–70), and was a Swiss pastor (1870–78). He was then appointed professor of the Old Testament at the University of Bern, where he remained until 1895, when he accepted his present position of professor of the same subject at the University of Greifswald. He has written commentaries on the historic and poetic hagiographa (in collaboration with W. Volck and J. Meinhold) for H. Strack and O. Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (2 vols., Nördlingen, 1888–89); *Ideal und Leben* (a collection of Biblical essays, Gotha, 1895); *Das Königsideal des Alten Testaments* (Greifswald, 1899); *Amos und Hosea, zwei Zeugen gegen die Anwendung der Evolutionstheorie auf die Religion Israels* (Gütersloh, 1901); *Wir haben geglaubt und erkannt* (a collection of sermons; 1902); *Der Kampf um Babel und Bibel* (Leipsic, 1902); *Das Gesetz Hamurabis und die Thora Israels* (1903); *Geschichte Israels bis zu Alexander dem Grossen* (Calw, 1905); *Die Autorität des Alten Testaments für den Christen* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1906); *Das 450 jährige Jubiläum der Universität Greifswald* (Greifswald, 1906); and *Die revidierte Lutherbibel* (1908).

OFFERINGS. See Sacrifice.

OFFERTORY. A term strictly used not of the ceremony of collecting and presenting the alms and Oblations (q.v.) of the people, nor of the offerings themselves; it properly stands for the sentence or sentences said or sung at the time of collecting and presenting the oblations. The custom of singing a psalm at this point in the service is as old as the time of St. Augustine (*Retractationes*, ii. 11). In the Latin mass these sentences (greatly abbreviated from the earlier use) vary with the day or season, and bear the distinct character of praise or prayer. In the English Prayer Book the sentences are hortatory concerning the duty of almsgiving; in the American Prayer Book others have been added to these, of a more eucharistic character, appropriate to the presentation of the offerings.

The word "offertory" is sometimes used, and seems to be so employed in the Prayer Book, for that part of the service which has to do with the presenting of the offerings. This has been performed, at different times and in different places, with greater or less solemnity; the clergy and the people coming forward to present their offerings, or these being gathered from them by appointed officers. The oblation by the priest at the holy table of the bread and wine to be used for the sacrament, is a distinct feature of Eastern and Western liturgies. See Oblation.

A. C. A. Hall.

Bibliography: J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 377, 379, 399, New York, 1908; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, p. 174, London, 1904.

OFFICES OF CHRIST. See Jesus Christ, Threefold Office of.

OFFICIAL: A term in canon law denoting an alternate in matters of jurisdiction. Thus the archdeacons, from the sixth century down, were the chief deputies of the bishops with relation to the *potestas jurisdictionis*, but after the twelfth century the archdeacons' encroachments were opposed by a line of synods; and even the bishops sought to restrict the undue power of the archdeacons by the institution of special officials, "extra-diocesan," and "principal officials" or "vicars-general." The two last terms were often used synonymously, and are still so used in all Italian districts, in Hungary, Dalmatia, and the East. In other instances, the two terms were differentiated, a special substitute, the "official," being appointed for the episcopal jurisdiction; another, the vicar-general, for the episcopal administration, as is still the case in Belgium, Spain, England, Africa, and in most German dioceses. When by action of the Council of Trent the archdeacons had been deprived of jurisdiction in matrimonial and criminal matters, the extra-diocesan officials became fewer, so that, as a rule, jurisdiction and administration are consolidated in the hands of the vicar-general. Under this officer's presidency, there properly exists the general vicariate, or ordinariate, also termed consistory; but where the actual jurisdiction, particularly in affairs of matrimony, is exercised by a special deputy of the bishop, he is assisted by a special collegiate tribunal, the so-called "officialate," or *consistorium*. E. Sehling.

O'GORMAN, THOMAS: Roman Catholic bishop of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; b. in Boston, Mass., May 1, 1843. He was educated in Chicago and St. Paul (1850–53), and studied in France (1853–65). He was rector at Rochester, Minn. (1867–78); a member of the Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle, New York City (1878–82); rector at Faribault, Minn. (1882–85); first president of the College of St. Thomas, Merriam Park, St. Paul, and professor of dogmatic theology until 1890. He was professor of modern church history in the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. (1890–96), and was consecrated bishop of Sioux Falls (1896). In 1902 he was a member of the delegation sent to Rome by the president of the United States to confer with the Vatican on certain problems presented by the American occupation of the Philippines. He has written *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1897).

O'HARA, HENRY STEWART: Church of Ireland, bishop of Cashel, Emly, Waterford, and Lismore; b. at Coleraine (28 m. n.e. of Londonderry), County Londonderry, Ireland, Sept. 6, 1843. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1865), and was ordered deacon in 1867 and ordained priest in 1868. He was curate of Ballyrashane, County Antrim (1867–68) and of Kildollagh, County Londonderry (1868–69), after which he was rector of Coleraine (1869–92), examining chaplain to the bishop of Down (1892–94), vicar of Belfast (1894–1899), and dean of St. Anne's Cathedral, Belfast (1899–1900), as well as canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and chancellor of Connor Cathedral (1897–1899). In 1900 he was consecrated bishop of Cashel, Emly, Waterford, and Lismore.

OIL. See Ointment.

OINTMENT: A spicy preparation employed for personal and religious purposes. While the invention of ointment is ascribed by Pliny to the Persians, India, Egypt, and Greece were in possession of it in far earlier times. This substance served in antiquity as medicine, as a cosmetic, and in worship. All three uses are referred to in the Bible. The Old Testament uses for the term "to anoint" *dishen* (Ps. xxiii. 5), "to rub with fat," also *suk*, "to pour ointment over one" (exclusively of cosmetics) and finally *mashaḥ*, originally a technical term for anointing an object with oil, but applied exclusively to the use of ointment in worship. As a noun only *shemen*, "oil," is used in the Hebrew; in the Aramaic of Ezra *mesaḥ* occurs; the Septuagint and the New Testament use *elaion*.

For ointment, especially perfumed ointment, *myron* is generally used in the New Testament. The Old Testament does not distinguish between "oil" and "ointment"; *shemen* is used for both. The oil used for ointment was extracted from olives, nard, and myrrh. The expensive perfumed ointments in liquid form were preserved sealed in costly alabaster flasks to keep them pure and protect them from fermentation. A "horn" (Hebr. *ḳeren*) or vial (Hebr. *pak*) served as the vessel of anointing (I Sam. x. 1, xvi. 1; I Kings i. 39; II Kings ix. 1 sqq.). The preparation of ointments was a special trade (Ex. xxx. 25, 35, xxxvii. 29; Neh. iii. 8), and the oil was mixed with foreign, often very expensive, drugs.

The first man mentioned in the Bible as having prepared ointment for uses of worship is Bezaleel (Ex. xxxi. 2 sqq.). In the principal passage (Ex. xxx.) are mentioned as constituents of the holy ointment, myrrh, cinnamon, calamus (*rhizoma calami*), cassia, and olive-oil. It was used on the Tabernacle and its utensils and furnishings (Ex. xxx. 26–28). The holy oil was kept in the holy place (I Kings i. 39), according to the Talmud beside the ark of the covenant and the vessel with manna. According to Ex. xxx. anointing as an act of worship was performed only by the high priest. "To anoint" seems to be often a metaphorical designation for entrusting somebody with an office, as in the anointing of prophets (I Kings xix. 16; cf. Isa. lxi. 1). In the New Testament the term is often used for the reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts iv. 27, x. 38; II Cor. i. 21 sqq.). In this sense Christ as the high priest is the especially anointed one. For the use of oil in the Christian Church see Baptism, III., 1, § 4, 2, §§ 1–2; Chrism; Extreme Unction; Sacramentals. (R. Zehnpfund.)

Bibliography: H. B. Tristram, *Natural Hist. of the Bible*, p. 485, London, 1867; W. Dymock, *Pharmocographia Indica*, ii. 233–238, London, 1891; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 85–86, 131, 254, 358, 365, 372; *DB*, iii. 590–594; *EB*, iii. 3471–72; *JE*, i. 611–613, ix. 391–392; *DCG*, ii. 227, 265.

O'KELLY, JAMES: Methodist clergyman; b. probably in southern Virginia c. 1757; d. there Oct. 16, 1826. Little is known of his early life. In 1778 he was admitted into the itinerant Methodist ministry and labored with great success in southern Virginia; and in 1784 was ordained as elder. He antagonized Francis Asbury, and at the first general conference of the Methodist Church at Baltimore in 1792 offered a resolution to the effect that " after the bishop appoints the preachers at conference to their several circuits, if any one think himself injured by the appointment, he shall have liberty to appeal to the conference and state his objections; and if the conference approve his objections, the bishop shall appoint him to another circuit." The resolution was rejected, and subsequently O'Kelly withdrew (see Methodists, IV., 1, § 4) and with his followers formed a new body entitled "The Republican Methodists," a popular term borrowed from the political agitation of the time, and immediately put into effect by leveling all ministers to the same grade. In 1801 the name was changed to " The Christian Church," in consequence of which it suffered two divisions, and although numbering at one time several thousand, it so declined that at the time of O'Kelly's death only a remnant remained. He was also an active opponent of slavery from press and pulpit and was charged with denying distinct personality in the Trinity, affirming that " God was Father from eternity, Redeemer in time, and Sanctifier forevermore."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. M. Buckley, in *American Church History Series*, v. 283–285 et passim, New York, 1896; A. Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church in U. S. A.*, iii. 16–37, ib. 1864; J. Lednum, *Hist. of the Rise of Methodism in America*, chap. xxiii., Philadelphia, 1859; Bennett, *Memorials of Methodism in Virginia*, chap. ix., Richmond, 1871; J. A. Faulkner, *The Methodists*, pp. 161–162, ib. 1903; and, in general, literature under METHODISTS.

OLAF, SAINT: King of Norway 1015–30. See NORWAY.

OLD CATHOLICS.

I. In Germany.
  Origin (§ 1).
  Faith and Practise (§ 2).
II. In Other European Countries.
III. In the United States.
  The Independent (Polish) Catholic Church (§ 1).
  National Catholic Church (§ 2).
IV. Statistics and the Congresses.

I. In Germany: The Old Catholic Church owes its origin to certain Roman Catholics who refused to accept the decree of the Vatican Council of 1870 (q.v.) affirming the infallibility of the pope when speaking ex cathedra. The decree had been fiercely debated and opposed by a considerable minority of the bishops present at the council, their arguments being based upon the early history of the Church and its fundamental faith and usages as declared by the ecumenical councils. A further charge made by the minority was that freedom of discussion had not prevailed at the council and that final action was forced. Of this minority only a few, however, persisted in the logical course indicated by their position. The organization of the opposition after the issuance of the decree was made at a meeting at Nuremberg, Aug. 27, 1870, of professors from Bonn, Breslau, Braunsberg, Munich, Münster, Prague, Würzburg, and other places, who, under the leadership of Johann Josef Ignaz von Döllinger (q.v.), declared against the decree. A gathering of laymen at Königswinter in September of the same year resolved that: " Considering that the council . . . did not deliberate in perfect freedom, . . . the undersigned Catholics [1,359 in number] . . . do not recognize the decrees concerning the absolute power of the pope and his infallibility as the decision of an ecumenical council, but rather reject them as innovations in direct contradiction to the uniform faith of the Church." Of the dissenting minority spoken of above Bishop Hefele was the last to submit (April, 1871). Ecclesiastical pressure was brought upon the dissenting professors, and those who continued in opposition were excommunicated. The necessity was seen for an organization to protect the scattered clergy who adhered to the position of the minority, and a congress was held at Munich Sept. 22–24, 1871, with Prof. J. F. von Schulte of Bonn presiding, at which the conclusions of the preceding gatherings mentioned were endorsed, the direction the movement should take was decided, and measures were taken for the cure of souls. The organization of congregations in various places followed. The second congress was held at Cologne Sept. 20, 1872, provision was made for the election of a bishop, who was chosen on June 4, 1873, the choice falling on Joseph Hubert Reinkens (q.v.), professor of theology at Breslau, who received consecration at Rotterdam from the Jansenist Bishop Heycamp of Deventer, his recognition by the king of Prussia following on Sept. 17 of the same year, and by other German princes a little later. At this congress provision was made for the government of the church by a synodical board of clerical and lay members. The third congress was held at Constance in Sept., 1873. Thereafter the congresses were regularly held, but their function was limited to general discussions for the general good, provision for the specific care of the church being committed to the synod which was organized.

1. Origin.

The first synod was held at Bonn, 1874, and successive synods shaped the polity and life of the church. The possibility of union with the Protestant Church was not overlooked. A catechism and a manual of instruction were issued, recognizing only those doctrines which were deemed apostolic. Auricular confession was made voluntary, and absolution was regarded as a ceremonial declaration made by the priest as a servant of Jesus Christ. Christ, " the son of God in the sense that he is of the same essence with the Father," is the head of the Church, which latter is defined as the invisible body including all who have part in salvation through faith in Christ. The Apostles' Creed is employed in all services except the mass, where the Nicene Creed is used. Attempts were made to do away with abuses arising from penance, fasts and festivals, the celibacy of priests, and various matters financial, while the use of the German language has been so extended as to cover the entire

2. Faith and Practise.

service. A board of clerics and laymen has been made an organ of church direction, with the bishop as president and a layman as vice-president. The synod is the representative body, constituted of the bishop, president *ex officio*, the board just named, and the priests and deputies of the congregation; its powers are legislative, judicial, disciplinary, and administrative. Pastors and assistant pastors are chosen by the congregations (since 1878), with episcopal approval, except in the case of benefices. Trial for lighter offenses is before the bishop or bishop and board, for more serious cases of offense before a synodal court, with procedure based upon the German code. For parish purposes a church board exists, composed of the pastor and a body of councilors chosen for three years by the congregation. Candidates are ordained by the bishop after examination, which is preceded by the regular course in the universities. Various funds exist for supporting the work of the church.

II. In Other European Countries: The priests who in Switzerland refused the Vatican decrees adopted a constitution for "The Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland" similar to that of the Old Catholics of Germany. The first synod was held at Olten in June, 1875, and Eduard Herzog (q.v.), professor of Catholic theology at Bern, was elected bishop in June, 1876. The general course of development was similar to that in Germany; communion in both kinds was made optional, and regulations for the festivals and observances were adopted. In Austria earlier efforts to organize Old Catholics were opposed by the upper house of parliament and the government. In 1875 governmental opposition was withdrawn, and in 1876 a meeting of delegates was held at Vienna, and legal recognition was given to the Old Catholic Church Oct. 18, 1877. At a provisional synod at Vienna in July, 1879, the reforms of the church in Germany and Switzerland were accepted. The first regular synod was held in June, 1880, when five priests and a number of laymen attended. At the twentieth synod in Vienna in 1900 sixty members were present, and there were reported 16,885 members, and other details of a remarkable growth were presented. In Italy the movement showed less vigor than in the other countries named above, and it was not till 1875 that delegates from a number of congregations met at Naples and elected Luigi Proto Giurlo bishop of the National Catholic Church. In France an active interest was taken by Charles Jean Marie Augustin Hyacinth Loyson (q.v.) and the Abbé Michaud, and a congregation was formed in Paris in 1878 to which the ministrations of bishops of Holland, Switzerland, and England were given at various times. A temporary bishop was chosen in 1888 in the person of Henry Lascelles Jenner. In Russia several communities of Bohemians attached themselves to the Old Catholic movement, obtained recognition, and also support from the State for three priests. In 1880 permission was gained for a conference to frame a constitution for permanent organization. A number of prelates of the Orthodox Church have shown sympathy with the movement and have attended the international congresses. The organization of the Old Catholic Church in England was not perfected till 1908, when A. N. Mathew was elected bishop, secured the recognition of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, and was consecrated at Utrecht Apr. 28, 1908, having in his diocese seventeen priests.

1. The Independent (Polish) Catholic Church.

III. In the United States: The discontent over the Vatican decrees in the United States was somewhat slower in taking organized form. Joseph René Villatte, a priest of French Canadian ancestry, who had sustained various relations in connection with various Protestant societies for mission work among foreign populations in Wisconsin, had received ordination from Bishop Herzog of the Swiss Christian Catholic Church (ut sup.) and also received episcopal consecration in 1892 from Archbishop Alvarez of India, Ceylon, and Goa. But the right of Alvarez to perform episcopal acts was under question, and the consecration of Villatte was not recognized by the Old Catholic bishops of Europe or by the Protestant Episcopalian bishops in the United States. Hence the attempts made by Villatte to found an Old Catholic Church in the United States had no permanent result. More successful has been the work among the Polish immigrants to this country, people of this nationality coming here with a lively dissatisfaction with the course of the Roman Catholic Church in their own land. Many of them had no ecclesiastical relations at all, and a movement was begun by Anthony Koslowski (d. Jan. 14, 1907), a Pole of Italian education, who became rector of a Polish congregation in Chicago in 1893. The next year he withdrew from the Roman Catholic communion and became a leader in the reform movement, was elected a bishop, and received consecration from the Old Catholic bishop of Switzerland at Bern, Switzerland, in 1897, founding the Independent (Polish) Catholic Church. The growth of the organization was remarkable; congregations were established in Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Buffalo, Jersey City, Fall River, Mass., and Wilkesbarre, Pa.; and in 1902 it reported 22 priests, 10 sisters, 26 congregations, 80,000 adherents, 26 schools with 3,000 attendants, 26 Sunday-schools, and 31 buildings. It had, besides, an educational institution with grammar and high school and industrial departments in Chicago, and connected with it a hospital and dispensary and a home for the aged. Overtures were made in 1902 to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States for recognition and intercommunion on the basis of the Lambeth "Quadrilateral" (see LAMBETH ARTICLES; LAMBETH CONFERENCE), but beyond referring the matter to a committee no definite action has been taken. In the overtures the object of the organization was stated as the wish to serve those who can not intelligently take part in worship conducted in the English tongue, and allegiance was pledged to the Old Catholic Synod of Europe until such time as the church shall be received by the Protestant Episcopal Church as an affiliated body.

The disposition to separate from the Roman Catholic Church illustrated by the formation of the Polish organization just described manifested itself

2. National Catholic Church.

also among Bohemians and others of Slavic race in America. A number of independent congregations nucleated in several cities. It was felt that these should be united under episcopal administration, and as the Independent (Polish) Catholic Church desired to restrict its work to Poles, a separate organization seemed necessary. The advice of the Old Catholic bishops of Utrecht and Switzerland was asked, and in consequence of their advice, taking into account the largeness of the country and the possibility of three or four Old Catholic dioceses, the National Catholic Church was organized, with Jan F. Tichy as episcopal administrator (appointed by the bishop of Utrecht). This Church "is formed upon the same basis as the mother Church in Switzerland," this including theoretical as well as practical matters. Its attitude is avowedly friendly toward the Polish organization and to the Protestant Episcopal Church. It derives its apostolic succession from the Church in Holland. It reported in 1906 9 churches and 11 missions in the United States and Canada, 7 priests, and about 15,000 members. It is incorporated in Ohio, and has a cathedral and other buildings in Cleveland with property valued at about $20,000. Bulletin 103 of the United States Census (Religious Bodies) gives the Polish National Church in America 24 priests, 24 ministers, 15,473 communicants, and church property valued at $494,700.

IV. Statistics and the Congresses: In 1900 there were reported 57 active clergy and 13,079 communicants in Germany; approximately 40 parishes in Switzerland; 24 parishes and 16,885 members in Austria; and 21 parishes in Holland, where it possessed also the Amersfoort theological seminary; a few churches existed in Italy, the movement was represented in France, and attempts had been made in Portugal and Spain. In 1904 the German states of Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, and Hesse had 65 clergy, 11,201 communicants, and 1,946 children receiving instruction in the schools. In 1878 the Old Catholics of Europe began holding their synods (for business) and their general congresses (for discussion) in different years. Congresses have been held at Cologne 1891, Lucerne 1892, Rotterdam 1894, Vienna 1897, and Bonn 1902. At these meetings representatives have at different times been present from the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, the Russian Church, the Petite Église of France, the Church of England. The subjects for discussion have taken a wide range, including the matter of international churches and the establishment of an international theological faculty, the dissemination of Old Catholic literature, the propaganda among the Slavic populations, the formation of societies for religious, educational, and social objects, practical matters such as the establishment of a fund for the support of priests joining the movement until they can be settled at work, and the *Los von Rom* movement (q.v.).

W. H. LARRABEE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. F. von Schulte, *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste und Bischöfe*, Prague, 1871; idem, *Der Altkatholizismus, Geschichte seiner Entwickelung . . . in Deutschland*, Giessen, 1887; J. L. Whittle, *Catholicism and the Vatican. With a Narrative of the Old Catholic Congress at Munich*, London, 1872; C. J. Loyson, *Catholic Reform*, London 1874; [J. B. Mullinger], *The New Reformation: Narrative of the Old Catholic Movement*, London, 1875; E. Friedberg, *Sammlung der Aktenstücke zum ersten vatikanischen Concil*, Tübingen, 1872; idem, *Aktenstücke der altkatholischen Bewegung*, ib. 1876; F. Meyrick, *The Old Catholic Movement*, London, 1877; *Sammlung der kirchlichen und staatlichen Vorschriften für die altkatholischen Kirchengemeinschaft*, Bonn, 1878; W. Beyschlag, *Der Altkatholizismus*, Halle, 1883; idem, in *AJT*, vol. ii., 1898; J. Rieks, *Der Altkatholizismus in Baden*, Heidelberg, 1883; A. M. E. Scarth, *The Story of the Old Catholic and Kindred Movements*, London, 1883; F. Rotert, *Bischof Reinkens und seine Helfer*, Leipsic, 1888; *The Old Catholic Reform*, in *Modern Church History Papers*, nos. 1–7, London, 1889; L. K. Goetz, *Die geschichtliche Stellung und Aufgabe des deutschen Altkatholizismus*, Leipsic, 1896; E. Herzog, *Beiträge zur Vorgeschichte der christkatholischen Kirche der Schweiz*, Bern, 1896; idem, *Église catholique nationale*, Paris, 1900; F. Nippold, *Die Anfänge der christkatholischen Bewegung in der Schweiz und der Los-von-Rom Bewegung in Oesterreich*, Bern, 1901; C. C. Grafton, *Autobiography of the Bishop of Fond du Lac*, Milwaukee, 1910; the official journal is *Amtliches altkatholisches Kirchenblatt*, Bonn, 1878 sqq.

OLD LIGHT ANTIBURGHERS. See PRESBYTERIANS.

OLD LIGHTS. See PRESBYTERIANS, I., 2.

OLD LUTHERANS. See LUTHERANS, II.

OLD ORDER BRETHREN: See DUNKERS, III.

OLD TWO-SEED-IN-THE-SPIRIT PREDESTINARIAN BAPTISTS. See BAPTISTS, II., 4 (i).

OLDCASTLE, SIR JOHN (LORD COBHAM): English Lollard; b. probably in the manor of Almeley (13 m. n.w. of Hereford) about 1378; d. a martyr at London Dec. 14, 1417. He married for his third wife, in 1408, Joanne, the grand-daughter of Baron Cobham and, by right of his wife's title, sat in the House of Lords. He approved himself a valiant soldier in the service of King Henry IV. in Burgundy and Wales, and was a personal friend of the prince, who became, in 1413, King Henry V. Herefordshire, and especially that part in which Almeley lay, was a hotbed of Lollardy. The first that is known of his connection with the Lollards was his effort to reform the clergy and to diffuse Wyclif's writings. Upon the discovery of Lollard tracts in his possession, he was summoned by the king (1413) and, his obstinacy defeating a conciliation, he further refused to heed three citations to appear before the archbishop's court at Leed's Castle, and was excommunicated. Arrested by royal writ and thrown into the Tower, he was tried by the archbishop's court at St. Paul's, Sept. 23, declared a heretic, and handed over to the secular arm with a respite of forty days to recant. Henry's chaplain wrote, in 1418, that Oldcastle was released on the promise to recant and abide by the judgment of the convention which was to meet the following November; but one William Fisher, a parchment-maker, was hanged in 1416, on the charge of arranging his escape, which is said to have been effected on or before Oct. 19. The proposed meeting of 20,000 armed Lollards in the field of St. Giles in Jan., 1414, shows that an uprising in his behalf and against the king was imminent; and Oldcastle escaped apprehension for four years, during most of which time he was concealed. A reward of 1,000 marks was placed on his head and he was formally declared an outlaw, but he steadfastly refused to renounce his convictions. His hiding-place, however, was finally discovered and he was taken by the lord of Powis, at Welshpool, across the Welsh border, after a desperate encounter in which Oldcastle was seriously wounded. Carried to London, he was summarily condemned as an outlaw, traitor, and heretic, Dec. 14, 1417. On the same day he was drawn on a hurdle from the Tower to St. Giles' field, hanged, and burnt hanging. Shakespeare seems to have elaborated the character into his Falstaff, the boon companion of the wild prince. On the whole, Oldcastle bears the record of a brave, upright, noble-hearted, though obstinate knight. See Lollards, § 7.

Bibliography: The official record of the trial by Archbishop Arundel is in the *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, ed. W. W. Shirley, in *Rolls Series*, No. 5, 1858; this forms the basis of J. Bale's *Brefe Chronycle concernye the Examinacyon and Death of . . . Syr John Oldecastell*, ed. H. Christmas for the Parker Society, London, 1849, and of Foxe's account in his *Acts and Monuments*. More recent lives are based on this material. Consult: W. Gilpin, *Life of Wycliffe, . . . (and) John Oldcastle*, in *Select Biography*, vol. ii., London, 1821; T. Gaspey, *Life and Times of the Good Lord Cobham*, 2 vols., ib. 1843; A. M. Brown, *The Leader of the Lollards, his Times and Trials*, ib. 1848; C. E. Maurice, *Lives of English Popular Leaders*, vol. ii., ib. 1875; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 69–97, ib. 1908; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 354–355; *DNB*, xlii. 86–93. Much of the literature under Wyclif, John, is pertinent, particularly the work of G. Lechler.

OLDENBURG: Grand-duchy consisting, for ecclesiastical purposes, of the duchy of Oldenburg and the principalities of Lübeck and Birkenfeld; situated in the northwestern part of the German Empire, bordering on the North Sea; area, 2,479 square miles; population, 544,713 (1905). Lübeck was the seat of a bishopric, founded in 946 and ceasing in 1523. The Evangelical Lutheran Church prevails in the duchy of Oldenburg, there being only one Reformed congregation. The Reformation arrived with the appointment by Count Johann XVI., in 1573, of Hermann Hamelmann as superintendent, who introduced the Lutheran organization. During the Danish epoch (1667–73) Oldenburg remained Lutheran, and with the reign of the Holstein-Gottorp house came a rationalism, the influence of which is traceable in the hymn-book of 1791. There followed in 1849 a new church constitution more liberal in confession and separating Church from State. It assigned the most important functions of government to the congregations and a synod; so that upon an appeal by the conservatives to the general council in 1852 the result was that the house of deputies of Oldenburg granted a new constitution which went into effect in 1853. This rests upon the basis of the Scriptures and the Augsburg Confession and makes the grand-duke the ruling head of the Church subject to the limits prescribed by the constitution. In the principality of Lübeck the Lutheran Church likewise prevails under the control of the civil government, the first ecclesiastic of Eutin being titled church counselor of the government. In Birkenfeld the twelve Lutheran and the two Reformed congregations accepted the plan of union toward the end of the fourth decade of the last century and in 1875 the Evangelical body secured a synodical constitution. The total number of professing Evangelicals in the duchy of Oldenburg and the principality of Lübeck, in 1905, was 442,400 and of Roman Catholics 98,518, while belonging to other Christian faiths are 1,547, and of Jews 2,029. (A. von Broecker.)

Bibliography: N. J. E. Nielsen, *Zur Statistik der oldenburgischen evang.-luth. Kirche*, Oldenburg, 1881; W. Hayen, *Oldenburgisches Kirchenrecht*, ib. 1888; L. Schanenburg, *Hundert Jahre Oldenburgischer Kirchengeschichte, 1573–1667*, 4 vols., ib. 1894–1903; E. Illigens, *Geschichte der lübeckischen Kirche 1530–1896*, Paderborn, 1896; G. Sello, *Alt-Oldenburg*, Oldenburg, 1903; J. Schneider, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (an annual).

OLEARIUS, ō″lê-ɑ̆′rî-us: The name of a family of German theologians and preachers.

1. Johannes Olearius I.: The founder of the family; b. at Wesel (32 m. n.w. of Düsseldorf) Sept. 17, 1546; d. at Halle Jan. 26, 1623. He attended the gymnasium at Düsseldorf; studied at Marburg and Jena; went to Königsberg in 1573 as rector of the gymnasium; was proposed for a chair in Hebrew at Königsberg but went to Helmstedt where he obtained a professorship in 1578. In 1581 he accepted a call as chief pastor of the Church of Our Lady and superintendent at Halle, where, for more than four decades, he labored worthily. He took charge of Hebrew instruction at the municipal Latin school, and delivered lectures to candidates for the spiritual office. An earnest representative of pure Lutheranism, he subscribed the Halle clergy's declaration provided in 1579 by Martin Chemnitz on the basis of the Formula of Concord. In 1594, he prepared a preface to the "Protocol or Acts of the Colloquy at Hertzberg." As commissary he took part in the general visitation of the archdiocese of Magdeburg in 1583.

2. Gottfried Olearius: Son of the preceding; b. at Halle Jan. 1, 1605; d. at the same place Feb. 20, 1685. He studied at Jena in 1622 and afterward at Wittenberg, where he received the master's degree in 1625, and was appointed assistant in the philosophical faculty in 1629. In 1630, he became pastor at St. Ulrich's Church, Halle. Occupying himself with homiletics he published the following: *Ideæ dispositionum Biblicarum* (1581), a five-volume work containing outlines of sermons for every chapter of the Bible; *Annotationes Biblicæ theoreticopracticæ* (Halle, 1677); and *Aphorismi homiletici* (Leipsic, 1658). Especially devoted to astronomy and botany he left a collection of specimens that was materially increased by his son and grandson.

3. Johannes Olearius II.: Brother of Gottfried; b. at Halle Sept. 17, 1611; d. at Weissenfels (11 m. s. of Merseburg) Apr. 14, 1684. He entered the University of Wittenberg in 1629, obtained the master's degree in 1632, and became assistant in the philosophical faculty in 1637. After being superintendent at Querfurt six years, he was called as court preacher and father confessor to Halle in 1643. Subsequently, he became chief court preacher and in 1664 general superintendent of the Weissenfels district. Though devoted to Lutheranism, he showed an intelligent appreciation of Pietism and was in active communication with Spener. He was a strong advocate of the school system, from the pulpit and in administration as well as in his tract, *Bedenken und Consilium*. His Christian culture books, such as on "Spiritual Meditation," "School of Patience," "School of Prayer," "School of Dying," and "Wonderful Goodness of God," were widely read. His contributions to young theologians found ready acceptance, as also the *Methodus studii theologici* (Halle, 1664); *Oratoria sacra* (Halle, 1665); and his Biblical expositions (Leipsic, 1678–81). In his hymn-book, *Geistliche Singekunst* (1671) he included 240 of his own hymns.

4. Johann Gottfried Olearius: Son of Gottfried; b. at Halle Sept. 25, 1635; d. at Arnstadt (10 m. s. of Erfurt) May 21, 1711. After 1658 he was his father's colleague at Halle; and after 1688, pastor, superintendent, and assessor and ephorus of the gymnasium at Arnstadt. Some of his church hymns have been preserved, as "Komm du wertes Lösegeld." *Poetische Erstlinge* appeared in 1664; and *Geistliche Singelust* in 1697. Some of his prose writings were, *Ehrenrettung gegen Johann Scheffler, Lutheromastigem;* and *Abacus Patrologicus* (1673), reissued by his son Johann Gottlieb as *Bibliotheca scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (1711). *Specimen floræ Halensis* and *Geistliche Hyacinth-Betrachtungen* (Leipsic, 1665) were the fruit of his botanical studies.

5. Johann Christof Olearius: Son of Johann Gottfried; b. at Halle Sept. 17, 1668; d. at Arnstadt (10 m. s. of Erfurt) Mar. 31, 1747. He was chief pastor, superintendent, and ephorus of the lyceum at Arnstadt in Thuringia and was celebrated for his versatile knowledge of history. After 1721, he was collaborator in the continuous collection of old and new theological matters. He was principally noted in hymnology, producing *Entwurf einer Liederbibliothek* (Arnstadt, 1702); *Evangelischer Liederschatz* (Jena, 1705); *Jubilierende Liederfreude und Nachrichten von den ältesten lutherischen Gesangbüchern* (1717); and *Evangelische Liederannales über 100 Gesänge* (1721). The church hymn "Ach Gott vom Himmel sieh darein" was directed against the Pietists. He occupied himself with the history of his Thuringian home, and with numismatics in which he was aided by a large library, a rich cabinet of coins, and a valuable collection of copper plates. The natural history collection of his grandfather was substantially increased.

6. Johannes Olearius III.: Second son of Gottfried; b. at Halle May 5, 1639; d. at Leipsic Aug. 6, 1713. He qualified as lecturer in the philosophical faculty at Leipsic, 1663; occupied the chair of Greek and Latin, 1667; became professor of theology, 1677; and later ephorus of the beneficiary students and canonicus at Zeitz. At the outbreak of the Pietistic disputes, he patronized its adherents. He openly opposed Carpzov in his attack upon them, and approved the refutation prefaced by Spener of that abusive document, *Imago pietismi*. In his lectures he emphasized a practical Christianity and a godly life; and his view that holiness was an essential qualification of a theologian and that the unregenerate could have no more than a literal and historical perception of divine things, brought him into conflict with Löscher and Wernsdorf. Of exegetical character are the *Hermeneutica sacra; Exercitationes philologicæ ad epistolas dominicales* (Leipsic, 1674); and *De stylo Novi Testamenti* (1678). In polemics, he issued, *Synopsis controversiarum cum Pontificiis, Calvinistis, Socianistis*, sqq. (1698); in ethics, *Introductio ad theologiam moralem et casuisticam;* and in practical theology, *Consilia theologica.*

7. Gottfried Olearius: Son of Johannes III.; b. at Leipsic July 23, 1672; d. there Nov. 10, 1715. He entered the university of his native town at an early age and became master in his twentieth year. After visiting Dutch and English universities, he returned to Leipsic in 1699 as professor of Latin and Greek, and after 1701 became professor of theology and doctor. Examples of his exegetical and dogmatic works are, *Observationes in Evangelium Matthæi* (1713); and *Jesus der wahre Messias* (1714). Much learning and painstaking industry were lavished on *Philostratorum quæ supersunt omnia* (1709); on *Stanleji historia philosophiæ* (Leipsic, 1702); and on the translation of John Locke's treatise on education. After his death appeared *Collegium pastorale* (Leipsic, 1718).

8. Johann Christian Olearius: Son of Johannes II.; b. at Halle June 22, 1646; d. there Dec. 9, 1699. He studied at Jena, Leipsic, Kiel, and Strasburg, and in Holland, and at an early age was made chief pastor and superintendent at Querfurt. In 1681, he was called as pastor to St. Maurice Church, Halle, and in 1685 as chief pastor of the Church of Our Lady and superintendent. Later he was a consistorial councilor in the Magdeburg consistory at Halle. He showed prudence and moderation in the disputes between the town clergy and the professors of the university and supported the efforts of the electoral commission constituted under Chancellor V. L. Seckendorf. In his preaching he was orthodox. Of his church hymns, one is famous: "O Gott, du weisst es, wie ich sinne."

9. Adam Olearius: Son of Johannes II.; b. at Aschersleben (?) (33 m. s.s.w. of Magdeburg) Aug. 1603; d. at Gottorp (a part of Sleswick, 86 m. n.n.w. of Hamburg) Feb. 22, 1671. He became master at Leipsic in 1627 and later professor. He was also associate rector at St. Nicholas school, 1630–33; and took part in the embassy directed by Duke Frederick III. of Sleswick-Holstein-Gottorp to Grand Duke Michael Feodorewich and the shah of Persia. His published account of this expedition gained great recognition. He continued as "mathematician and antiquary" at the court of his patron and his successors and arranged the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts that he had brought from the East. In 1665, he published a *Kirchenbuch*, the first liturgy in High German in Sleswick-Holstein. He advocated raising the efficiency of the schools. GEORG MÜLLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. G. Leuckfeld, *Historia Hesshusiana*, ii. 234–248, Quedlinburg, 1716; J. B. Liebler, *Hymnopoiographia Oleriana*, Naumburg, 1727; *Vollständige Register über die andern Zehen Jahr der Unschuldigen Nachrichten 1711–20*, Leipsic, 1728; M. Ranfft, *Leben und Schriften derer sächsischen Doctoren der Theologie*, ii. 809–892, Leipsic, 1742; J. C. von Dreyhaupt, *Beschreibung des Saalkreises*, i. 1007 sqq., Halle, 1749; C. G. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, iii. 1050–57, Leipsic, 1751; H. W. Rotermund, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon, Fort-*

setzung, v. 1041–64, Leipsic, 1784; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, III. sect., 3. part, pp. 37–44; *ADB*, xxiv. 269–284; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 866–867.

OLEVIANUS, o-lē''vî-ā'nus (**OLEVIAN**), **KASPAR**: German Reformer; b. at Treves Aug. 19, 1536; d. at Herborn (32 m. n.e. of Nassau) Mar 15, 1587. Passing rapidly through the schools of his native city, he visited Paris for wider education as early as 1550. He went later to Orléans and Bourges to study law, where he attached himself to the Reformed congregations, thriving here in secret. While in the act of saving the young Duke Hermann Ludwig of the Palatinate from drowning, he himself was rescued by a servant. Believing this to be an act of divine providence, he now studied the Holy Scriptures with great fervor, while continuing at the same time his legal studies and acquiring in 1557 his doctorate in civil law. Visiting Zurich and Geneva in 1557, he received such encouragement from Farel and Calvin that in June, 1559, he returned to Treves, resolved to complete his studies for the preaching of the Gospel. There, at his own request, Olevianus was engaged by the council as teacher of philosophy in the university, where he started to lecture in Latin; and on Aug. 10, 1559, he preached his first sermon in the German language and bore earnest witness for the Evangelical truth. Owing to numerous protests, the council decided to forbid his sermons in the said department, but the town church of St. James was submitted to his acceptance. Beginning with Aug. 20, unmolested by the councilors of Elector Johann VI., who happened to be absent at the Imperial Diet at Augsburg, Olevianus assembled a daily increasing Evangelical congregation. In its name Burgomaster Johann Steuss acknowledged his adherence to the Augsburg Confession no later than Aug. 21, and desired religious freedom under terms of the Religious Peace of Augsburg (q.v.). Steuss held himself to be thoroughly justified in this demand, by reason of the ancient liberties of the city of Treves; whereas the governor of the city declared it subject to the archbishop, and on Sept. 14 renewed the interdiction against preaching. Yet even now, by request of his followers, Olevianus fearlessly continued his sermons, and on Sept. 23, in the person of Superintendent Cunemann Flinsbach (1527–71), who had been despatched to him from Zweibrücken by Duke Wolfgang, he still received a welcome support in his labors. Meanwhile, on Sept. 16, Elector Johann himself had returned to Treves from Augsburg for the purpose of suppressing the Evangelical preaching. But when even those of Roman proclivities encountered him with undisguised mistrust, he departed again from the city, Sept. 28, and sought to bring it to submission by force. Calling the nobility and the peasantry to arms, he invested the city and cut off all its supplies. In this way the elector finally induced the alarmed Roman Catholic members of the council to accede to his demand so far as to arrest, on Oct. 11, Olevianus and Flinsbach, together with Steuss and eight aldermen, and four Evangelical citizens. On Oct. 25, the archbishop marched victoriously into Treves with 120 troopers and 600 infantry, to resume control. On Nov. 15, he had the prisoners indicted on capital charges, as though guilty of high treason. It was only when Elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate, and five other Evangelical princes in an embassy to Treves vigorously interceded for the prisoners, that Elector Johann dropped the accusation and liberated the prisoners, Dec. 19, upon payment of 3,000 florins, and after exacting a solemn oath to keep the peace without vengeance. They and all other Protestants were expelled from the city. The Jesuits were called thither, in June, 1560, to insure Roman sentiment.

Olevianus was released after ten weeks' imprisonment. By invitation of the Palatine elector's envoy he went to Heidelberg, and Jan., 1560, he found a suitable sphere of activity as director of the "College of Wisdom" now converted into a theological seminary. In the following year he became professor of dogmatics at the university. He soon exchanged his position for the more congenial office of pastor of a city church. As member of the church council he exercised considerable influence upon the reconstruction of the church régime along Reformed lines. The final revision of the Heidelberg Catechism (q.v.) may probably be referred to him. At the Maulbronn Conference in Apr., 1564 (see Maulbronn), he capably represented the Reformed position. At the colloquy with Lutheran theologians at Amberg, in Nov. and Dec., 1564, Olevianus proved less successful. The Upper Palatinate could not be induced to adopt Calvinism. Olevianus took prominent part in the Rhenish Palatinate church organization of Nov. 15, 1563; and in the institution of presbyteries and church discipline according to the electoral edict of July 15, 1570. Unfortunately Olevianus also subscribed to the judgment of the Heidelberg theologians who advocated the enforcement of the death penalty against blasphemers in the so-called Arian affair; and thus made himself a partner in guilt in the execution of Johannes Silvanus, Dec. 23, 1572 (see Friedrich III.); thereby showing that he, too, had not yet overcome the Old-Testament spirit still dominant with many sterling theologians in that age. When the Lutheran Elector Ludwig II. acceded to power, Olevianus was deposed from his offices, Nov. 17, 1576. In Mar., 1577, he accepted a call to Berleburg, as tutor to the sons of Count Ludwig of Wittgenstein, where he also cooperated powerfully in the reorganization of church affairs in the spirit of Calvinism. In 1584 he was called as pastor and teacher in the new academy at Herborn; but, after several months' illness, he died Mar. 15, 1587.

Olevianus undoubtedly was one of the most important Reformed theologians of his time. A popular preacher and eminent catechist, a clear thinker and energetic character, he was at the same time a sincere, devout, humble Christian.

Julius Ney.

Bibliography: A short sketch of Olevian's life by Johann Piscator is prefixed to the former's *Gnadenbund Gottes*, Herborn, 1590. Consult further K. Sudhoff, *C. Olevianus und Z. Ursinus*, Elberfeld, 1857; J. H. Wyttenbach, *Versuch einer Geschichte von Trier*, iii. 32–57, Treves, 1817; J. Marx, *Caspar Olevian*, Mains, 1846; F. W. Cuno, *Blätter der Erinnerung an Dr. Kaspar Olevianus*, Barmen, 1887; J. Ney, *Die Reformation in Trier 1559*, Halle, 1906–1907.

OLGA, SAINT: Russian grand-duchess. She came of a poor family, but became the wife of Grand Duke Igor of Kief, and governed the country with great success during the minority of her son Sviatoslav. In 952 she went to Constantinople, embraced Christianity, and was baptized by the Patriarch Theophilaktes, assuming the name of Helena in honor of the mother of Constantine. After her return to Kief, she is said to have labored for Christianity, though without any palpable effect. Her day of commemoration is July 11 (new style, 21).

Bibliography: L. E. Castremonte, *Hist. de l'introduction du Christianisme sur le continent Russe, et la vie de S. Olga*, Paris, 1879.

OLIER, ō″lyê′, JEAN JACQUES: Founder of the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice in Paris and a leader in the spiritual life of France in the seventeenth century; b. in Paris Sept. 20, 1608; d. there Apr. 2, 1657. He studied theology at the Sorbonne and attended the discourses of St. Vincent de Paul at Saint-Lazare on the duties of the clerical state. His intercourse with Vincent determined the direction of his life, and gave him the mystical tendency visible in his writings. Deciding to devote himself to the education of the clergy, he began his work at Vaugirard in Jan., 1642. The next year he became curé of Saint-Sulpice, and erected a new church and a seminary. His activity in the cure of souls was widely renowned; he founded associations for the care of the sick, the poor, and orphans. In 1652 he resigned his parochial charge in order to devote himself exclusively to the work of the seminary. He was able before long to provide for the establishment of similar institutions in various cities of France, and even as far away as Montreal, and established the Congregation of Saint-Sulpice to insure the perpetuation of his work. Among his works, few in number and principally of a devotional character, should be mentioned his *Catéchisme chrétien pour la vie intérieure* (Louvain, 1686). The Seminary was later detached from the parish of the same name, and had a number of strong directors who trained an excellent class of priests. Fénelon spent five years here. (C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: His *Œuvres complètes* were published by Migne in Paris, 1857. Biographies are by Magot, Paris, 1818; De Bretonvilliers, 2 vols., Paris, 1841; E. H. Thompson, London, 1861 (based on a work by the Abbé Faillon); an anonymous *Vie* appeared in Lille, 1861; the subject is treated in F. J. Holzwarth, *Handbücher für das priesterliche Leben*, vol. v., Leipsic, 1860. Consult further: H. J. Icard, *Doctrine de M. Olier*, Paris, 1889; idem, *Explication de quelques passages de Mémoires de M. Olier*, ib. 1892.

OLIN, STEPHEN: Methodist divine; b. at Leicester, Vt., Mar. 2, 1797; d. at Middletown, Conn., Aug. 16, 1851. He was graduated from Middlebury College in 1820; entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and, after several appointments, was professor of English literature in the University of Georgia, 1827–34; president of Randolph Macon College, Virginia, 1834–1837; and president of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., from 1842 till his death. From 1837 to 1841 he traveled in Europe, Egypt, and Palestine, the fruits of which journey were, *Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land* (New York, 1843); and *Greece and the Golden Horn* (New York, 1854). His *Works*, consisting of sermons, sketches, lectures, and addresses, appeared (2 vols., New York, 1852).

Bibliography: *Life and Letters of Stephen Olin*, 2 vols., New York, 1853 (ed. his wife).

OLIVE TREE. See Fruit Trees in the Old Testament.

OLIVERS, THOMAS: Wesleyan preacher and hymn-writer; b. at Tregynon, in Montgomeryshire, Wales, in 1725; d. at London Mar., 1799. Illiterate and profligate as a youth, he was converted under Whitefield's preaching, became in 1753 one of Wesley's most active preachers, and was his supervisor of the press in 1775–88, doing much work in the Calvinistic-Arminian controversy. He wrote *A Descriptive and Plaintive Elegy on the Death of the Late Reverend John Wesley* (London, 1791); and in 1791 four hymns, whereof "The God of Abraham praise" (Nottingham, n.d.) is generally allowed to be one of the noblest odes in the language.

Bibliography: A biographical sketch by J. Kirk is in an edition of Olivers' *Hymns and an Elegy*, London, 1868; and an autobiography is in T. Jackson's *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers*, vol. i., ib. 1837; cf. *DNB*, xlii. 156; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 867; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 520–521, New York, 1886.

OLIVES, MOUNT OF, OLIVET: A mountain range east of Jerusalem, the modern Jabal al-Ṭur. For the topography and description see Jerusalem, I.

Olivet is first mentioned in the Bible in connection with David's flight from Absalom (II Sam. xv. 30). It was the scene of the worship of Chemosh and Molech (qq.v.), set up by Solomon (I Kings xi. 7), destroyed by Josiah (II Kings xxiii. 13, 14); thence, also, the people, by order of Ezra, got the branches for the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii. 15). The allusions to it in the New Testament are more numerous. It is thus described by P. Schaff (*Through Bible Lands*, p. 272, New York, 1878): "It is very prominent in the closing scenes of our Savior's ministry. In Bethany, on the eastern slope of Olivet, he had his most intimate friends—Lazarus, Martha, and Mary—and performed his last and greatest miracle (Luke x. 38–42; John xi.). 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 xxi. 37). Descending from this mountain, he wept over the ungrateful city, and foretold her fearful doom (Luke xix. 41–44; cf. ver. 37). To it he repaired on the night of his betrayal (John xviii. 1); from it he ascended to heaven to take possession of his throne (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 12). "Gethsemane was upon the hither slope of Olivet; and so upon the same mountain pressed the feet of Jesus when in the depths of his humiliation and in the heights of his triumph."

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 tradition said 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 1834. On the spot traditionally pointed out, stands to-day a Mohammedan mosque, around whose court "are ranged the altars of various Christian churches."

Bibliography: T. Tobler, *Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg*, St Gall, 1852; P. Schaff, ut sup.; J. Mislin, *Les Saints Lieux*, ii. 466–479, 3 vols., Paris, 1851–57; Liévin de Hamme, *Guide-Indicateur de la terre-sainte*, i. 335–363, 3d ed., ib. 1887; K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*, pp. 72–79, Leipsic, etc., 1906; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., cols. 1779–1793; and the literature under Jerusalem; and Palestine.

OLIVÉTAN, o″lî″vê″tān′ **(OLIVIER), PIERRE ROBERT:** French Biblical scholar; b. at Noyon in Picardy (67 m. n.n.w. of Paris) in 1506 (?); d. at Ferrara (20 m. n.n.e. of Bologna) in 1538. He was a cousin of John Calvin, both having the same birthplace. He studied law, first at the University of Paris and later at Orléans, where he was converted to Protestantism. In turn he brought Calvin to adopt the Evangelical doctrines, probably at Paris. Being suspected of Lutheran heresy, he fled to Strasburg in 1528, where he was welcomed by the Reformers of that free city, Butzer and Capito, who encouraged him to make a thorough study of Hebrew and Greek in order to be able to translate the Holy Scriptures. In 1531 he removed to Geneva and then to Neuchâtel, where he worked as a schoolmaster. In the last-named city he became acquainted with the Waldenses and went to their Synod of Chamforans, in Sept., 1552, which entrusted him with a French translation of the Bible. In May, 1536 or 1537, he returned to Geneva, where he was appointed teacher at the new gymnasium. After Mar., 1538, Olivétan paid a visit to Renèe of France (q.v.), duchess of Ferrara, in Italy; then traveled farther in that country and disappeared at the end of the year. His principal works are: *La Bible, qui est toute la Saincte Écriture, en laquelle sont contenus le Vieil Testament et le Nouveau, translatez en françois, le vieil de lebrieu, et le nouveau du grec*, Neuchâtel, 1535; *Les Psalmes de David translatés d'ébrieu en français* (Lyons, 1537); *Instruction des enfants* (1537). G. Bonet-Maury.

Bibliography: *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, ii. 132, iii. 290, v. 228, 280, Geneva, 1878; E. Reuss, in *Revue de théologie*, Jan., June, 1851, Jan., 1852; A. Lefranc, *La Jeunesse de Calvin*, Paris, 1888; O. Douen, in *Revue de théologie et philosophie*, 1889; E. Doumergue, *Vie de Calvin*, vol. i., Lausanne, 1901; W. Walker, *John Calvin*, 1906; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, ix. 186; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, ii. 2363.

OLIVI, ō″lî″vî′, **PIERRE (JEAN):** A Franciscan enthusiast of the thirteenth century; b. at Sérignan in Languedoc in 1248 (1249?); d. at Narbonne Mar. 14, 1298. At fourteen he entered the Franciscan order at Béziers, and later studied theology in Paris. His rigorist conception of the vow of poverty, coupled with a tendency to apocalyptic enthusiasm, exposed him to numerous attacks, and he was brought before the superiors of his order three times on a charge of erroneous teaching, but usually managed to justify himself. His defense before the chapter held at Montpellier in 1287 was so successful that he was given an important position in the house of Santa Croce, from which he afterward went to a still more influential one at Montpellier. Before his death he gathered his brethren around him and gave them a solemn charge on the strict observance of the vow of poverty, which was circulated as his testament. The conflict which had been kept within bounds in his lifetime broke out after his death. Against his followers, known as "Spirituals" or "Olivists," who were pressing for his canonization on the ground of alleged miracles at his tomb, Clement V. pronounced in the dogmatic decree *Fidei catholicæ fundamento* promulgated at the general council of Vienne in 1312, which condemned three propositions of Olivi's, while it contained no injurious expressions against his person or the greater part of his writings (see Francis, Saint, of Assisi, III., §§ 4–5). John XXII. proceeded more strongly against the party, expelling the Spirituals of Narbonne and Béziers from their houses and sanctioning an inquisitorial process against Olivi's principal writings, which resulted (Feb. 8, 1326) in the condemnation of his work on the Apocalypse and the discouragement of the further circulation of the others. These included a collection of *Quæstiones* as a commentary on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, and treatises *De sacramentis, De virtutibus et vitiis, De quantitate, De perlegendis philosophorum libris;* exegetical works on Genesis, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Ezekiel; writings on questions relating to his order, *Quæstiones de evangelica perfectione*, a treatise on the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas concerning poverty, another on the abdication of Celestine V., and an *Expositio super regulam fratrum minorum;* and apparently a number of mystical-ascetic works, such as the *Tractatus de gradibus amoris* mentioned by Sbaraglia. His general position seems to be one of dependence on the mysticism of Bonaventura and opposition to the philosophy of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. The most zealous and accomplished advocate of Olivi's teaching was Ubertino of Casale (q.v.).

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: All earlier work is superseded by the article by F. Ehrle, in *ALKG*, iii (1887), 409–552. Consult also: P. Feret, *La Faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs*, ii. 94–96, Paris, 1894; *KL*, ix. 828–834; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, iv. 321–326, Innsbruck, 1899.

OLMSTED, ɵm′sted or ʊm′sted, **CHARLES SANFORD:** Protestant Episcopal bishop of Colorado; b. at Olmstedville, N. Y., Feb. 8, 1853; educated at St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. (B.A., 1873), and the General Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1876. He was ordered deacon in 1876 and priested in 1877. He was minister at Morley, N. Y. (1876–84); rector of Christ Church, Cooperstown, N. Y. (1884–96), and of St. Asaph's, Bala, Pa. (1896–1902), and in 1902 was consecrated bishop of Colorado. In 1902 he delivered the Reineker lectures on the discipline of perfection, and has written *December Musings* (poems, Philadelphia, 1898) and *Essay on Mediæval Poets* (Denver, 1904), besides contributing to the *Church Club Lectures* (New York, 1895).

OLMSTED, ɵm′sted or ʊm′sted, **CHARLES TYLER:** Protestant Episcopal bishop of Central New York; b. at Cohoes, N. Y., Apr. 28, 1842; educated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (A.B., 1865), and pursued his theological studies at St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. He was ordered deacon in 1867 and priested in the following year, and was professor of mathematics at St. Stephen's College (1866–68). He was assistant in Trinity parish, New York City (1868–84); rector of Grace Church, Utica, N. Y. (1884–99); vicar of St. Agnes' Chapel, New York (1899–1902). In 1902 he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Central New York, and on the death of Bishop F. D. Huntington in 1904, succeeded him as bishop of the diocese.

OLSHAUSEN, ōls″hɑu′zen, **HERMANN:** New-Testament exegete; b. at Oldeslohe (24 m. n.e. of Hamburg), in Holstein, Aug. 21, 1796; d. at Erlangen Sept. 4, 1839. He studied at the universities of Kiel and Berlin, and at the festival of the Reformation in 1817 he gained the prize for his *Melanchthons Charakteristik aus seinen Briefen dargestellt* (Berlin, 1818). In 1820 he became privat-docent at Berlin, in 1821 extraordinary professor, and 1827, ordinary professor at Königsberg. He suffered from a feeble constitution and, in the hope of benefiting his health, accepted a call to Erlangen in 1834. He prepared the way for his commentary in a work on the historical proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels in the first two centuries (*Die Aechtheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien*, Königsberg, 1823, Eng. transl., Andover, 1838). He stated his exegetical principles in two works, *Ein Wort über tieferen Schriftsinn* (Königsberg, 1824), and *Die biblische Schriftauslegung* (Hamburg, 1825), defending the allegorical and typical methods, but without opposing the grammatical and historical. His ideas were most fully expressed in his commentary on the New Testament (vols. i.–iv., extending as far as the epistles to the Thessalonians, by Olshausen himself, Königsberg, 1830–40; completed in three additional volumes and revised by Ebrard and Weisinger, 1837–62; Eng. transl., 10 vols., Edinburgh, 1847–60; 6 vols., New York, 1856–58).

Bibliography: A biography by his widow is in *Allgemeines Repertorium für theologische Litteratur*, 1840, fasc. vii., pp. 91–94. Consult further: P. Schaff, *Germany: its Universities, Theology and Religion*, pp. 295–300, Philadelphia, 1857; *Berliner allgemeine Kirchenzeitung*, 1839, no. 76; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., cols. 1793–1795; *ADB*, xxiv. 323–328.

OLSHAUSEN, JUSTUS: Orientalist; b. at Hohenfelde, Holstein, May 9, 1800; d. at Berlin Dec. 28, 1882. He received an excellent education, first from his father and further in the schools of Glückstadt and Eutin. Olshausen was so thoroughly prepared that in the autumn of 1816 he was able to enter the University of Kiel. Here he zealously continued the study of Hebrew which he had begun in 1814 under his father's tutelage, and although primarily occupied with theology, he soon combined the study of other oriental languages with that of Hebrew. He passed the winter semester of 1819–20 at the University of Berlin, where, besides other work, he prosecuted his Arabic studies with the equally ambitious August Tholuck. In Oct., 1820, Olshausen, by the aid of a royal Danish stipend, was enabled to go to Paris where he remained until Apr., 1823, and attended the lectures of Sylvestre de Sacy, the celebrated professor of Arabic and Persian. He enjoyed the society of an inspiring circle of friends and also made the acquaintance of Alexander von Humboldt. On Nov. 4, 1823, soon after his return from Paris, Olshausen's well-founded reputation, both for unusual linguistic ability and for sterling character, procured him the position of extraordinary professor of oriental languages at the University of Kiel. In 1830, he became ordinary professor and continued in the university until 1848. Because of the confidence reposed in him by his colleagues, he was chosen four times as rector and displayed great talents as an administrator. In the interest of his studies he went sometimes to Copenhagen as well as to Paris, where he stayed from the autumn of 1826 until Jan., 1828. These were the only interruptions of his sojourn in Kiel until the restless year of 1848 brought politics disturbingly into his tranquil scholarly life.

The overthrow of the Danish rule made Olshausen, who was then curator of the university, vice-president of the convention of these provinces. When, however, in 1852, the Danish government reestablished its authority, Olshausen lost his offices and gained a settled position only by entering the service of the Prussian government, thanks to the influence of Alexander von Humboldt. From Königsberg, where he had become ordinary professor of oriental languages and chief librarian, he accepted, in 1858, a call to Berlin as ministerial councilor, and until 1874 superintended the Prussian universities. After celebrating the semi-centenary of his official life, Olshausen's continued devotion to his oriental studies procured for him a happy retirement after an active career.

Of his works which do not immediately concern theology, those regarding the study of the cuneiform inscriptions may be briefly mentioned: *Die Pehlewi-Legenden auf den Münzen der letzten Sasaniden, auf den ältesten Münzen arabischer Chalifen, auf den Münzen der Ispehbed's von Taberista und auf indo-persischen Münzen des östlichen Iran* (Copenhagen, 1843). Already in his first work, published in 1826, the *Emendationen zum alten Testament*, Olshausen, through Gen. x. and Isa. xxiii., had been led to conclusions concerning Babylon and the Chaldeans, which were later substantiated by Assyriology, and his sound judgment as expressed in his treatise entitled: *Prüfung des Characters der in der assyrischen Keilinschriften enthaltenen semitischen Sprache* was fully confirmed by later researches. Not less important was the service rendered by Olshausen to this branch of study through his successful efforts for the transfer of Eberhard Schrader (q.v.) to Berlin in 1875. Since 1826 Olshausen, by his many and continuous contributions to the textual criticism of the Old Testament, has, as Schrader rightly says, "opened a new path for exegetical and critical research." His theory that most of the mistakes in the text were to be sought in the consonants and not in the vowels still deserves serious consideration. His most widely known work in the direction of textual criticism, executed in a masterly style, is the second edition of the Commentary on Job by Hirzel, revised by Olshausen (Leipsic, 1852). Still more important, however, is his individual exegetical work on the Psalms (Leipsic, 1853). His greatest effort is without doubt his excellent *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Brunswick, 1861), which contains, in the first book, the phonetics, and from page 170 the paradigms. Unfortunately the third book, to be devoted to the syntax, has not appeared. Sachau calls this grammar a book that marks an epoch in the history of oriental philology, and Nöldeke terms it a very commendable work, although Olshausen in this book has carried to an extreme his view that Arabic represented very closely the primitive Semitic language.

A. Kamphausen†.

Bibliography: E. Schrader, *Gedächtnisrede auf Justus Olshausen*, in the *Mitteilungen* of the Royal Prussian Academy, Berlin, 1883; *ADB*, xxiv. 328–330; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., col. 1795.

OLSSON, OLAF: Swedish Lutheran; b. at Karlskoga (130 m. w. of Stockholm), Vermland, Sweden, Mar. 31, 1841; d. at Rock Island, Ill., May 12, 1900. He studied at the universities of Stockholm and Upsala; then at the Missionary Institute at Leipsic, 1859–60; graduated from the University of Upsala, 1861; and from the theological department of the same university, 1863; was ordained for the Lutheran ministry, 1863; was pastor first at Persberg, Sweden, then at Sunnemo, till 1868, when he came to America; was pastor of Swedish Lutheran congregations in Lindsborg, Kan., 1869–76; professor of historical theology and catechetics in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., 1877–88; pastor at Woodhull, Ill., 1890; professor and president of Augustana College and Seminary from 1891. He was editor of various Swedish papers and periodicals, and author of many tracts in Swedish. He wrote in Swedish "At the Cross" (Rock Island, 1878?); "Reminiscences of Travel" (1880?); and "The Christian Hope" (Chicago, 1887?).

OLTRAMARE, ōl″trɑ-mɑ′rê, **MARC JEAN HUGUES:** Pastor and exegete; b. at Geneva Dec. 27, 1813; d. there Feb. 23, 1891. He was descended from an Italian family that had fled to Geneva in the sixteenth century for the sake of religious freedom. He studied at the college and the University of Geneva and later at Berlin, where he was a pupil of Neander. When he returned to Geneva, he became one of the most popular pastors of the city, a strong opponent of the errors of the Roman Catholic Church and of the disestablishment of the national church and against the adoption of the Confession of Faith as the doctrinal basis of the Church. In 1854, he was appointed professor of New-Testament exegesis in the Academy (after 1876 the University) of Geneva. The translation of the New Testament (Geneva and Paris, 1872), edited by the Compagnie des pasteurs de Genève, is his most important work. His rendering of John i. 1, *La Parole était dieu*, was very sharply criticized by the orthodox on account of the small d. In 1881–82, he issued a commentary on the epistle to the Romans (Paris, 1881–82), and in 1891–1892 a commentary on the epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and Philemon. A remarkable expounder of the Scriptures, he was a thorough scholar and introduced German methods of exposition into French theological literature. As a critic he was rather conservative; he favored the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pastoral Epistles. He devoted his life to the study of the thoughts and work of St. Paul and was one of the most prominent representatives of the Church of Geneva in the nineteenth century.

Eugène Choisy.

Bibliography: F. Chaponnière, *H. Oltramare*, Geneva, 1891; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., cols. 1795–1796. There is a biographical notice by A. Bouvier in vol. ii. of his commentary to the Colossians, etc., ut sup.

O'MEARA, o-mê′rɑ, **THOMAS ROBERT:** Canadian Anglican; b. at Georgetown, Ont., Oct. 16, 1864. He was educated at the University of Toronto and Wycliffe College, Toronto (B.A., 1885); was curate of St. Philip's, Toronto (1887–88); dean of Wycliffe College (1888–89), assistant curate of Holy Trinity, Toronto (1889–1903). Since 1904 he has been rector of the same church, and since 1903 has also been professor of practical theology and principal of Wycliffe College. He is president of the Church of England Deaconess and Missionary Training House, Toronto, and a canon of St. Alban's Cathedral, Toronto. In theology he is conservative as regards the Bible and theological problems, and is in sympathy with the Protestant and Evangelical wings of the Church of England.

OMOPHORION. See Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical.

OMRI: Sixth king of Israel, successor of Elah (and Zimri), and founder of a new dynasty. His dates according to the old chronology were 926–915, according to Schrader 900–875, according to Kamphausen 890–879. The sources of information concerning him are I Kings xvi., the Moabite Stone (q.v.), lines 4–8, and the Assyrian inscriptions. The data afforded by the first-named are meager, but from I Kings xvi. 15–22 it is clear that he owed his elevation to the throne to a military revolution. It is not impossible that he was of humble, and even Arab, origin. His possession of the throne was not undisputed, his rival being Tibni the son of Ginath (assisted, according to the Septuagint, by his brother Joram), doubtless of Israelitic descent. It would also seem that the faction of Tibni was at first victorious, and that he reigned four years. If, then, Omri reigned twelve years (I Kings xvi. 23), he held undisputed possession of the throne only eight years. After reigning at Tirzah for the six years following the revolution he transferred the capital of Israel to Samaria (I Kings xvi. 24), a site hardly less beautiful than Tirzah, and far superior strategically. Though the author of I Kings refers for the complete history of Omri to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel" (xvi. 27), it is clear from I Kings xx. 34, that he fought unsuccessfully against the Syrians, for whom he had been obliged to open bazaars in Samaria. Against Moab Omri was more successful, for it is clear from the Moabite Stone of Mesha (q.v.) that Omri occupied the land of Medeba "during his days and half the days of his son, forty years."

In the Assyrian inscriptions Omri, though not directly mentioned, is often implied, since the kingdom of Israel is frequently termed "the house of Omri," to which even Jehu is made by Shalmaneser to belong. This phrase clearly shows that Israel first came within the ken of Assyria during the reign of Omri. Although it is not known that Omri came into direct contact with the Assyrians, it seems probable that the marriage of his son Ahab (who came into hostile relations with Assyria) with the Tyrian princess Jezebel was due to political measures of his father's connected with the growing Assyrian peril. The failure rightly to estimate the power of Assyria, and the attempt to oppose it by a Phenician alliance, were destined to cost Omri's dynasty dear, for its overthrow by Jehu was doubtless inspired by, and effected under the protection of, Assyria. (R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the pertinent sections of the literature given under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; and MOABITE STONE; also the articles in the Bible dictionaries, especially *DB*, iii. 620–621.

ON: A city of ancient Egypt and capital of a district, called by the Greeks Heliopolis. Its insignificant ruins are located at the village Maṭariyah, about six miles northeast of Cairo. The local deities are the hawk-headed sun-god, Rê-Harmachis (whence the Greek name of the city) and the human-headed Atum manifested in the sacred black bull Mnevis. Amenemhet I., first king of the twelfth dynasty, rebuilt an ancient temple to these deities in front of which his successor Sesostris I. erected two obelisks of which one yet stands. The priests of On were far-famed for the religious Egyptian literature that they produced and were celebrated even in the time of the Greeks for their wisdom. Joseph's wife was Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On (Gen. xli. 45, 50, xlvi. 20) and On was one of the most important cities of Egypt (Ezek. xxx. 17). (G. STEINDORFF.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 4 vols., New York, 1906–07; idem, *Hist. of Egypt*, ib. 1905; idem, *Hist. of the Ancient Egyptians*, ib. 1908.

ONCKEN, enk'en, **JOHANN GERHARD:** Founder of the Baptist congregations in Germany; b. at Varel (35 m. n.w. of Bremen) Jan. 26, 1800; d. at Zurich Jan. 2, 1884. After his father had fled from under the yoke of the French to England, the boy was educated in the house of his grandmother, but received very little instruction, and owing to the prevailing rationalism only scanty religious impressions. In 1814 he became the apprentice of a Scotch merchant, and remained nine years in Scotland and England. He came in contact mainly with the independent congregations, was mightily influenced by the rich Christian life of Great Britain, and became familiar with the various works of charity and the flourishing work of the Sunday-schools. After his conversion, he returned to Hamburg in 1823, in the service of the Continental Society, for the purpose of evangelizing. Together with Pastor Rautenberg he rented a large hall and preached to constantly increasing crowds of people; and perceiving the desolate condition of school-children in the poorer parts of Hamburg, he founded a Sunday-school society, like those of England, whence he derived the funds, and on Jan. 9, 1825, the first Sunday-school was opened. The movement spread also to Bremen, where similar institutions were founded. Soon after his arrival he became a member and secretary of the Lower Saxon Tract Society, organized a temperance union, and, in 1828, became agent of the Edinburgh Bible Society. In the minds of Oncken and his little band of disciples, there arose doubts concerning the baptism of infants, and in 1834 he, together with his wife and five other persons, were immersed by the Baptist Barnas Sears. In this way the first Baptist congregation on the European continent was founded. Taunted as an "Anabaptist," and losing his former support and his connection with the tract society, he was taken up in 1835 by the American Baptist Missionary Society through the recommendation of Sears. The congregation grew to the number of sixty-eight members in 1836, among whom Julius Köbner was one of the most prominent. Through the distribution of religious literature and his travels, his views on baptism became widely known; so that in 1837 a small congregation was founded in Berlin, under the leadership of Gottfried Wilhelm Lehmann. The same year, because of a public disturbance, Oncken was imprisoned four weeks at Hamburg and his followers were scattered; but the refugees became propagandists wherever they went. Thus new congregations resulted; namely, in Stuttgart and Oldenburg, 1838, and the first Baptist congregation in Denmark, 1839–40, so the way was open for the expansion of the society in Sweden. In 1849, at a general conference at Hamburg, there were fifty-six delegates, representing thirty-seven Baptist congregations, with over 2,000 members, and here Oncken effected the organization of the United Congregations of Baptized Christians in Germany and Denmark, after the order of the Independents. Oncken now traveled throughout England and America, and carried his journeys even as far as Russia, collecting a building-fund for a central chapel at Hamburg. This chapel was enlarged and rebuilt in 1867. When the quarter-centennial was celebrated in 1859, the original seven had increased to 1,288 members. The latter part of Oncken's life was overshadowed by a controversy over church polity. In contrast with that of the Independents and Baptists in England and America, Oncken was intent upon a closer union of the German congregations, but in spite of all his efforts in this direction he could not stem the tide of decentralization. His following was threatened with division for a while, but at last a separation was averted, when Oncken yielded to the opposition. (G. GIESELBUSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Dupree, *Leben und Wirken von J. G. Oncken*, Cassel, 1900; J. Lehmann, *Geschichte der deutschen Baptisten*, 2 vols., Hamburg and Cassel, 1896–1900; G. Ecke, *Die evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert*, pp. 109–110, Berlin, 1904; J. H. Cooke, *Johann Gerhard Oncken. His Life and Work*, London, 1908.

ONDERDONK, HENRY USTICK: Protestant Episcopal bishop; b. at New York Mar. 16, 1789; d. at Philadelphia Dec. 6, 1858. He graduated at Columbia College, 1805; studied medicine in London; with V. Mott, edited *The New York Medical Journal;* was ordained 1815; ministered at Canandaigua, N. Y., 1816–20; was rector of St. Ann's, Brooklyn, 1820–27; became assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, 1827, and bishop 1836; was suspended 1844 and restored 1856. He published *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined* (1835). He was active in assisting the appointed compilers of the 212 hymns which, from 1827 to 1871, were usually bound with the Prayer Book and employed in the Protestant Episcopal Church, rewriting several hymns, and contributing ten entirely his own. Of these, "The Spirit in our hearts" is the best known.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 49, New York, 1895; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 541–542, ib. 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 869–870.

ONEIDA COMMUNITY. See COMMUNISM, II., 8.

ONIAS IV. AND HIS TEMPLE. See LEONTOPOLIS.

ONKELOS, enk'e-les: Jewish teacher of the first century, to whom the principal Targum is ascribed (see BIBLE VERSIONS, A, V., § 2). Tradition makes of him a proselyte, and to his father is given the name Kalonymus or Kalonikos. He is also called a disciple of Gamaliel, the teacher of Paul. Many scholars are of the opinion that Onkelos and Aquila, the maker of a Greek version of the Old Testament (see BIBLE VERSIONS, A, I., 2, § 1), are one and the same person. The Greek forms of the name (*Ankelos, Ankulion*) might give rise equally to Aquila and Onkelos. The identification is further supported by the reading Aquila in *Tosefta, Demai* vi. 13, *Yerushalmi, Demai* 25a. In Jewish tradition both Aquila and Onkelos are known as proselytes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: M. Friedmann, *Onkelos und Akylas*, Vienna, 1896; *JE*, ii. 36–37, ix. 405, xii. 58–59; *DCB*, i. 150–151; *DB*, iv. 865; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., cols. 1819–20.

OORT, ōrt, **HENRICUS:** Dutch orientalist; b. at Eemnes (3 m. n.n.e. of Utrecht) Dec. 27, 1836. He studied theology at Leyden; was successively pastor of the Reformed Church at Zandpoort 1860, at Harlingen 1867; professor of oriental literature at the Atheneum, Amsterdam, 1873; and professor of Hebrew and Jewish antiquities at Leyden, 1875-1907. He is the author of: *De dienst der Baälim im Israël* (Leyden, 1864; Eng. transl., *The Worship of Baalim in Israel*, by J. W. Colenso, London, 1865); *Het menschenoffer in Israël* (Haarlem, 1865); *De Bijbel voor jonge lieden*, in collaboration with Hooykaas (Harlingen, 's Gravenhage, 1871–78; Eng. transl., *The Bible for Young People*, P. H. Wicksteed, London, 1873–79; reprinted, *The Bible for Learners*, Boston, 1878–79); *Evangelie en Talmud uit het oogpunt der zedelijkheid vorgeleken* (Leyden, 1881; Eng. transl. in *Modern Review*, London, July, Oct., 1883); *Atlas voor Bijbelsche en Kerkelijke geschiedenes* (1884); and *Textus Hebraici emendationes* (1900).

OOSTERZEE, ōs″ter-zê′, **JAN JAKOB VAN:** Dutch Protestant preacher and theologian; b. at Rotterdam Apr. 1, 1817; d. at Wiesbaden (5 m. n.n.w. of Mainz) July 29, 1882. He was educated at the University of Utrecht (1835–39), and then held pastorates at Eemnes-Binnen (1841–43), Alkmaar (1843–44), and Rotterdam (1844–62), attaining great fame as a pulpit orator. Early in 1863 he was appointed professor of practical theology at Utrecht, with which institution he was variously connected till the end of his life. Of his sermons some 270 were printed in more than twelve volumes (1846–70), including *Mozes* (Rotterdam, 1859; Eng. transl., *Moses: a Biblical Study*, Edinburgh, 1876). He likewise published *De Heidelbergsche Catechismus* in fifty-two lectures (1869), and issued many individual sermons which were widely circulated. In these sermons Van Oosterzee laid his entire stress (in somewhat rhetorical fashion) on the preaching of the Gospel, the proclamation of Christ according to the Scriptures, and the announcing of salvation; but regarded the pulpit least of all the place from which to transcend the Gospel into the regions of dogmatic speculation. His avowed aim as a preacher was rather to edify than instruct. Holding himself aloof from the radical, naturalistic, and purely ethical tendencies, remaining neutral toward negative criticism, and in Christology maintaining a distinctly supernaturalistic position, he was pleased to call himself "Evangelical, or Christian Orthodox." With all his activity as a preacher, Van Oosterzee devoted himself zealously to theological science. This phase of his activity he began with the first article, *Verhandeling over den tegenwoordigen toestand der Apologetiek*, in the newly founded *Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke theologie*, followed the next year by his treatise "On the Value of the Acts of the Apostles" (1846). To this same period belongs his *Leven van Jezus* (1846–51), followed by *Christologie* (Rotterdam, 1855–61; Eng. transl., *The Image of Christ as Presented in Scripture*, London, 1874) and by his commentaries on Luke (Bielefeld and Leipsic, 1859), the pastoral epistles and Philemon (1861), and James (in collaboration with J. P. Lange, 1862) for J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk*.

After his professorial appointment at Utrecht in 1863, Van Oosterzee wrote his brief *Theologie des Nieuwen Verbonds* (Utrecht, 1867; Eng. transl., *Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1893), which was followed by the larger *Christelijke dogmatiek* (2 parts, 1870–72; Eng. transl., *Christian Dogmatics*, 2 vols., New York, 1876). The best of his academic works, however, was his *Praktische theologie* (2 parts, Utrecht, 1877–78; Eng. transl., New York, 1879), in which he considered homiletics, liturgics, catechetics, pastoral theology, missions, and even apologetics. In 1877, with the passage of the law forbidding the theological faculty to lecture on Biblical, dogmatic, and practical theology, Van Oosterzee was compelled, against his will, to teach the philosophy of religion, New-Testament introduction, and the history of Christian dogma, in which he gave instruction until his death. His memoirs appeared posthumously under the title *Uit mijn levensboek, voor mijne vrienden* (Utrecht, 1883), and collections of his minor writings were published later in two groups comprising: *Redevoeringen, verhandelingen en verspreide geschriften* (Rotterdam, 1857); *Varia. Verspreide geschriften* (1861); *Christelijk-litterairische opstellen* (Amsterdam, 1877); *Christelijk-historische opstellen* (1878); and *Christelijk-kerkelijke opstellen* (1879). Mention should also be made of his popular devotional book, *Het jaar des heils: Levenswoorden voor iederen dag* (1874; Eng. transl., *Year of Salvation: Words of Life for every Day,* New York, 1875), and of the posthumous collection of his poems, entitled *Uit de dichterlijke nalatenschap* (Amsterdam, 1884). (S. D. VAN VEEN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the autobiography ut sup., consult: The sketch by A. W. Bronsfeld in *Mannen van Beteekenis*, Haarlem, 1882; idem, *Een theologisch klaverblad*, Rotterdam, 1897; by Evans, in the *Catholic Presbyterian*, 1882; J. J. Doedes, in *Utrechtsche Studenten-Almanak*, 1883.

OPHIR: A district described in the table of nations (Gen. x. 29) as Joktanite, or South Arabian, although its precise location is unknown. It is of peculiar interest as the terminus of the trading voyages of Solomon, and is thus brought into contact with valuable articles of commerce of the ancient East. According to I Kings ix. 26–28, Solomon built at Ezion-geber (on the Edomitic shore of the Red Sea) ships which brought 420 talents of gold from Ophir (cf. II Chron. viii. 17–18). According to I Kings x. 11–12, the ships of Hiram brought Solomon not only gold, but also almug trees and precious stones. The Ophir of these passages was taken by Josephus (*Ant.* VIII., vi. 4, vii. 1) to be India; while Eusebius (*Præparatio evangelica,* IX., xxx. 4; Eng. transl., *Preparation for the Gospel,* i. 476, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903), quoting Eupolemus (160–150 B.C.), states that David built ships in the Arabian city Aelan and sent miners to the island of Urphe (Uphre) in the Red Sea, whence gold was brought to Judea. The frequent transcription of Ophir by the Septuagint *Sophir, Souphir,* connoted, as is clear from Coptic vocabulary, a part of India; and it has been compared with the Supara of Ptolemy and the Uppara of Arrian, a place in the vicinity of the modern Goa. The Urphe (Uphre) of Eupolemus corresponds, in all probability, to the Ophir of the Old Testament, especially as it points to an Arabian locality.

Those who have depended on the Old Testament, especially on Gen. x. 29, have sought Ophir in Southern Arabia. Sprenger located it in 'Asir between Hajaz and Yemen (19–17° n. lat.), since Greek and Arab writers mention gold mines and river gold on the west coast of Arabia. Herzfeld sought Ophir on the southern coast in the Himyaritic territory, south of the Sabeans (cf. Gen. x. 28–29), who are said by Ptolemy to have been an inland people. Although, according to Agatharchides, the Arabians considered gold worth only one-third as much as copper and half as much as iron, the servants of Solomon can scarcely have gained their 420 talents by trade, but more probably mined in the highlands in the land of the Alilæans and Casandrians. Glaser regards Ophir as the western coast of the Persian Sea as far south as the promontory Ras Musandum. The geographer al-Hamdani (about 940 A.D.) located the most of the gold mines in the northeastern part of inner Arabia around the Jabal Yamamah. Here he places the land of Havilah, "where there is gold" (Gen. ii. 11), taking Ophir as the corresponding coast land to the Persian gulf. Between the peninsula of Ḳaṭar and the Ras Musandum he locates the harbor of Ommana, which is mentioned as a place of export for gold. Glaser likewise compares the peculiar form-names Apira, Apir, which were applied to the west and northeast shores of the Persian Gulf. The evidence seems, on the whole, to be in favor of the localization of Ophir on the eastern coast of Arabia.

Lassen and Ritter sought to locate Ophir in India near the delta of the Indus and the Gulf of Cambay, partly because of the Sanskrit name Abhira as applied to a pastoral people. This view, however, has little in its favor, especially as the inhabitants of Syria first became acquainted with India through the Persians and Greeks. The same criticism applies to Von Baer's attempt to locate Ophir in the peninsula of Malacca, where the distance forms a fatal objection to the theory. In recent years there has been a revival of the hypothesis that Ophir was situated on the east coast of South Africa. In 1871 Mauch discovered remarkable ruins on the Mountain of Fura or Afura which, according to Portuguese documents of the sixteenth century, were attributed by the natives to the Queen of Sheba or to Solomon. These ruins are situated at Zimbabye, in a district formerly inhabited by the Malotse, west of the Portuguese station of Sofala or Sofara. The resemblance of the name Fura or Afura to Ophir is too slight to be accepted without further evidence; and the name Sofala, though compared with the Sophir of the Septuagint, is really cognate with the Hebrew Shefelah, "lowland." The gold fields at the headwaters of the Nile were known at a very early date, but the first uncertain records of gold fields in South Africa do not antedate Ptolemy (2d cent. A.D.). Even had knowledge of their existence spread to Syria about 1000 B.C., it would still be incredible that the workmen of Hiram and Solomon would have mined at the distance of forty German miles from the coast. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. K. Keane, *The Gold of Ophir,* London, 1901; C. Lassen, *Indische Altertumskunde,* i. 538 sqq., 651 sqq., ii. 553 sqq., Bonn, 1844–63; A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens,* p. 57, Bern, 1875; idem, in *ZDMG,* xliv (1890), 515–516; L. Herzfeld, *Handelsgeschichte der Juden,* pp. 18–36, Brunswick, 1879; K. E. von Baer, *Reden,* iii. 112–180, St. Petersburg, 1880; J. Lieblein, *Handel und Schiffahrt auf dem rothen Meer,* pp. 142 sqq., Leipsic, 1886; E. Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens,* ii. 345–354, 357–383, Berlin, 1890; idem, in *ZDMG,* xliv (1890), 721; K. Peters, *Das goldene Ophir,* Munich, 1895; idem, *Im Goldlande des Alterthums,* ib. 1902; idem, *Ophir nach den neuesten Forschungen,* Berlin, 1908; J. Kennedy, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* pp. 241–288, 1898; G. Oppert, *Tharshish und Ophir,* Berlin, 1903; *DB,* iii. 626–628; *EB,* iii. 3513–15; *JE,* ix. 406–407; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire,* xxix. 1829–33; the commentaries on Gen. x.; and the literature under TABLE OF NATIONS.

OPHITES.

Name and Classification (§ 1).
The Naassenian Hymn (§ 2).
Cosmic Views (§ 3).
Man, Revelation, and Redemption (§ 4).
The Mysteries (§ 5).

1. Name and Classification.

Ophites (Ophians) is the accepted designation, in the literature of ecclesiastical history, of a group of Gnostic sects (see Gnosticism). A common characteristic of these sects, however, can not be determined. Mention of the serpent, from which they derive their name, does not occur in the doctrine of some of them; nor, where it does occur, has it the same relative prominence. Ophites, then, is a mere collective term for those Gnostic sects that do not attach themselves to some head of a school particularly, or to persons endowed with special prophetic or philosophical gifts. Individual men did indeed emerge from that great stream of the syncretistic movement, which, in so far as it also attracted Christianity in its Gnostic guises, came to be of danger to the Christian congregations. Such men were Satornilus, Basilides, Valentinus, who developed independent philosophic views and established schools. But alongside of these courses the broad main stream of all those sectarian developments which flourished on the tradition deposited in pseudepigraphic literature, in turn variously transformed the same. It is these sects that we term Ophites. In the nature of the case, they are generally more entangled in pagan superstition, and acquire more of the character of mystery associations than of philosophic schools. Yet even in this regard it is not possible to draw a sharp line of distinction between them and the other sects. It is customary to separate the sects according to their cosmologies and cosmogonies; as a second differentiating mark may be named the mysteries. It is not known, however, how much disagreement was allowed or what agreement was required on these points between members of the same sect as necessitated by its unity. Furthermore, if the defective knowledge and the still more defective reports of the Church Fathers be taken into account, the conclusion follows that definite lines can not be drawn between the individual sects. In view of this, the separate sects are to be enumerated and their common theology briefly summarized. (1) The so-called *Gnostici Barbelo* of Irenæus (*Hær.*, i. 29; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, i. 353–354), whose source exists in the *Apocryphum Johannis*, a Coptic translation not yet published. (2) The Ophites of Irenæus (*Hær.*, i. 30; Eng. transl. ut sup., pp. 354–358, cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxvii.). (3) The closely allied Ophians of Origen, who were known by Celsus. Origen declares the sect in his time to have become practically extinct. Celsus and Origen were acquainted with the graphic representation of the world by this sect, the so-called "Diagram of the Ophites." (4) The Naasseni, described by Hippolytus. For the Naassenian Hymn, see below, § 2. (5) The Peratæ, described by Hippolytus. Euphrates, a teacher of this sect, surnamed by Origen (according to Hippolytus) Peraticus. (6) Justin the Gnostic (q.v.). (7) The Sethites, described by Hippolytus. (8) Another sect, styled Sethites, is described in Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxix. (9) A branch of this sect were the Archontics of Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xl. They were represented in Palestine by Peter, an anchorite, and his disciple Eutactus transplanted them to Armenia. These men were contemporaries of Epiphanius. (10) Identical, perhaps, with (9) above, are the Gnostic opponents of Plotinus (Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, xvi.). (11) The Severians, of Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlv. (12) Closely allied with the foregoing were the sects which produced the *Pistis-Sophia* and the first of the Coptic-Gnostic works issued by Schmidt. (13) The Cainites of Irenæus (*Hær.*, i. 31; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, i. 358) and Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxviii. (14) The Nicolaitans, opposed in Rev. ii. at Ephesus, Pergamos, and Thyatira. They are mentioned by Irenæus (*Hær.*, i. 26; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, i. 352) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, iii. 4). (15) Antitactes. (16) Prodicians: this and the last-named were antinomian sects mentioned only by Clement (*Stromata*, iii. 4). (17) The faction described in Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvi., under the various designations of Gnostics, Phibionites, Barbelites, Borborians, Stratiotics, Coddians. Epiphanius encountered them in Egypt during his youth, and effected their expulsion from a certain town.

2. The Naassenian Hymn.

Undoubtedly, the most ancient document of Ophitic Gnosticism is the Naassenian Hymn. It expresses most simply and forcibly the fundamental ideas not only of the Ophites, but also of Gnostics generally. The following is Harnack's paraphrase (*SBA*, 1902, pp. 542 sqq.):

> "The generating principle of the universe, the first in order, was 'reason'; but the second principle was the first-born's emitted 'chaos'; and the third principle was received by the soul, which descends from both. Therefore, fashioned like a trembling deer, the soul wrests herself free from the grip of death (strengthening itself by such exertions). Now she wins the mastery and sees the light; now plunged into wo, she weeps; again, in the depths of evil, the unhappy one becomes ensnared in a maze. Then spake Jesus: 'Behold, O Father! this being, pursued by ills, roams astray upon earth, far from thy breath. It seeks to escape bitter chaos, and knows not whither to find escape. Therefore, send me, O Father, with the seals in my hand will I descend: all eons will I traverse, all mysteries reveal, and show the forms of the gods. I will deliver the secret of the holy way, and call it Gnosis.'"

Here, then, reason and chaos, the intelligent and the material world, stand opposed; and between them is the human soul, belonging to both spheres, yet striving toward the higher and the spiritual. The soul is unable to ascend by its own power; therefore, a heavenly being, concordant with the will of the supreme principle, descends into the human world and redeems the soul by showing it the way through the spheres which sunder it from the world divine. These primary conceptions are then variously amplified among the several sects. It is not mere thirst for knowledge that impels the Gnostics to speculate on these matters, but essentially a concern of salvation; because the Gnostic's salvation depends on the possession of the Gnosis respecting these things.

Like Gnosis at large, the Ophites teach the existence of a Supreme Being, standing infinitely high above the visible world; qualified as purely spiritual,

3. Cosmic Views.

the primal basis of all things, the starting-point of the cosmic process. His names are, Father of the Universe, First Man, the "Uncreated," the "Unspeakable," the "Unapproachable God." He is self-evolving, and thus becomes the source of all being. The first products of this spontaneous evolution still belong to the purely spiritual spheres. The Ophitic theology tends to separate this supreme God into an ever-increasing number of separate entities. In the aforesaid Hymn, only the Son is mentioned beside the Father; but a tetrad occurs among the Ophites of Irenæus and the Naassenians; an entire decad among the *Gnostici Barbelo;* while the Coptic writings disclose a countless host of higher beings. The Supreme Being's mode of evolution is set forth, now as a generative, again as a psychologic process; and frequently the two ideas are combined. Some heathen mythology lies obviously at the root of the matter; which accounts also for their syzygial views; for, in part at least, the Ophites aimed to interpret the ancient myths as psychologic processes, though but half successfully and with little consequence. Over against the Supreme Being stands chaos, the material principle. Yet there is not here a sharp dualism. In the Hymn, the phrase "the firstborn's emitted chaos" implies that it is derived from a higher being. In only very few instances is chaos an evil power, an active principle. It is not the existence of chaos which contradicts perfection; but rather the mixture of luminous parts with material elements. This mixture, in a word, is the great calamity, the loss that must be retrieved through redemption. How did this mixture come to pass? The Hymn designates the soul, the principle of this compound, as the common product of mind and chaos. Such is also the theory of the Peratæ and Sethites, mentioned by Hippolytus. These sects most nearly approach the dualistic scheme, yet the latter is not distinctly defined. In Justin, also, dualism is diminished.

Among the Ophites of Irenæus the origin of the mixed world is most completely represented. When the Father and the Son begat Christ from the Holy Ghost, the Spirit, or *prima femina,* could not comprehend the fulness of their infusive light; and there thus resulted from the overflow and effervescence of the luminous attributes of the first *masculi,* out of the first *femina,* a second birth. This was the *Sophia,* or *Prunicos;* also termed *Sinistra:* a bisexual being. This Wisdom no longer belonged to the sphere of incorruption; but became thenceforth the instrument of the cosmic process. Prunicos ascends once more to the elements; and as these cleave to her there arises the mixed world. Prunicos now spans the sky (the firmament of fixed stars) with her body, and begets the seven Archons; which are the planetary spirits, Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloëus, Horeus, Astaphæus. These archons have no longer a knowledge of the world above; and they continue the downward generating process. First, the angels come into being; next, begotten from matter by Ialdabaoth in anger, came the *Nus serpentiformis,* or "mind in the serpent's form," and the powers of evil; lastly, human beings. Considerably more complex is the universe of divine spheres and the human world in *Pistis-Sophia.* So also in the other Coptic writings, the intermediate realm is peopled with a numerous progeny.

4. Man, Revelation, and Redemption.

The Ophitic dilemma is, how man, who so evidently belongs to the material world, and is a creature of material forces, at the same time bears about in himself an affinity to the higher world. The solution is, that the creation of man was itself a beginning of his redemption, or a separation of the improperly mixed. Now men are by no means all alike. The Ophites, in common with other Gnostics, are determinists. And Hippolytus most expressly accentuates the doctrine of human classification among the Naassenians, who discriminate the "intellectual or angelic," the "spiritual," and the "terrestrial" as three churches distinguished from one another. *Pistis-Sophia* deals with a whole multitude of classes of men. Together with many other factors, the constellation predominant at birth determines to what class a man should belong. Astral religion influences the cosmic philosophy of these sects considerably. A comparative knowledge of God is accorded even to paganism. The Naasseni allegorize all possible pagan myths, ideas, and mystic practises, finding everywhere hidden suggestions of the highest truths. Homer is employed like the Old Testament. Justin knows of an attempt to reveal the redemptive Gnosis to the pagans. The usual view is that the heathen, seduced by subordinated spirits, then worshiped these as their gods. The Ophites in common with all other Gnostics share the opinion that the God of the Jews is only the demiurge, who pretended to the people of Israel to be the Most High God. Consistent with this attitude toward Israel's religion, there is a singular criticism of Biblical history. The Peratæ, Cainites, and Borborians took sides with all those characters whom the Old Testament sets forth as miscreants, and turned them into servants of the true God and light-giving foes of the demiurge. Other sects only present a variation of the Biblical version of the episode of Paradise. The serpent ministered to the beneficent powers, and brought to men the Gnosis of the Supreme God and of the demiurge's inferiority. Here, too, the serpent may properly be treated. As an evil spirit, this animal is encountered among sundry sects. But Irenæus, even in his time, observes that the serpent is variously represented; and, according to his testimony, some identify Sophia herself with the serpent. Again, it occupies an equivocal position, at once an evil being and the redeemer and bearer of the Gnosis that is necessary to salvation. In fact, there is mention even of serpent worship. The problem of redemption is to release from their false conjunction with matter the attributes of the divine realm of light. This conjunction exists principally in men, at least among the spiritual ones; but it likewise appears in the Sophia in so far as she plays a part in the sphere of ideas of the sects. There is translated into the world above, not only what was derived from the Sophia, but man's person itself; only the material admixture is stripped away. Redemption proper consists partly in the weakening of the mundane powers, partly in the revelation of knowledge that endows its possessor with mastery over those mundane powers. The bearer of salvation is invariably a being from the higher world, the *Soter*, or Christ; and he stands, in every instance, more or less closely allied with the personality of Jesus. Hence the Ophites did not efface the character of Christianity as a historic, redemptive religion; but the Savior of sinners they changed into some heavenly being who brings knowledge to men concerning the divine sphere, and thus elevates them. The union of this heavenly being with the man Jesus is conceived in various ways. In some quarters it is supposed to take place at his birth; in others, at the age of twelve; and again, at his baptism. However, the matter is no such great problem for the Ophites as it came to be for the theology of the Church; because, in the case at hand, the divine incarnation is not at all the great decisive fact for salvation, but redemption rather consists principally in the revelation of the redemptive Gnosis. Neither does any salutary significance attach itself to events in the life of Christ; such as his death and resurrection. At best, these occurrences are susceptible of a symbolic interpretation. Nor, indeed, is there any question of an atonement; this is unnecessary for the reason that, under the very determinism of the Gnosis, there can be no question of guilt in the premises. The innocent subject involved in matter must be set free by being brought into touch with the spiritual, which result is effected through the Gnosis, or the revelation of the higher world and redemptive rites.

5. The Mysteries.

In the first place, the work of redemption simply brought to souls the possibility of entering the realm of light; whereas the realization of this entrance is still menaced by all sorts of difficulties. The soul must be purified of unclean elements by means of prescribed ceremonies, and must learn the magic formulas by whose aid it can protect itself against the wiles of the archons. These ideas appear as the more popular embodiments of the Gnosis in most of the Ophite sects. They are also practically the most important, being sect-producing. In the Coptic documents, the number of these rites multiplied incredibly. This expansion was promoted by penitential discipline, in that against recurrent sins after participation in the expiatory sacraments new mysteries had to be devised. As may well be understood, this artificial sacramentalism neutralizes all moral interest. The believer's trust rests altogether in the mysteries. Through these it is that the soul attains to that estate in which no hostile powers can further molest it. Such ceremonial sanctities occur also among some earlier Ophitic sects. But we naturally learn very little on the subject from the treatises on heresy, because these sacraments are secret and are not communicated to the uninitiated. So early as in the Naassenian Hymn, Jesus is represented as saying: " I will descend with the seals in my hand," with some obvious implication evidently of such mystic rites. The mysteries furthermore consist in showing the forms of the gods, and in yielding up the secret of the holy way, as it is phrased in the Hymn. This holy way is the one which the spiritual soul must follow when liberated from the body, in order to gain entrance into the divine sphere. The gods are the archons, who design to barricade this way. Accordingly, the soul must be exactly acquainted with the successive series of these beings, and know what to say to each and every one of them for an effectual countersign. Sometimes, as in the Coptic documents, these consist of mere senseless conglomerations of sounds such as are found in the papyri of ancient magic. Here then, religion has sunk to the lowest grade of sorcery. The conquest of obstacles on the way to the world beyond finds a place also in the apocryphal accounts of the apostles; notably, in the apostles' prayers before their death. These apocryphal Acts are not assignable to any definite sect; they are products of a vulgar type of Gnosis. But they are still free from magic art; and God is entreated simply for help against adverse powers. Morality is neglected where men's whole concern is preempted by redemptive magic. The sects are both of a libertine cast committing the most abominable excesses, and ascetic. The history of the Ophitic sects is one of continuous degeneration; so that, eventually, the Church in general overcame them easily. See GNOSTICISM, § 2, for reference to articles which illumine the subject.

(R. LIECHTENHAN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources as indicated in the text are Irenæus, *Hær.*, i. 29–31; Hippolytus, *Hær.*, v.; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, iii. 4; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vi. 24–35; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxv.–xxvi., xxxvii.–xl., xlv.; and the *Pistis-Sophia*—for editions see under Gnosticism, and the transl. by G. R. S. Mead, London, 1896. Of first importance is the literature given under GNOSTICISM, and useful material will be found also in the literature under MANDÆANS; MANICHEANS. Consult further: A. Fuldner, *De Ophitis*, Rinteln, 1834; K. R. Köstlin, in *Theologisches Jahrbuch*, 1854, pp. i. sqq.; A. Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, 1862, pp. 400 sqq.; R. A. Lipsius, in *ZWT*, 1863. pp. 410 sqq.; J. N. Gruber, *Die Ophiten*, Würzburg, 1864; A. Hoenig, *Die Ophiten*, Berlin, 1889; A. Harnack, in *TU*, vii. 2 (1892); W. Ans, in *TU*, xv (1897), 1–32; R. Liechtenhan, *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus*, Göttingen, 1901; idem, in *ZWT*, 1901, pp. 236 sqq.; idem, in *ZNTW*, 1902, pp. 222 sqq.; C. Schmidt, in *TU*, xx. 4 (1901); E. C. H. Peithmann, *Biographia antiqua*, ser. iv., parts 1–3, Bitterfeld, 1903; E. H. Schmitt, *Die Gnosis*, vol. i., Jena, 1903; E. Preuschen, *Zwei Gnostische Hymnen*, Giessen, 1904; *DCB*, iv. 80–89.

OPTATUS: Bishop of Mileve in Numidia, author of a well-known work entitled *De schismate Donatistarum adversus Parmenianum*. Augustine, in his work against Parmenianus, calls him " the Bishop of Mileve of venerable memory," and Fulgentius places him by the side of Augustine and Ambrose as a defender of the Catholic faith. Apart from his book nothing is known of his life. According to Jerome the work was written in the reigns of Valentinian and Valens (364–375); the fact that Optatus refers to the persecution of Maximian as having occurred sixty years before allows us to date it about 368. It is true that he speaks (ii. 3) of Siricius as bishop of Rome, which he was not until 384; but these words were considered an interpolation even by earlier scholars. The fact appears to be that the work was originally in six books, and was known by Jerome in this form; the seventh is an independent addition, which was possibly written by Optatus himself in 384, when he may have revised the entire work. It is an answer from the Catholic side to the lost Donatist treatise of Parmenianus and is one of the most important sources for the history of the controversy.

The work is written in a conciliatory tone, and even when the author has allowed himself to bring grave charges in detail against his opponents, he checks himself by the recollection that they are his Christian brothers. He adheres throughout to the fundamental distinction between heretics and schismatics; the former are "deserters or falsifiers of the creed," and thus no Christians, while the Donatists are rebellious Christians. The heretics have no true baptism, no power of the keys, no proper worship; but the Donatists, although outside of the Catholic Church, "have derived true sacraments from the common source." Thus he goes much further than in the latter days of the Novatian controversy Cyprian had been willing to go, who had denied the legitimacy of both the faith and the sacraments of the schismatics, placing them practically on a level with heretics. Yet Optatus goes on to say that the possession of these gifts by the schismatics is a fruitless one; they are only a "quasi-church." The distinguishing marks of the true Church are, first, the possession of the sacraments—and here he is far from clear, if not self-contradictory; and, secondly, catholicity in extension, while the Donatists exist only in Africa, outside of a small colony in Rome. In both these points he prepared the way for Augustine's doctrine of the Church, and it is this that constitutes his importance in the history of dogma. Again, he takes a distinct step in advance of Cyprian in his doctrine of the sanctity of the sacraments, summed up in the proposition that "the sacraments are holy in themselves, not through the sanctity of men." This assertion of the objectivity of the sacraments was of fundamental importance for the development of western doctrine. Another part of the argument shows that the Cyprianic ideal view of the unity of the episcopate as summed up and represented in the Chair of Peter was still accepted and unsuspectingly fostered in Africa. Where Parmenianus enumerates six "gifts" of the Church (essential portions of its endowment), Optatus admits only five: *cathedra*, the ecumenical unity; *angelus*, the legitimate local bishop; *spiritus; fons*, a true baptism; and *sigillum*, the orthodox creed of the Trinity. In opposition to the Donatists, who denied the authority of the State over their ecclesiastical actions, he put forth the proposition which was afterward taken so ill, "The State is not in the Church, but the Church in the State, that is in the Roman Empire." The seventh book shows an even more conciliatory attitude than the others; the conception of the unity of the Church is still more sharply emphasized in it. (A. HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *editio princeps* was by J. Cochlæus, Mainz, 1549; a corrected ed. was by Baudouin, Paris, 1562, 1569; the edition upon which later editions were founded was by Dupin, Paris, 1562, or Antwerp, 1569, reproduced in *MPL*, xi.; the newest ed. is by C. Ziwsa, in *CSEL*, xxvi., Vienna, 1893. Consult C. Ziwsa, *Beiträge zu Optatus Milevitanus, Eranos Vindobonensis*, pp. 168–176, Vienna, 1893; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, v. 107-149; Harnack, *Dogma*, ii. 93, iii. 80, 223, v., passim; *DCB*, iv. 90–93; *KL*, ix. 932–934.

OPTIMISM: Philosophically the theory that the universe is the best possible and existence is essentially good. The term is modern; yet as a mood and a disposition optimism is as old as human life. As a distinct theory it was proposed about the same time by Lord Shaftesbury, Archbishop King, and Leibnitz. Shaftesbury first expounded it in his *Inquiry concerning Virtue*, written in 1692 and surreptitiously published in 1699; King in his *De origine mali* (1702); and Leibnitz in his *Theodicée* (1710). It had occurred independently to Leibnitz; but before he published on the subject he had read what Shaftesbury and King had written. Pope's *Essay on Man* (1732–34) advocated the doctrine in verse; Voltaire in *Candide* (1759) ridiculed it. According to Leibnitz "there was an infinity of possible ways of creating the world, according to the different designs which God might form, and each possible world depends upon conditions of certain principal designs or ends of God proper to itself." From this infinite number of possible worlds God chose to bring into existence the present system of things. And since God is a being not only of infinite power but of infinite wisdom and goodness, under the law of sufficient reason the present world must be the best possible. The optimism here presented rests upon an assumption concerning the nature of God and his purpose in the creation, and interprets particular experiences and events in the light of the world-view. The theory of optimism has also been presented inductively, with the aim of showing that good or happiness preponderates over pain and evil in human life, and that the animal consciousness is far less susceptible to pain than has been commonly supposed. Moreover, experiences which, regarded separately, appear wholly evil, when brought into instrumental relations with ethical ends are seen to be indispensable to virtue or the good. Optimism has furnished a key to a difficult problem which haunted New England Theology (q.v.) from 1750 onwards, viz., the relation of sin to the divine goodness and government, or the wisdom of God in the permission of sin. The general principle was that sin is a necessary means of the greatest good. According to Joseph Bellamy (q.v.) sin was a means through which God's glory was manifested and the good of the universe promoted; a doctrine drawn from Leibnitz, grounded on the assumption of the divine nature alone (*Works*, vol. ii., Boston, 1850). Samuel Hopkins (q.v.), reasoning from the same premises, taught that sin, even the most odious and abominable, was necessary for the glory of God and the good of the creature; and God can so order things that any number of men shall become sinful when it is most for his glory and the general good (*Works*, i. 140, 220, Boston, 1852). Stephen West (q.v.) maintained the desirability of sinners and moral evil existing, that God might exercise and manifest his mercy and also his hatred of sin (*Moral Agency*, p. 204, New Haven, 1772). Leonard Woods (q.v.) declared that in every instance in which sin occurred God preferred it to holiness.

N. W. Taylor (q.v.) denied that sin was the necessary means to the greatest good, but held that this world contained the greatest good possible to God (*Moral Government*, ii. 276, New York, 1859). L. F. Stearns (q.v.) asserted that God intended to permit a certain amount of sin in his world for the sake of a greater good (*Present Day Theology*, p. 244, New York, 1893). The ultimate questions thus raised concerning sin and evil persist in other forms and associated with other interests, as in a general attitude toward life (Goethe, Emerson, and Stevenson), and in the implications of evolution (J. Le Conte, *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought*, New York, 1888), of the idealistic philosophy (J. Royce, *The World and the Individual*, New York, 1899-1901), and of the Fatherhood of God (G. A. Gordon, *Immortality and the New Theodicy*, Boston, 1897). C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. H. Achterfoldt, *Optimismus und Pessimismus*, Bonn, 1855; W. Gass, *Optimismus und Pessimismus*, Berlin, 1876; L. B. Hellenbach, *Eine Philosophie des gesunden Menschenverstandes*, Vienna, 1876; F. Bowen, *Modern Philosophy*, New York, 1877; J. Duboc, *Der Optimismus als Weltanschauung*, Bonn, 1881; L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1881; G. Morandi, *Ottimismo e pessimismo*, Milan, 1891; H. Lorm, *Der grundlose Optimismus*, Dresden, 1897; G. H. Palmer, *The Glory of the Imperfect*, New York, 1898; H. Bols, *La Philosophie de l'homme heureux*, Paris, 1899; the literature under PESSIMISM and such works on the history of philosophy as those of J. E. Erdmann, London, 1894–96, A. Weber, ib. 1896, and F. Ueberweg, Berlin, 1901–03.

OPTION: The obtaining through the choice of the acquirer himself of a church-living that has become vacant. Besides, in the chapters (in which, at least in Germany, in consequence of the strictly regulated manner of the canonicate, this right is obsolete to-day) there is found an option in the college of cardinals. E. SEHLING.

OPUS OPERANTIS, OPUS OPERATUM ("Work of the doer, work wrought"): Two phrases much employed in discussions on the sacraments and representing quite closely respectively the Protestant and the Roman Catholic views. The first phrase sums up concisely the belief that the effect of the sacrament depends upon the spiritual disposition of the participant. The second emphasizes the necessary and inherent grace which flows (one may say) automatically from sacramental administration ("from the thing done"). The first regards the sacraments as instruments which act as aids to the mind and enable it to make immediate approach to God and so to receive the grace flowing from the sacraments. The second makes of the sacraments immediate instruments through which God works and without which he does not work. The view of the Roman Catholic Church was authoritatively expressed in the Council of Trent (session VII., canons vi.–vii.).

The conception of sacraments and the like working *ex opere operato* is not confined to Christian theology. It is a part of Brahmanic and Hindu belief that, e.g., the sacrifice operates automatically, and that whatever is said or done by the officiant during the ceremony has inevitably its appropriate effect independent of the disposition or intention of the beneficiary (who is altogether passive) or even of the celebrant, whose chance word or act, even, is irrevocable.

OPZOOMER, ōp-zū'mer, CORNELIS WILLEM: Dutch theologian; b. at Rotterdam Apr. 20, 1821; d. at Osterbeek Aug. 22, 1892. Educated at the high school at Leyden, he became professor of philosophy at the University of Utrecht at the age of twenty-four. Jurisprudence was his specialty, but he distinguished himself also in oriental and classical literature, art, and philosophy; but it is especially for his apologetics, reconciling the conflicting relation of science with religion, that he is mentioned here. Coming to Leyden as a young enthusiast over the Reformed confession, he passed under the influence of the heterodoxy of the Groningen theology on the infallibility of the Scriptures, and was soon cast into violent controversy, as indicated by his *Antwoord aan Isaac Da Costa, ter wederlegging van het stukje: Rekenschap van gevoelens* (1843). With the revival of apologetics, Opzoomer distinguished the actual from the ideal in Christianity; for the former, he demanded historical proof and attached himself to the Tübingen School (q.v.); for the latter he demanded none but rational grounds. He heartily recommended the system and method of K. Krause, and drew upon himself the charge of arch-heretic and pantheist. *De leer van God bij Schelling, Hegel, en Krause* was an effort to establish the Christian faith on the basis of philosophy. Soon he aroused greater antagonism by turning from speculation to the experience, philosophy, and inductive logic of John Stuart Mill as a method not only for thought but also for ethics, because of the certain results of natural science. The fruit of this investigation resulted in *De twijfel des tijds, de wegwijzer der tockomst* (1850); *De weg der wetenschap* (Utrecht, 1851); *Het wezen der kennis* (Amsterdam, 1863); *Wetenschap en Wijsbegeerte* (1857); *Geschiedenes der Wijsbegeerte* (1860) and *Een nieuwe kritiek der wijsbegeerte* (1871). He was accused of being a preacher of sensualism and of a coarse-minded morality (*Het teeken des tijds*, 1858); but unjustly, because he gave empiricism a new application by supplementing sensual perception as the only source of natural science, with an independent subjective spiritual perception. He endeavored to construct a theory of the universe possessing scientific certainty, out of immediate experience and certain logic, for the materials of which he distinguished the sensual, esthetic, and moral sensations as mutuually independent, to which he added a fourth, namely, "the religious sensation" (*De waarheid en hare kenbronnen*, 1859). Opzoomer's position now rapidly gained adherents; his lecture-room became thronged; and, by his profound thought, clear presentation, and brilliant rhetoric, he became the leader of the liberals and one of the founders of modern theology in his own land. He also undertook to popularize philosophy among the laity (*Cartesius*, 1861), and also science (*Natuurkennis en Natuurpoëzie*, 1858).

The fundamental presupposition of Opzoomer's original religious philosophy was the verity of religion and the impossibility to thought of an essential contradiction between religion and science.

At first he asserted a monism in which he identified faith and reason. He presupposed a supersensual consciousness and, through an acute analysis of the same, thought to rise to a consciousness of the absolute. The existence of God, ethical freedom, consciousness of sin, and immortality, he evolved from the conception of infinite being. Anthropomorphism and miracles he rejected by resolving the antithesis of deism and pantheism, transcendence and immanence, the natural and the supernatural, in the realization that the finite is wholly conditioned upon the infinite. Ethics is thus only an emanation of religious faith (*Het wesen der deugd*, 1848; *De vrucht der godsdienst*). However, with the revolution of his philosophical position, he dismissed the identity of faith with science. Faith pronounced the dictum that God reigns; science answered the question how he reigns. Religion was adaptable to all scientific theories, and the attacks of science were due to the adherence of religion to an antiquated hypothesis. The postulate of empiricism was the law of causation, in scientific knowledge as well as historical reality, the application of which was imperative upon Biblical narrative. He excluded miracles from the spiritual as well as the material, and in the name of religion banished free will. In the expulsion of the unscientific from religion he saw the latter not only left unimpaired but he saw also the reconciliation of faith and science and the advent of another Reformation (*De geest der nieuwe richting*, 1862; *De godsdienst*, 1864). He invited an unlimited criticism in the Church. He presided over the first assembly of the Netherland Protestant Union organized against the conservative confessional reactionaries at the exclusion, in 1857, of religious instruction from the state schools. He dreamed of the Church of the future as based on piety alone and embracing all Christians. The most dangerous foe he recognized in skepticism, which he exposed as untenable and unreasonable, and further set forth how nearly philosophical religion borders on scientific certainty, if only the methods of science are employed, seeing that science for itself dares to conclude upon the reality of existence from no other source than perception. Mathematics and poetry he regarded as worthy elements of both the scientific and religious systems. A material science he deplored, and in a one-sided scientific evolution he feared pessimistic gloom and menace to culture. Only the harmonious union of science and religion would satisfy all the demands of life, and therefore to him philosophy remained the sovereign science which was able to reconcile man with himself.

(I. MOLENAAR.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. P. Trottet, in *Revue chrétienne*, 1860, pp. 340 sqq.; J. H. Scholten, *Twee briefen over het materialisme*, Amsterdam, 1860; idem, *Het kritisch Standpunkt van C. W. Opzoomer*, ib. 1860; F. A. van Hartsen, *Het empiricisme van Mr. C. W. Opzoomer*, Zalt-Bommel, 1865; idem, *Inleiding tot de wijsbegeerte*, Haarlem, 1865; A. Pierson, in *De Gids*, Mar., 1893; Van der Wyck, in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, cvi (1895), 1–19.

ORANGE, SYNODS OF: Two synods held at Orange in the south of France. The first took place on Nov. 8, 441, under the presidency of Hilary of Arles (q.v.), Eucherius of Lyons also being present. Seventeen bishops attended the meeting. Thirty canons were passed, dealing with unction, the permission of penance, the right of asylum; recommending caution to bishops in the ordination of foreign clergy, the consecration of churches outside of their own jurisdictions, and other matters; imposing limitations on the administration of ecclesiastical rites to those who were in any way defective, either in body or mind; and emphasizing the duty of celibacy for those belonging to the clerical state, especially deacons and widows, with express reference to canon viii. of the synod of Turin (401). The exact interpretation of some of them (ii., iii., xvii.) is doubtful. Canon iv. is in conflict with a decretal of Pope Siricius; and ii. and xviii. betray an inclination to resist the introduction of Roman customs. These canons were confirmed at Arles about 443 (see ARLES, SYNODS OF). On July 3, 529, another synod took place at Orange, which in the mean time had passed under Burgundian and then Ostrogothic rule. This meeting, for which occasion was given by the consecration of a church built by the governor of Gallia Narbonensis, was attended by fourteen bishops under the presidency of Cæsarius of Arles. Its decrees, which have a certain importance in the history of Augustinianism, received the papal sanction. (E. HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Canons of the Second Council of Orange. A.D. 526*, London, 1882; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 291–295, 724 sqq., Eng. transl., iii. 159–164, iv. 152 sqq.; J. Sirmond, *Concilia antiqua Galliæ*, i. 70 sqq., 215 sqq., Paris, 1629.

ORARIUM. See VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

ORATORIO. See SACRED MUSIC, II., 2, §§ 5, 6.

ORATORY: Name of a place of prayer. When, in the early Church, parochial churches were established, celebration of the sacraments and public worship, with certain exceptions, came to be confined to these; and sanctuaries in connection with private homes and corporate institutions, which were frequently memorials and martyries, were limited to private prayer and were called oratories. "People's oratory" was also a name applied to the nave of a church. Later the term chapel came into use and applies to adjunct sanctuaries of private houses, court-houses, colleges, monasteries, or churches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, VIII., v. 2; H. D. M. Spence, *White Robe of Churches*, p. 2, New York, 1900.

ORATORY OF THE DIVINE LOVE: (*Oratorium divini amoris*): The name of a circle of reformers at Rome in the sixteenth century. Among analogies to Protestantism in Italy, Ranke (*Popes*, i. 101 sqq.) accords first place to this institution. It was an attempt to effect a reform within the Roman Catholic Church, but without such a separation as Luther brought on. Only so far does the analogy obtain as that pious men at Rome (about 1520), such as Giberti (q.v.), Sadoleto, Giovanni Pietro Caraffa (see PAUL IV., Pope), and others, availed themselves of such means as the Church afforded for the purification of church life; namely, sedulous participation in the divine office and the sacrament, pilgrimages, fasting, almsgiving, and the like. But they do not strike to the heart of the Reformation movement, and issue with little result of a permanent character. The participants remained loyal members of the Roman Catholic Church. They assembled, some fifty or sixty in number, at Trastevere, in the Church of St. Dorothea. A similar society existed at Verona, in the circle of Bishop Giberti. The Roman Oratory appears to have reached its termination during the assault and plundering of the city, in 1527; but an *Archiconfraternitas Divini Amoris*, transferred from St. Dorothea to St. Andrew, in 1750, is yet in existence. The significance of the Oratory rests not upon its direct results, which were slight, but rather on the fact that the experience of one of its individual members, Gætano of Thiene, furnished the vital impulse for the founding of a separate order (see THEATINES). K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief source is A. Caracciolo, *Vita Pauli IV.*, p. 182, Cologne, 1612. Consult further: Miss Tucker, in the *English Historical Review*, xviii. 6, pp. 27, 66; K. Benrath, *Bernard Ochino*, p. 58, Brunswick, 1892.

ORATORY, PRIESTS OF THE. See NERI, PHILIP, SAINT, AND THE ORATORIANS.

ORDEAL.

Definition and Character (§ 1).
The Fire Test (§ 2).
Water (§ 3).
Other Ordeals (§ 4).
Among Primitive Peoples (§ 5).
In Non-Christian Codes (§ 6).
In the Old Testament (§ 7).
In Christianity (§ 8).
Official Ecclesiastical Position (§ 9).

1. Definition and Character. The ordeal is a form of trial to determine guilt or innocence, in which trial superhuman intelligence is supposed to control the operation and to guide to right results. The word is Anglo-Saxon (*ordel* or *ordal*, "judgment"), and it occurs in cognate form in Old Saxon, Old Friesic, Dutch, Old High German; Germ. *Urtheil;* the phrase used for the idea in German well brings out its distinctive character—*Gottes-Urtheil*, "judgment of God." The essence of the ordeal is an appeal to deity to give a decision in a doubtful case; it assumes that God will bring innocence to light, if need be even by a miracle. It arose in an evident desire to do justice, and in a recognition of the fallibility of human knowledge and discernment. These same human faculties are, of course, the cause of the prevalence and continuance of what science shows to have been a superstition. It is to be noted that the fatal consequences which so often attended the test were not derived from a punitive intent, since punishment was never the essential element. The process had its roots in the animistic stage of religious development, in which the belief was held that the innumerable spirits thought to exist were interested in and affected the lot of human beings. It persists in the barbaric stage, often leaving only relics in a higher stratum of practise, but it frequently recurs as a relic in advanced civilizations. It has affiliations with magic, since many of the means used to forecast or influence the future were employed in the ordeal. The Oath (q.v.) common in judicial processes in Christian lands is a distinct relic of the ordeal; its essential character being the appeal to deity either symbolically by the raising of the hand or the kissing of the Book or verbally in the formula "So help me, God!" The principal ordeals employ fire, water, earth, or a combination of these substances or forces with others, and also employ many other means which have a symbolic or magical force.

2. The Fire Test. In the case of fire, very persistent is the method of walking with bared feet over burning coals, or between fires fiercely burning. Not infrequent is the putting of the hand into the fire, or the leaping into or through the flames. But much more usual is the use of hot iron, very frequently in the shape of plowshares (seven or nine or ten or twelve—sacred numbers) heated to redness, the subject either walking blindfold—when chance directs the issue —or treading on each one, the decision then depending upon the degree of injury inflicted. Fully as common is the carrying in the hand (sometimes after the latter has passed through a ceremonial which may or may not lessen the susceptibility to damage by heat) of a heated iron, sometimes of nondescript shape, or it might be a plowshare, or a ball of fixed or of undetermined weight, a stated distance and either casting it down or placing it in a definite spot or receptacle. In rare cases the iron was applied to the tongue. After carrying the iron, generally the hands were bandaged and sealed by the officials conducting the ordeal, and the bandages were removed on the third or a later day and an inspection of the injuries made. The extent, or presence or absence, of injury determined the guilt or innocence of the suspects. According to Indian, Norse, and Christian legend, sacred relics were subjected to the test by fire and came out unharmed, thus establishing their genuineness. It is an interesting fact that in Christendom the abbeys were often the guardians of the iron used, which had often received episcopal benediction. Altogether unusual was the test by molten metal which appears only in Zoroastrian circles (see below).

3. Water. The tests by water were exceedingly numerous and diverse, this substance naturally lending itself to a variety of forms of use. Thus it was employed cold, after invocation or imprecation was pronounced over it by the religious or judicial official; it was given pure as a potion, the imprecation being supposed to bring evil on the recipient in case of guilt; or it was mixed with some substance innocuous in itself but supposed to work evil in the case of guilt (so in the Hebrew water of jealousy; see below), just as when the water was drunk pure as above; or a poison was added, the idea then being that superhuman powers would protect the innocent from harm. Or the suspect was lowered or thrown into a lake or river, the underlying assumption being that water as a pure and purifying element rejects those whom guilt has rendered impure; sometimes the principle of the counterbalance was employed, the suspect being enclosed (bound) in one sack and a stone in another, the two being tied together and thrown into the water; if the man floated, he was innocent. By this same test the legitimacy of children was determined by the Celts and Teutons, those which floated being owned as legitimate. In India self-immersion is practised while an arrow is shot and retrieved—a mere test of ability to hold the breath. A legendary form attributes to cold water the power to scald the guilty who dares the test. Far more common was the use of hot water, taking its place with the use of the plowshare and ball described above. The usual method was to deposit some object—a stone, ring, piece of metal, or the like—in a caldron of water the ebullition of which kept the object in motion; the suspect was then obliged to plunge his hand and arm into the water and produce the object. In the case of the Ainus the decision rests upon the degree of injury received. In less primitive circumstances the hand is bandaged and sealed and judgment is rendered as in the case of the fire ordeals above. This test is preceded by exorcism or adjuration of the element, the religious conduct of the test being the invariable accompaniment. In India the Brahmins officiate, in Africa the ju-ju man, in Christendom the bishop, abbot, or priest. In India and elsewhere substitutes for hot water are employed, as hot oil or melted butter.

4. Other Ordeals.

While fire and water, possibly, as the two elements universally employed in ceremonial purification, are most used, other substances and methods are common. (1) Earth is used, as in India, where a clod is taken from a furrow and put in the subject's mouth, after which he swears to his innocence; in the Hebrew ritual earth or dust is taken from the floor of the tabernacle; in Africa soil is taken from a place supposed to be haunted by spirits; in Australia, in case of a disputed title to land, earth is taken from the plot under discussion. (2) The balance is employed in India; the suspect is first accurately weighed; after an interval he again sits in the scales, after the adjuration: "Thou, O Balance, art the mansion of truth; thou wast anciently contrived by deities: declare the truth, therefore, O giver of success, and clear me from all suspicion. If I am guilty, O venerable as my own mother, then, sink me down; but if innocent, raise me aloft" (cited by H. C. Lea, *Superstition and Force*, p. 295, Philadelphia, 1878). If he rises in the scales, he is pronounced innocent. In Christianity this form of ordeal was employed in witch trials, the Bible being used as the counterbalance in England, Holland, Hungary, and other countries. (3) As noted above, in the water ordeal poison is sometimes mixed with the water. Poison is also employed alone, the particular substance varying with the environment, a miracle being worked, it is supposed, to declare innocence. This is especially common in Africa, particularly in cases of witchcraft, and there the poison bean is the ordinary means, this being responsible for probably thousands of deaths yearly. (4) Quite common is what among Anglo-Saxons was called the corsnæd. The people named took a small piece of bread or cheese consecrated by the usual ceremonies and administered it to the suspect, the guilty being supposed unable to swallow it. In India this took the form of a kind of rice consecrated by invocations to deities, while among the Dravidian tribes salt was used in the same way. It was almost inevitable that in Christianity this should pass over into the use of the host, and there was accompanied by a prayer to God or Christ so to constrict the throat of the guilty, that he should be unable to swallow it. That auto-suggestion made this effective is certain beyond a doubt. Hildebrand employed this against Henry IV., who refused the test. (5) The use of religious symbols was common, as when in Africa a fetish is taken in the hand and the oath of expurgation taken. Like reasoning caused in Christianity the use of the cross. Here the ordeal might be singular or dual or plural, suspect, or complainant and defendant, or these and their witnesses standing with arms outstretched before the cross, the first to lower his arms being adjudged to have lost his cause. Among the Irish the ordeal of the cross and salt are combined in the ordeal to which suspected fairy changelings are subjected, the use of these compelling the return of the abstracted infant. (6) The lot was employed, this being regarded as especially effective in giving scope to the deity's power to make innocence manifest. (7) In Christian nations from the thirteenth century use has been made of the bier-right. A suspected murderer is brought into the presence of the corpse of a murdered person and made to touch it, the belief being that on contact with the guilty person the corpse would bleed afresh. In the late Middle Ages this form was employed especially against Jews who were accused of killing Christian girls. (8) The oath, either actual or implicit, is in all the preceding usually essential, the person undergoing the ordeal asseverating his innocence in solemn form. In modern Christian lands it is the one ordeal in common use, and is the survival of the compurgatorial ordeal. It is an appeal to deity in direct form, and among backward peoples it is still a superstition that perjury will result in an immediate or early visitation of God in physical form. While judicial investigations tend in the mass to run in grooves, ingenuity and uniqueness of personality or singularity of circumstance have ever influenced to expedients not "orthodox" or usual. These can not here be catalogued.

5. Among Primitive Peoples.

The field of the ordeal is the world. In Africa this institution blooms. Among the Barotse the hot-water ordeal is used to detect sorcerers, and the peeling of the skin shows guilt. The vicarious test is used—to fowls are given the poison bean, and the death of the fowl proves the offense (L. Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 76, London, 1898), or the lizard fetish is whipped, and the thief or wizard confesses to avoid the anger of the fetish. Or the poison bean is swallowed by the individual accused, and death reveals guilt. Or a feather is plucked from the under side of a fowl's wing and thrust through the suspect's tongue; if the feather bends, innocense is proved (M. H. Kingsley, *West African Studies*, pp. 160–161, 490, London, 1899). In Madagascar a harmless liquor is drunk and proves poisonous in case of guilt (J. S. C. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde*, i. 181; cf. C. Keller, *Madagascar, Mauri-*

tius, pp. 95–96, London, 1900). In Ceram food on which a sword has been laid serves the same purpose; and in Tenimber the suspect sips of his own blood in which a sword has been dipped (J. G. F. Riedel, *De Sluik en Kroes-harige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 129, 284, The Hague, 1886). A Samoyed drinks water to which gunpowder and earth have been added and in which a sword has been dipped, and invokes sickness, powder, and sword on himself if he be guilty (J. Georgi, *Les Nations Samoyeds*, p. 48, St. Petersburg, 1776); and Malays have a custom exactly parallel (W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic*, p. 528, London, 1900). The Balinese use a bowl of pure water (A. Featherman, *Social Hist. of the Races of Mankind*, ii. 408, London, 1885). It is not unlikely that the element of the ordeal is to be traced in the initiation into the mysteries of savage tribes, the purport being to discover the acceptability of the candidates to the spirits which are patrons of the mysteries (cf. A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, i. 281 sqq., London, 1887; R. H. Codrington, *Melanesian Studies*, chap. v., ib. 1891; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, iii. 204 sqq., 422 sqq., ib. 1900; and the work of Decle cited above, p. 78).

6. In Non-Christian Codes.

The native conservatism of man would justify the expectation that a custom so universal among primitive peoples would perpetuate itself among those more advanced and become parts of recognized judicial procedure. This is found to be the case. In Babylonia, in the code of Hammurabi (see Hammurabi and His Code) §§ 2 and 132 provide for the ordeal of water by casting into "the holy river" a suspected sorcerer or adulteress, the floating of the suspect proving innocence (contrary to the usual judgment, see below). In Zoroastrianism the *Vendidad* (iv. 54–55) notes an ordeal of "brimstone, golden, truth-knowing water," but the context throws no light upon the method of employing it. In iv. 44–46 (128) boiling water appears as the means. The *Shayast la-Shayast* (xv. 14–17) notes the unique ordeal of molten metal which, poured over the body or breast of the believer, is harmless or even pleasant; but on sinners, eats the very flesh; the same source (xiii. 17) refers to the six hot ordeals of the Husparam (Sakadun) Nask. The *Dadistani Dinik* (xxxvii. 74) refers to an ordeal of poison which apparently the litigant seeks to evade. The *Dinkart* (iv. 33) refers to fire and melted iron. In India the Institutes of Vishnu (chaps. ix.–xiv.; Eng. transl., *SBE*, Am. ed., viii. 1, pp. 52–61) regulate the use of ordeals and name those which involve holding, while taking the oath, a blade of grass, or of sesamum, or of silver or gold, or of the lump of earth from the furrow; the sacred libation of three handfuls of water in which an image has been washed, the balance, fire, water, and poisons, are also named and treated. In an Indian fire ordeal in the code of Yajnavalkya, the subject bathed, rubbed his hands with rice bran, with a series of seven vegetable objects, and with barley moistened with curds, and then invoked the fire: "Thou, O fire, pervadest all things; O cause of purity, who givest evidence of virtue and of sin, declare the truth in my hand." He then carried the hot iron the stipulated distance.

7. In the Old Testament.

In the Old Testament is given a typical case of the ordeal, the entire process being expressly under the protection and direction of religious authorities (Num. v. 11–31). An offering of distinctive character, one-tenth of an ephah of barley meal without oil and frankincense, is brought to the priest and held during the trial by the woman suspected of wrongdoing. Into water that has been consecrated by the priest he puts dust from the floor of the tabernacle, and this mixture is held by the woman while the priest utters over her a promise of immunity from harm in case of her innocence, which, however, becomes a terrible imprecation if she be guilty, to which the woman gives assent. The promise or imprecation is written in a book and then blotted out with part of the water of ordeal. Next the offering is taken from the woman's hand, waved toward the altar and a handful of it burned; then the woman drinks the rest of the potion and goes free if she is innocent; or, in case of guilt, she is supposed to suffer death in a horrible form through the disruptive action of the otherwise harmless potion. There is no necessity in this case to fall back upon the explanation offered of infection by plague through water or dust in cases in which death followed the ordeal; a much closer and more effective explanation lies ready to hand in the operation of auto-suggestion—a principle abundantly in evidence among both primitive and advanced peoples. The essential of the ordeal is employed in the use of the lot, as when Achan's offense was discovered (Josh. vii. 13–26) and in the case of Jonathan's breach of taboo (I Sam. xiv. 36–45). The combat of David with Goliath is an instance of the wager of battle. It is noteworthy that David speaks again and again of the Philistine defying "the armies of the living God," and in his answer to the taunt of Goliath says: "I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God . . . whom thou hast defied" (I Sam. xvii). It is held by rabbinic interpreters of Ex. xxxii. 30 that the drinking of the water in which the gold dust from the calf of Sinai was mixed was an ordeal, the gold making red the beards of those who had worshiped the idol. As exegesis this is, of course, unscientific; but it is interesting as marking the continuance of the superstition among the Jews. In effect, but not in purpose, the episode of the three children in the fiery furnace (Dan. iii.) was an ordeal.

8. In Christianity.

The peoples who were converted to Christianity brought with them this institution, and here, too, for a time the sanction of religion was given to its employment. Moreover, the legal status of the process is exhibited in the phrase used in documents of the form *judicium ferri*, "judgment by iron," in the fact that the weight of the iron was in some parts fixed by law and the method of use was determined in the same manner, while the hand, after bandaging, was sealed by the judge's signet. The process as a judicial means is embodied in a number of European codes from the eighth to the twelfth centuries, such as the Salic, Visigothic, Anglo-Saxon, and Lombardic, ranging from England to Hungary and from Norway to Spain and Italy (cf. *MGH*, *Leges*, v. 599 sqq., and translations in Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*, pp. 400 sqq.). The relation to the Church is shown by the fact that the ordeal was often preceded by a two days' fast on bread and water in the case of the iron ordeal, three days if water was used, and the test took place after reception of the sacrament, that (as in Spain) the bishop blessed the iron, that often the abbeys were the custodians of the implements used, that the inquisition had recourse to it, that such adjurations were used at the sacrament preceding as: "This body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to thee this day a manifestation" (E. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, ed. J. D. Mansi, ii. 575 etc., 4 vols., Paris, 1761–64), and that exorcism of water was carried out with the use of a number of formulæ still preserved in Baluze. There was in many cases a solemn ceremony in the church, while the water, iron, or plowshare was placed in the church porch and sprinkled with holy water. The Slavs of Mecklenburg (to cite only one example out of many) when converted were directed to refrain from taking oaths at sacred trees, fountains, and the like, to bring criminals to be tried by the hot iron or plowshare (E. Lindenborg, *Scriptores rerum Germanarum*, p. 215, Frankfort, 1609). Hincmar of Reims defended on symbolic grounds the ordeal of boiling water, since it combined the elements of fire and water, and thus represented the final judgment and the deluge (*De divortio Lotharii*, vi. in *MPL*, cxxv.). The ordeal of cold water he defended on the same ground as did non-Christians: "The pure nature of water recognizes as impure and rejects as incompatible human nature which has become infected with guilt."

Yet the official attitude of the Church was not consistent. Synods in numbers directed, approved, or commended its use (so Salzburg, 799; Mainz, 848; Soissons, 853; Worms, 868, cf. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv. 370; Tribur, 895; Tours, 925; Seligenstadt, 1023; Mainz, 1028; Auch, 1068; Gran, 1099; and Reims, 1157, against the Cathari).

9. Official Ecclesiastical Position.

Gregory VII. (1073–85) approved and used it; Calixtus II. approved it at Reims (1119). Other ecclesiastics than Hincmar (ut sup.) defended it, such as Guibert of Nogent (q.v.) and John, bishop of Avranches (1061); Ivo of Chartres (q.v.) pronounced its decisions indisputable, while Honorius of Autun (q.v.) claimed it as a prerogative of his order (the Benedictine). In 1182 the abbey of La Seauve received the right to enjoy the revenues proceeding from the fees charged for the process. Yet there was an intermittent undercurrent of protest beginning early. Avitus of Vienne (see Avitus, Alcimus Ecdicius) in the sixth century objected to the use of the wager of battle; Agobard of Lyons (q.v.) wrote two works against the ordeal; Pope Leo IV. (847–855) condemned it, as did Stephen V. (885–891), Sylvester II. (999–1003), Alexander II. (at the Fourth Lateran Synod, 1215, which forbade ecclesiastical ceremonies at ordeals), and Honorius III. (1216–27). The civil power shows the same wavering. Charlemagne sanctioned the ordeal of the cross among his descendants in cases of dispute regarding territory; Louis le-Débonnaire prohibited it (816); his son, Lothair, first followed Louis, and then sanctioned it; Henry IV. in 1219 directed judicial officers to employ other methods, this being prohibited by the Church; Alexander II. of Scotland (thirteenth century) forbade it, as did the Neapolitan code of 1231. While then the ordeal was used under Christian auspices at least as early as the sixth century it was still alive at the end of the thirteenth century in Germany, in the sixteenth it survived in Spain. During the sixteenth century the cold-water ordeal was revived in Germany for the trial of witches, and in the seventeenth was a recognized judicial procedure in France. James I. of England defended the ordeal, and in his times it was employed in Scotland, and in the nineteenth century in Belgium; while upon the basis of a confession procured by the use of the bier-right a conviction was obtained in New York State in 1824 and is recorded in the law books. On Nov. 17, 1908, it is reported from Monticello, Ark., that an odd ordeal was proposed at a coroner's inquest, viz., that the suspect's gun be fired, it being claimed that if he were guilty, blood stains would show on the barrel. After the test, the negro who proposed it pointed out a red stain on the barrel (which proved to be a rust stain), and the accused at once cut his throat. Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: Numerous German liturgical formulas for the ordeal are collected and edited by K. Zeumer in *MGH*, *Leg.*, sectio V., i (1886), 599 sqq.; material is collected in *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources*, vol. iv., Philadelphia, 1897. The chief work on the ordeal as employed by Christendom is F. Patetta, *Le Ordalie*, Turin, 1890; the best work in English is H. C. Lea, *Superstition and Force*, Philadelphia, 1893 (very full and satisfactory). Consult J. L. C. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechts-Alterthümer*, pp. 908 sqq., Göttingen, 1828; H. T. Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization*, London, 1867; H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1892; K. Lehmann, *Das Bahrgericht*, in *Germanistische Abhandlungen zum 70 Geburtstag K. von Maurers*, Göttingen, 1893; J. B. Thayer, *Preliminary Treatise on Evidence*, vol. i., Boston, 1896. On the practise among orientals consult: E. Schlagintweit, *Die Gottesurtheile der Inder*, Munich, 1866; S. Das, *Journey to Lhasa*, pp. 188 sqq., Calcutta, 1893; L. Decle, *Three years in Savage Africa*, p. 76, London, 1898; Miss M. H. Kingsley, *West African Studies*, pp. 162–166, London, 1899; J. G. Fraser, *The Golden Bough*, 3 vols., ib. 1900; C. Keller, *Madagascar*, pp. 95–96, ib. 1900; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, ib. 1903. The best sources for a study of the ethnic phase of the subject are the books of travel among primitive peoples.

ORDER OF SALVATION (*Ordo salutis*): A technical term of Protestant dogmatics to designate the consecutive steps in the work of the Holy Spirit in the appropriation of salvation. The phrase seems to occur for the first time in Buddeus (*Institutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ*, p. 40, Leipsic, 1723), but the idea is an inherent constituent of the older Protestant dogmatics. In medieval theology no definite analogue appears. As Protestantism proceeded from the criticism and displacement of the Roman Catholic conceptions of repentance, faith, and works, and as it recognized in faith the form of the religious conviction, its interest

History of the Term.

from the beginning was turned toward the origin and development of religious acts in man. It was Calvin who grouped the conceptions of the order of salvation in a systematic way, by treating first of faith, then of repentance as regeneration and conversion which comprise the whole life of the Christian, then of justification, and finally of election. The Protestant confessions do not advance beyond this circle. Repentance, which comprises contrition and faith, is effected by the Law and the Gospel. The believer receives justification and forgiveness of sins as, on the other hand, his faith —the beginning of a new life effected by the Holy Spirit—shows itself in good works (Augs. Con., art. xii.; Formula of Concord, *Solida declaratio*, art. xi., §§ 17 sqq.). Among the older Lutheran dogmaticians and among the Reformed essentially the same order is found, but the division of the Reformed was superior to that of the Lutherans in its simplicity and its conspicuous subordination of religious conditions to divine effects. The modern development of the doctrine begins with Schleiermacher. He interpreted the different parts of the order of salvation as proceeding from Christian consciousness. Regeneration, as the fact of being received into life communion with Christ, comprises within itself the entrance into a new relation of man to God as well as the basis of a new form of life. The former is justification, the latter conversion; conversion includes penitence or repentance, which is effected by the view of the perfection of Christ, and faith as " the desire to accept the impulses of Christ." Justification consists in the experience of the forgiveness of sins and adoption, and is therefore a subjective condition mediated by conversion. The division of Schleiermacher has found followers here and there in modern dogmatics, but, on the whole, the conceptions of the old dogmaticians have been retained.

Biblical Teaching.

In spite of the fact that the earlier conceptions are still in force, there exist considerable variations concerning their explanation and connection. In the Bible there is set forth no order of salvation in the sense of later dogmatics. The Biblical conceptions may be arranged in the following manner: (1) Christ calls sinners to repentance and saves them (Matt. ix. 13, xi. 28 sqq.). By his work Christ effects repentance (Gk. *metanoia*) as well as faith. Faith is an effect and gift of God (John vi. 29). It is active in love (Gal. v. 6). (2) As faith seizes the revelation of God in Christ, God declares the believer just (Rom. iv. 11, iii. 28). By the obedience of Christ, in his blood, the believers have forgiveness of sins (Rom. v. 9), reconciliation with God, etc. It is therefore God who effects faith. Faith seizes justification and is at the same time the principle of the new life of repentance. (3) The Christian is a new creature (*kainē, ktisis*, II Cor. v. 17); for God has regenerated him by his Spirit, the Word, and baptism (John iii. 3). Christ is the sanctification of the Christian (I Cor. i. 30). (4) The new life, as it consists in faith, love, repentance, and works, and is realized by God through regeneration, justification, and sanctification, rests simply upon the grace of God in Christ (Gal. ii. 21). (5) Since now the Spirit of God as the Spirit of Jesus Christ, who is active and present in the congregation of believers in Christ, continues and makes effective the word and work of Jesus (John vii. 39), the new life of the Christian may be traced also to the efficacy of the Spirit (cf. Matt. iii. 11). The word of God comes " in demonstration of the Spirit and of power " (I Cor. ii. 4). It is the Spirit that effects and guides the new moral life of the Christian (Rom. viii. 4 sqq.), that brings him regeneration, renovation, and the like (Titus iii. 2 sqq.). It is therefore justifiable according to Holy Scripture also, to trace regeneration, faith, experience of justification, repentance and the new life of sanctification to the Holy Spirit as the moving cause in the congregation of the faithful.

From what has been said it is clear that the traditional scheme of the order of salvation is not found in Scripture and thus has no absolute authority. Some of its conceptions are duplicated and may be eliminated without loss; the conception of illumination, for instance, is entirely covered by that of calling (or regeneration). Moreover, the dissection of the divine activity in the soul can neither be traced to actual observation nor is it logically necessary. In an attempt at a positive construction of an order of salvation there is to be presupposed the knowledge of the work of Christ.

The True Order.

Redemption is realized in the congregation of the faithful. There the Spirit of Jesus Christ is active and present to give redemption to individuals and preserve them in it. This takes place by special means, i.e., the means of grace, primarily the Word. The question is, therefore, how the Spirit of God generates and preserves the new life in the heart. The answer can be gained only by the observation of the inner processes of Christian life as effects of God in which the Holy Spirit is manifest as the moving cause. Only in this connection can the activities of the divine Spirit in the soul be spoken of. The content may be grouped according to the following points of view: distinction must be made (1) between the religious and moral conditions of the soul, and the divine moving cause that manifests itself in them; (2) between the beginning, the content, and the continuation of the new life, and the divine effects which correspond to it. These effects, as being mediated by the Word, are in this connection always to be understood from the point of view of effectual calling. Thus there results the following scheme: (1, a) Conversion: faith, repentance, love; (b) calling as regeneration; (2, a) calling as justification, and (b) as renovation; (3) as sanctification. It is evident that (1) and (2) entirely coincide as to time, while (3) follows them; likewise, that the elaboration of (2, b) and (3) belongs to the sphere of ethics. (R. SEEBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Wacker, *Die Heilsordnung*, Gütersloh, 1898; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, i. 362 sqq., 447 sqq., Berlin, 1854; Schröder, in *TSK*, 1857, part 3; H. Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche*, pp. 367 sqq., Elberfeld, 1861; Gennrich, in *TSK*, 1898, part 3; H. Schultz, in *TSK*, 1899, part 3, pp. 350 sqq. Where the subject is treated at all in English or American theology, it appears in the works on dogma or systematic theology under " Salvation."

ORDERICUS VITALIS: Monk and historian; b. at Atcham (4 m. s.e. of Shrewsbury), England, Feb. 16, 1075; d. probably on Feb. 3 of some year later than 1141. He was the son of a Norman-English priest named Odelerius; was sent when thirteen years of age to be trained for the monastic life at the monastery of St. Evroult in Normandy; he was ordained subdeacon 1091, deacon 1093, and priest 1107; attended possibly the Synod of Reims, 1119, and an assemblage of monks at Cluny, 1132. His significance depends upon his *Historia ecclesiastica*, in thirteen books, completed in 1141, and reaching from the first preaching of the Gospel to 1141. For the earlier parts the work has no independent value, the substance being derived from other authors. It is of value chiefly for the period following the Norman conquest. The style is somewhat florid and pedantic; but for his own period has interest for its detail and its first-hand views of things. A manuscript which is very possibly the autograph is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. The original edition was in A. Duchesne's *Historiæ Normannorum Scriptores*, pp. 319–925 (Paris, 1619), reproduced in *MPL*, clxxxviii.; other editions are: Bouquet, *Recueil*, vols. ix.–xi.; A. le Prévost, 5 vols., Paris, 1838–1855. A French transl. by L. Dubois (4 vols., Paris, 1825–27) and an Eng. transl. (in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library*, 4 vols., London, 1853–54) are accessible.

Bibliography: The chief source is his own work, principally (Prévost's ed.), ii. 300–302, 416–422, v. 133–136. Consult the *Notice* prefixed to vol. v. of Prévost's ed.; *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, xxxiv. 267–282, xxxvii. 491–494; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, ii. 111–116, London, 1846; T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue*, in *Rolls Series*, No. 26, ii. 211–223, ib. 1862–71; R. W. Church, *Life of St. Anselm*, chap. vi., ib. 1870; J. Tessier, *De Orderico Vitali*, Paris, 1872; F. A. Wichert, in *Forschungen zu deutschen Geschichte*, xii (1872), 57–112; Rioult de Neuville, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxi (1877), 173–184; E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iv. 495–500, Oxford, 1879; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 94, 636 et passim; *DNB*, xlii. 241–242.

ORDERS, HOLY: The usual term for the distinctions in rank and office among the clergy, also applied in the prelatical churches to the office and functions of the ministry. The term *ordo* was very early employed in the first sense; it occurs more than once in Tertullian, and was probably part of the recognized terminology before his time. For discussion of the separate orders see Acolyte; Bishop; Deacon; Organization of the Early Church; Ostiarius; Polity; and Presbyter; and for the "sacrament of orders" see Ordination. This article deals with the history and origin of the classification in general. At first no special stress was laid on an exact number or on a division into major and minor orders. Tertullian certainly knew other offices besides those of bishop, priest, and deacon, but it is impossible to determine exactly which they were. In the letters of Cornelius of Rome to Fabius the functionaries of the Roman Church include presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers; and there is evidence of the existence of all these but the last about the same time in Africa. The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions treats of the setting apart of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and readers only, although another part shows that the compiler was familiar with exorcists and singers as distinct official classes. But for a long time there was no settled number of orders; the functions which developed out of the necessities of church life took different forms in different places. Scholasticism undertook to systematize the matter. Peter Lombard regards the number seven and the division into two classes as settled, naming the presbyterate and diaconate as the only ones which existed in the primitive Church under explicit apostolic authority; according to him the episcopate is not a distinct order but "the name of a dignity and an office," subdivided into patriarchs, archbishops, metropolitans, and bishops. Thomas Aquinas agrees with him in substance, except that he numbers the subdiaconate among holy orders. The Council of Trent made the scholastic systematization a matter of faith, although some of the orders were no longer more than nominal, and nothing more than mere steps to the priesthood. In the Eastern Church (q.v.) the gradation of offices was not so systematically developed; the only ones to which significance is attached are the episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate.

(A. Hauck.)

In the Roman Catholic Church the orders are distinguished into major (priests, deacons, and subdeacons) and minor (acolytes, exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers). Some difference of opinion seems to exist as to whether bishops constitute a separate order, in which case bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons are the major orders (see Deacon, II., § 1). Admission to these orders is governed in each church by canonical regulations.

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, II., i. 1, III., i. 1–2; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, i. 1, pp. 281 sqq., Mainz, 1825; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, xi. 75 sqq., Leipsic, 1830; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 5 sqq., Berlin, 1869; G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 297–298, Regensburg, 1881; E. Friedberg, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 25 sqq., Leipsic, 1903.

ORDINAL: "A form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" added to the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal churches, not being, strictly speaking, a part thereof. It is translated and adapted from what among pre-Reformation books was called the Pontifical, a book containing services performed by a bishop. The first English ordinal was put forth in 1550, following the Prayer Book of 1549. It was somewhat revised in 1552, and again in 1662. The American ordinal dates from 1792. The Preface to the ordinal of 1550 (somewhat enlarged and strengthened in 1662 in view of the Presbyterian domination during the Commonwealth) declares that it is the intention of the Church of England to continue the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons maintained in the Church from the apostles' time (see Succession, Apostolic).

It was plainly the object of the compilers of the Anglican ordinal to retain all that was essential, according to Scriptural and primitive use, in the older offices, while aiming at greater simplicity (the Latin rites had become not only complicated but confused), and discarding several symbolical ceremonies which had gathered around and sometimes obscured the earlier and necessary forms. In all the early rites, according to L. Duchesne (*Christian Worship*, p. 377, London, 1904), " the ceremony of ordination consists especially of a prayer recited over the candidate in a public and solemn assembly. This prayer is accompanied by the imposition of hands." This solemn prayer is preceded in the English ordinal by an examination of the candidate in the presence of the people, with a challenge to any to object to the ordination of an unworthy man, by a bidding to prayer and the saying of the litany with special suffrages, by the invocation, in the case of the ordination of a priest or a bishop, of the Holy Spirit in the ancient hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*. The imposition of hands by the bishop is accompanied by an imperative formula: (1) " Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee; in the Name," etc. (2) " Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy Sacraments; in the Name," etc. (The American Book has an alternative formula: " Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful Dispenser, etc."). (3) " Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee," etc.

In the ordination of a priest, the attending priests unite with the bishop in the laying on of hands; in the consecration of a bishop three bishops concur. This is followed by the delivery of the New Testament to a deacon, of a Bible to a priest and to a bishop with an appropriate commission or charge. In the ordinal of 1550 the priest received with the Bible a chalice and bread, and the bishop with the Bible a pastoral staff. These relics of the *porrectio instrumentorum* (a comparatively late feature in the conferring of the holy—as distinct from the minor—orders) were dropped in 1552. The idea undoubtedly was to emphasize the supreme importance of the teaching office of the ministry, its prophetic and pastoral aspects having been overshadowed by an exaggerated stress laid on the sacerdotal side. But authority to minister the sacraments was explicitly conferred along with the preaching of the Word. For all these changes from the more elaborate rites ample sanction will be found in the earlier forms of ordination, such as those given in the Canons of Hippolytus, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Prayer Book of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt (q.v.).

The whole rite of ordination is interwoven, as of old, with the service of the holy communion, deacons being ordained between the Epistle and the Gospel (that one of them may exercise his prerogative of reading the appointed Gospel in its proper place), priests after the Gospel and bishops after the Creed. A. C. A. Hall.

Bibliography: L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: its Origin and Evolution*, chap. x., London, 1904; F. Proctor and W. H. Frere, *A New Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 648–673 et passim, ib. 1905; J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 32, 460, 657 sqq., New York, 1908.

ORDINARY: In canon law this expression denotes the bishop of the diocese as the ordinary judge, that is, the regular and customary possessor of jurisdiction within his diocese. In contradistinction to the ordinary are all those churchmen who are regularly in possession of jurisdiction, but only through a delegation of the power from the ordinary, such as the vicars-general and officials, also those who for especial reasons have been exceptionally summoned by the pope to the direction of the ecclesiastical affairs of a diocese, such as the coadjutors. All bishops are not ordinaries; for instance, the suffragan bishops, and especially all the so-called titular bishops. See Bishop; Bishop, Titular. E. Sehling.

ORDINATION: The solemn act by which men are set apart for the Christian ministry. The ordinance is differently understood in different branches of the Church and the manner of its administration varies. The Greek and Roman Catholic Churches hold ordination one of the seven sacraments (see Sacrament). The Council of Trent declared that by it " a character is imprinted which can neither be effaced nor taken away "; the words of the bishop, " Receive ye the Holy Ghost," impart this character; hence those who have once been duly ordained can never again become laymen (session xxiii., *Doctrina de sacramento ordinis*). The " character " is independent of the person or life of either ordinant or candidate, and, like baptism, ordination may not be repeated. To ordain belongs to the bishop and every bishop has the power; but in certain cases presbyters may ordain to the four minor orders (e.g., an abbot may ordain one already subject to him in his monastery). Every ordination by a properly ordained bishop is " valid " (*valida*), but that it be also " lawful " (*licita*) certain provisions of canon law must be complied with, e.g., the bishop must not be a heretic, a schismatic, or suspended, and must act within his competency. Hence ordination by Swedish, Danish, and Anglican bishops is not recognized by Rome. As to competency, the principle is that the candidate must be under the jurisdiction of the ordinant according to canon law. The bishop is bound to exclude the incompetent and unfit (see Irregularity), and to observe the rules as to rite, place, and time.

The Greek and Roman Catholic Churches.

The Anglican Churches.

In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, ordination has not the significance of a sacrament; the view of the English Reformers was not that the laying on of hands 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, however, was acknowledged by the Reformers of the Elizabethan period. The custom now prevails universally, of reordaining 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.

Other Protestant Churches.

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. xiv.), "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. Besides the laying on of hands it includes the Scripture lesson from I Tim. ii. and Acts xx., the pledge to evangelical ministration and conduct, and closes with the Eucharist. 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 while prayer is offered, and thus setting him apart for the ministry. The Moravians confine the right to ordain to their bishops, but recognize the ordination of other Protestant bodies as valid. The Disciples of Christ, Quakers, and Plymouth Brethren 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. See also CLERGY; LAYING ON OF HANDS; ORDERS, HOLY; also BISHOP; DEACON; EPISCOPACY; PRESBYTER; PRIEST; etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best single article is in *DCA*, ii. 1501–1520 (exhaustive); L. Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église*, 3 vols., Paris, 1725; E. Marténe, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, 3 vols., Antwerp, 1736–37; Bingham, *Origines*, book iv.; T. Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, vol. i., Schwerin, 1854; C. Hodge, *Discussions in Church Polity*, New York, 1878; G. Rietschel, *Luther und die Ordination*, Wittenberg, 1889; *KL*, ix. 1026–27; T. Kolde, in *TSK*, 1894.

ORDINATION CONTROVERSY. See KNIPSTRO, JOHANNES.

ORDING, JOHANNES: Norwegian theologian; b. at Drammen (22 m. s.w. of Christiania) Jan. 19, 1869. He was educated at the University of Christiania (B.A., 1886; candidate in theology, 1893); became chaplain at the Johannnes-Kirke, Christiania (1893); resigned to pursue studies in systematic theology (1900); competed in 1903 for the chair of systematic theology in the University of Christiania, but was rejected as being anticonfessional in his view of the sacraments, though his scholarship was regarded as superior; in a new competition he was successful because of the yielding of government and faculty (1906) in the "professor controversy" which raged over the appointment of men holding "anticonfessional" views to chairs in the university. The result was the retirement of Sigurd Vilhelm Odland (q.v.), with the formation of a new independent faculty. Ording is a conservative Ritschlian. His writings are contained in current theological journals.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

ORDO ROMANUS: In the ecclesiastical language of the Middle Ages, a directory of church rites, giving the order and arrangement of the different ceremonies, but not the liturgical text. By the twelfth or thirteenth century, the name *Ordo* began to be replaced in current usage by the term *Ceremoniale*, and is now applied only to a small book published each year for the clergy and others who recite the daily office, specifying the exact service for each day in the year. The ancient *ordines* extant are all of a more or less Roman character. The matter contained in them is now divided between the *Ceremoniale Romanum* and the *Ceremoniale episcoporum*. The former was drawn up in 1488 by Augustinus Patricius Piccolomini, but first printed at Venice in 1516; the latter was published in 1600 by Clement VIII., and enlarged later by Innocent X. and Benedict XIII. and XIV. The following is a list of the more important *ordines Romani*. (1) The so-called *Ordo Romanus vulgaris*, first published by G. Cassander (Cologne, 1559 and 1561); it contains the entire liturgy, and can hardly be older than the tenth century. (2) The fifteen *ordines* published by Mabillon in his *Museum Italicum* (vol. ii., Paris, 1689), and usually quoted by his numbers. The first six contain the pontifical mass, and are of different dates. Grisar and Probst ascribe no. 1 to the time of Gregory the Great, Duchesne to the ninth century; Amalarius of Metz comments on it about 830. The next five are decidedly later. No. 7 deals with baptism, nos. 8 and 9 with ordination; no. 10 combines a variety of different rites, such as the liturgy for the last three days of Holy Week, confession, visitation and communion of the sick, and extreme unction. No. 11 contains the papal liturgy for the whole year; it was drawn up before 1143 by Benedict, canon of St. Peter's, and adopted by Guido of Castello, later Celestine II. No. 12 was compiled by Cardinal Cencio de' Sabelli, later Honorius III., and contains the papal rites from Advent to Holy Cross Day, besides various papal functions, and the rites for the election and consecration of a pope and the coronation of an emperor. No. 13 was compiled by order of Gregory X. (1272); it deals with the election and with the functions of the pope, as does no. 14 in more detail; according to Mabillon this latter is to be ascribed to Cardinal James Cajetan (first half of the fourteenth century). No. 15, covering the ceremonies of the entire ecclesiastical year, was compiled by Peter Amelius, bishop of Sinigaglia (d. 1398). (3) Besides these, Duchesne has published a number of other important *ordines*, including nine out of a Parisian manuscript of about 800 (*Origines du culte chrétien*, 2d ed., Paris, 1898, pp. 439–471); and others are found in M. Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris liturgiæ Alemanniæ* (4 parts, St. Blaise, 1777–79), and E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus* (3 vols., Rouen, 1700–02) and *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* (5 vols., Paris, 1717).

(P. DREWS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: V. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, i. 41–44, Freiburg, 1883; F. Probst, *Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien und Ordines*, pp. 386–422, Münster, 1892; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, pp. 146–150, Paris, 1903; G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, i. 346–347, Berlin, 1900; Meckel, in *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1862, pp. 50–83; Grisar, in *ZKT*, ix (1885), 409–421 x (1886), 727 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 1027–42.

OREGLIA, o-rê'gli-ā, **DI SANTO STEFANO, LUIGI:** Cardinal; b. at Bene Vagienna (55 m. n.w. of Genoa), Piedmont, July 9, 1828. He was educated at the Jesuit college in Turin and at the Accademia dei nobili ecclesiastici, Rome, and, after being canon in the Lateran and domestic prelate, was appointed referendary of the Segnatura in 1858. Later sent to Holland as internuncio, he was consecrated titular archbishop of Damiathis in 1866, and was papal nuncio at Brussels and Lisbon successively. In 1873 he was created cardinal priest of Santa Anastasia, and after being prefect of the Congregation of Indulgences for several years, became chamberlain of the Holy Roman Church in 1885. In 1884 he became cardinal bishop of the suburbicary see of Palæstrina, and is also commendatory abbot of Santi Vincenzo ed Anastasio. From 1889 to 1896 he was subdean of the College of Cardinals and suburbicary bishop of Porto and Santa Rufina, which he exchanged in 1896 for Ostia and Velletri, when he was promoted to be dean of the College of Cardinals. As chamberlain of the Holy Roman Church, he is also archchancellor of the Roman University and presides over the Congregation of Rites.

ORELLI, HANS CONRAD VON: Swiss Protestant; b. at Zurich Jan. 25, 1846. He was educated at the universities of Lausanne, Zurich, Erlangen, Tübingen, and Leipsic; was chaplain at the Zurich orphan asylum for two years (1869–71); became privat-docent at the University of Basel (1871); associate professor of Old Testament, the history of religion, and Arabic (1873), and full professor (1881). He served as president of the international congress of religions at Basel, 1907. He has written *Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit* (Leipsic, 1871); *Durchs heilige Land, Tagebuchblätter* (Basel, 1878); *Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches* (Vienna, 1882; Eng. transl. under the title of *The Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom traced in its Historical Development*, Edinburgh, 1885); *Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia* (Nördlingen, 1887; Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1889); *Das Buch Ezechiel und die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1888); contributed the part on *Theologie des Alten Testaments* to *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, 3d ed., Munich, 1889; *Christus und andere Meister* (Basel, 1893); *Handbuch der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte* (Bonn, 1899); *La Valeur religieuse de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris, 1905); *Die Eigenart der biblischen Religion* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1906); and *Der Knecht Jahve's im Jesajabuche* (1908); and translated into German J. Robertson's *Early Religion of Israel* as *Die alte Religion Israels* (Stuttgart, 1896). He has likewise contributed a large number of articles to the Hauck-Herzog *RE*, and since 1881 has been the editor of the conservative *Kirchenfreund.*

ORGAN.

Early History (§ 1).
The Organ in Roman Catholic Churches (§ 2).
The Organ in Protestant Churches (§ 3).
Organists and Composers (§ 4).
The Modernizing of Organ-Style (§ 5).

1. Early History.

The organ, as treated in this article, is a musical wind instrument used in religious worship. The term organ, from the Greek *organon*, was at first applied to instruments of all kinds, then was restricted to musical instruments, and finally came to apply (according to the description of Cassiodorus, 489–570) to an instrument of at most ten pipes pitched according to the tones of the diatonic scale. The inventor is given by Tertullian (*De anima*, xiv.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 193–194) as Archimedes (d. 212 B.C.), but by Vitruvius and Pliny as Ctesibius (d. 170 B.C.). Because the organ was a means of enjoyment by society in general, its use was rejected in early Christian circles. Smaller organs were at first employed before singing classes, especially in cloisters, to fix the correct tone, and the first large organ of which there is certain knowledge was that erected under Charlemagne in the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle. The first organ enlarged to eight chromatic keys, besides fourteen diatonic, belongs probably to the thirteenth century, and the addition of the pedal, about 1426, marked an important advance. It was used in the churches, first, to give the key-tone, then to accompany vocal music alternatively, and finally, also to prefix a prelude to the hymn. The accompaniment of the organ contributed especially, in great songs of thanksgiving, to the festal effect.

2. The Organ in Roman Catholic Churches.

At the Councils of Constance (1414) and Basel (1431) the *Te Deum* was sung with organ accompaniment. It was an abuse when whole passages of the mass were taken from the singers and assigned to the organ, whether to relieve the former or to supply their place when absent; or when the organ interrupted the chanting priest, in order to shorten the mass, and thus deprived it of long passages, such as the *Credo*, *Præfatio*, and the *Pater Noster*. (For examples and citations cf. G. Rietschel, *Die Aufgabe der Orgel*, pp. 11 sqq., Leipsic, 1893). Sebaldus Grave of Nördlingen, in 1474, was required "to play the organ at St. Jürgen with godly zeal at all weddings and feasts, and, when ordered, at mass and vespers and at other times." To arrest its excessive use, a series of synods were forced to take steps against the undue preponderance of the organ (Treves, 1549; Augsburg, 1567; Roermund, 1570; Thorn, 1600; and others). The directions of the *Cæremoniale* of 1600 must be taken as concessions to the use of the organ, which had indeed become widely established. These regulations permitted the employment of the organ in the rendition of various chants of the mass (e.g., in the litany, the *Christe Eleison*, the *Gloria in excelsis*, and others). In a strict sense of the term, the organ neither was nor is now regarded as a necessary liturgical instrument; but as an auxiliary of liturgical song it has its place in public worship just so far as this requires. As an instrument for artistic music, whether alone or in combination with technical choral music, it is subject to the same restrictions as the music of the Mass (q.v.).

According to the Evangelical view also, the organ is not a strictly liturgical instrument, and is not essential. As artistic culture, organ music is for the Evangelical conception on the same plane as technical church music or indeed as art in general;

3. The Organ in Protestant Churches.

it is to be admitted as a welcome addition to divine service just so far as it does not displace the preaching of the Gospel from the central place in the divine service, and does not divert the attention from the worship but rather stimulates attention to it. Hence the opposition of the Reformers, even of Luther himself in the beginning, because the danger of abuse outweighed the advantages (cf. G. Rietschel, ut sup., pp. 17, 18). The organ first came into close connection with the worship of the Evangelical Church as the leader of congregational singing, musically styled as the choral devotions. However, this connection also is an actual not an essential or necessary one, being due to practical needs and resulting from expediency. In fact, the Evangelical service was long carried on without the organ, not only in the Reformed Church but for more than a century in the Lutheran Church. Congregational singing was under the direction of the choirmaster and his pupils without the accompaniment of the organ. The custom of organ accompaniment did not become general until the eighteenth century (for instances, cf. G. Rietschel, ut sup., pp. 46 sqq.).

This use of the organ became a necessity only when the number of melodies increased to such an extent that the congregation could not know them all familiarly, and when the first enthusiasm of the earliest Evangelical singing had abated, so that it required more aid than was afforded by the choir. The first organ choir-book for choir accompaniment to congregational singing, or organ alone, is the *Tabulaturbuch* of Samuel Scheidt (Halle, 1650), which does not indeed presuppose congregational singing with an organ accompaniment, but prepares the way. At first the organ only accompanied the singing of the congregation for a few lines and then stopped when the song was under way. Later, on account of confusion, the organ was allowed to accompany the whole hymn, and finally, the instrument completely overshadowed the congregational song. The latter was robbed of its original rhythm; the continuity of the melody was broken by interludes between the verses, and congregational singing was, so to speak, absorbed in the organ music. These abuses rather than the employment of art and musical instruments in public worship must be regarded as the occasion for the opposition from influential sources. Its misuse, however, is not a necessary corollary of organ accompaniment. The organ is not only an auxiliary to congregational singing, but also the normally evolved means for shaping and reinforcing the devotions. It gathers the voices of the multitudes into unison, harmonizes the music with environment and season, and by modulation of pause and cadence, it sways the waves of devotion so as to be deeply impressive. It must prepare the congregation for the hymn that is to be sung and incline it to devotion by the overture or prelude; it must integrate the choral prayer of the congregation with the rest of the service by the interlude, and bring the awakened spirit of worship to a fitting cadence by the postlude. A multiplicity of artistic forms are at the disposal of the instrument; such as prelude, motet, figuration, fantasia, and fugue.

4. Organists and Composers.

The adaptation of the organ to sacred music, which may be regarded as at once the supreme spiritualization and idealization of organ-music, is the work and also the characteristic distinction of the classical German organ-masters, whose great teacher was Jan Pieterszon Sweelinck (1562–1621), while the greatest classic composer is Johann Sebastian Bach (q.v.). Mention may be made of Sweelinck's pupils, Jacob Prätorius of Hamburg (d. 1651), Heinrich Scheidemann in Hamburg (d. 1663), Samuel Scheidt in Halle (1587–1654), the author of the *Tabulaturbuch* of 1650 (ut sup.), who was the pioneer in the adaptation of choral music to the organ. He was followed in this direction by Strunck, Theile, Alberti, Jan Reinken (1623–1722), Dietrich Buxtehude (1637–1707), and, lastly, Johann Pachelbel (1653–1706), who combined the inclination to grace and smoothness inherited from the South Germans with the stricter forms of the North Germans. Bach made the choral with all its liturgical bearings the subject of a pure, artistic transfiguration; he looked upon the song of the congregation as a fair gift of nature for his art. This itself was art for the organ in the highest sense of the word; he thought and composed, moved by the very soul of the organ which lent speech to his creative fancy. He possessed an easy command of all its forms and filled them with his individuality. His style, though firmly founded on tradition, bears everywhere the stamp of his personality; it is his own style throughout, truly and genuinely Protestant.

5. The Modernizing of Organ Style.

The succeeding age has softened and modernized this style in connection with the technical development of organ-building, which has made the instrument more flexible and so has withdrawn it from its narrow isolation. In the eighteenth century the organ learned to speak the language of Mozart, in the nineteenth that of Mendelssohn, and in the twentieth, it even begins to assimilate the elaborate coloring of the music of Wagner and Liszt. The modernization of organ-style is involved with the question of music in general and esthetics, and no objection can be raised so long as the demands made on religious music by the Church are duly regarded. Congregational adaptability, as it increases in appreciation, will appropriate every advance that makes for edification. However, organ style must continue consistent with the essential quality of the instrument itself. Organ music must observe the limits set by the nature of the instrument; it should not, for example, invade the domain of the voice, the piano, or orchestra. In such case it would always be inferior to the instrument which it imitates; and, at the same time, sacrifice its own peculiar power and artistic value. It would be artistically false, and what is false in art is not permissible in liturgy. On the other hand, not everything artistically true is at the same time suitable for public worship, so that organ music may be correct in style and adapted to the instrument, yet not be liturgical in the proper sense. In addition, therefore, the organ style must bear the stamp of church music and clearly show its relation to the congregational hymn, to the reinforcement of which it owes its place in worship. To the extent that it is based on this and inspired by it, and recognizes its function of artistic exposition and glorification, organ music proves itself indeed a homogeneous element of Evangelical worship.

(H. A. Köstlin†.)

Bibliography: A. G. Ritter, *Zur Geschichte des Orgelspiels*, Leipsic, 1884; J. W. Warman, *The Organ*, London, 1884; E. J. Hopkins, *The Organ, its History and Construction*, London, 1887; U. Kornmüller, *Die alten Musiktheoretiker*, Regensburg, 1887; J. H. Seidel, *Die Orgel und ihr Bau*, Dresden, 1887; H. V. Couwenbergh, *L'Orgue ancien et moderne*, Lierre, 1888; G. Rietschel, *Die Aufgabe der Orgel im evangelischen Gottesdienst*, Leipsic, 1894; Frenzel, *Die Orgel und ihre Meister*, Dresden, 1899; A. Pirro, *J. S. Bach and his Works for the Organ*, New York, 1902; H. C. Lahee, *The Organ and its Masters*, Boston, 1903; C. F. A. Williams, *The Story of the Organ*, 1903; idem, *The Story of Organ Music*, London, 1905.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

- I. Jewish Christianity.
  - Ecclesiastical and New-Testament Conceptions (§ 1).
  - Classes of Believers; the Titles Used (§ 2).
  - The Term Church and its Implicates (§ 3).
  - Officers and their Functions (§ 4).
  - The Mother Church; the Deacons (§ 5).
  - Monarchical Episcopate Foreshadowed (§ 6).
- II. Gentile Christianity.
  - Factors Influencing Organization (§ 1).
  - Independence of Local Communities (§ 2).
  - New-Testament Indications, 69–138 A.D. (§ 3).
  - Clement, Hermas, the Didache, and Polycarp (§ 4).
  - The Monarchical Episcopate and Other Offices (§ 5).
  - Causes of the Episcopate (§ 6).
  - Distinction Between Clergy and Laity (§ 7).
  - Distinctions Within the Clergy (§ 8).
  - Development of Ecclesiastical Law (§ 9).
  - Ecclesiastical Provinces (§ 10).

1. Ecclesiastical and New-Testament Conceptions.

I. Jewish Christianity: In no other field of Church history is the contrast between the confessional and the historical view so great as in all that relates to the constitution of the ancient Church. According to Roman Catholic teaching, while Christ founded the Church, Peter was placed at the head of it. Depending on Peter was the ruling apostolate, which was continued in the episcopate, just as the primacy was continued in the successors of Peter. In both Calvinism and Lutheranism the position was held that the Church was the intentional and direct foundation of Christ. These conceptions are opposed to the entire historic development of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age. They stand or fall with the historicity of certain passages in the New Testament, notably some in the Gospel of St. Matthew, which historical criticism compels to regard as later additions. The fact remains that the disciples and the faithful founded the Church and that the Twelve were appointed by Jesus to spread his teachings and to act as the future judges of the twelve tribes of Israel. But nothing was due to a preconsidered plan. What took place was the outgrowth of temporal conditions and proceeded from the fraternal community of men who, through Jesus, had found God. In this brotherhood with its belief in God and with its tradition of a Jewish theocracy is found the seed from which the Church developed.

2. Classes of Believers; the Titles Used.

As to the point of departure for the development of Christian institutional life, the situation is as follows: After Jesus had drawn to him the original four disciples, there assembled about him a larger and a narrower circle of adherents, viz., disciples and the twelve apostles. This last class, perhaps also the Seventy, during his lifetime he sent abroad to teach and to heal in his name. At the time of receiving this mission they had not, perhaps, the name of apostle. They realized that they were apostles first when Peter and they along with him recognized their teacher as their heavenly Lord and were conscious of receiving from him, through the Holy Ghost, the direction to preach his word. When Jesus' adherents had assembled in Jerusalem after his passion there were three distinct classes mentioned in the early records of the Church. (1) The Twelve; or rather the Eleven, increased by election to Twelve (Acts 1–15), who were regarded as the foundation of his followers because they had been selected by Jesus himself to be the future rulers of the kingdom of the Messiah (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 28–30). (2) The apostles, or the missionaries, to which general class also the Twelve belonged. (3) The other disciples of both sexes (Acts ix. 36). Most prominent among these were the original disciples (Acts xxi. 16) and especially the brothers of Jesus at whose head stood James (Acts i. 14). The Twelve were rulers in the Messianic kingdom and at the same time missionaries. The term "disciple" did not last long, for personal discipleship depended on the actual presence of Jesus. Converts from paganism hardly use the term at all and Paul never employed it as a designation of Christians in general. "Disciple" gradually became limited to the Twelve and to those who had personally seen the Lord. The Twelve, the Apostles, and the rest formed in Jerusalem the Messianic community of Jesus. They were a band of Jews, distinguished from their fellow countrymen only by their recognition of the fact that they already knew the Messiah and were expecting his future coming after a short interval. The followers of Christ tended to separate themselves from the Jews by their insistence on the teaching and commandments of Jesus, and by their confidence that they were sharers in the gift of the Holy Spirit. While they were called in scorn, "Galileans," "Nazarenes," and "the poor," they called themselves the "people of God," "the seed of Abraham," "the elect people," "the twelve tribes." In place of the term disciple, the words believer, saints, the brethren, the Church, came into use. All of these can be shown to be Jewish in origin. Believers in Christ called themselves saints, because they had been made holy by baptism in the Holy Ghost. They had practical attestation of this in the charisms (see CHARISMATA), wonders, and signs accomplished through them. The epistle to the Ephesians (iii. 5) speaks of "holy apostles." The name brother goes back to the teaching of Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 8). It is found also in connection with the words "in the Lord," and Jesus desired to include himself among the brethren (Matt. xii. 48; Rom. viii. 29). In the third century the general use of the term fell gradually into abeyance. It no longer described actual conditions, and was finally reserved for special classes of Christians, particularly for the clergy.

3. The Term Church and its Implicates.

The term "Church" was in existence at the time of Paul's conversion, though it probably does not go back to Jesus, notwithstanding Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17; it is found in the early chapters of the Acts (v. 11, viii. 1). The Jewish equivalent is *ḳahal*, "assembly," translated in the Septuagint by the Greek word *ekklēsia* (see Church, the Christian, I.). In daily use the Jews, at the time of Christ, employed the word "synagogue" more often than *ecclesia*. The employment of this word by the Christians made it unnecessary for them to take over the term synagogue. The term *ecclesia* put the brand of newness upon the community and at the same time gave it significance as a realization of an old ideal. It indicated, too, a practical separation from Judaism. It helped the spread of the Church among the heathen Christians, enabling them to distinguish by the existence of this terminology their teaching from the Law of Moses. An authoritative element did not originally inhere in the word "Church"; indeed, as a spiritual fact, representing an ideal-actual community, it concealed it. The Church took preeminence over the individual, it had its own ordinances, its particular powers and organization. How early judicial authority was associated with the individual community is shown by Matt. xviii. 17, and in I Tim. iii. 15 occurs the classical passage "the house of God which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." As early as Tertullian occurs the expression "mother Church" (*Ad martyras*, i.). Most important in this connection were St. Paul's speculations connecting the Church with Christ. The conception is well summed up by Tertullian in the following words: "In a company of two is the Church; but the Church is truly Christ. When, then, you cast yourself at the brethren's knees, you are handling Christ, you are entreating Christ" (*De pœnitentia*, x.; *ANF*, iii. 664). The concrete nature of the community is found in the idea of fellowship (Acts ii. 42; Gal. ii. 9) expressed in a common meal. Decisions on important questions lay with the ecclesia (cf. Acts xv., an assembly which is very wrongly called "The Council of the Apostles"). The records do not show whether there was a regular meeting of this body; what was the exact position of the apostles in it, or how their functions as members were differentiated from those of the "elders." The formula used by Luke (Acts xv. 22, 28) implies that the assemblage regarded itself as the organ of the Holy Spirit. The ordinary method of procedure was that the Apostles and elders proposed measures and the community either accepted or rejected them (Acts iv. 32, vi. 2, 5, xv. 12, 30, xxi. 22). At first Christian teachers and disciples living in the community were organized almost like a family, the true Israel in the midst of whom the Lord was soon to appear. This community accepted originally the obligations of the Jewish law; but when a conflict arose they had to reject the authority of the spiritual court at Jerusalem (Acts v. 29). The commandments of Jesus held the first place along with the directions of the Holy Spirit. In addition to these two authorities and that of the Old Testament there was the authority of the Twelve under the leadership of Peter. This showed itself chiefly in the forgiveness of sins, and to it was joined judicial powers of punishment, the classical example being Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1 sqq.). But the community might use disciplinary measures as well as the Apostles (Matt. xviii. 15). The transformation of the Jewish synagogue into the ecclesia of God directed its policy and laid the foundation of its specific rules and laws. How far a new construction was organized appears from the account in Acts of the life of the early Christian community which extended the principles of brotherhood even to an economic conclusion. But it is a mistake to picture the Christian community of this period as a union of communistic Quakers. The possession of the Judaic law, the ideals of the Messianic kingdom, the prerogatives of the Twelve, and the power of the infallible community placed strict limitations on the free activity of the individual, on his independence and equality.

4. Officers and their Functions.

In addition to the Twelve and the Apostolate, there were associated with the last from early times professional prophets and teachers. "God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers" (I Cor. xii. 28; cf. Eph. iv. 11). These three constituted a unity because they all were entrusted with speaking the Word of God. Along with the Apostles, who were in the habit of doing their missionary work two by two (Peter and John, Barnabas and Paul, Barnabas and Mark, Paul and Silas, Timothy and Silas, Timothy and Erastus, Mark vi. 7; Luke x. 1; Acts xix. 22), were the prophets, whose work was sometimes given to particular communities, sometimes more general (Matt. x. 41; Acts xi. 27, xxi. 10). The teachers seem to have been connected with special communities (Acts xiii. 1; Didache xi.). All of these were charismatic, their call rested on an impartation of the Spirit; but it also depended on the recognition of the community. The Apostles seem to have depended for each missionary journey on a special commission. When the commission was fulfilled, the Apostle might become again a teacher or a prophet. Taken strictly, he is an Apostle only to those for whom he has received a commission; "apostle of the circumcision," "apostle of the Gentiles" (I Cor. ix. 2; Gal. ii.; Rom. xi. 13). The classical passage is Acts xiii. 1–2. The appointment for services in the community followed after prayer and fasting by the laying on of hands (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; I Tim. iv. 14; II Tim. i. 6). The laying on of hands was not simply a symbolical act; it was the imparting of the charisma necessary for the office. The function of laying on of hands was undertaken not only by the Twelve (Acts vi. 6), but also by individual communities (I Tim. iv.

14), by Apostles and missionaries (I Tim. v. 22; II Tim. i. 6), or Apostles and communities cooperated together.

5. The Mother Church; the Deacons.

As to the position of the Mother Church in Jerusalem toward the Judaistic daughter churches, the records are too meager to admit of a definite conclusion. It is as often associated with as distinguished from subordinate communities (Gal. i. 22; I Thess. ii. 14; Acts xi. 1, 29, xv. 1). Jerusalem was regarded as the central point. It was called by Palestinian Christians "the holy city" (Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53). It is significant that the Church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to control the heathen Christian organization at Antioch (Acts xi. 22), that Silas and Judas were sent there (Acts xv. 22–32), that Peter proceeds there (Gal. ii. 11), as well as messengers from James (Gal. ii. 12), that the diaspora was controlled by Jerusalem Christians, and finally that the so-called Council of the Apostles—in reality the community of Jerusalem—took action for all the Jewish communities. Paul's relation to it must also be taken into account; not only his care for sending collections to it, but also his desire to have its recognition. It is remarkable how the Galilean Christians fall into the background. The transition from Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida to Jerusalem marks a new evolution in the ancient history of the Church, and is undoubtedly connected with the birth of legend, the rise of the Infancy Gospels, and the transference of the appearances of the risen Lord from Galilee to Jerusalem. As to the appointment of the seven deacons and causes given for it in Acts vi., a number of ambiguities arise. The Seven, as their names indicate, were probably Hellenists; but were they appointed solely for the Hellenist widows, or for other widows? Were their economic occupations a novelty? Besides, they disappear from view in a curious way; that is, all with the exception of Stephen, the "miracle worker," and the first martyr. A diaconate, in the later sense, their office was not, for the deacon's was no independent position; they rather resembled bishops than deacons. It is possible to see in them Hellenist rivals of the Twelve. It is remarkable that the persecution directed against Stephen did not involve the Twelve (Acts viii. 1).

6. Monarchical Episcopate Foreshadowed.

According to an old tradition the Twelve remained twelve years in Jerusalem. They scattered on account of the persecution of Herod to which James, the son of Zebedee, fell a victim. This led to a total change in the Jerusalem community. In place of a government through the Twelve, there came into prominence James, the brother of the Lord. Acts does not mark the steps in this development; but it gives him preeminence (xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18). This marks the decline of the pneumatic, Messianic conception; yet during the presence of members of the Twelve at Jerusalem their authority was not impaired (Gal. ii.; Acts xv., xxi.). The new order has three significant characteristics: (1) The relatives of Jesus came into prominence. After the death of James a cousin of Jesus, Symeon, was chosen his successor (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xi.; *ANF*, 2 ser. i. 146). The early lists of the bishops at Jerusalem are probably lists of the relatives of Jesus. (2) The disappearance of the pneumatic, Messianic element. (3) The influence of distinctly Jewish precedents. The original Twelve may have died, or they may have been engaged in missionary activity, or the relatives of Jesus may have been regarded as their rivals. The prominence of the relatives of Jesus would naturally be due to their position as members of the house of David. The new constitution there with James at its head and twelve (?) presbyters under him seems to give James the position of high priest and to put elders in the place of a sanhedrin. The position of James was peculiar. Heathen Christian tradition names him as the first bishop of Jerusalem, appointed by Christ and by the Apostles. Undoubtedly he and his followers exercised a monarchical power. It is not likely, however, that James used the title of bishop, for it has not a Judaistic origin. In the Clementines the exalted position of James is a later exaggeration. The idea and realization of a monarchical episcopate under the Jewish Christians first comes into existence, then, in the person of James. Perhaps Matt. xvi. 18 is the protest of Palestinian Christians, who did not accept him. The original persecutions allowed the Church to continue in existence at Jerusalem. The first sharp persecution was under Herod, in 42 A.D. No great agitation against Jerusalem Christians took place until the execution of James and the great uprising against Rome. This last changed the situation. The Jewish communities became active against the whole Christian diaspora. Symeon, the successor of James, was a martyr. In the second century, by the second destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian, Jewish Christianity lost its position of centrality, and existed only as single communities and groups of communities.

II. Gentile Christianity:

1. Factors Influencing Organization.

Turning the attention now to the position of Christianity under the heathen, the complexity of the situation is increased by the tendency to bring in, in connection with church organization and constitution, family customs, the social and religious clubs, and school, city and provincial organizations. All of these elements must have influenced the development of Christian institutions. The Christian community was built out of elements with definite, previously existing social characteristics. Considerable tension between the parts was to be expected. Thus one might have looked for antagonism between a central and local authority, between spirit and office, between charisma and canon, among individuals, among those claiming spiritual gifts, among those occupying ecclesiastical position, and finally, between the lay and the clerical elements, between an ecclesiastical democracy and an ecclesiastical aristocracy. As initial factors in early organization must be considered, first, the authority of those speaking the Word of God, apostles, prophets, teachers; the authority of the elders over against younger members; the distinction between officials appointed with administrative and with executive power. The Christian communities of the Diaspora developed, either as offshoots from synagogues, or from being founded by Jewish proselytes. They follow the order of synagogue usages. The reading of the Old Testament was not the only reminiscence of the synagogue. The Acts in many passages shows how, at the beginning, women such as Priscilla, Lydia, and Phœbe were important in the life of the Church.

2. Independence of Local Communities.

The impressions derived from the epistles of Paul suggest the independence of each community. In them individuals either with local honorary titles or with official positions were subordinate. The communities were directly under the apostles who founded them. The whole Christian community was pictured in each of its parts. The ideal unity lies in the work of the Holy Spirit (Acts xv.). The way the disciplinary case at Corinth was handled by Paul is a crucial example. He and the community acted together, there is no question of special officials. Early terminology shows the same result—" the Church of God abiding in the city " (cf. I Clement i.; and the salutations with which Polycarp begins his epistle). Each community is part of an organism belonging to heaven, for the time being dwelling on earth: " The Churches of God, when carefully contrasted with the assemblies of the districts in which they are situated, are as beacons in the world " (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 29; *ANF*, iv. 476). The importance of the spiritual democracy is seen in Paul's epistles. The part represents the whole. What concerns one community concerns all. The identity of the local with the universal was encouraged by the preeminence given to the apostle who belonged to the whole church. Paul is to the several communities their teacher and father (I Cor. iv. 17, vii. 17, xiv. 37). But I Cor. xii.–xiv. is the clearest proof that the charismata are the decisive factors. What is reported of local authorities is different in different places. According to Acts presbyters were ordained by Paul and Barnabas (xiv. 23), and called together and warned to shepherd the Church of God. In I Thess. v. 12, Paul asks the community " to know them that labor among you, and are over you in the Lord and admonish you," and the following verses seem to be directed to these persons. In Galatians a local office is not mentioned, and the same holds good of Corinthians where, from the contents of the letter, mention of such an office seems to be expected. Along with apostles, prophets, and teachers are mentioned certain charisms and after them helps and governments. The same is true of Romans where organization comes into being through the charismata—among them are named prophecy, ministry, teaching, showing mercy, and ruling (xii. 6 sqq.). A certain Phœbe is mentioned as deaconess (xvi.), and different house communities are mentioned (xvi. 3 sqq.). In Colossians the community is directed to say to Archippus, " take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it " (iv. 17). The word ministry may signify a part in the worship of the community. In Ephesians, a circular letter, the whole community is spoken of as being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets (ii. 20, iii. 5) and a local office is mentioned and connected with apostles, prophets, and teachers—pastors and evangelists find a place in this list (iv. 11.; cf. Acts. xi. 8; II Tim. iv. 5; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxvii.), the last being missionaries whose activity is purely local and who therefore can not claim the name of Apostle. Philippians is remarkable because its address contains the words bishops and deacons as the letter returns thanks for an offering (i. 1). Their office was probably connected with this act; the deacons have no accompanying genitive and there is no article, facts which point to an administrative position (see Deacon). The same must be said of the word " bishop " (see Episcopacy; Polity). Its significance is as ambiguous as that of presbyter, which may distinguish the elder from the younger, may be a title of honor signifying some special authority, personal or otherwise, or may indicate membership of a council, and be either of Jewish or autonomous origin (see Presbyter). The word bishop may be due to the usage of the Septuagint. It signifies overseer or superintendent. The object of oversight is uncertain, it may be souls (I Pet. ii. 25), or the church (Acts xx. 28). It may mean oversight of economic or natural objects. The troubles related in II Corinthians do not indicate any tension between a local and the universal apostolic organization. It refers only to the operation of a clique grouping itself around different apostles.

3. New-Testament Indications, 69–138 A.D.

The records extending from the time of Vespasian to that of Hadrian begin with I Pet. iv. 10–11: " As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth." Here organization is founded on the charisma, which itself constitutes a ministry. Later the author addresses the presbyters, calling himself a fellow presbyter (v. 1–2), who are opposed to the " younger " (v. 5), but the presbyters do not include all of those over a certain age, they are officials limited in number with the functions of pastors and duty of being examples to the flock (v. 2–3). This indicates a local office and in this light the stress laid on charismata in chap. iv. is remarkable. In James v. 14 presbyters of the Church are mentioned in connection with praying over and anointing the sick, while chap. iii. warns against multiplicity of masters. In the Epistle to the Hebrews presbyters are not mentioned but officers are, the general term used being *hegoumenoi*, which also occurs in Acts (xv. 22) as a designation of prophets (Heb. xiii. 17); possibly Heb. xiii. 7 refers to the apostles Peter and Paul. In the Apocalypse twenty-four presbyters are mentioned (chap. iv.) and a prophetess is named in Thyatira (ii. 20) but no local officer. The angels of the communities are not to be explained as bishops. The writer of the work appears as a superintendent of the communities. Twelve apostles are mentioned, also false apostles (ii. 2), and a reader in each community (i. 3). The author of the three Johannine letters appears as a superintendent calling himself in II and III John *presbyteros*. He administers by letters and emissaries many communities as their head. He is strongly opposed and some of his adherents are excommunicated. The opposition comes from a man who loveth to have the preeminence, in other words, a local pastor. Demetrius seems to be a colleague of the person addressed in the letter. There is obviously a conflict here between the spiritual universal missionary organization and the local one (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives*, xlii., for an account of John's activity in appointing bishops, pacifying churches, and founding a ministry on his missionary journeys). In the Gospel apostles are warned against ambition (xiii. 13 sqq.) and there is a passage mentioning the bestowal on Peter of a universal pastoral office (xxi. 15 sqq.). The Pastoral Epistles show Titus and Timothy as representatives of the Apostles, they guard the teaching, they appoint officers and shepherd the communities. In Titus, the elders, both men and women, seem to have an official position (ii. 2 sqq.), presbyters are mentioned and their qualifications, and then follow at length the qualifications of a bishop (i. 5 sqq.); probably this is an interpolation, if so it refers to a monarchical bishop. In I Tim. v. elders, both men and women, young men and women, and widows in two classes, are carefully distinguished. Mention is made of presbyters; there is a long passage (iii. 1–13) discussing the qualifications of bishops and deacons introduced by the words "if any one desire the office of a bishop he desires a good work." The similarity with the passages in Titus suggests doubts as to the genuineness of both passages.

4. Clement, Hermas, the Didache and Polycarp.

The First Epistle of Clement gives detailed references to the organization of the Church at the period it was composed. It is all the more valuable because it comes from Rome and because it can be certainly dated. The occasion of the letter was trouble in the Corinthian community, a revolt of the younger elements against the older. The facts are as follows: The community is divided into presbyters and the younger element; those who lead are taken from the presbyters, *hegoumenoi*, *prohegoumenoi* (i. 3, iii. 3, xxi. 6) under these leaders. The letter from chap. xl. on is specially directed to those who conduct worship. These the author calls three times bishops and deacons. Their office is called *episkopē*. They are appointed officials, admitted with the approval of the whole community. The function of the *episkopē* is primarily and essentially divine worship; to offer the gifts, to read the liturgies (xl. 2, xliv. 4). These officials also have the title of presbyter. Despite the significance of their position, the power belongs finally to the community ("to do whatever the majority commands," liv.). The author of the letter writes in the name of the Roman community. Those whom it sends to Corinth are not mentioned as clerical personages. From this it follows that the bishops and deacons, who are constantly named together and who have the common functions of the *episkopē* or liturgy, belong, probably as appointed presbyters, to those who are called "leaders." It does not follow, however, that the ministers of public worship are alone the "leaders." In addition to these facts Clement's Epistle adds theories and historical statements in relation to public worship. It connects Christian usages with the Old-Testament regulation of worship. The letter states that the appointment of bishops and deacons is prophesied in the Old Testament. It declares that the Apostles are sent from Christ, just as Christ was sent from God. It also asserts that our Apostles (i.e., Peter and Paul) had revealed to them that there would arise a difficulty over the *episkopē* and for that reason they provided after their death that other approved men should undertake their services. The Epistle of Clement leaves the question of a monarchical episcopate at Rome open, but this possibility is excluded by Hermas, who also wrote in Rome and whose work must be dated in the course of the third decade of the second century. Hermas keeps in view not a local community, but the whole community of Christians. In his foreground stand apostles and teachers, belonging to a preceding generation, some of whom, however, are still alive. In the universal organization of the Church his order gives apostles, bishops, teachers, deacons. Bishops and deacons are associated together and their chief duty is caring for widows and orphans and the poor. Their service is called *diakonia* and *leitourgia*. Vision II., ii. 6 speaks of those who preside over the Church, who are also called "those who occupy the first seats," which means, all of those, whether they are prophets or teachers, to whom the community stands in the relation of receiving instruction. Precedence, as such, the author does not disapprove, his frown is only for those who are emulous concerning the first places and concerning fame and as fools indulge in rivalry (Similitude VIII., vii. 4; *ANF*, ii. 42). This throws an important light on the organization of a monarchical episcopate. Hermas mentions presbyters in two places (Vision II., iv. 2, III., i.)—presbyters who rule over the Church, and he asserts that there are worthier persons in the Church than presbyters, namely, martyrs. The relation of these two groups remains uncertain. Perhaps "presbyters" in his mind were associated entirely with the local community. The existence of a monarchical episcopate can not be made to harmonize with the use of presbyters in the plural, or with bishops in the plural. The Didache in this respect resembles Hermas; it concerns itself with the whole community, and with local communities only as developments of it. It discusses the activities of apostles, prophets, and teachers. Those who speak the Word are to be honored as the Lord. Prophets are highly reverenced; criticizing them is an unforgivable sin. Prophets, it says (xiii. 3), are your high priests. In chap. xiv. services on Sunday and the solemn sacrifice are mentioned. Chap. xv. contains the following: "Elect therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not lovers of money, and truthful, and approved; for they, too, minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers; they are honored along with prophets and teachers" (P. Schaff, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 211–

212, New York, 1890). These words are notable. They closely associate bishops and deacons. Their functions are primarily concerned with public worship, are personal in character, and deal also with financial administration. Unlike Apostles, prophets, and teachers, they are appointed by the community. They show that speaking the Word does not belong naturally to their functions, but that this service in the lack of prophets and teachers is already in process of transference to them. A great distinction seems to prevail between prophets and teachers on the one side and bishops and deacons on the other, which the author says must be avoided, because the last class are now performing the services of the first. The letter of Polycarp is addressed to the community at Philippi. It appears that at Philippi there was no monarchical episcopate, but a collegial administration. First are mentioned men, then widows, then deacons, then the younger element, then virgins, then presbyters; presbyters and deacons are to be reverenced by the younger element as God and Christ. The title bishop is not found in the letter; directions and warnings as to administration and pastoral care are directed to the presbyters. Valens, an individual who seems to be entrusted with the economic administration of the community, is mentioned as a presbyter.

5. Monarchical Episcopate, and Other Offices.

Immediately after the time to which these various records belong, a monarchical episcopate along with its special organization is found everywhere in the Church. In Antioch and in Asia the letters of Ignatius show that it existed about 115. [It is to be noted that the authenticity and early date of these writings are still questioned by many scholars. A. H. N.] At the head of each community stands a bishop by this name, and no other (the Roman community is an exception). He is the real monarch of the community. He takes the lead in divine worship and in their meetings: "nothing against the bishop; nothing without the bishop." This is the tenor of all these letters. Under him there is a college of presbyters, acting not individually, but as a whole as counsel of the bishop. The deacons are not organized in a college, but are looked upon as individuals. They act as administrative organs of the bishop in divine worship and in ministering to the community and so are especially near to him. The bishop, in Ignatius' eyes, stands in the position of God; the presbyters in the position of the Apostles. How far this theory was realized in Asia is uncertain. Later records show that monarchical bishops were still called presbyters. Ignatius' warnings and speculations certainly produced one effect; to give the bishop preeminence in conducting public worship. The episcopal lists of the second century show that in Rome the monarchical episcopate did not originate until 150. Anicetus is mentioned as a bishop in an almost contemporary document. At the same time Primus is called bishop in Corinth by Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV., xxiii. sqq.). There are records by various authorities of monarchical bishops in Greek and Asiatic cities; still a Christian regarded himself as belonging to the whole Church rather than simply to a local community. The government was regarded as a spiritual government; charismata were given preeminence. The whole community was ruled in strict monarchical form; Christ was its shepherd, leader, and bishop; it is built upon the infallible Word of God, and this was present in a living form as the teaching of the Apostles in those who witnessed to it and declared it. The influence of profane organizations for worship probably was small. The internal life of the local community, the natural distinction between presbyter and the younger element, was of the utmost importance. To the presbyter belonged all of those whose merits and services deserved honor and recognition. Where the conditions did not permit the missionaries to hand over the care and supervision of the whole to the father of a family, or to the most prominent first converts, or to the elders, there were officers appointed, probably always by laying on of hands. The appointment may have been due to the missionary apostles, or to the influence of the prophets, or the community could request the appointment of an individual. The officials had not everywhere the same name. The name presbyter was suggested naturally by the distinction between the old and the young. By the laying on of hands this particular type of elder was sometimes distinguished from the whole mass of elders though they sometimes disappeared again in it. "Shepherds and overseers" indicates not an office but a function. The function of these presbyters was, so long as edification by the free activity of the Spirit was the rule, of a diaconal nature. Here distinction must be made between a *diaconia* in a narrower and in a broader sense. Broadly it signifies any kind of service which is not the service of the Word. In a narrower sense it indicates care for the poor and the service during the congregational gathering. From this point of view the presbyters received the appellations bishop and deacon. In the broader use of the word they were called bishops only in the beginning, and even then rarely. As a rule, the terminology was applied to presbyters engaged in the diaconate in the narrower sense; that is, it was given to those who were engaged in looking after the poor and in services performed in the congregational gathering. The practise became usual then of not reckoning these officials among the presbyters, but of giving them the title "deacon." The word deacon, used of one who now really became a server, was no longer looked upon as a title of honor. Originally it must have stood higher.

In the earliest times, here and there, the presbyter and the bishop are assimilated, so that every "appointed" presbyter was also called bishop. But soon the terminology changed. The custom arose that only those officials employed in active and leading duties concerned with the care of the poor and with the conduct of congregational meetings were called bishops, without, however, losing the title of presbyter or their places in the college of presbyters. The victory of the *episcopos* is plainly an indication of the increased importance of the care for the poor and of the services undertaken in congregational gatherings, which more and more took the form of established public worship.

The disappearance of prophets and teachers contributed to give importance to the functions of bishops and deacons, although I Timothy shows that at that time there were presbyters capable of teaching; but both the Didache and Hermas prove that the service of prophets, teachers, and apostles was performed by bishops and deacons.

6. Causes of the Episcopate.

Neither of these authorities mentions presbyters in this connection. Clement is the first to connect this local organization with the Old Testament and apostolic foundation. He mentions the connection between the office and divine worship and also the permanence of the ministers. Their election was limited to a certain class; the community gave its approval or withheld it as the case might be. This system was not peculiar to Rome, it also existed in Corinth. This letter of Clement is important as exhibiting the decline of the pneumatic factor and in showing how the conception of the universal Church lost its importance and was superseded by the view which exalted the local community and made it the foundation of apostolicity and legality. That bishops and deacons had some relation as officials to divine worship is proved by Paul. Clement carries their institution back to the time of the apostles. Virtually a similar position is taken by the Didache and Hermas. There must have been some factor in the original constitution of the Church tending to the development of a monarchical episcopate. Probably the monarchy of a leading apostle in certain places became after his death changed to the leadership of a presbyter who, taking precedence in his college, became a presbyter-bishop. It was natural in public worship for the lead to be taken by one individual. Justin (i. 67) speaks of one *proestōs* and several *diakonoi*. Intercourse with other churches suggested the need of a representative, as, for example, when Clement composed a letter to Corinth in the name of the Roman community. The struggle with the Gnostic sects suggested the necessity of some one authoritative teacher. Division of responsibility would have also had a bad effect in time of persecution. The drawing up of episcopal lists indicates that in many communities from early times the college of presbyters must have had a *primus inter pares*. The development of the monarchical episcopate appeared as no break with the past because the bishop still continued to perform many functions along with the college of presbyters. For example, Marcion appeared before the Roman presbyters (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii. 2), Noetus was tried by the presbyters in Smyrna (Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, i.). The presence of the college of presbyters in some cases delayed for decades the final stage of this development. The earliest organization of the community must also have had its influence. What had been arranged by the first missionary was of great importance: " As in any city where Christians have not been converted (*nati*), if some one comes and begins to teach, work, and instruct there and draws them to the faith, he himself becomes afterward for them whom he has taught a leader and bishop " (Origen on Numbers, *Hom.* xi. 4). The final sovereignty of the local community could not be attained as long as a representative man of apostolic character existed. The struggle between the smaller and the larger conception of the Church must have gone on in an accentuated form (cf. III John). The theory of Jerome of an original identity between presbyters and bishops is not entirely correct, since there were communities where this could not be true. Also the explanation Theodore of Mopsuestia gives of the origin of the episcopate, associating it with a provincial organization going back to apostolic times, can hardly be accepted. He lays far too much stress on the ordination rights of a bishop when he declares that after the death of the apostle who presided over a province the term presbyter was generally retained, while the word bishop was reserved for those who had the right of ordination. The term apostle, he says, was given up because of the cessation of miracles and because also their representatives were too modest to claim the title after the apostolic period. With the monarchical episcopate came the tendency of Christians to unite in one community in any particular place; the house communities ceased to exist. Occasionally in episcopal lists two bishops appear as existing together in one place. This indicates more than one congregation. There is also evidence in early writers of the establishment of Christian schools for purposes apologetic and polemic, e.g., the catechetical school in Alexandria, the schools of Justin, Tatian, Theodotus and others in Rome, while Marcion's church was a " school," so Lucian's " school " is spoken of. These schools may have constituted a danger to the unity of the bishop's church. Any community existing outside the bishop's community was looked upon as a *hæresis*. It was the rule that no matter how small the place or how few the number of converts an episcopal community could be founded; even twelve were sufficient (*TU*, ii. 5, pp. 7 sqq., 1889). There had to be at least two presbyters and three deacons to work with the bishop. As early as the first and the second century Christians are known who lived in the country, but they had to come to the city for worship on Sunday. Only in the third and fourth centuries does there appear a separate organization for the country.

7. Distinction Between Clergy and Laity.

The distinction between clergy and laity arose gradually in the second century. It shows an influence of the Jewish differentiation between priesthood and people. Traces of it are seen in the first epistle of Clement and in the apostolic church order. Clement of Alexandria uses the three terms, presbyters, deacons, and laymen (*Strom*, III., xii.), and this usage is frequent in Tertullian: " when the authorities themselves, that is, deacons and presbyters and bishops, flee " (*De fuga*, xi.). The origin of the word " clergy " is seen in the Acts of the Apostles. The first election in a community took place by *klēros*, " lot," but this word is usually found in early Christian literature in a general sense. An example of the technical use is to be seen in places like Acts i. 17; its limitation to church officers is first to be observed in Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus. The Latin term answering to *klēros* is *ordo*, which is frequently used by Tertullian also in a wider sense, but he expressly states that the distinction between clergy and laity is of postapostolic and ecclesiastical origin. Tertullian makes *ordo* include not only bishops, presbyters and deacons, but all who have received ordination. The clergy are called by him *auctores*. Even in Tertullian's day, the conception of the universal priesthood still endured: " Are not we laymen priests?" he says. A special priesthood need not be considered a derivation from Jewish custom, and heathen precedent is irrelevant. The origin of a specific priesthood is to be sought in the idea of a specific offering developing out of the conception of the communion (see Eucharist; Lord's Supper; Mass). This development took place at an early period, as we see from such ancient authorities as I Clement xliv. and Didache, xiv. The word priest in an ecclesiastical sense first appears in Tertullian. He calls the bishop a high priest, but presbyters were also recognized by him as priests. He speaks of a sacerdotal order (*De exhortatione*, vii.), of sacerdotal gifts (*De præscriptione*, xxix., xli.), of a sacerdotal office (" On the Veiling of Virgins," ix.). Deacons were not given sacerdotal character because they did not take a principal part in the offering. This brought the presbyters into close relation with the bishops and separated them from deacons with whom there were special reasons that they should be assimilated. A power of absolution associated with the priesthood is first found in the third century, in its strict form in Cyprian. The rise of the monarchical episcopate fixed the various stages of the clergy and their duties. The bishop represents the community in public worship and in administration. The idea of an apostolic succession first appears at the close of the second century, its foundation lies in the conception of an office or calling handing down a system of teaching that is regarded as a deposit. A guaranty seemed to be given in this way through a chain of legitimate succession that no alteration could be made in the teaching. This idea was common to Roman constitutional law and to the schools of ancient philosophy. Before the episcopate, there was a recognized succession of teachers and prophets. The thought appears strongly expressed in II Tim. ii. 2: " And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." It is easy to see how, as a matter of fact, such a succession came to be limited to bishops alone. The basis of the whole process comes from the fact that the twelve apostles were recognized as a form of apostleship. When the universal apostolate died out, the struggle with the Gnostic sects forced the Church back on eye witnesses and so brought forward the existence of an apostolic form of proof. The bishops were regarded as having by succession evangelical truth as a charism received from the apostles. This conception was first found in Irenæus and Tertullian. Pure apostolic teaching was associated not so much with an apostolic see as from the fact that the men who held it taught in harmony with the rest of the episcopate. Preliminary stages of this development are seen in the earliest Christian literature. The prominence of certain bishops gave them weight as representing the apostolic character. An example of this is the community at Smyrna describing their Bishop Polycarp: " Polycarp being in our days an apostolic and prophetical teacher, bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna " (the letter of the church of Smyrna is quite fully transcribed in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV., xv., and is given in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., pp. 947–948, London, 1885). The prominent position of such men was recognized by the heathen community as is seen from Lucian's writing on Peregrinus (*De morte Peregrini*), where he speaks of extraordinary honors given by Christians to those who preside over them. There soon arose a tradition that the apostles themselves had appointed bishops in several communities and hence came the custom of drawing up episcopal lists in Asia, Rome, and Lyons. But it was not before the year 220 that apostles themselves were set down in these lists as bishops of a community. In this elevation of a bishop of a community to equality with an apostle the presbyters still retained relative equality with them. Exactly what were the functions of a college of presbyters is uncertain. Where there was only one meeting for worship they probably had little significance; where there were many, a good deal.

8. Distinctions within the Clergy.

Deacons originally were only slightly distinguished from bishops. They were occupied in the service during worship and in looking after the poor and in pastoral cares. Their close association with the episcopate made their elevation to it easy. In Rome the archdeacon was regularly advanced to the episcopate. There were, however, orders below the stage of deacons, although in the second century there was no regularly systematized minor order of clergy. At this date there are on record orders of widows, virgins, and deacons, and lectors and exorcists are added. All of these were regarded as charismatic positions. Finally, confessors themselves were given special position in the *ordo*. As Tertullian says: " One of lower rank may attain to a higher if, in enduring persecution, he shall have taken an upward step " (*De fuga*, xi.). The distinctions of apostle and teacher gradually disappeared. Prophets ceased to exist last of all; their extinction was due to the Montanistic crisis. They are still found in the beginning of the third century teaching communities in Phrygia and in Egypt. The qualities demanded from the clergy after they had been tested and elected by the community were that they should have orderly households, should abstain from second marriages, should not engage in trade. As to the service of women in the Christian community they were kept strictly apart from the men (L. Zscharnack, *Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche*, Göttingen, 1902; L. Stoecker, *Die Frau in der alten Kirche*, Tübingen, 1907.) The rights of the clergy as an order implied particular honor and obedience, the right of receiving support from the community, especial places of honor in divine service, and exemption from accusations except under particular conditions. But

Hippolytus makes it a serious charge against the schismatic church of Theodotus that they pay their bishop a monthly salary (cf. Hippolytus, *Hær.*, vii. 23–24, x. 19, in *ANF*, v. 114–115, 147, with the full references there to passages in other writers).

9. Development of Ecclesiastical Law.

The development of a system of church law was due to the concern of the Church for the whole life and thought of the faithful; besides the Church was placed in relations and even in antagonistic relations with a highly developed State, and so the need for law arose. Its relation to the State was a complicated one; it was subordinate yet opposed to it. Christians accepted the material rights of their position and their civic relations. There was an inclination to substitute or to improve upon rights or legal relations existing in the State, and Paul himself was active in this direction when he forbade Christians to have recourse to secular tribunals. As time went on a local organization with its bishop, its clergy of presbyters, and its deacons became consciously or unconsciously rivals of the municipal administration. From this came the regular development into provinces which finally led to an imperial organization. The Church system partly accepted and partly rejected the usages of the State. In many respects as to slavery, marriage, attitude to certain classes of crime, support of the poor, and class equality, the Church showed itself more progressive than the State. Hippolytus (*Philosophumena*, IX., xii.) gives an instance where a Roman bishop Calixtus recognized as legal a kind of marriage which was prohibited by Roman law when he gave his consent to a union of a Christian maiden with a slave. [Secret concubinage rather than marriage, connived at rather than actually permitted, seems to be the object of the stricture of Hippolytus. A. H. N.] Church law in the narrow sense also goes back to the second century. It is applied chiefly to the power of the keys and to the development of penance. Tertullian applies the word *jus* to baptism, teaching, and the Scriptures. As to the organization of the early heretical sects, it received much criticism from orthodox teachers, although they had martyrs, churches, bishops, and presbyters. The following passage from Tertullian about the Marcionites is instructive:

> "For I must not omit a description of the conduct also of the heretics—how frivolous, how worldly, how merely human, without seriousness, without authority, without discipline, as befits their faith. To begin with, it is doubtful who is a catechumen, and who a believer; they have all access alike, they hear alike, they pray alike—even heathens, if any such happen to come among them. . . . Simplicity they will have to consist in the overthrow of discipline, attention to which on our part they call bawdry. . . . The very women of these heretics, how wanton they are. They are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures, it may be even to baptize. Their ordinations are carelessly administered, capricious, changeable. At one time they put novices in office; at another time men who are bound to some secular employment, at another time men who have apostatized from us. . . . So it comes to pass that to-day one man is their bishop, to-morrow another. To-day he is a deacon who to-morrow is a reader; to-day he is a presbyter who to-morrow is a layman, for even on laymen do they impose the functions of priesthood" (*De præscriptione*, xli.; *ANF*, iii. 263).

The most prominent feature of the Montanistic communities was the position they accorded to women (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlix. 2): "Women are bishops among them, presbyters are women and so on." Mention has been made of the distinction between the universal and the local organization of the Church, also of the conflict between these two factors.

10. Ecclesiastical Provinces.

A third factor soon appeared, the grouping of several churches together in a province. Paul organized his missions according to provinces. Authorities in the second century followed the same precedent. Cities like Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome became centers of Christian activity for the regions extending about them. As time went on the provincial system was fully developed, and the limit of this development was not bounded by the frontiers of a province. The metropolitan constitution, the superior position accorded to one bishop over others in his neighborhood, is first to be seen in the second century. The road is already opened up for a universal bishop, the bishop of bishops, as Tertullian calls the Roman bishop. The metropolitan system was furthered by the practise of turning over to bishops of provincial chief cities epistolary communications with other communities and also by the custom of calling synods. These last were regarded as representative and had great influence, as is shown in Tertullian's words: "That representation of the whole Christian name is greeted with great veneration" ("On Fasting," xiii.). Their organization was influenced by local secular assemblies, but they were regarded as being under the direction of the whole spirit and dealt with the weightiest questions of church life. All the elements of the later constitutional history of the Church are found in the first two centuries, even the *de facto* primacy of Rome. As time went on it can hardly be said that the church system became more complicated; as a matter of fact, in the earliest ages the organization of the Church was extremely complicated. If there was any change, it was in the direction of simplification. The first real break came in with the period of the Reformation. That not only destroyed the medieval organization of the Church, but it broke entirely with the church system of the first and second centuries. All that the Reformation insisted on was the preaching of the Word of God and that some office must be found for this preaching. See CLERGY; CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN, II.–III.; ELDERS; EPISCOPATE; PARISH AND PASTOR; PRESBYTER. (A. HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Much pertinent literature will be found named in and under the articles APOSTOLIC COUNCIL; CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN; CLERGY; DIDACHE; also in the articles on the Fathers and patristic works named in the text; consult as well the books on the history of the Ante-Nicene Church, e.g., Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. i., chap. x., vol. ii., chap. iv. The three books of first importance here are the essay of J. B. Lightfoot on *The Christian Ministry* in his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, 6th ed., London, 1881; E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, 5th ed., ib. 1895; and A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1906, Eng. transl., *The Expansion of Christianity*, 2d ed., 2 vols., New York, 1909; cf. also his *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechtes in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, Leip-

sic, 1910. Other special works to be consulted are G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung*, 5 vols., Hanover, 1803 sqq.; R. Rothe, *Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*, Wittenberg, 1837; A. Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, in *TU*, ii. 1–2 (1884); E. Löning, *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristentums*, Halle, 1888; C. Weizsäcker, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, Freiburg, 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1894–95; J. Réville, *Les Origines de l'episcopat*, Paris, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, New York, 1897; S. von Dunin-Borkowski, *Die neueren Forschungen über die Anfänge des Episkopats*, Freiburg, 1900 (reviews the later literature); K. Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients*, Münster, 1901; H. Bruders, *Die Verfassung der Kirche bis . . . 175*, Mainz, 1904; R. Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1905; P. A. Leder, *Die Diakonen, die Bischöfe und Presbyter*, Stuttgart, 1905; K. Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums*, Stuttgart, 1908; C. Bigg, *The Origins of Christianity*, Oxford, 1909; F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals: a Study of Christian Origins*, London, 1909; O. Pfleiderer, *The Development of Christianity*, ib. 1909.

ORIENTIUS: The received name of the author of *Commonitorium*, a Christian didactic poem of the first part of the fifth century. He is probably identical with Bishop Orientius of Auch, envoy from the Gothic King Theodoric I. to the Roman generals Ætius and Litorius, in the year 439. His poem describes the way to blessedness, and urgently admonishes against various byways of sin, especially against carnal temptation. The poem has for its constructive background the devastation of Gaul by the Alans, Suevi, Burgundians, and Vandals, 406 A.D. Classic poets are consulted; in particular, Catullus, Ovid, and Virgil. Whether there is also some reference to Christian poets (Prudentius?) is doubtful. In the extant manuscript, codex Ashburnham, tenth chapter, the *Commonitorium* is followed by five lesser poems and several poetical prayers of uncertain origin.

The best edition is that of R. Ellis in *CSEL*, xvi. 191–261 and in *MPL*, lxi. 977–1006.

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: An early *Vita* is in *ASB*, May, i. 61–64. Consult further: A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 410–414, Leipsic, 1889; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 192–201, Stuttgart, 1891; *KL*, ix. 1052–53; *DCB*, iv. 96.

ORIGEN.

- I. Life.
  - Early Training (§ 1).
  - Teacher and Writer (§ 2).
  - Conflict with Demetrius and Removal to Cæsarea (§ 3).
- II. Works.
  - Exegetical Writings (§ 1).
  - Extant Commentaries of Origen (§ 2).
  - Dogmatic, Practical, and Apologetic Writings (§ 3).
- III. Views.
  - Philosophical and Religious (§ 1).
  - Theological and Dogmatic (§ 2).
  - The Logos Doctrine and Cosmology (§ 3).
  - Christology (§ 4).
  - Eschatology (§ 5).
- IV. Character.

1. Early Training.

I. Life: Origen, one of the most distinguished of the Fathers of the early Church, was born, probably at Alexandria, about 182; and died at Cæsarea not later than 251. His full name was apparently Origenes Adamantius; and he received from his father, Leonides, thorough instruction in the Bible and in elementary studies. But in 202 the outbreak of the persecution of Septimius Severus robbed Origen of his father, whom he sought to follow in martyrdom, being prevented only by a ruse of his mother. The death of Leonides left the family of nine impoverished, their property being confiscated. Origen, however, was taken under the protection of a woman of wealth and standing; but as her household already included a heretic named Paul, the strictly orthodox Origen seems to have remained with her but a short time. Since his father's teaching enabled him also to give elementary instruction, he revived, in 203, the catechetical school at Alexandria (see Alexandria, School of), whose last teacher, Clement, was apparently driven out by the persecution. But the persecution still raged, and the young teacher unceasingly visited the prisoners, attended the courts, and comforted the condemned, himself preserved from harm as if by a miracle. His fame and the number of his pupils increased rapidly, so that Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, made him restrict himself to instruction in Christian doctrine alone. Origen, to be entirely independent, sold his library for a sum which netted him a daily income of 4 obols (about twelve cents) on which he lived by exercising the utmost frugality. Teaching throughout the day, he devoted the greater part of the night to the study of the Bible and lived a life of rigid asceticism. This he carried to such an extent that, fearing that his position as a teacher of women as well as men might give ground for scandal to the heathen, he followed literally Matt. xix. 12, partly influenced, too, by his belief that the Christian must follow the words of his Master without reserve. Later in life, however, he saw reason to judge differently concerning his extreme act.

2. Teacher and Writer.

During the reign of Caracalla, about 211–212, Origen paid a brief visit to Rome, but the relative laxity under the pontificate of Zephyrinus seems to have disillusioned him, and on his return to Alexandria he resumed his teaching with zeal increased by the contrast. But the school had far outgrown the strength of a single man; the catechumens pressed eagerly for elementary instruction, and the baptized sought for interpretation of the Bible. Under these circumstances, Origen entrusted the teaching of the catechumens to Heraclas (q.v.), the brother of the martyr Plutarch, his first pupil. His own interests became more and more centered in exegesis, and he accordingly studied Hebrew, though there is no certain knowledge concerning his instructor in that language. From about this period (212–213) dates Origen's acquaintance with Ambrose of Alexandria (q.v.), whom he was instrumental in converting from Valentinianism to orthodoxy. Later (about 218) Ambrose, a man of wealth, made a formal agreement with Origen to promulgate his writings, and all the subsequent works of Origen (except his sermons, which were not expressly prepared for publication) were dedicated to Ambrose. In 213 or 214, Origen visited Arabia at the request of the prefect, who wished to have an interview with him; and Origen accordingly spent a brief time in Petra, after which he returned to Alexandria. In the following year (215), a popular uprising at Alexandria caused Caracalla to let his soldiers plunder the city, shut the schools, and expel all foreigners. The latter measure caused Ambrose to take refuge in Cæsarea, where he seems to have made his permanent home; and Origen, who felt that the turmoil hindered his activity as a teacher and imperilled his safety, left Egypt, apparently going with Ambrose to Cæsarea, where he spent some time. Here, in conformity with local usage based on Jewish custom, Origen, though not in orders, preached and interpreted the Scriptures at the request of the bishops Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cæsarea. When, however, the confusion in Alexandria subsided, Demetrius recalled Origen, probably in 216. Of Origen's activity during the next decade little is known, but it was obviously devoted to teaching and writing. The latter was rendered the more easy for him by Ambrose, who provided him with more than seven stenographers to take dictation in relays, as many scribes to prepare long-hand copies, and a number of girls to multiply the copies. At the request of Ambrose, he now began a huge commentary on the Bible, beginning with John, and continuing with Genesis, Ps. i.-xxv., and Lamentations, besides brief exegeses of selected texts (forming the ten books of his *Stromateis*), two books on the resurrection, and the work "On First Principles."

3. Conflict with Demetrius and Removal to Cæsarea.

About 230, Origen entered on the fateful journey which was to compel him to give up his work at Alexandria and embittered the next years of his life. Sent to Greece on some ecclesiastical mission, he paid a visit to Cæsarea, where he was heartily welcomed and was ordained presbyter, that no further cause for criticism might be given Demetrius, who had strongly disapproved his preaching before ordination while at Cæsarea. But Demetrius, taking this well-meant act as an infringement of his rights, was furious, for not only was Origen under his jurisdiction, but, if Eastern sources may be believed, Demetrius had been the first to introduce episcopal ordination in Egypt. The metropolitan accordingly convened a synod of bishops and presbyters which banished Origen from Alexandria, while a second synod declared his ordination invalid. Origen accordingly fled from Alexandria in 231, and made his permanent home in Cæsarea. A series of attacks on him seems to have emanated from Alexandria, whether for his self-castration (a capital crime in Roman law) or for alleged heterodoxy is unknown; but at all events these fulminations were heeded only at Rome, while Palestine, Phenicia, Arabia, and Achaia paid no attention to them. At Alexandria Heraclas became head of Origen's school, and shortly afterward, on the death of Demetrius, was consecrated bishop. At Cæsarea Origen was joyfully received, and was also the guest of Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and of the empress-dowager, Julia Mammæa, at Antioch. The former also visited him at Cæsarea, where Origen, deeply loved by his pupils, preached and taught dialectics, physics, ethics, and metaphysics; thus laying his foundation for the crowning theme of theology. He accordingly sought to set forth all the science of the time from the Christian point of view, and to elevate Christianity to a theory of the universe compatible with Hellenism. In 235, with the accession of Maximinus, a persecution raged; and for two years Origen is said, though on somewhat doubtful authority, to have remained concealed in the house of a certain Juliana in Cæsarea of Cappadocia. Little is known of the last twenty years of Origen's life. He preached regularly on Wednesdays and Fridays, and later daily. He evidently, however, developed an extraordinary literary productivity, broken by occasional journeys; one of which, to Athens during some unknown year, was of sufficient length to allow him time for research. After his return from Athens, he succeeded in converting Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, from his adoptianistic views to the orthodox faith; yet in these very years (about 240) probably occurred the attacks on Origen's own orthodoxy which compelled him to defend himself in writing to the Roman pontiff Fabian (236–250) and many bishops. Neither the source nor the object of these attacks is known, though the latter may have been connected with Novatianism (see Novatian, Novatianism). After his conversion of Beryllus, however, his aid was frequently invoked against heresies. Thus, when the doctrine was promulgated in Arabia that the soul died and decayed with the body, being restored to life only at the resurrection, appeal was made to Origen, who journeyed to Arabia, and by his preaching reclaimed the erring. In 250 persecutions of the Church broke out anew, and this time Origen did not escape. He was tortured, pilloried, and bound hand and foot to the block for days without yielding. These tortures seem to have resulted in his death. A later legend, recounted by Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, liv.; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 373–374) and numerous itineraries place his death and burial at Tyre, but to this little value can be attached.

1. Exegetical Writings.

II. Works: According to Epiphanius (*Hær.*, lxiv. 63) Origen wrote about 6,000 works (i.e., rolls or chapters). A list was given by Eusebius in his lost life of Pamphilus (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., xxxii. 3; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 277), which was apparently known to Jerome (*Epist. ad Paulam*, *NPNF*, vi. 46). These fall into four classes: text criticism; exegesis; systematic, practical, and apologetic theology; and letters; besides certain spurious works. By far the most important work of Origen on textual criticism was the Hexapla (see Bible Versions, A, I., 1, § 4). With Origen's great text-critical work a closer acquaintance is afforded by the discovery of an original fragment. By this work he thought to establish a basis for the study of the Old Testament, that should be adequate to scientific demands. As a sample of the execution of the work, a page is offered.

Hebrew.	Hebrew Transliterated.	Aquila.	Symmachus.	LXX.	Theodotion.	Variants.
לַמְנַצֵּחַ	λαμανασσηα	τῷ νικοποιῷ	ἐπινίκιος	εἰς τὸ τέλος	τῷ νικοποιῷ	εἰς τὸ τέλος
לִבְנֵי קֹרַח	βνη κορα	τῶν υἱῶν κορέ	τῶν υἱῶν κορὲ	ὑπὲρ τῶν υἱῶν κορέ (τοῖς υἱοῖς)	τοῖς υἱοῖς κορέ	
עַל-עֲלָמוֹ	αλ· αλαμωθ	ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων	ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰωνίων	ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων	ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων	
שִׁיר	σιρ	ᾆσμα	ᾠδή·	ψαλμός	ᾠδή	ψαλμός
אֱלֹהִים לָנ	ἐλωειμ λανου	<ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν>	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν	
מַחֲסֶה וָעֹז	μαασε· ονοζ	ἐλπὶς καὶ κράτος	πεποίθησις καὶ ἰσχύς	καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις	καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις	
עֶזְרָה	εζρ	βοήθεια	βοήθεια	βοηθὸς	βοηθὸς	
בְצָרוֹת	βσαρωθ	ἐν θλίψεσιν	ἐν θλίψεσιν	ἐν θλίψεσι	ἐν θλίψεσιν	
נִמְצָא מְא	νεμσα· μωδ	εὑρεθεὶς σφόδρα	εὑρισκόμενος σφόδρα	ταῖς εὑρούσαις ἡμᾶς σφόδρα (εὑρεθήσεται ἡμῖν)	εὑρέθη σφόδρα (ταῖς εὑρούσαις ἡμᾶς)	
עַל-כֵּן	αλ· χεν	ἐπὶ τούτῳ	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο	
לֹא נִירָא	λω· νιρα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	
בְּהָמִיר	βαamιρ	ἐν τῷ ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι	ἐν τῷ συγχεῖσθαι	ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι	ἐν τῷ ταράσσεθαι	
אָרֶץ	[α]αρσ	γῆν	γῆν	τὴν γῆν	τὴν γῆν	
וּבְמ.ט	ου βαμωτ	και ἐν τῷ σφάλλεσθαι	καὶ κλίνασθαι	καὶ μετατίθεσθαι	καὶ σαλεύεσθαι (μετατίθεσθαι)	
הָרִים	αριμ	ὄρη	ὄρη	ὄρη	ὄρη	
בְּלֵב	βλεβ	ἐν καρδίᾳ	ἐν καρδίᾳ	ἐν καρδίᾳ	ἐν καρδίᾳ	
יַמִּים:	ιαμιμ	θαλασσῶν	θαλασσῶν	θαλασσῶν	θαλασσῶν	

Of the fate of the Hexapla nothing is known. The Milan discovery (see for this BIBLE VERSIONS, A, I., 1, § 4) proves that at least some individual parts existed much longer than was supposed up to that time. The references to the Hexapla by later manuscripts and authors obtain therefore a greater significance than hitherto. The Tetrapla was an abbreviation of the former in which Origen placed only the translations (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Septuagint) in parallels. He was likewise keenly conscious of the textual difficulties in the manuscripts of the New Testament, although he never wrote definitely on this subject. In his exegetical writings he frequently alludes to the variant readings, but his habit of making rough citations in his dictation, the verification being left to the scribes, renders it impossible to deduce his text from his commentaries. The exegetical writings of Origen fall into three classes: scholia, or brief summaries of the meaning of difficult passages; homilies; and "books," or commentaries in the strict sense of the term. Jerome (ut sup.) states that there were scholia on Leviticus, Psalms i.-xv., Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, and part of John. The *Stromateis* were of a similar character, and the margin of Codex Athous, Laura, 184, contains citations from this work on Rom. ix. 23; I Cor. vi. 14, vii. 31, 34, ix. 20-21, x. 9, besides a few other fragments. Homilies on almost the entire Bible were prepared by Origen, these being taken down after his sixtieth year as he preached. It is not improbable that Origen gave no attention to supervising the publication of his homilies, for only by such a hypothesis can the numerous evidences of carelessness in diction be explained. The exegesis of the homilies was simpler than that of the scientific commentaries, but nevertheless demanded no mean degree of intelligence from the auditor. Origen's chief aim was the practical exposition of the text, verse by verse; and while in such barren books as Leviticus and Numbers he sought to allegorize, the wealth of material in the prophets seldom rendered it necessary for him to seek meanings deeper than the surface afforded. Whether the sermons were delivered in series, or the homilies on a single book were collected from various series, is unknown. The homilies preserved are on Genesis (17), Exodus (13), Leviticus (16), Numbers (28), Joshua (16), Judges (9), I Sam. (2), Psalms xxxvi.-xxxviii. (9), Canticles (2), Isaiah (9), Jeremiah (7 Greek, 2 Latin, 12 Greek and Latin), Ezekiel (14), and Luke (39).

2. Extant Commentaries of Origen.

The object of Origen's commentaries was to give an exegesis that discriminated strictly against the incidental, unimportant historical significance, in favor of the deeper, hidden, spiritual truth. At the same time, he neglected neither philological nor geographical, historical nor antiquarian material, to all of which he devoted numerous excursuses. In his commentary on John he constantly considered the exegesis of the Valentinian Heracleon (probably at the instance of Ambrose), and in many other places he implied or expressly cited Gnostic views and refuted them. Unfortunately, only meager fragments of the commentaries have survived. Besides the citations in the *Philocalia*, which include fragments of the third book of the commentary on Genesis, Ps. i., iv. 1, the small commentary on Canticles, and the second book of the large commentary on the same, the twentieth book of the commentary on Ezekiel, and the commentary on Hosea, and of the commentary on John, only books i., ii., x., xiii., xx., xxviii., xxxii., and a fragment of xix. have been preserved. The commentary on Romans is extant only in the abbreviated version of Rufinus, and the eight books preserved of the commentary on Matthew likewise seem to be either a brief reworking or a rough outline. Codex Vaticanus, 1215, gives the division of the twenty-five books of the commentary on Ezekiel, and part of the arrangement of the commentary on Isaiah (beginnings of books VI., VIII., XVI.; book X. extends from Isa. viii. 1 to ix. 7; XI. from ix. 8, to x. 11; XII., from x. 12 to x. 23; XIII. from x. 24 to xi. 9; XIV. from xi. 10 to xii. 6; XV. from xiii. 1 to xiii. 16; XXI. from xix. 1 to xix. 17; XXII. from xix. 18 to xx. 6; XXIII. from xxi. 1 to xxi. 17; XXIV. from xxii. 1 to xxii. 25; XXV. from xxiii. 1 to xxiii. 18; XXVI. from xxiv. 1 to xxv. 12; XXVII. from xxvi. 1 to xxvi. 15; XXVIII. from xxvi. 16 to xxvii. 11a; XXIX. from xxvii. 11b to xxviii. 29; and XXX. treats of xxix. 1 sqq.). The Codex Athous Laura, 184, in like manner, gives the division of the fifteen books of the commentary on Romans (except XI. and XII.) and of the five books on Galatians, as well as the extent of the commentaries on Philippians and Corinthians (Romans: I. from i. 1 to i. 7; II. from i. 8 to i. 25; III. from i. 26 to ii. 11; IV. from ii. 12 to iii. 15; V. from iii. 16 to iii. 31; VI. from iv. 1 to v. 7; VII. from v. 8 to v. 16; VIII. from v. 17 to vi. 15; IX. from vi. 16 to viii. 8; X. from viii. 9 to viii. 39; XIII. from xi. 13 to xii. 15; XIV. from xii. 16 to xiv. 10; XV. from xiv. 11 to the end; Galatians: I. from i. 1 to ii. 2; II. from ii. 3 to iii. 4; III. from iii. 5 to iv. 5; IV. from iv. 6 to v. 5; and V. from v. 6 to vi. 18; the commentary on Philippians extended to iv. 1; and on Ephesians to iv. 13).

3. Dogmatic, Practical, and Apologetic Writings.

Among the systematic, practical, and apologetic writings of Origen, mention should first be made of his work "On First Principles," perhaps written for his more advanced pupils at Alexandria and probably composed between 212 and 215. It is extant only in the free translation of Rufinus, except for fragments of the third and fourth books preserved in the *Philocalia,* and smaller citations in Justinian's letter to Mennas. In the first book the author considers God, the Logos, the Holy Ghost, reason, and the angels; in the second the world and man (including the incarnation of the Logos, the soul, free will, and eschatology); in the third, the doctrine of sin and redemption; and in the fourth, the Scriptures; the whole being concluded with a résumé of the entire system. The work is noteworthy as the first endeavor to present Christianity as a complete theory of the universe, and was designed to remove the difficulties felt by many Christians concerning the essential bases of their faith. Earlier in date than this treatise were the two books on the resurrection (now lost, a fate which has also befallen two dialogues on the same theme) dedicated to Ambrose. After his removal to Cæsarea, Origen wrote the works, still extant, "On Prayer," "On Martyrdom," and "Against Celsus." The first of these was written shortly before 235 (or possibly before 230), and, after an introduction on the object, necessity, and advantage of prayer, ends with an exegesis of the Lord's Prayer, concluding with remarks on the position, place, and attitude to be assumed during prayer, as well as on the classes of prayer. The persecution of Maximinus was the occasion of the composition of the "On Martyrdom," which is preserved in the "Exhortation to Martyrdom." In it, Origen warns against any trifling with idolatry and emphasizes the duty of suffering martyrdom manfully; while in the second part he explains the meaning of martyrdom. The eight books against Celsus (q.v.) were written in 248 in reply to the polemic of that pagan philosopher against Christianity. Eusebius had a collection of more than one hundred letters of Origen (*Hist. eccl.,* VI., xxxvi. 3; Eng. transl. *NPNF,* 2 ser. i. 278–279), and the list of Jerome speaks of several books of his epistles. Except for a few fragments, only a short letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus and the epistle to Julius Africanus (defending the authenticity of the Greek additions to Daniel) have been preserved. For forgeries of the writings of Origen made in his lifetime cf. Rufinus, *De adulteratione librorum Origenis.* The *Dialogus de recta in Deum fide* (q.v.), the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus (q.v.), and the Commentary on Job by Julian of Halicarnassus (q.v.) have also been ascribed to him.

1. Philosophical and Religious.

III. Views: Origen, trained in the school of Clement and by his father, was essentially a Platonist with occasional traces of Stoic philosophy. He was thus a pronounced idealist, regarding all things temporal and material as insignificant and indifferent, the only real and eternal things being comprised in the idea. He therefore regards as the purely ideal center of this spiritual and eternal world, God, the pure reason, whose creative powers call into being the world with matter as the necessary substratum. Likewise Platonic is the doctrine that those spirits capable of knowing supreme reason, but imprisoned in the body in this world, will rise after death to divinity, being purified by fire. In his attempt to amalgamate the system evolved by Greek thought with Christianity, Origen found his predecessors in the Platonizing Philo and even in the Gnostics. His exegesis does not differ generally from that of Heracleon, but in the canon of the New Testament and in the tradition of the Church, Origen possessed a check which kept him from the excesses of Gnostic exegesis. He was, indeed, a rigid adherent of the Bible, making no statement without adducing some Scriptural basis. To him the Bible was divinely inspired, as was proved both by the fulfilment of prophecy and by the immediate impression which the Scriptures made on him who read them. Since the divine Logos spoke in the Scriptures, they were an organic whole and on every occasion he combatted the Gnostic tenet of the inferiority of the Old Testament. He was aware of the discrepancies between the Old and New Testaments and the contradictory accounts of the Gospels; but he considered these only as inconsistencies that lend themselves to an unspiritual historical exegesis according to the letter. In his exegesis, Origen sought to discover the deeper meaning implied in the Scriptures. One of his chief methods was the translation of proper names, which enabled him, like Philo, to find a deep meaning even in every event of history (see EXEGESIS OR HERMENEUTICS, III., § 2); but at the same time he insisted on an exact grammatical interpretation of the text as the basis of all exegesis. A strict adherent of the Church, Origen yet distinguished sharply between the ideal and the empirical Church, representing "a double church of men and angels," or, in Platonic phraseology, the lower church and its celestial ideal. The ideal Church alone was the Church of Christ, scattered over all the earth; the other provided also a shelter for sinners. Holding that the Church, as being in possession of the mysteries, affords the only means of salvation, he was indifferent to her external organization, although he spoke sometimes of the office-bearers as the pillars of the Church, and of their heavy duties and responsibilities. More important to him was the idea borrowed from Plato of the grand division between the great human multitude, capable of sensual vision only, and those who know how to comprehend the hidden meaning of Scripture and the diverse mysteries; church organization being for the former only. It is doubtful whether Origen possessed an obligatory creed; at any rate, such a confession of faith was not a norm like the inspired word of Scripture. The reason, illumined by the divine Logos, which is able to search the secret depths of the divine nature, remains as the only source of knowledge.

2. Theological and Dogmatic.

Origen's conception of God is entirely abstract —God is a perfect unity, invisible and incorporeal, transcending all things material, and therefore inconceivable and incomprehensible. He is likewise unchangeable, and transcends space and time. But his power is limited by his goodness, justice, and wisdom; and, though entirely free from necessity, his goodness and omnipotence constrained him to reveal himself. This revelation, the external self-emanation of God, is expressed by Origen in various ways, the Logos being only one of many. Revelation was the first creation of God (cf. Prov. viii. 22), in order to afford creative mediation between God and the world, such mediation being necessary, because God, as changeless unity, could not be the source of a multitudinous creation. The Logos is the rational creative principle that permeates the universe. Since God eternally manifests himself, the Logos is likewise eternal. He forms a bridge between the created and uncreated, and only through him, as the visible representative of divine wisdom, can the inconceivable and incorporeal God be known. Creation came into existence only through the Logos, and God's nearest approach to the world is the command to create. While the Logos is substantially a unity, he comprehends a multiplicity of concepts, so that Origen terms him, in Platonic fashion, "essence of essences" and "idea of ideas." The defense of the unity of God against the Gnostics led Origen to maintain the subordination of the Logos to God, and the doctrine of the eternal generation is later. Origen distinctly emphasized the independence of the Logos as well as the distinction from the being and substance of God. The term "of the same substance with the Father" was not employed. He is merely an image, a reflex not to be compared with God; as one among other "gods," of course first in rank.

3. The Logos Doctrine and Cosmology.

The activity of the Logos was conceived by Origen in Platonic fashion, as the world soul, wherein God manifested his omnipotence. His first creative act was the divine spirit, as an independent existence; and partial reflexes of the Logos were the created rational beings, who, as they had to revert to the perfect God as their background, must likewise be perfect; yet their perfection, unlike in kind with that of God, the Logos, and the divine spirit, had to be attained. The freedom of the will is an essential fact of the reason, notwithstanding the foreknowledge of God. The Logos, eternally creative, forms an endless series of finite, comprehensible worlds, which are mutually alternative. Combining the Stoic doctrine of a universe without beginning with the Biblical doctrine of the beginning and the end of the world, he conceived of the visible world as the stages of an eternal cosmic process, affording also an explanation of the diversity of human fortunes, rewards, and punishments. The material world, which at first had no place in this eternal spiritual progression, was due to the fall of the spirits from God, the first being the serpent, who was imprisoned in matter and body. The ultimate aim of God in the creation of matter out of nothing was not punishment, but the upraising of the fallen spirits. Man's accidental being is rooted in transitory matter, but his higher nature is formed in the image of the Creator. The soul is divided into the rational and the irrational, the latter being material and transitory, while the former, incorporeal and immaterial, possesses freedom of the will and the power to reascend to purer life. The strong ethical import of this cosmic process can not remain unnoticed. The return to original being through divine reason is the object of the entire cosmic process. Through the worlds which follow each other in eternal succession, the spirits are able to return to Paradise. God so ordered the universe that all individual acts work together toward one cosmic end which culminates in himself. Likewise as to Origen's anthropology, man conceived in the image of God is able by imitating God in good works to become like God, if he first recognizes his own weakness and trusts all to the divine goodness. He is aided by guardian angels, but more especially by the Logos who operates through saints and prophets in proportion to the constitution of these and man's capacity.

The culmination of this gradual revelation is the universal revelation of Christ. In Christ, God, hitherto manifest only as the Lord, appeared as the Father. The incarnation of the Logos, moreover, was necessary since otherwise he would not be intelligible to sensual man; but the indwelling of the Logos remained a mystery, which could be represented only by the analogy of his indwelling in the saints; nor could Origen fully explain it.

4. Christology. He speaks of a "remarkable body," and in his opinion that the mortal body of Jesus was transformed by God into an ethereal and divine body, Origen approximated the Docetism (q.v.) that he otherwise abhorred. His concept of the soul of Jesus is likewise uncertain and wavering. He proposes the question whether it was not originally perfect with God but, emanating from him, at his command assumed a material body. As he conceived matter as merely the universal limit of created spirits, so would it be impossible to state in what form the two were combined. He dismissed the solution by referring it to the mystery of the divine governance of the universe. More logically did he declare the material nature of the world to be merely an episode in the spiritual process of development, whose end should be the annihilation of all matter and return to God, who should again be all in all. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body he upholds by the explanation that the Logos maintains the unity of man's existence by ever changing his body into new forms, thus preserving the unity and identity of personality in harmony with the tenet of an endless cosmic process. Origen's concept of the Logos allowed him to make no definite statement on the redemptive work of Jesus. Since sin was ultimately only negative as a lack of pure knowledge, the activity of Jesus was essentially example and instruction, and his human life was only incidental as contrasted with the immanent cosmic activity of the Logos. Origen regarded the death of Jesus as a sacrifice, paralleling it with other cases of self-sacrifice for the general good. On this, Origen's accord with the teachings of the Church was merely superficial.

5. Eschatology. His idealizing tendency to consider the spiritual alone as real, fundamental to his entire system, led him to combat the rude Chiliasm (see Millennium, Millenarianism) of a sensual beyond; yet he constrained himself from breaking entirely with the distinct celestial hopes and representations of Paradise prevalent in the Church. He represents a progressive purification of souls, until, cleansed of all clouds of evil, they should know the truth and God as the Son knew him, see God face to face, and attain a full possession of the Holy Spirit and union with God. The means of attainment of this end were described by Origen in different ways, the most important of which was his Platonic concept of a purifying fire which should cleanse the world of evil and thus lead to cosmic renovation. By a further spiritualization Origen could call God himself this consuming fire. In proportion as the souls were freed from sin and ignorance, the material world was to pass away, until, after endless eons, at the final end, God should be all in all, and the worlds and spirits should return to a knowledge of God.

IV. Character: In Origen the Christian Church had its first theologian in the highest sense of the term, nor has the Greek Church ever had his superior. Attaining the pinnacle of human speculation, his teaching was not merely theoretical, like that of his antagonists, the Gnostics, but was also imbued with an intense ethical power. To the multitude to whom his instruction was beyond grasp, he left mediating images and symbols, as well as the final goal of attainment. In Origen Christianity blended with the paganism in which lived the desire for truth and the longing after God. When he died, however, he left no pupil who could succeed him, nor was the church of his period able to become his heir, and thus, his knowledge was buried. Three centuries later his very name was stricken from the books of the Church; yet in the monasteries of the Greeks his influence still lived on, and the spiritual father of Greek monasticism was that same Origen at whose name the monks had shuddered. See Origenistic Controversies.

(Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: For the earlier literature on Origen consult *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 50–55; U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, pp. 1683 sqq., 2756 sqq., Paris, 1904; A. Ehrhard, *Die altchristliche Litteratur*, in *TSK*, 1880–84, and the supplement for 1885–1900. The one complete edition of the *Opera* is that by C. and V. de la Rue, 4 vols., Paris, 1733–59 (but cf. the ed. of Lommatzsch, 25 vols., Berlin, 1831–48), reproduced in *MPG*, xi.–xvii.; a new edition, which will supersede the earlier editions, is in process under the auspices of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, vols. i.–iv., Leipsic, 1899–1903. The exegetical writings, ed. P. D. Huet, with learned dissertations, *Origeniana*, appeared, 2 vols., Rouen, 1668, Paris, 1679, Cologne, 1685. The commentary on John, ed. A. E. Brooke, appeared 2 vols., Cambridge, 1891; and individual works or excerpts in *TU*, ii. 4, vi. 1, xii. 3, xvi. 3. Several of his works ("On First Principles," "To Africanus," "To Gregory," and "Against Celsus") are in Eng. transl., with an introduction, in *ANF*, iv. 221 sqq. For the English reader of first importance is Westcott's fine article in *DCB*, iv. 96–142. Consult further: G. Thomasius, *Origen*, Nuremberg, 1837; E. R. Rudepenning, *Origenes*, Bonn, 1843–46; C. Ramers, *Origens Lehre von der Auferstehung des Fleisches*, Treves, 1851; A. Fournier, *Exposition critique des idées d'Origène sur la rédemption*, Strasburg, 1861; G. Contestin, *Origène exégete*, Arras, 1867; F. Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, Klemens und Origenes*, Zurich, 1869; C. E. Freppel, *Origène*, Paris, 1875; A. H. Charteris, *Canonicity*, Edinburgh, 1880; J. Denis, *La Philosophie d'Origène*, Paris, 1884; C. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 115–268, Oxford, 1886; C. Boyer, *La Rédemption dans Origène*, Montauban, 1886; F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, pp. 187–203, New York, 1886; idem, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. 291–323, ib. 1889; J. Patrick, *The Apology of Origen in Reply to Celsus*, London, 1892; F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, Leipsic, 1894; C. Klein, *Die Freiheitslehre des Origenes*, Strasburg, 1894; Klostermann, in *TU*, xvi. 3 (1897); G. Capitaine, *De Origenis ethica*, Münster, 1898; W. Fairweather, *Origen and Greek Patristic Theology*, Edinburgh, 1901; A. Zöllig, *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes*, Freiburg, 1902; G. Anrich, *Clemens und Origines als Begründer der Lehre vom Fegfeuer*, Tübingen, 1902; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, ii. 68–158, Freiburg, 1903; A. Zöllig, *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes*, Freiburg, 1903; E. C. Dargan, *Hist. of Preaching*, pp. 49 sqq., New York, 1905; F. Prat, *Origène, le théologien et l'exégète*, Paris, 1907; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxix., cols. 1870–1889 (a worthy discussion); Krüger, *History*, 173 sqq.; Harnack, *Dogma* (consult index); idem, *Litteratur*, i. 332–405 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 785 sqq., et passim; and in general the works on the church history of the period; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ii. 130–440; *KL*, ix. 1053–73; and in general works on the history of doctrine. For some new fragments of the Hexapla cf. *Cairo Genizah Palimpsests*, London, 1901.

ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

Among the Church Fathers (§ 1).
Among the Monastic Orders (§ 2).
Points of Antagonism (§ 3).

1. Among the Church Fathers.

The Origenistic controversies were a series of controversies in the Greek Church concerning the doctrines of Origen (q.v.), extending from the fourth to the sixth century. Though Origen himself had been obliged to defend his orthodoxy, he nevertheless controlled the theology of the third century. Peter of Alexandria and Methodius of Olympus (qq.v.) were decided opponents of his views, the latter attacking Origen's teaching of the eternity of the world, the preexistence of souls, and the resurrection of the " form " only. Eustathius of Antioch, in his *De engastromytho,* likewise sharply opposed Origen, who found defenders not only in Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius of Alexandria (qq.v.), Theognostus, and Pierius, but also in Pamphilus and Eusebius (qq.v.). Next the controversy over Arianism superseded the questions on which the followers and opponents of Origen were divided. In his doctrine of the Trinity Alexander of Alexandria professes to be a pupil of Origen, and Athanasius is not willing to concede to the Arians Origen whose doctrine stood as a simple basis preceding the antagonistic views and afforded a powerful support to Athanasius' formula of the eternal generation. Even the appeal of the Arians to Origen, and even if the middle party represented by Eusebius of Cæsarea must be recognized as the closest followers of Origen, yet the decided advance of the three Cappadocians in the Nicene doctrine did not hinder them from maintaining their respect for Origen to whom they ascribed their learning, and from introducing Hellenistic science into orthodox circles. Such orthodox Latin ecclesiastics as Victorinus of Pettau, Hilary, Eusebius of Vercelli, Ambrose, and Jerome began to make the treasures of Origen's theology accessible to the West. In the rising power of monasticism passionate hatred of Origen and enthusiastic reverence for him stood side by side. Thus Epiphanius, who united zeal for orthodoxy with monastic interests, saw in Origen the father of all heresy, not only opposing his influence over the Church in the *Ancyrotus* and *Panarion,* but also occasioning, while at Jerusalem (392 or 393), the controversies in the monastic colony in Palestine. Here a band of learned and ascetic students attached to Bishop John of Jerusalem found in Origen the main treasury of their studies. This band was joined by Rufinus (378) and Jerome (386). In the Church of the Resurrection Epiphanius preached energetically, only to be answered by John of Jerusalem in a sermon directed against anthropomorphism. Epiphanius (who had become an opponent of Origen) fled to the monks of Jerome at Bethlehem and urged them to break with John. The latter appealed to Egypt and Rome, but the strife was ended through the mediation of Theophilus of Alexandria. In the mean time a bitter strife arose between Rufinus (q.v.), as a friend of Origen, and Jerome, which was much lamented by Augustine. Pope Anastasius, in approval of the condemnation of Origen at Alexandria, summoned Rufinus from his retirement at Aquileia, to justify himself, but the latter, protected by John of Jerusalem, evaded the mandate, and Anastasius left him to his own conscience.

2. Among the Monastic Orders.

The turn of events at Alexandria had contributed decisively to the hostilities against Rufinus. The Bishop Theophilus, in his Easter letter of 399, opposed the anthropomorphic views wide-spread among the monks of Egypt, who attributed body and human form to God since man was made in the image of God, and Theophilus affirmed in Origenistic fashion that God and God only must be regarded as non-material. But the monks of the Scetic desert hurried to Alexandria and so intimidated Theophilus that he acquiesced in the condemnation of the works of Origen, and took occasion to proceed against the Origenistic monks of the Nitrian mountains named " the four long brothers " who had roused his anger by joining his opponent, the presbyter Isidore. A synod at Alexandria in 399 or 400 and a stormy assembly in the Nitrian mountains had to condemn Origen. The stern measures of Theophilus against the monks and his declaration against Origen even as far as Jerusalem won approval from Anastasius, Jerome, and Epiphanius; and in Constantinople, whither " the four long brothers," Isidore, and fifty monks had fled, began the repulsive proceedings that were to end with the banishment of Chrysostom (q.v.). Nevertheless, the partizans of Origen did not disappear. Conspicuous among them were Evagrius, Ponticus, Palladius, and Socrates. Even Theodoret, who differed from him in hermeneutics, did not rank him as a heretic. Origen likewise found supporters in southern France, as in Vincent of Lerins. On the other hand, Leo the Great approved the condemnation of Origen, and Antipater of Bostra wrote an answer to the apology for Origen by Eusebius. After the middle of the fifth century the Palestinian Abbot Euthimius expelled monks from the vicinity of Cæsarea for Origenistic errors as to preexistence. In 514, however, four Origenistic monks led by Nonnus were received in the laura. They were driven out by the new abbot, but readmitted by his successor. They kept their views quiet until 531, when one of their number, Leontius of Byzantium, expressed Origenistic theories at a colloquy with the Monophysites. After the death of Sabas (q.v.), Nonnus (q.v.) is said to have won over all the more learned monks of the new laura, over which Nonnus and Leontis held sway, extending their influence to neighboring monasteries. On the other hand, their adherents, numbering forty, were driven from the old laura. An assault by the new party failed, as also further efforts for readmission. Both parties now sought support from without. Through Eusebius the Origenistic faction succeeded in having their most bitter opponents removed from the old laura about 542. The latter, in their turn, not only induced Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch, to condemn Origenism, but secured also the support of the papal apocrisary Pelagius and Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople. Under their influence Justinian wrote his famous letter to Mennas, calling for a synod for the condemnation of Origen's doctrines and for requiring every bishop and abbot to anathematize Origen and his heresies before consecration. Justinian's plans were frustrated, however, by Theodorus Ascidas, who had risen from the new laura to episcopal dignity, and who by a counterstroke not only induced the emperor not to proceed further in the matter, but also moved him to condemn the dogmas of the Antiochians, which conjured up the "Three-Chapter Controversy" (q.v.). Ascidas also enforced the readmission of the Origenistic monks to the new laura, from which they had been expelled for refusing to obey the edict against Origen's teachings. After the death of Nonnus in 547, a schism arose among the Origenistic monks themselves, the one faction being branded by their opponents as *Isochristoi* (because of the perfect equality with Christ which was to be attained at the final restoration), while the other was called *protoktistai* and *Tetraditæ* (on account of their views concerning the doctrine of the preexistence of the soul of Christ). The superior numbers of the Isochristoi obliged their antagonists to become formally reconciled with the orthodox; and when (probably in 552) the Isochristoi succeeded in having one of themselves chosen patriarch of Jerusalem, the orthodox in Constantinople were able not only to remove him, but even to secure the condemnation of Origenism together with Antiochian theology at the fifth ecumenical council in 553. The neolaurites, who refused to recognize the council, were expelled from the new laura and replaced by orthodox monks. There remains no doubt of the condemnation of Origen by the said council.

3. Points of Antagonism.

The special points regarded as offensive in Origen's teaching are given in the "Apology" of Pamphilus and by Methodius, *De resurrectione* and *De creatis;* Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxiv.; Jerome, *Contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum* (Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vi. 185–186); Orosius, *Commonitorium*, and Augustine's reply; Theophilus (Mansi, *Concilia*, iii. 979–980); the anonymous writer in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 117; and Justinian, *Ad Mennam;* and the anathemas. In contrast with later writers, Pamphilus defended Origen's doctrine of the Trinity against subordinationism as well as against Sabellianism and Gnostic theories of emanation; but from the first Origen caused offense by his restriction of the resurrection of the body to its mere "form" in unison with his doctrines of the incarnation of spirits fallen from a pretemporal state, the preexistence of souls, the eternal creation of the world, his idealized restatement of the Biblical construction of the creation and paradise, and the restoration of all, even the devil. Though there was no lack of partizans of Origen's peculiar doctrines, yet those who were later antagonized as apologists of Origen acknowledged his views only to a limited extent. By one witness only of the sixth century are the doctrines of the preexistence and restoration attributed to these later Origenists. Even the Isochristoi, against whom the resolutions of the council of 553 were directed, dared to teach only a union of pretemporal spirits in the Logos and a future translation of deified souls in him, to be considered Origenists—a term which came to include any who held the doctrine of preexistence and restoration to be Adiaphora (q.v.). See Chrysostom; Epiphanius of Constantia; and Leontius of Byzantium.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, vii. 362–760, Leipsic, 1762–85; B. Eberhard, *Die Betheiligung des Epiphanius am Streite über Origines*, Treves, 1859; A. Vincenzi, *In sancti Gregori Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova defensio*, Rome, 1865; F. W. Farrar, *Mercy and Judgment*, London, 1881; H. N. Oxenham, *What is the Truth with Regard to Eternal Punishment?* London, 1876; F. Loofs, in *TU*, iii. 1–2 (1887); W. Rügamer, *Leontius von Byzanz*, Würzburg, 1894; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1899; N. Bonwetsch, in *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft* vii. 1 (1903); G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, ii. 1–94, Berlin, 1908; L. B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria, Theognostus, Pierius and Peter*, London, 1908; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 89 sqq., 786 sqq., 859 sqq., Eng. transl., ii. 430 sqq., iii. 217 sqq., 289 sqq., Fr. transl., ii. 1, pp. 137 sqq. (where excellent notes and references to literature are provided), ii. 2, pp. 1182 sqq., iii. 1, pp. 73 sqq. (wherever possible, the Fr. transl. should be used for the valuable notes and literature); Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 698 sqq.; *DCB*, iv. 142–156; *KL*, ix. 1073–78; and the literature under the articles named in the text.

ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHERS. See Presbyterians.

ORIGINAL FREE-WILL BAPTISTS. See Baptists, II., 4 (d).

ORLÉANS, FIRST SYNOD OF: A synod called by Clovis, king of the Franks, after his conquest of the West Gothic kingdom in Gaul. It met July 10, 511, and consisted of thirty-two bishops, including five metropolitans, viz., those of Bordeaux, Bourges, Tours, Elusa, and Rouen. Its principal concern was with matters of Asylum (q.v.), relations of the bishops to monks, the discipline of monks and the lower clergy, sexual relations and marriage, and matters of church property, and these are discussed in thirty-one canons. The inviolability of churches as places of asylum is reasserted, though not against the ravisher of a woman or against a fugitive slave; provision is made for the application of income from church property to certain definite uses, and protection is afforded against episcopal aggression upon one who has claims on church property; the rights of ordination are carefully guarded—a slave should not be ordained without his master's consent, and care in other matters was enjoined; abbots and monks are not to go over the heads of the bishop to the prince; the rights of bishops to certain parts of offerings and income, together with obligations to certain duties, are established; remarriage of widows of priests or deacons is forbidden; the discipline of the monasteries is regulated; a forty days' fast (not fifty days) before Easter is prescribed, and the Rogation Days are to be observed; divination is forbidden. The evident purpose of the synod was to organize the work of the church of the region after the mode deemed more orthodox than under the Goths. Other synods were held at Orléans in 533 (21 canons), 538 (33 canons), 541 (38 canons), 549 (24 canons), and 1022.

Bibliography: Sources are: Mansi, *Concilia*, viii. 350 sqq.; Harduin, *Concilia*, ii. 1008 sqq.; J. Sirmondi, *Concilia antiqua Galliæ*, i. 177 sqq., Paris, 1629; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 661 sqq., Eng. transl., iv. 87 sqq., and especially Fr. transl., ii. 2, pp. 1005–15 (valuable for the

notes and literature which are given); *MGH, Concilia*, i (1893), 1–14. Consult: Bouquet, *Recueil*, iv. 103–104; D. Lobineau, *Les Saints de Bretagne*, i. 131–134, Paris, 1836; E. Bimbenet, *Les Conciles d'Orléans considérés comme sources de droit coutoumier*, pp. 743–744, ib. 1864; G. Kurth, *Clovis*, ii. 131–154, ib. 1901.

ORME, WILLIAM: Scotch Congregationalist; b. at Falkirk (25 m. n.w. by w. of Edinburgh) Feb. 3, 1787; d. at London (?) May 8, 1830. He entered upon the study of theology in 1805; became Congregational minister of Perth, 1807; and, removing to London, was appointed pastor at Camberwell Green, and foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society. He wrote *An Historical Sketch of the Translation and Circulation of the Scriptures from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (Perth, 1815); *Memoirs of John Owen* (London, 1820); *Life of William Kiffin* (1823); *Memoirs, . . . Letters, and . . . Remains of J. Urquhart* (2 vols., 1827); *Life of Richard Baxter*, prefixed to his *Works* (1830); and especially, *Bibliotheca Biblica: A Select List of Books on Sacred Literature, with Notices, Biographical, Critical, and Bibliographical* (Edinburgh, 1824).

Bibliography: *Evangelical Magazine*, 1830, pp. 253 sqq., 289 sqq.; *DNB*, xlii. 257–258.

ORMUZD AND AHRIMAN. See Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism.

ORNAMENTS: An ecclesiastical term which comprehends the articles actually used in the church service, especially of the Anglican Church. The usual sense involving something decorative is here entirely absent, and the term is technical, covering vestments (see Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical), books (as the Homilies, q.v.), cloths, chalices, patens, communion tables, and the like. The question of what are legal ornaments has led to much litigation in England, with the result that the demarcation between those permitted and those forbidden is practically settled (See Ritualism).

Bibliography: J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 67–74, 86, New York, 1908; C. H. H. Wright and C. Neil, *Protestant Dictionary*, pp. 482–491, London, 1904; F. Procter and W. H. Frere, *A New Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 360–367 et passim, London, 1905.

OROSIUS, ō-rō'si-us, **PAULUS:** Patristic writer; b. at an uncertain date in Galicia, probably at Bracara, the modern Braga (35 m. n.e. of Oporto), in Portugal; d. after 418. The forename Paul is not evident before the eighth century. In 414 he is mentioned as presbyter in Africa, where he presented to Augustine a *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum;* which Augustine answered with the tract, *Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*. During a journey to the East, in 415, he appeared before Bishop John of Jerusalem as accuser of Pelagius (see Pelagius, Pelagian Controversies), and defended his own position in the *Liber apologeticus*, addressed to the presbyters of Jerusalem. On his homeward journey, he took with him a portion of the first martyr Stephen's relics, just then discovered; but left them on the Island of Minorca, and returned to Africa. While in Africa he wrote, probably before 418, the historical work which made his name famous: *Historiarum adversus paganos*. This was written at the request of Augustine, who was preparing his great work *De civitate Dei* and desired historical proof from Orosius to the effect that humanity had been worse beset with war, sickness, and other natural calamities before the Christian era than at that time. By this means it was purposed to confute the pagans' reproach that Christianity was the cause of the contemporary woe. This book, which covered a vast field of original sources (Cæsar, Livy, Suetonius, Florus, Justin, Eutropius, Eusebius, Jerome, and others), was widely used during the Middle Ages as a guide to universal history. Even to-day, the same is extant in nearly 200 manuscripts. The best edition is that of Zangemeister, in *CSEL*, vol. v. (Vienna, 1882; smaller edition, Leipsic, 1889); it is also in *MPL*, xxxi. 663, 1216. The *Commonitorium* is in *MPL*, xlii. 665–670, and, ed. G. Schepss, in *CSEL*, vol. xviii. (Vienna, 1889). G. KRÜGER.

Bibliography: For editions and literature cf. Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 882–883. An Anglo-Saxon translation of the *Historiarum* was made by King Alfred, ed. with Eng. transl. by D. Barrington, London, 1773; B. Thorpe, ib. 1854; and J. Bosworth, ib. 1856; and in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. Consult: T. de Mörner, *De Orosius vita ejusque historiarum libris vii.*, Berlin, 1844; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 1, pp. 398–411, Regensburg, 1864; C. Paucker, *Die Latinität des Orosius*, Berlin, 1883; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 337–344, Leipsic, 1889; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, ed. L. Schwabe, pp. 1165–68, ib. 1890; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ix. 356–357, x. 1–6; *DCB*, iv. 157–159.

ORPEN, RAYMOND D'AUDEMER: Church of Ireland; b. at Dublin Aug. 31, 1837. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1859; M.A., 1864; D.D., 1907); was made deacon in 1860 and priest in 1861; was curate of Rathronan, 1860–62, of Holy Trinity, Limerick, 1862–63, of Tralee, 1863–67, and of Adare, 1867–69; rector of Tralee, 1869–1907; precentor of Ardfert, 1878–85, also rural dean of Tralee; archdeacon of Arfert, 1885–1907; chaplain to the bishop of Limerick, 1894–1907; canon of Taney at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, 1905–07; canon of Effin in St. Mary's Cathedral, Limerick, 1906–07; and was consecrated lord bishop of Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe, 1907.

ORR, JAMES: United Free Church of Scotland; b. at Glasgow Apr. 11, 1844. He was graduated from the university of his native city (M.A., 1870) and the Theological Hall of the United Presbyterian Church (1872). He was minister of East Bank United Presbyterian Church, Hawick (1874–1891); professor of church history in the Theological College of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland (1874–1901). Since 1901 he has been professor of apologetics and theology in Glasgow College of the United Free Church. He has lectured repeatedly in the United States under the auspices of various theological seminaries, at Chicago in 1895, at Alleghany and Auburn in 1897, at Princeton in 1903, and in Toronto in 1909, and was also one of the chief promoters of the union between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. Among his numerous writings, special mention may be made of his preparation of homilies on Exodus, Deuteronomy, II Kings, and Hosea for *The Pulpit*

Commentary (London, 1881–89); *The Christian View of God and the World* (Kerr lectures for 1891; Edinburgh, 1893, 3d ed., 1897); *The Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith* (London, 1897); *Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity* (1899); *The Early Church: Its History and Literature* (1901); *The Progress of Dogma* (Elliot lectures; 1901); *David Hume and his Influence on Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh, 1903); *Ritschlianism; Expository and Critical Essays* (London, 1903); *God's Image in Man and its Defacement in Light of Modern Denials* (1905); *Problem of the Old Testament Considered with Reference to Recent Criticism* (Bross prize; 1906, 5th impression, 1908); *The Bible under Trial. Apologetic Papers in View of Present Day Assaults on Holy Scripture* (1907); *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1907); and *The Resurrection of Jesus* (1908).

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY.

Definition and Derivation (§ 1).
Historical Unfolding (§ 2).
The Modern Antithesis (§ 3).
Conflicts in America and Great Britain (§ 4).

1. Definition and Derivation.

Orthodoxy refers to a conscientious adherence to the Christian faith as taught in the Bible [or rather in the ecumenical creeds], and heterodoxy to a divergence from such teachings. The concepts do not occur in the Bible, for such phrases as those in Titus i. 9, 13; I Tim. i. 3; II Tim. i. 13, do not correspond to the antithesis expressed by these terms. Yet the passages just cited furnish the basis for the concept of orthodoxy, since Paul required that Christian teaching be in conformity with the words uttered by Christ and his disciples, equal authority being claimed for both because of such passages as Matt. x. 20, 40; Luke x. 16; John xiv. 12, which place the testimony of the apostles under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. While the Church, in her establishment of the canon of Scripture, definitely recognized this norm of doctrine, she did not proceed immediately from the Bible, since there always intervened the general interpretation of the Word and the general belief of Christendom. Both these factors progressed, though by no means simultaneously and directly; but in such a way that the present time, with all its historical and philological skill in exegesis, falls far short of the living faith of the patristic or of the Reformation period, while the teaching of the Church then made a progress which can no longer be equaled. If orthodoxy be taken to mean, in its most general sense, conformity with the prevailing doctrines of the Church, it follows that such orthodoxy is no constant quantity, so that, in the course of evolution, a belief may be orthodox at one time and heterodox at another. This purely historical evolution is further complicated by sectarian divisions of the Church, thus giving rise to Lutheran orthodoxy and Reformed orthodoxy, Roman Catholic orthodoxy and Greek Catholic orthodoxy, and the orthodoxy of the most varied sects. This leads to the widest application of the terms, but a narrower sense is approached in considering in what measure the conformity of Church members with Church doctrine may be expected. While the terms are seldom used with reference to laymen and non-theologians, all should be so instructed as to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them (cf. I Pet. iii. 15). Those who give religious instruction, on the other hand, must be known to be in strict conformity with the teaching of the Church; and orthodoxy becomes of decisive importance for the clergy and scientific theologians, for they expressly take upon themselves the obligation to defend and to present the teachings of the Church whose service they have entered. The clergy not only should give orthodox sermons and instructions, but should be orthodox themselves. Even granting that the academic teacher and the theological writer should have wider scope than the general clergy, nevertheless no church can disassociate its theology from connection with the creed which it professes so as to allow the theologian to exchange the banner of the Church for liberal science. At the same time, the question arises as to where orthodoxy ceases and heterodoxy begins, and as to how far heterodoxy is to be tolerated before it evolves into actual error.

2. Historical Unfolding.

In answering this problem, Marheineke, in Daub and Creutzer's *Studien* (1807), shows for the first three centuries the gradual unfolding of a fixed and authoritative norm of doctrine by the development of the rule of faith, the labors of the Church Fathers, and the Catholic episcopate. The crystallization of doctrine involved two elements: the divine, which assured the abiding foundation of the Christian faith (i.e., the right understanding of the Scriptures); and the human, which made the development the transition to a stereotyped orthodoxy which sapped the spiritual life of the Greek Church more and more since the time of John of Damascus. In the western Church, on the other hand, the popes, rather by neglect than intention, gave ample scope throughout the Middle Ages to individual concepts and presentations of the doctrines of the Church. A great change was ushered in by the Reformation; for the Protestants not only made for themselves formal creeds, but forced others to do the same. The sixteenth century, therefore, was the period of creeds, and the seventeenth that of orthodoxy. Not only was this true of Protestantism, especially in Germany; but in France, during the same period, Roman Catholic orthodoxy, more especially Jesuitism, fought its great battle with Jansenism; and the Greek Church, roused from her apathy by Cyril Lucar, again formulated her doctrines in the "Confession" of Petrus Mogilas. When orthodoxy became idolized and attempted to assert its exclusive despotism over the Church, it led to its own downfall. Yet the very flood of heterodoxy in the eighteenth century soon revealed what a dam had been removed; nor could either Pietism or supernaturalism withstand the onslaughts of rationalism, the Enlightenment, skepticism, and speculation. Despite all this, faith gradually found a firmer basis, even though there was, in the very nature of things, no return to the seventeenth century. The orthodoxy of the present must and will endure an entirely different measure of heterodoxy within the Church; and the reigning spirit is one of liberalism.

3. The Modern Antithesis.

There is, however, another struggle pending, which may lead to the last schism in Christianity. This does not concern deviating concepts and presentations of individual doctrines, or the acceptance or rejection of this or that ecclesiastical position, but in it two views of the universe—practically, two religions—stand opposed to one another. For if, ostensibly to ethicize Christianity, its nerve of faith be severed, if the essential divinity of Christ be replaced by his human uniqueness, if the Bible be dethroned for the consciousness of the community, then there is no longer a mere conflict between orthodoxy and heterodoxy; but the existence of the confessional churches is imperiled, and the way is opened for the formation of entirely new types of religious organization. Protestantism is evidently destined to surrender to this new development. The antithesis is no longer between conservative and liberal theology, but between Church and modern theology. The question is whether Christianity is to maintain itself as the religion of revelation, or is to lapse to a mere phase of the general evolution of religious history.

(Karl Burger†.)

4. Conflicts in America and Great Britain.

Orthodoxy and heterodoxy receive a different application according as there is an established Church, or a binding creed to be interpreted by a constituted authority, or a body of churches more or less loosely connected with a declaration of faith subject to revision or susceptible of a considerable margin of explanation. In America and Great Britain this subject has come up under a variety of conditions. In America, e.g., about the middle of the eighteenth century, the Arminian position concerning free will and original sin (see Arminianism) as represented by Daniel Whitby (1726) and John Taylor (1761) was branded by Jonathan Edwards and others as heterodox and fought as the most deadly enemy of religion in New England. Later, at the rise of Unitarianism (see Unitarians), in the Congregational Churches of New England the line between orthodoxy and heterodoxy was sharply drawn by Noah Worcester and Moses Stuart on one side, and on the other by Henry Ware, Sr., W. E. Channing, and Andrews Norton (qq.v.). The next controversy emerged nearly simultaneously in the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches. In the Presbyterian Church, in connection with the movement which resulted in the organization of the New School branch, Albert Barnes (q.v.) was first tried and condemned by his presbytery and afterward acquitted by the General Assembly, and Lyman Beecher (q.v.) was tried but acquitted for advocacy of the universality of the Atonement (q.v.). A few years later Horace Bushnell (q.v.) was repeatedly threatened with prosecution by some of his ministerial brethren in Connecticut for alleged heretical writings on Christian nurture, the Trinity, and the atonement. These movements were ultimately abortive and the suspected teachings have long since taken their place by the side of other accredited doctrines of the respective churches. Near the close of the last century two other movements appeared in the same religious bodies. Professor C. A. Briggs (q.v.) of Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), tried for heresy by the New York Presbytery and acquitted, was the following year suspended by the General Assembly for heterodox teaching with reference to historical criticism of the Old Testament. The same year a similar fate and for a like reason befell Professor Henry Preserved Smith (q.v.) of Lane Theological Seminary. In the Congregational denomination (1882–93) the so-called Andover hypothesis of probation after death (see Probation) became the subject of heated controversy, in which not only Andover Seminary, but all who sympathized with the larger hope were charged with defection from the orthodox faith. This controversy was resolved by appointment of men as missionaries who were in sympathy with Andover, by a declaration by the National Council of Congregational Churches at Minneapolis in 1892 that creeds were to be used "not as tests, but as testimony," and finally (1908) by the affiliation of Andover Seminary with the Divinity School of Harvard University—an event of extraordinary significance in the light of the early history of both institutions. In the Protestant Episcopal Church the opposition to teaching regarded by many as heretical, for a long time smoldering, here and there breaking out, overtook the Rev. T. H. MacQueary, charged with the denial of miracles and suspended for six months (1891), and the Rev. A. S. Crapsey, deposed from the ministry (1908) on the ground of rejecting the birth-stories of Jesus in the first and third Gospels. Other denominations have experienced similar conflicts between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, e.g., the Baptists in the agitation which resulted in the retirement of Professor C. H. Toy from the chair of Hebrew in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., in 1879, and is more recently convulsing the Northern Baptists on the subject of baptism (immersion) as a *sine qua non* of admission to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

In Great Britain in the Church of England (see England, Church of), at one time the Evangelical, at another time the High-church, party, professing the orthodox faith, has stamped as heterodox the Broad-church or liberal party as heretical, without, however, being able to excommunicate their leaders. Scotland was the scene of a fierce battle when William Robertson Smith (q.v.), professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College of Aberdeen, was in 1881 removed from his chair by the extraordinary act of the General Assembly, on account of his articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in which he had advocated the views of Wellhausen and his school respecting the religion of Israel and the canon of the Old Testament.

C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties and Schools of Religious Thought*, Philadelphia, 1874; J. H. Allen, *Ten Discourses on Orthodoxy*, Boston, 1849; J. F. Clarke, *Orthodoxy, its Truths and Errors*, ib. 1866; J. J. Overbeck, *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism*, London, 1866; E. C. Towne, *The*

Question of Hell: Essay on New Orthodoxy, New Haven, 1873; J. T. Sunderland, *Orthodoxy and Revivalism*, New York, 1877; D. Dorchester, *Concessions of "Liberalists" to Orthodoxy*, Boston, 1878; J. Cook, *Orthodoxy*, ib. 1879; E. H. Hall, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Christian Church*, ib. 1883; S. E. Herrick, *Some Heretics of Yesterday*, ib. 1885; R. Balmforth, *The New Reformation*, London, 1893; W. G. T. Shedd, *Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy*, New York, 1893; G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy*, ib., 1908.

ORTLIBENSES, ORTLIBIANS. See ORTLIEB OF STRASBURG.

ORTLIEB OF STRASBURG AND THE ORTLIBIANS: A sect mentioned in the writings of the heresy hunters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Concerning Ortlieb himself (who lived c. 1200) there is extant only one sentence (best given by Haupt in *ZKG*, vii. 1886, 503, 559, from a Mainz manuscript): "To say that man must abstain from outward things and follow the answers of the spirit within himself is the heresy of a certain Ortlieb of Strasburg, which Innocent III. condemned." But notices of the sect are found in the so-called Passau Anonymus (*Bibliotheca maxima Lugdunensis*, xxv., quoted below). They are said to assert the eternity of the world (267, C). To the church doctrine of the Trinity and Christology they give an entirely new interpretation, affirming (266, H): whoever has joined the sect, is the Father; he who is converted by him, the Son; he who aids and confirms the convert, the Holy Ghost. Adam was the first man who was created anew by the word of God and fulfilled God's commandments (267, C). Adam and Christ, however, are to them not historical persons but symbols of the perfect man, hence they also affirmed "that there was no Trinity before the birth of Christ" (267, A). Jesus they assert to be the son of the carpenter Joseph and not free from sin (266, G). As they rejected the fundamental doctrines of the Church, so also they rejected the sacraments; infant baptism is useless unless the baptized is afterward made perfect in the sect. What the Church calls the body of Christ, is only bread; the true body of Christ is the body of the believers. They reject the hierarchy and oppose to it the perfect ones of the sect; such a one binds and looses and can do everything. In the papacy they saw the root of all evil; the Church of the pope they consider the harlot of the Apocalypse. Only when all shall be converted to their sect, will it be possible to live quietly in eternity, but even then men will be born and die. They deny the resurrection, but believe that the spirit continues to live. Of their institutions it is known only that they generally prayed by threes. Their life is said to have been austere, and some fasted every other day (267, E). They also rejected sexual intercourse in marriage (267, F). The Ortlibians have been differently classified; some have connected them with the Amalricians (see AMALRIC OF BENA), others with the Cathari (see NEW MANICHEANS, II.). K. Müller, finding that in the notices of the Waldensians by Stephen of Bourbon (*De septem donis spiritus sancti*) many things coincide strikingly with what the Passau Anonymus says concerning the Ortlibians, has drawn the conclusion that the latter were originally Waldensians, but adopted some things from the Amalricians and from the Brethren of the Free Spirit (see FREE SPIRIT, BRETHREN OF THE). But all that is justified by the fact is the inference that Stephen had questioned Ortlibians. That he considered them Waldensians loses much of its importance because, according to his own statement, the declarations of the heretics whom he examined contained much that was contradictory. Besides, as Haupt has shown, he proves himself not well informed concerning the relations of the heretics to each other. Against Müller's view speaks the fact that nothing specifically Waldensian appears among the utterances of the Ortlibians, but only similarities, and such similarities they have in common with other heretics. On the other hand, the whole spirit of their teaching is bluntly opposed to the Waldensians. Some of the opinions quoted above come nearer to the Cathari, though they contain very little specifically Catharistic. They show a certain rationalistic, as it were enlightening, trait, which seems to point to a relationship with the Brethren of the Free Spirit. From the records now extant, a positive decision is hardly to be reached.

S. M. DEUTSCH†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Stephan de Borbone, *Tractatus de diversis materiis prædicalibus*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche, in *Anecdotes, legendes et apologues*, Paris, 1877; and "The Anonymus of Passau," partly given in *Bibliotheca patrum maxima Lugdunensis*, xxv. 262–277, Leyden, 1677. Consult: C. Schmidt, *Die Sekten zu Strasburg im Mittelalter*, in *ZHT*, x (1840), 46 sqq.; A. Jundt, *Hist. du panthéisme populaire au moyen âge*, pp. 31 sqq., Strasburg, 1875; W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*, i. 191 sqq., Leipsic, 1877; H. F. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*, ii. 237 sqq., 375 sqq., Berlin, 1877; M. K. Müller, *Die Waldenser*, pp. 130 sqq., 169 sqq., Gotha, 1886; H. Haupt, *Waldensia*, in *ZKG*, x (1889), 316 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, iv. 872; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, p. 488. Allusions will be found in the literature on the Waldenses.

ORTON, JOB: Dissenting minister; b. at Shrewsbury (43 m. s.s.e. of Liverpool) Sept. 4, 1717; d. at Kidderminster (16 m. s.w. of Birmingham) July 19, 1783. Being inclined toward the ministry, he prepared privately and at an academy at Northampton, of which he became assistant tutor in 1739, and in the same year was licensed. He assumed charge of the Presbyterian congregation of High Street Chapel, Shrewsbury, in 1741, where he received ordination in 1745. Owing to impaired health, the work devolved mainly on his assistants after 1741, and in 1766 he resigned and retired to Kidderminster. His period of greatest influence (1766–83) was that of retirement when he corresponded with dissenting ministers of all sections. A few of his numerous writings were: *Religious Exercises Recommended* (Shrewsbury, 1769); *Discourses to the Aged* (1771); and *Letters to Dissenting Ministers*, with *Memoir* by Palmer (London, 1806). His *Practical Works* with letters and memoir was published (2 vols., 1842).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Memoirs* noted above, consult *DNB*, xlii. 271–272, where references to scattering literature are given.

OSBORNE, EDWARD WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Springfield, Ill.; b. at Calcutta, India, Jan. 5, 1845. He was educated at Gloucester College, England, became curate of Highworth in 1869 and of Kenn, Devonshire, in 1872; member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist (the Cowley Fathers), 1875; member of the staff of St. John the Evangelist, Boston, 1877; curate of St. Philip's, Capetown, 1890; was priest in charge of the same church, as well as chaplain of St. George's Home, Capetown (1891–96); superior of the mission church of St. John the Evangelist, Boston (1898–1904); and in 1904 was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Springfield, becoming full diocesan on the death of Bishop G. F. Seymour in 1906. He has written *The Children's Saviour* (New York, 1879); *The Saviour King* (1888); and *The Children's Faith* (1889).

OSGOOD, HOWARD: Baptist; b. on Magnolia Plantation, Plaquemine Parish, La., Jan. 4, 1831. He was educated at Harvard College (A.B., 1850). In 1856 he was ordained, and held pastorates at Flushing, L. I. (1856–58), and New York City (1858–66). From 1868 to 1874 he was professor of Hebrew at Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., and held a similar position in Rochester Theological Seminary (1874–1901). He was a member of the American Company of Old-Testament Revisers from 1874 to 1901, and in theology is an adherent of the orthodox school. He translated J. P. Lange's general and special introductions to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers in the American Lange series (New York, 1876).

OSGOOD, SAMUEL: American clergyman and writer; b. at Charlestown, Mass., Aug. 30, 1812; d. at New York City Apr. 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. After editing *The Western Messenger* at Louisville, Ky., for two years he assumed charge, in 1837, of the Unitarian Church, Nashua, N. H. In 1841 he became pastor at Providence, R. I., and, in 1849, of the Church of the Messiah, New York. In 1869 he changed his theological views, and, after a year of travel in Europe, entered the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Not caring to reenter parochial work, he spent the remaining ten years of his life in writing for periodicals and lecturing. He was regarded as a leading man of letters, and was especially noted for the deep interest he took in the New York Historical Society and other public literary institutions. Among his writings are: *Studies of Christian Biography* (New York, 1851); *God with Men* (1853); *Milestones in our Life-Journey* (1855); *Student Life* (1860); *American Leaves* (1867).

OSIANDER, ō″zī-ān′der: The name of a family of German Lutheran scholars and theologians.

1. **Andreas Osiander I.:** German Reformer; b. at Gunzenhausen (37 m. s.s.w. of Nuremberg) Dec. 19, 1498; d. at Königsberg Oct. 17, 1552. He studied Hebrew at the University of Ingolstadt, was ordained a priest in 1520, and became teacher of Hebrew at the Augustinian cloister in Nuremberg. In 1522 he issued a Latin version of the Bible, improved by means of the original text and supplied with marginal annotations, and in the same year was called as preacher to St. Lorenz, where he soon took a leading position in the Protestant Reformation. Even while the papal legate Campegius was present in the city, Osiander offered both elements of the communion to Queen Isabella of Denmark, sister of Charles V. and of Ferdinand, and, during passion-week, thundered against the Roman antichrist. He wrote a severe polemic in 1525 against the Franciscan Kaspar Schatzgeier, attacking the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. In the controversy between the Saxon and Swiss Reformers, Osiander took part with the former and placed himself in opposition to Zwingli. At the conference at Marburg called by Philip of Hesse, Osiander again sided with the representatives of Wittenberg against the Swiss. Osiander's popularity in Nuremberg was considerably impaired by his incessant and bitter disputes with his colleagues. Nevertheless, Melanchthon, in 1537, urged the council to send Osiander to the assembly at Schmalkald, where in a sermon he asserted his own opinions against Luther. He was also present at the important meetings of 1540 at Hagenau and Worms. At Worms he became acquainted with Calvin, who was offended by his indecorous table-talk. In 1542, Count Ottheinrich of Palatinate Neuburg invited him to introduce the Reformation in his territory.

Osiander's literary activity never paused. In 1537, he produced a harmony of the Gospels. To polemics he contributed: "The Remarkable Prophecy" (1527); a keen reply to the attacks of Eck; and his *Conjecturæ de ultimis temporibus*, against the papacy. His mathematical and astronomical interest was such that he was invited by Copernicus to make corrections of his work, *De revolutionibus orbium cœlestium* (1543), and unknown to the author prefixed a preface. At variance with the Zwinglians on the one hand, and, on the other, menaced with other Protestants by the approach of the Smaldkald War and the downfall of the Protestant cause, Osiander's position in Nuremberg became ever more uncomfortable. After the victorious advance of the imperial army, he was not in accord with the succeeding Interim and left the city, to reappear soon after in Breslau. Osiander then wrote to Duke Albert of Prussia (q.v.), who had been won to the Protestant cause by his preaching at Nuremberg, with whom he had remained in continuous correspondence. Not waiting for a reply he arrived at Königsberg (1549) and although he had no academic degree received a pastorate and a head professorship in the theological faculty. He was soon engaged in disputes with his colleagues and the supporters of the Interim. In the remarkable tract, *Von dem neuen Abgott und Antichrist zu Babel*, both his wrath against Rome and his opposition to the Interim appear. On Oct. 24, 1550, occurred the momentous disputation on the question of justification by faith, which gave Osiander's enemies occasion for attack.

Osiander opposed the Roman doctrine of justification by works, and was in accord with Luther in emphasizing salvation only by the grace of Christ and justification by faith. He remained steadfast, however, in the mystical conception of the same, namely, by the real indwelling of God induced by faith. Duke Albert assembled a conference, Feb., 1851, for the purpose of conciliation.

Osiander's doctrines were with difficulty understood. He claimed to have Luther on his side. His opponents presented an array of Luther's sayings to prove the opposite, and Osiander replied in similar form with his *Excerpta quædam*. The outcome of the disputation was an absolute breach between Osiander and his opponents. Osiander was then appointed superintendent with spiritual functions, but Mörlin, his arch-opponent, denied him the sacrament and his colleagues withdrew their recognition. On Oct. 5, 1551, the duke sent Osiander's statement of his opinions together with an account of the dispute so far to the Evangelical princes and cities of Germany with the request that the matter be regularly discussed in synods. All Evangelical Germany began to be stirred. In Nuremberg especially the debate waxed warm. In Stettin, Peter Artopöus and the physician G. Curio supported Osiander's views; but, outside of Prussia, there was almost unanimous opposition. There was objection to the dangerous mysticism of the divine indwelling; to the one-sided emphasis of the divine nature of Christ, which, in connection with the separation of forgiveness of sin from justification, seemed to depreciate the humanity of Christ and to diminish his merit; and, finally, to the identification of justification with regeneration. Osiander replied to the presentation of the moderate opinion of Melanchthon with an intemperate tract, *Widerlegung der ungegründeten undienstlichen Antwort Philippi Melanchthoni* (1552). He answered a number of assailants together in the coarse but keen *Schmeckbier* (1552). Osiander died in the midst of the strife, which continued for several years after his death, despite the duke's efforts to restore peace. See Briessmann, Johann; Funck, Johann; and Moerlin, Joachim. (P. Tschackert.)

2. Lucas Osiander the Elder: Pastor and theologian; son of Andreas by his first marriage; b. at Nuremberg Dec. 15, 1534; d. at Stuttgart Sept. 17, 1604. He moved with his father to Königsberg in 1549, and after the father's death entered the University of Tübingen. When but twenty-three years old he became superintendent at Blaubeuren and the same at St. Leonhard's in Stuttgart, in 1562. He was created doctor of theology in 1564; court preacher and consistorial councilor, in 1567; and gained commanding influence under Duke Ludwig (1568–93). The opinionated new Duke Friedrich, made restless by the harsh tone of his sermons, transferred him, in 1593, to the cathedral pulpit; and, in 1596, to the Abbey of Adelberg. As abbot of this former cloister, Osiander became a member of the diet, and thus ventured to remonstrate with the duke for patronizing the Jews. He was now deposed, and banished from the country. Retreating no farther than Esslingen, he there caused much disturbance by his sermons, but was soon permitted to return to Stuttgart. His wife was Margareta Entringer, widow of Caspar Lyser, and mother of the renowned Lutheran Polycarp Lyser. She was, furthermore, a sister of the wife of Jacob Andreas, with whom Osiander made common cause in establishing for the Church of Württemberg the "Brenz" Lutheran type.

Osiander's activity in Church and State was many-sided; as in the conflict with Calvinism (conference at Maulbronn, 1564; Zweibrücken, 1579; Mömpelgard, 1586); in behalf of Lutheran union by means of the Formula of Concord (at Maulbronn, q.v., Jan. 19, 1576; pronouncement on the "Torgau Book"; first Latin translation of the Formula of Concord Sept. 6, 1576); in behalf of inaugurating the Reformation of Cologne under Archbishop Gebhard, 1583; and in the direction of an understanding with the Greek Church, as well as in opposition to the papacy. A declaration against the Gregorian calendar, 1583, may be noted; and his polemical tracts against the Jesuits. As preacher, he disdained all rhetorical ornament, avoided useless controversy, spoke simply and colloquially, with Biblical edification (*Bauernpostille*, 5 parts, 1597–1600). Of great importance proved his *Quinque libri Moysis [and the other books of the Bible] iuxta veterem seu vulgatam translationem, ad Hebræam veritatem (ad Græcum textum) emendati, et brevi . . . explicatione illustrati, insertio etiam præcipuis locis communibus in lectione sacra obseruandis* (9 vols., Tübingen, 1573–86), forming a paraphrase of the entire Bible; *Institutio Christianæ religionis* (1576–86), an exhibition of the Evangelical Lutheran doctrinal system, in opposition to Calvin's "Institutes," commended to the Gallic and Belgian Churches for proselyting "foreign Christendom"; *Epitomes historiæ ecclesiasticæ centuria i.–xvi.* (1592–1604), at the same time a digest and a continuation of the "Magdeburg Centuries" (1597–1600), a very useful work for its day.

Osiander rendered a great service to hymnology; first, by publishing, conjointly with B. Bidembach, in 1569, the Choral Book of Sigmund Hemmel, *Der ganz Psalter Davids*, and by issuing, in 1586, his *Fünfzig geistliche Lieder und Psalmen mit 4 Stimmen*.

3. Andreas Osiander II.: Eldest son of Lucas I.; b. at Blaubeuren (10 m. w.n.w. of Ulm) May 26, 1562; d. at Tübingen Apr. 21, 1617. He served as pastor at Güglingen, 1587; was associated with his father as court preacher, 1590; became abbot at Adelberg, 1598, and professor of theology and chancellor of the university at Tübingen, 1605. He took part in the religious colloquy at Baden, 1589, and at Regensburg, 1601. He wrote sundry zealous tracts in defense of the Formula of Concord, and in antagonism to the papacy, e.g., *Papa non papa* (Tübingen, 1599; Frankfort, 1610). Of great and lasting importance was his brief manual for communicants (Tübingen, 1590).

4. Lucas Osiander, the Younger: Son of Lucas I.; b. at Stuttgart May 6, 1571; d. at Tübingen Aug. 10, 1638. He was superintendent at Leonberg, 1601; at Schorndorf, 1606; abbot at Bebenhausen, 1612; at Maulbronn, 1616; professor of theology at Tübingen, 1619; provost and chancellor of the university, 1620. Like his father and brother, he was one of the most orthodox Lutherans and a most vehement controversialist. His four *Enchiridia controversiarum* comprise: (1) *Cum Calvinistis*, 1605; (2) *Cum Anabaptistis*, 1605; (3) *Cum Schwenkfeldianis*, 1607; (4) *Cum Pontificiis*, 1602; besides various polemical tracts against Jesuits and Calvinists (e.g., against a Reformed preacher, *Scul-*

tetus atheus, in 1620). Osiander became known by his contest with the Giessen Kenotists (see KENOSIS), and his theological denunciation of Johann Arndt's *Wahres Christentum*, 1623, which he termed a "book of hell," because he found in it papistical, monastical, ecstatic, Flacian, Calvinistic, Schwenkfelder, and Weigelian heresies; at the same time pronouncing all subjective oracles and revelations to be mere delusion. His sweeping judgment of Arndt is unfair and was not approved either by the Lutherans of his own province or those of others. Meldenius rightly observes that Christ himself stands on Arndt's side, not on the side of Osiander's scholastic theology.

5. Johann Adam Osiander: Nephew of the two next preceding; b. at Vaihingen (15 m. n.w. of Stuttgart) Dec. 3, 1622; d. at Tübingen Oct. 26, 1697. In 1656 he became extraordinary professor of theology, and professor of the Greek language at Tübingen; ordinary professor in 1660; and chancellor of the university in 1680. Esteemed by his contemporaries as the "eye of the Lutheran Church," he was on friendly terms with Spener, and an opponent of Cartesianism, syncretism, and unionism.

6. Johannes Osiander: Son of the preceding; b. at Tübingen Apr. 22, 1657; d. there Oct. 18, 1724. His theological course at Tübingen was supplemented by extensive journeys abroad, and a sojourn of two years in Paris. In 1686 he was appointed professor of the Hebrew language and geography at Tübingen; professor of the Greek language and philosophy, 1688; ephorus of the theological scholarships, 1692; abbot of Königsbronn, 1697; of Hirsau, 1699; and director of the consistorium, 1708. He introduced confirmation, 1721–1723. Being a man of large attainments in languages and possessing a wide knowledge of the world, he was often entrusted with diplomatic missions, and in 1688 managed to prevent both Tübingen and Stuttgart from being plundered by the French.

7. Johann Rudolf Osiander: Son of the preceding; b. at Tübingen May 21, 1689; d. Oct. 25, 1725. He was professor of theology at Tübingen, 1720, and was known as an opponent of Christian Wolf.

8. Johann Ernst Osiander: Biblical scholar; b. at Stuttgart June 23, 1792; d. at Göppingen Apr. 3, 1870. He became professor at the theological seminary in Maulbronn, 1824; dean at Göppingen, 1840. He was a profound Swabian Biblical theologian, well versed in the Scriptural theology of Menken, and his commentaries on I–II Corinthians (1849–58) belong to the best of their time.

G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The earlier literature on Andreas is given in Wilken, *Andreas Osianders Leben, Lehre und Schriften*, Stralsund, 1844, and in A. Möller, *Andreas Osianders Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, Elberfeld, 1870. Consult further: J. A. Osiander, *Gens Osiandrina*, Tübingen, 1820; C. Ulenberg, *Geschichte der lutherischen Reformatoren M. Luthers . . . und A. Osianders*, vol. ii., Mainz, 1837; Schmidt, *Johannes Osiander*, Tübingen, 1843; Heberle, in *TSK*, 1844, pp. 371 sqq.; F. C. Baur, *Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung*, pp. 316 sqq., Tübingen, 1838; A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, i. 723 sqq., 1882, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1872; idem, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, ii. 325 sqq., 3 vols., Bonn, 1880–86; R. F. Grau, *De A. Osandri doctrina commentatio*, Marburg, 1860; Lehmann, *Stammtafel der Familie Osianders*, Königsberg, 1890; *ADB*, xxiv. 473 sqq.

OSMUND (OSMOND, OSMER), SAINT: Bishop of Salisbury; b. in Normandy; d. Dec. 3, 1099. He went to England with his uncle, William the Conqueror, and was by him made bishop of Salisbury in 1078. His *Liber ordinalis*, or *Liber consuetudinarium ecclesiæ*, concerning the forms and ceremonies of divine worship, known as the "Sarum Use," was very widely adopted in Great Britain and Ireland, and was continued in use down to the time of Henry VIII. He was canonized by Calixtus III. in 1457.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *The Register of St. Osmund* was edited by W. H. R. Jones in *Rolls Series*, no. 78, 2 vols., 1883–84. For his life consult: *ASB*, Jan., i. 77; *DNB*, xlii. 313–315; S. H. Cassan, *Lives and Memoirs of the Bishops of Sherborne and Salisbury*, pp. 109–120, Salisbury, 1824.

OSNABRUECK, ōs′nū-brük″, **BISHOPRIC OF:** An ancient bishopric in the present kingdom of Prussia. This part of the early Saxon territory was converted apparently by the missionary work of the monasteries of Meppen and Visbeck, founded in the reign of Charlemagne, while the origin of the bishopric probably falls in that of Louis the Pious —possibly in the third decade of the ninth century, if the Bishop Geboinus who took part in a synod at Mainz in 829 is identical with Gefwin of Osnabrück, the first in the list of incumbents of the see. The northern districts of Westphalia formed the jurisdiction of the diocese. (A. HAUCK.)

The best-known of the bishops of the period prior to the Reformation was Benno II. (1068–88), a zealous supporter of Henry IV. and his companion in the journey to Canossa. The fifty-fourth bishop, Francis von Waldeck (1532–53) accepted the Reformation. His successor, John IV. von Hoya (1553–1574), held to the old faith, but was able to do little for it, and the see was occupied by Protestant incumbents from 1574 to 1624. Francis von Wartenburg, however (1624–61), supported by the troops of Tilly, carried out the principles of the Counter-Reformation with a strong hand until a Swedish army appeared before the gates in 1633. The town was under Swedish government until the Peace of Westphalia (q.v.), by which it was provided that thenceforth there should be alternately a Roman Catholic bishop and one of the Augsburg Confession. The latter was to be taken always from the house of Brunswick-Lüneburg, and during his administration the Roman Catholic population was to be subject in spirituals to the archbishop of Cologne. By the settlement of 1803 it passed to Hanover, in 1806 to Prussia, the next year to the new kingdom of Westphalia, in 1810 to France, and in 1814 back to Hanover. As for the ecclesiastical relations, the ancient Roman Catholic diocese was reerected in 1857, and made immediately subject to the pope, the bishop being *ex officio* apostolic provicar of the northern missions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Much of the literature under MUENSTER, BISHOPRIC OF, is pertinent. Consult further: C. Stüve, *Geschichte des Hochstifts Osnabrück*, Jena, 1853; J. C. Möller, *Geschichte der Weihbischöfe von Osnabrück*, Lingen, 1887; F. Philippi, *Osnabrücker Urkundenbuch*, Osnabrück, 1892 sqq.; F. Jostes, *Kaiser- und Königsurkunden des Osnabrücker Landes*, Münster, 1899; A. Wurm, *Osnabrück, seine Geschichte, . . . Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler*, Osnabrück, 1901.

OSSAT, ARNAUD D': French cardinal of the sixteenth century; b. probably at Laroque-en-magnoac (Bagnéres Bigorre, department of Hautes Pyrénées) Aug. 23, 1536; d. at Rome Mar. 13, 1604. He resided at Rome after 1574, where he finally served as ambassador; hence the collection of his correspondence furnished abundant material on his ecclesiastical and political contemporaries. He obtained the papal absolution for Henry IV., and was made a cardinal in 1599 by Clement VIII. His correspondence has been repeatedly published since 1624; the best edition is that by A. de la Houssaye (2 vols., Paris, 1697). K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mme. Thiroux d'Arconville, *Vie du Cardinal d'Ossat*, 2 vols., Paris, 1771.

OSTERWALD, ōs′ter-vālt″, JEAN FRÉDÉRIC: Preacher of Neuchâtel; b. at Neuchâtel Nov. 16, 1663; d. there Apr. 14, 1747. He pursued his preparatory studies in his native city and in Zurich, and in 1678 entered the academy of Saumur, and subsequently studied at Orléans and Paris under Claude Pajon, Pierre Allix, and Jean Claude. In 1686 he was appointed deacon in his native city. His methods of instructing children attracted general attention and his sermons met with such favor that a new church was built for him, of which he became pastor in 1699. In 1700 he became a member of the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and during his whole life he was on intimate terms with English and Dutch clergymen. In 1702 he began to gather students, and his activity as teacher, pastor, and writer exerted so lasting an influence upon the church of Neuchâtel that he was called its second reformer. He was no creative theologian, and did not essentially advance the development of theology. Influenced by the theologians of Saumur, he represented, with Turretin of Geneva and Werenfels of Basel, the opposition to orthodoxy, and strove to make his opposition effective by silently passing over in his practical activity the dogmas which seemed to him superfluous and by trying to preserve for his church dogmatic freedom. He was neither a rationalist nor a moralist, but might be called a Pietist in so far as he tried to replace dogmatics by the Bible and doctrinal disputes by the cultivation of personal piety and a genuine preaching of the Gospel. He opened his effective activity in the practical service of the Church by a treatise, *Des sources de la corruption, qui régne aujour d'hui parmi les Chrétiens* (Neuchâtel, 1700; Eng. transl., London, 1700, and in Bishop Watson's *Collection of Theological Tracts*, vi., Cambridge, 1785). It was a work parallel to Spener's *Pia desideria* and similar in its effects. Osterwald demanded the continuation of the reformatory work in the direction of the reformation of morals. He devoted great energy to the moral elevation of his hearers and of the children to be confirmed, also to the elevation and reform of worship and to the revision of the liturgy. In 1702 appeared his catechism, which found a large circulation. It was immediately introduced in Neuchâtel, took the place of Calvin's catechism in Geneva, and was accepted even in England, Holland, and Germany (Eng. transl. by H. Wauley and G. Stanhope, *The Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion*, London, 1704). The ignorance and indifference which he found on his pastoral visits led him to prepare *Arguments et réflexions sur l'écriture sainte* (1709–15), from which proceeded the "Osterwald Bible-version" (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, VI., § 3). An Eng. transl., in 2 vols., appeared in London, 1716–18. (W. HADORN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Museum Helveticum*, part v. and vi., Zurich, 1747; *Journal helvétique*, April, 1747, pp. 369–416. Modern biographies are by L. Henriod, Neuchâtel, 1868; R. Gretillat, ib. 1904. Consult also J. F. Osterwald, in *L'Église nationale*, 1891, nos. 42–50; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, x. 98–104.

OSTIARIUS: Primarily a porter and later one of the minor orders of the clergy. Originally the porter was a slave (cf. Mark xiii. 34; John x. 3, xviii. 17; Acts xii. 13); but when the Christians came to possess their own churches, they were compelled to have porters, who, after the second half of the third century, were reckoned among the minor clergy. From Rome the employment of porters (Lat. *ostiarius*, rarely *æditnus* and *mansionarius;* Greek, *pyloros*, *thuroros*, or *ostiarios*) spread, so that most Western and some Eastern communities possessed them in the fourth century. Since the office was entrusted only to persons of settled age, and since frequent changes were undesirable, the ostiarius was debarred from ecclesiastical advancement. An ordination rite, with the giving of the keys of the church as its central feature, is given in the *Statuta ecclesiæ antiqua*, ix., and, more fully, in the Sacramentary of Gregory (*MPL*, lxxviii. 218). In the East the order declined earlier than in the West, though ostiarii are mentioned as late as the Trullan Council of 692. Also in the Roman Church sacristans are no longer clergy, though the ostiarius ordination is still conferred, as a matter of form, at the beginning of the clerical career. (H. ACHELIS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, III., vi.; J. G. Geret, *De exorcistis et ostiariis*, Ansbach, 1747.

OSTORODT, CHRISTOPH. See SOCINUS, FAUSTUS, SOCINIANS, I., § 2.

OSWALD, SAINT: King of Northumbria, 634–642; b. about 605; slain in battle with Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, at Maserfield (probably Oswestry, 16 m. n.w. of Shrewsbury, Shropshire), Aug. 5, 642. His father, Ethelfrid, fell in battle (617) with Edwin, the great king of Northumbria, who afterward became its first Christian ruler (see EDWIN; PAULINUS). Oswald and his brothers, being forced to flee, took refuge in Iona, where he was converted and baptized. He recovered his kingdom in 634, defeating the British King Cadwallon at Heavenfield (near Hexham), and at once introduced Christianity (see AIDAN). Although he was a great king and ruled over wider dominions than any of his ancestors, he was devout, humble, gracious, and charitable to the poor, "always wont, while ruling a temporal kingdom, to labor and pray for an eternal one" (Bede, *Hist.*, iii. 12). A mass of legend gathered about his name and miracles were attributed to his relics, which were kept at Gloucester, Bamborough, Lindisfarne, Durham, and other places.

Bibliography: Sources are: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 5, 14, 20, iii. 1–3, 5–7, 9–14, 23–24, iv. 14, v. 24; *Vita*, by Drogo, a monk, in *ASB*, Aug., ii. 94–103; *Vita*, by Reginald of Durham, ed. J. Raine for the Surtees Society, 1838, and in Simeon of Durham's historical works, ed. T. Arnold, in *Rolls Series*, no. 75, i. 326–385, London, 1882. Consult: T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, pp. 462–466, London, 1842–46; J. R. Green, *Making of England*, pp. 274–276, 290–294, ib. 1897; W. Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 149–159, 175–179, Oxford, 1897; *DNB*, xlii. 321–323; *DCB*, iv. 163–164.

OSWY: King of Northumbria, 643–671, important in the history of the Christianization of the English; b. about 612; d. Feb. 15, 671. He was a younger son of the Northumbrian King Ethelfrid, and, by his mother, a nephew of Edwin. On the overthrow of his father in 617 (see Edwin), with his brother Oswald (q.v.), he found refuge in Iona, and was baptized and educated there. He succeeded Oswald as king in 643. For several years he was menaced by the alliance between the heathen Saxons and the British, which had overthrown Edwin and Oswald, but in 655 he defeated and slew Penda of Mercia, the great heathen champion, and all except one of the British leaders. A rival king, Oswin, also established himself in Deira; he was murdered in 651 at Oswy's instigation, and the latter afterward gave his queen, Eanfled (daughter of Edwin), land for the foundation of a monastery at the place of the foul deed that prayers might be offered there for both the slayer and the slain. The dispute between the adherents of Roman and Celtic usages in the Church came to a crisis under Oswy, being by him decided against the latter at the Synod of Whitby in 664 (see Whitby, Synod of). His conduct leaves little doubt that he was anxious both to consolidate his kingdom and to bring his church and people into closer connection with Rome and the continent. Another indication of sound political judgment on Oswy's part, as well as of an intelligent desire to promote the best interests of his church and realm was his consultation with Egbert of Kent about 667 with regard to filling the vacant see of Canterbury (see Deusdedit). Finan, Colman, Ceadda, and Wilfrid of York (qq.v.) were all active during Oswy's reign.

Bibliography: Sources are: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 5, iii. 14–15, 21–25, 29, iv. 1, 3, 5; the *Vita* by Reginald of Durham in Simeon of Durham's *Historical Works*, ed. T. Arnold for *Rolls Series*, no. 75, 2 vols., 1882–85; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. with Eng. transl., B. Thorpe, in *Rolls Series*, no. 23, 1861; Henry of Huntington, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. T. Arnold for *Rolls Series*, no. 72, 1870. Consult: J. R. Green, *Making of England*, pp. 295–309, 319–325, London, 1897; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 45, 47, 53–56, 59–63, 70, London, 1897; W. Hunt, *The English Church, 597–1066*, ib. 1899; *DNB*, xlii. 333–337; *DCB*, iv. 166–167.

OTFRID OF WEISSENBURG: German poet of the ninth century. There were two monks of this name in the monastery at Weissenburg in Speyergau during the abbotship of Grimald, but it is entirely doubtful which of them wrote the original of two documents preserved in the Weissenburg copybook, one undated and the other in 851. Both Otfrids, however, must be distinguished from the Otfridus mentioned in a fragmentary Latin poem of Weissenburg dating from the beginning of the tenth century. Knowledge concerning the first High-German poet Otfrid is restricted to the scanty information afforded in the 7,416 lines of his *Liber Evangeliorum* and his Latin dedication to Archbishop Liutbert. The South Frankish dialect in which the poem is written was doubtless Otfrid's mother tongue. He accordingly seems to have been born near Weissenburg, but apparently studied for a time at Fulda under Rabanus Maurus and Solomon. This was before 838, for in that year Solomon became bishop of Constance. Otfrid was probably ordained priest after returning to Weissenburg, where he conceived the plan of writing his poem; partly to counteract the influence of secular and pagan hymns which were displeasing to certain approved men, obviously of spiritual rank, and partly because he was urged by his brethren and an aged matron named Judith to make a partial translation of the Gospels. This was designed primarily for his fellow monks, being adapted for the laity only in so far as they could have it read to them. From the narrative portions of the Gospel Otfrid chose those passages appointed as lessons by the Church, though in his arrangement he by no means followed the order of the church year. He likewise incorporated material from the Apocrypha, the Church Fathers, and the early medieval theologians, the latter especially in the "mystical," "spiritual," and "moral" interpretations of events recounted in the Bible. He was influenced chiefly by the homilies of Gregory the Great, certain writings of Augustine, the commentaries of Rabanus Maurus, and Paschasius Radbertus on Matthew, of Alcuin on John, and of Bede on Matthew, Luke, and John; drawing this material, in all probability, principally from some compendium of all these sources.

The poem is divided into five books; professedly, for the purification of the five senses. The first book is devoted to the birth and baptism of Christ; the second to his life from the temptation to the healing of the leper after the sermon on the mount; the third to selected miracles until the decision of the high priest to put Christ to death; the fourth to the passion; and the fifth to the resurrection, ascension, and last judgment. All the books are divided into chapters which were not invariably written in their present order. While the work is the earliest extant Old High-German composition in rime, this form of poetry was clearly no innovation. Otfrid's earlier models had derived their riming verse from France; and not only did this system of rimes stand in sharp antithesis to the Germanic alliteration, but the verses had four accents instead of two. Nevertheless, in the older portions of the poem there are clear traces of the old Germanic poetry of two accents with alliteration. The system of four accents doubtless had arisen in Germany, as also Otfrid's strophe, which consists of two lines; each composed of two half-lines corresponding in rime, and with four accents. This structure may be illustrated by the following example (i. 19):

Ióseph io thes sínthes   er húatta thes kíndes
(uuas thíonostman gúater),   bisúorgata ouh thia múater.

After years of toil on the *Liber evangeliorum*, Otfrid had a clean copy of the poem prepared by two scribes, which he then revised with his own hand and provided at the same time each half-verse with its accents. This autograph is preserved in the Codex *V*(*indobonensis*), the parent of *P*(*alatinus*) and of the fragmentary *D*(*iscissus*). The manuscript *F*(*risingensis*) does not contribute to the textual determination, and this together with the few other codices still await investigation. Copies of the poem were sent by Otfrid to King Louis the German, Archbishop Liutbert of Mainz, Bishop Solomon of Constance, and the monks Hartmuat and Werinbraht of St. Gall, as is clear from the prefatory epistles in V and P. These epistles, moreover, serve to date the *Liber evangeliorum* between 863 and 871, for Liutbert became archbishop in 863, Solomon died in 871, and in the following year Hartmuat was made abbot of St. Gall. The text has been edited by J. Kelle (3 vols., Regensburg, 1856–81), P. Piper (2 vols., Paderborn and Freiburg (1878–84), and O. Erdmann (Halle, 1882).

There is no demonstrable trace of Otfrid's influence upon later writers, and his work remained unknown until about 1495, when Trithemius repeatedly alluded to him. The manuscript F was discovered by Beatus Rhenanus in 1531, and forty years later Flacius Illyricus and Pirminius Gassar edited P, which was then owned by Ulrich Fugger. Nor is it difficult to explain the small popularity of the *Liber evangeliorum*. Otfrid attached less interest to the acts of Christ than to their symbolic interpretation and the dogmatic questions derived from them. Concerned about orthodoxy and heavily equipped with theological science, he writes on the whole for the learned. His national enthusiasm and his pure human interest which finds expression in occasional touching similes can not hide his melancholy, his barren prolixity, and his jejune allegorizing. Esthetically, the work is a hybrid theology in clumsy verse, neither an epic nor a series of pious hymns; but historically it is an index of the clerical training of the Carolingian period, and linguistically it is almost the only source for a certain knowledge of Old High-German metrics, syntax, and orthography.

(E. STEINMEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. T. Horning, *Conjectures sur la vie et l'education d'Otfrid*, Strasburg, 1833; F. Rechenberg, *Otfrids Evangelienbuch*, Chemnitz, 1862; K. Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften*, i. 358 sqq., Berlin, 1876; P. Schütze, *Beiträge zur Poetik Otfrids*, Kiel, 1887; W. Wilmanns, *Der altdeutsche Reimvers*, Bonn, 1887; F. Saran, *Ueber Vortragsweise und Zweck des Evangelienbuches Otfrids*, Halle, 1896; A. L. Plumhoff, *Beiträge zu den Quellen Otfrid's*, Kiel, 1898; A. Schönbach, in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, vols. xxxviii.–xl.; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 768 sqq.

OTHNIEL: A Kenizzite prominent in the Israelitic conquest of Palestine. According to Judges i. 11–16 (cf. Josh. xv. 15–19), he took the city of Kirjath-sepher (the later Debir), and received from his elder brother Caleb the hand of his daughter Achsah, the reward promised by Caleb to him who should reduce the place. Achsah, moreover, when leaving her father, secured from him the gift of certain wells. Since Caleb appears as the son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite (Num. xxxii. 12; Josh. xiv. 6, 14), while Othniel is termed the son of Kenaz, he was probably merely a clan-brother of Caleb, both being sons of Kenaz in the sense that they were Kenizzites, these being originally Edomites (Gen. xxxvi. 9–11, 15, 42) who were later incorporated with Judah. The entire account of the taking of Kirjath-sepher is now frequently explained as a union of the Kenizzite clans Caleb, Othniel, and Achsah, made for the reduction of the city, or for its occupation by Caleb's daughter after being captured.

Othniel is again mentioned in Judges iii. 7–11, which states that after Joshua's death the Israelites were punished for their idolatry by bondage to Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia. Thereupon God caused Othniel to conquer the oppressor, after which Israel had peace for forty years. That this Othniel is identical with the one mentioned above is evident. Soon after the conquest of the mountains of Judah, he must have been involved in fresh and greater wars. Little can be said concerning the historical character of this passage; but most likely the connection here is with a generally accepted but entirely faded tradition of a participation on his part in the wars between the Syrian dynasties and the Mesopotamian despots; and a liberation of Israel as a nation from a foreign yoke is out of the question. The hypothesis that the redactor makes Othniel a judge in his effort to assign a judge also to Judah (Wellhausen) can scarcely be entertained. Also, the inference that at the time of the conquests of the tribe of Kenaz or its clan, Othniel did not yet belong to Israel (W. Nowack, *Hand-Kommentar, Richter-Ruth*, p. 23, Göttingen, 1900) can scarcely be received as a basis of the foregoing assumption. Nothing can be asserted of the time of the confederation of Kenaz; and if Othniel conquered Debir for Israel, he must at least have belonged to Israel from that time. Rather may it be assumed that a tradition was extant concerning further wars after the deliverance of Debir, of which the later redactor of Judges knew little more than the fact. The schematic reference in Judges iii. 7–11 thus explains itself. The name of his adversary Chushan-rishathaim ("twice malignant villain") explains itself on the same grounds as an artful construction; yet what name this construction, which need not be a pure invention, conceals is not known; and there is also a possibility of wars with Edom (Schrader, *KAT*, p. 219).

(R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the relevant sections in the works on the history of Israel (under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF), especially R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 81–82, Gotha, 1909; and the sections in the commentaries on Joshua and Judges dealing with the passages cited, particularly the works of Moore and Budde on Judges.

OTHO (OTTO), ANTON. See ANTINOMIANISM, II., 1, § 5.

O'TOOLE, LAURENCE, SAINT (LORCÁN UA TUATHAIL): Archbishop of Dublin; b. in Leinster, Ireland, c. 1130; d. at Eu (Latin, Augium, 17 m. n.n.e. of Dieppe on the English Channel) Nov. 14, 1180. He was brought up and educated to the monastic life in the monastery of Glendalough, of which he became abbot at the age of twenty-five. In 1162 he was consecrated archbishop of Dublin. He was canonized by Honorius III. in 1226; and was the first Irishman to labor in his native land and receive canonization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* by an anonymous author is in Massingham, *Florilegium insulæ sanctorum*, pp. 379–389, Paris, 1624. Consult: J. Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, iv. 228–244, Dublin, 1829; *DNB*, xlii. 339–340.

OTTE, CHRISTOPH HEINRICH: German archeologist; b. in Berlin Mar. 24, 1808; d. at Merseburg (56 m. s.s.e. of Magdeburg) Aug. 12, 1890. He received his theological education at Berlin and Halle, and passed his second examination in 1832; he was then pastor at Fröhden near Jüterbog in Saxony, 1832–78, and retired for his last years to Merseburg. His great interest in archeology was not gained from his university course, but rather from observation of the monuments and from the cathedral at Merseburg; he was stimulated also by association with Puttrich and K. E. Förstemann, and in this way became the leading authority in German ecclesiastical archeology of the Middle Ages. His first book, *Kurzer Abriss einer kirchlichen Kunst-Archäologie des deutschen Mittelalters* (Nordhausen, 1842) grew from thirty-two pages in its first to 1,462 in its fifth edition (1883–85), an illustration of the development in the science under the man who was really the pioneer in this particular field. Indeed, all of his books passed through several editions, and remain useful in their departments. Among these may be named *Archäologisches Wörterbuch zur Erklärung der in Schriften über mittelalterliche Kunst vorkommender Kunstausdrücke* (Leipsic, 1857); *Archäologischer Katechismus: kurzer Unterricht in der kirchlichen Kunstarchäologie des deutschen Mittelalters* (1859). He also edited the brief-lived but worthy *Zeitschrift für christliche Archäologie und Kunst* (1856–58). It is noteworthy that these works were accomplished by a man engaged in the absorbing cares of the pastorate. (VICTOR SCHULTZE.)

OTTER, JAKOB: Reformer; b. at Lauterburg (34 m. n.e. of Strasburg) c. 1485; d. at Esslingen (7 m. e.s.e. of Stuttgart) Mar., 1547. In 1507 he came as baccalaureus to Strasburg, and became a priest of the cloister of the Penitents, and secretary to Johann Geiler of Kaisersberg (q.v.). He then edited some of his master's works, and Gerson's *Sermo de passione*. Upon Geiler's death, 1510, Otter went to Freiburg, obtaining the master's degree in 1515, and was qualified as licentiate in 1517. He continued issuing Geiler's works until 1513. In 1518 Otter became pastor at Wolfenweiler, near Freiburg, and labored there as an adherent of Luther even as early as 1520. In 1522 he removed to the Austrian village of Kenzingen. There he pursued his calling as a Reformer with quiet moderation and much success. He defended himself from the reproach of heresy and insurrection by publishing his sermons on the epistle to Titus (Strasburg, 1524). The sovereign, Archduke Ferdinand, demanded his removal, and the diet threatened him with forcible procedure. To spare his congregation, Otter withdrew, on June 24, 1524, escorted by 150 citizens; turning first into the district of Margrave Ernst of Baden, then to Strasburg. From Strasburg Otto was recommended to the Knight Hans Landschad, a zealous adherent of Luther, who granted him the pastorate of Neckarsteinach, near Heidelberg. He won the whole congregation to the new faith, soon abolished the mass, procured by sale of church properties a regular administration of church charities, and maintained peace and quiet at Neckarsteinach during the excesses of the Peasants' War. Otter dedicated to his patron, 1528, the beautiful tract, *Christlich Leben und Sterben* (Strasburg, 1528). King Ferdinand and his counselors viewed Otter solely as an agitator and seducer of Kenzingen, and the king more than once demanded his dismissal. Hans Landschad valiantly defended his pastor, who, in turn, justified himself against the calumniations of his adversaries, by means of his sermons on "The First Book of Moses" (Hagenau, 1528). Ferdinand persisted in urging Elector Ludwig of the Palatinate to proceed against Otter; and finally, in Feb., 1529, succeeded in having Landschad summoned before the high court of justice at Heidelberg. Otter's dismissal was demanded under threat of the emperor's disfavor. Landschad refused, and the elector now forcibly expelled Otter, who then went to Strasburg. Capito commended him to Zwingli, through whose mediation he was called as pastor to Soleure by a minority of the council. Provoking only unrest by his preaching, he relinquished the position, and went to Bern, whence, at the end of Aug., 1529, he went to Aarau. Here he married; wrote a catechism, *Ein kurz Ynleitung* (1530), which was but little adapted for children; and was recording chairman of the conference with the Anabaptists at Bern in 1531. He was also an eager mediator in the negotiations between Zurich and the original cantons, Sept., 1531.

On Apr. 2, 1532, Blaurer (q.v.) called him to take charge of the church at Esslingen, where the former had labored as Reformer, and where Luther's cause had early found friends. At first Otter's efficiency was impeded by jealousy on the part of Chaplain Martin Fuchs, and Otter even thought of resigning, but Fuchs was dismissed. Otter labored very faithfully in propagating the Reformation. He created an order of worship in 1533; a form of order and discipline 1534, and lay ministration for the sick. He provided for the improvement of juvenile instruction, issuing his revised catechism in 1532 and a brief summary of the faith, 1534, with succinct directions concerning spiritual attention to the sick and dying. He mitigated Blaurer's form of expulsion with deference to those infirm. He antagonized both Roman Catholics and Anabaptists, and also Schwenkfeld, who had made some advances toward him. When Duke Ulrich of Württemberg recovered his domains in May, 1534, Otter was called, in July, to preach at Stuttgart as colleague of Alber; but the Lutherans about the duke received him distrustfully, because Otter held Zwingli's view and that of the South Germans regarding the Eucharist. Strife ensued, until Otter, with Butzer and the South Germans, went to Wittenberg in May, 1536, and ratified the peace with Luther in terms of the Wittenberg Concord; to which conclusion Otter in vain sought to win Blaurer. Otter rendered service to the entire Evangelical church by means of his excellent *Betbüchlein für allerley gemein Anliegen der Kirchen* (Strasburg, 1537–41). The "little man" gradually gained a firm position at Esslingen, but collapsed under the horrors of the Schmalkald War and the emperor's Spaniards, in Mar., 1547. Nevertheless he was spared from the bitterest anguish for South German Protestantism during the Interim.

Well did Butzer describe his friend Otter as "a man distinguished not by sound learning alone, but also by Christian virtues, and especially by modesty, forbearance, charity; a man of innocent life, pure doctrine, averse to all manner of pompous pride, one of consummate skill in dealing with all the various concerns of our Church."

G. Bossert.

Bibliography: H. Susann, *Jakob Otter*, Carlsruhe, 1893; *Brieswechsel der Brüder . . . Blaurer*, ed. Schiess, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1908–10; and the literature under Blaurer, Ambrosius.

OTTERBEIN, ot′ter-bain, **PHILIP WILLIAM:** Founder of the United Brethren in Christ (q.v.); b. at Dillenburg (40 m. n.e. of Coblenz), Prussia, June 3, 1726; d. in Baltimore Nov. 17, 1813. He belonged to a family of ministers of the German Reformed Church, entered the school of Herborn in 1742 and completed the course there, including three years in theology, and in 1749 was ordained and became vicar at Ockersdorf. In 1752 he accompanied the Rev. Michael Schlatter (q.v.) to America and was settled over the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Penn., till 1758, then labored successively in Tulpehocken, Penn., Frederick, Md. (1760–65), and York, Penn. (1765–74), after which he organized and had charge of the Evangelical Reformed Church of Baltimore. At Lancaster he instituted prayer-meetings, trained laymen as leaders, held evangelistic services in the open air, and was in close fellowship with ministers of other denominations, especially Martin Böhm, a Mennonite, and Francis Asbury and Richard Wright, Methodists. In 1784 he assisted Dr. Coke in consecrating Asbury bishop. On Sept. 25, 1800, in conjunction with Böhm, he convened a conference of thirteen ministers near Frederick, which resulted in the organization of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ. He never left the German Reformed communion, and only desired to secure a reorganization of the methods in vogue within the Church. Otterbein University, at Westerville, O., under the control of the United Brethren, preserves his name.

Bibliography: A *Life* was written by A. W. Drury, Dayton, Ohio, 1884. Consult: H. Harbaugh, *Fathers of the German Reformed Church*, 5 vols., Lancaster, Pa., 1857 sqq.; F. Piper and H. M. MacCracken, *Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal*, Bethlehem, Pa., 1879; J. H. Dubbs, in *American Church History Series*, viii. 305–313, New York, 1895; D. Berger, in the same, xii. 317 sqq., ib. 1897.

OTTLEY, EDWARD BICKERSTETH: Church of England; b. at Richmond (40 m. n.w. of York), Yorkshire, Jan. 18, 1853. He received his education at Merchant Tailors' School, London, and Keble College, Oxford (B.A. 1876; M.A., 1879); was made deacon in 1876 and priest in 1878; was curate at Hawarden, 1876–80, and at St. Saviour, Hoxton, 1880; principal of Sarum Theological College, 1880–83; vicar of the Church of the Annunciation (formerly Quebec Chapel), St. Marylebone, 1883–1908; prebendary of Caddington Major in St. Paul's Cathedral, 1905–07; residentiary canon of Rochester, since 1907. He has written *Rational Aspects of Some Revealed Truths* (London, 1887).

OTTLEY, HENRY BICKERSTETH: Church of England, brother of the preceding; b. at Richmond (40 m. n.w. of York), Yorkshire, Nov. 3, 1850. He received his education at St. John's College, Oxford (B.A., 1874; M.A., 1876); was made deacon in 1874 and priest in 1876; was curate of All Souls, Langham Place, London, 1874–1876; vicar of Newton-on-Trent, 1876–79; of St. Margaret's, Ilkley, 1879–83; and of Horsham, 1884–87; rector of West Hackney, 1887–90; vicar of Eastbourne, 1890–98; and of South Norwood, 1898–1907; and honorary canon of Canterbury, 1907. He also served as commissary to the bishop of Jerusalem, 1887–96; special missioner for the Armenian relief fund, 1896; and as Golden lecturer at St. Margaret's, Lothbury, 1898–99. He is the author of: *The Great Dilemma: Christ his own Witness or his own Accuser* (London, 1881); *The Challenge to the Church of God: "Give us a Reason of your Hope"* (1882); *Modern Egypt; its Witness to Christ* (1884); *The Seven Voices of the Cross* (1886); *Christ and Modern Life* (1894); *Map of the Armenian Massacres* (1896); *Christ in the City: some Elements of Religion in Common Life* (1899); *Great Solemnity: Lessons from the Sacring of the King* (1902); *Baptism and National Life* (1904); *The Christian Sunday: a Manual of Prayer and Instruction* (1907).

OTTLEY, ROBERT LAWRENCE: Church of England; b. at Richmond (22 m. n.w. of Ripon), Yorkshire, Sept. 2, 1856. He was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford (B.A., 1878), and Christ Church, Oxford (M.A., 1881), where he was student in 1879–86 and tutor in 1883–86. He was ordered deacon in 1881 and ordained priest two years later. He was vice-principal of Cuddesdon College (1886–90), after which he was dean of divinity in Magdalen College, Oxford (1890–93), fellow and tutor of Magdalen, as well as principal of Pusey House, Oxford (1893–97), rector of Winterbourne Bassett (1897–1903), was appointed canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and regius professor of pastoral theology in the University of Oxford (1903), both which dignities he still retains. He was also examining chaplain to the bishops of Durham (1884–87) and Oxford (1890–93), select preacher at the University of Oxford (1889–90), and Bampton lecturer in 1897. Since 1904 he has been examining chaplain in England to the bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria. Besides contributing the essay on *Christian Ethics* to *Lux Mundi* (London, 1889), he has written *Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1894); *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2 vols., 1896); *Aspects of the Old Testament* (1897); *The Hebrew Prophets* (1898); *Short History of the Hebrews* (Cambridge, 1902); *The Religion of Israel* (1905); and *Christian Ideas and Ideals. An Outline of Christian Ethical Theory* (1909).

OTTO OF BAMBERG: Apostle of Pomerania; b. in Swabia about 1060; d. at Bamberg (33 m. n. of Nuremberg) June 30, 1139. Destined for the Church in early life, he came while still a young man to the court of the Polish Duke Ladislaus, whose service he exchanged before 1090 for that of the Emperor Henry IV. He seems to have become chancellor in 1101, and in the following year bishop of Bamberg. Though receiving his investiture from Henry IV., it proved impossible for him to secure consecration until 1105, when he went over to Henry V., and was consecrated at Rome in the following year. Nevertheless, Otto was never a political partizan; and not only did he gratefully acknowledge his indebtedness to Henry IV., but he also remained faithful to Henry V. despite suspension by the Synod of Fritzlar in 1118. Three years later, however, he was an earnest advocate of peace at the conference held at Würzburg. During the period of religious struggle Otto was employed chiefly in administering his diocese and increasing its territories, churches, castles, and especially its monasteries, of which he built or restored more than twenty. In his old age, moreover, he was called to aid in the reestablishment of religious peace; for in 1120 the treaty with Poland opened Pomerania to Christianity. After his successive efforts to establish Polish and Italian clergy in Pomerania failed, Boleslaus III. of Poland invoked German aid, and in agreement with the pope, Henry V., and the German princes, the choice fell upon Otto. In May, 1124, the bishop left Bamberg for Pomerania, and after baptizing several thousand converts near Pyritz, he reached the Pomeranian capital, Cammin, where the duchess welcomed him as cordially as the duke had done. After days of peril in the rich commercial city of Julin, Christianity found entrance there, and Otto then pressed on to Kolberg and Belgard. During his tour, he established eleven churches in nine cities, and baptized 22,165 persons, returning in Feb., 1125, from Pomerania to Bamberg. Nevertheless, paganism lingered on, and in Stettin the ancestral deities were still reverenced beside the German God. Three years later, therefore, Otto returned to Pomerania, ransoming a number of captives at Demmin on the Mecklenburg boundary, and converting all the nobles of the land by a powerful sermon at Usedom. Founding new churches at Wolgast and Gützkow, and strengthening the faith at Stettin and Julin, he returned to Bamberg about Christmas, where he discharged his duties as bishop and prince until his death. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Sources are: Eccehard, *Chronicon*, in *MGH, Script.*, vi (1884), 263; *Relatio de piis operibus Ottonis*, in *MGH, Script.*, xv (1888), 1151–66. *Vitæ* and other documents are collected in *MGH, Script.*, xii (1856), 721–919 and in *ASB*, July, i. 349–465. Consult: J. Zimmerman, *Der heilige Otto, Bischof von Bamberg und Apostel der Pommern*, Freiburg, 1875; J. Looshorn, *Der heilige Otto*, Munich, 1880; M. J. Höfner, *Otto I. Bischof von Bamberg in seinem Verhältnisse zu Heinrich V. und Lothar III.*, Giessen, 1868; L. Hoffman, *Otto I. episcopus Bambergensis*, Halle, 1869; J. N. Seefried, *Otto des Heiligen, Bischofs von Bamberg und Apostels der Pommern, Herkunft und Heimat*, Augsburg, 1886; G. F. Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, London, 1888; G. Juritsch, *Geschichte des Bischofs Otto I. von Bamberg, des Pommern Apostels (1102–1139)*, Gotha, 1889; A. Lahner, *Die ehemalige Benedictiner Abtei Michelsberg zu Bamberg*, pp. 38–122, Bamberg, 1889; W. Wiesener, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche in Pommern zur Wendenzeit*, Berlin, 1889.

OTTO OF FREISING: Bishop of that city; b. between 1111 and 1115; d. at the monastery of Morimund (at Morimont, diocese of Langres, Burgundy) Sept. 22, 1158. Of noble lineage on both sides, he was destined while still a child for the Church and was appointed abbot of Klosterneuburg near Vienna. The income thus obtained enabled him to study for several years in Paris and to acquire all the knowledge of the time; though it is not known who his teachers were, despite the evident influence exercised on him by Gilbert de la Porrée, whom he must have visited at Chartres. He was also acquainted with the writings of Hugo of St. Victor, whom he may have heard at Paris. On his return from France, Otto with fifteen noteworthy clericals visited the Cistercian monastery of Morimund and there, early in 1134, all entered the order. Within a short time, though not before the latter half of 1136, Otto was chosen abbot; but on the death of Henry, bishop of Freising, Oct. 9, 1137, the canons of Freising elected Otto to be his successor. In the following year he went to Freising and was consecrated. In 1143–46, during the troubled reign of Conrad III., Otto wrote his eight books of chronicles, which he entitled *De duabus civitatibus* (ed. R. Wilmans, *MGH, Script.*, xx., 1868, pp. 83 sqq.), implying the conflict of the city of God against the city of the devil. Herein Otto followed Augustine, and his second model was Orosius. The chronicle runs from the creation to 1146 in seven books, the chief sources being Orosius, the church history of Eusebius (as translated by Rufinus), and the chronicle of Frutolf-Ekkehard to the year 1106. The unique feature of the work was the search for the cause and effect as contrasted with the mere series of events set forth by other chroniclers. An eighth book on antichrist and the last judgment is appended.

In 1147–48, Otto took part in the disastrous crusade of Conrad III., commanding a division which separated from the main army and marched through the coast countries of Asia Minor, where it was annihilated. Impoverished and undergoing the extremest hardships, the bishop escaped to a maritime town, whence he sailed to Palestine, visited Jerusalem and other sacred places, and apparently returned to France with Louis VII. It is certain, at all events, that he was with Bernard of Clairvaux in 1150, from whom he carried a letter to Conrad. After Otto's return to Germany, war with the Guelphs broke out anew, but with the accession of Frederick I., in 1152, the long struggle was ended; and Otto, who had worked zealously for peace, was employed in the cares of state even more frequently than in the preceding reign. From 1157 until his death Otto wrote the two books of the history of his nephew, the Emperor Frederick I.; the first book narrating the events from the beginning of the struggle between emperor and pope under Henry IV. to the death of Conrad III., and the second extending from 1152 to the autumn of 1156; the whole forming a work of distinct value.

When, in the summer of 1158, the emperor went with a great army through Italy, he detached Otto, who went to France to attend the general council of the Cistercians. On the way he visited his old monastery of Morimund, where he fell sick and died. His *Gesta Friderici I.* (ed. G. Waitz in *Scriptores* *rerum Germanicarum*, Hanover, 1884) was given for continuation to his chaplain, the Freising Canon Rahewin; and the last two books of this history, therefore, received from Otto, at most, only preliminary collections of material. Otto was of an amiable character and his position on all questions was one of mediation. It was fortunate for him that he was never called upon to choose between Frederick I. and Alexander III., as would have been the case had he lived until the schism of 1159. Strict Cistercian though he was, he established in his diocese one Premonstratensian and two Benedictine monasteries; and to him is also due the honor of having introduced the study of philosophy into Freising. (O. Holder-Egger.)

Bibliography: A rich list of MSS., editions, and literature is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 885–887. The best source for a life is *MGH, Script.*, ix (1851), 610–611. Consult: R. Wilman's introduction to the edition in *MGH*, ut sup.; idem, in *Archiv für ältere deutsche Litteratur*, x. 131–173, xi. 18–76; B. Huber, *Otto von Freising; sein Charakter, sein Verhältniss zu seiner Zeit und seinen Zeitgenossen als ihr Geschichtschreiber*, Munich, 1847; L. Lang, *Psychologische Charakteristik Ottos von Freising*, Augsburg, 1852; H. Grotefend, *Der Werth der Gesta Friderici des Bischofs Otto von Freising für die Geschichte des Reichs unter Friedrich I.*, Hanover, 1870; T. Sorgenfrey, *Zur Charakteristik des Otto von Freising als Geschichtschreiber*, Greiz, 1873; W. v. Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, iv. 394–399, Brunswick, 1877; W. Lüdecke, *Der historische Wert des ersten Buches von Ottos von Freising Gesta Friderici*, Halle, 1884; E. Vacandard, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxxv (1884), 52–114; E. Bernheim, *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, vi (1885), 1–51; J. Schmidlin, *Die geschichtsphilosophische und kirchenpolitische Weltanschauung Ottos von Freising*, Freiburg, 1906; Hauck, *KD*, iv. 476 sqq.

OTTO OF PASSAU: Franciscan; d. not before 1386. He is noteworthy for his book entitled *Die vierundzwanzig Ablässe*, one of the popular devotional anthologies of the last centuries of the Middle Ages (cf. W. Wackernagel, *Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte*, pp. 334, 353, Basel, 1848). Of Otto himself is known only what he tells in his preface, where he styles himself a humble brother, Otto of Passau, of the order of St. Francis, sometime lector at Basel, who completed his book on the Purification of the Virgin Mary, 1386. He was probably a teacher in the Franciscan school at Basel and wrote his work at Passau. He calls the readers for whom he wrote "friends of God," and it may be remembered that Basel was then the headquarters of the pious who were wont so to name themselves. In the preface he takes credit for his diligence, not without reason, for, as concerns richness of contents, his book takes the first place among the anthologies of his time. He mentions 104 authors whom he had used, and his list is not complete—including, of the Greeks, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Dionysius, and others; the latest is John of Damascus. Much larger, of course, is the number of Western teachers from Cyprian to Nicholas of Lyra (1340). The writings of the so-called German mystics, however, are not used, probably because they were not considered as belonging to theology. To make the reading of the passages quoted pleasant, the author has used the device of putting them into the mouths of the twenty-four elders of the Apocalypse in such a way that they quote them with the name of the author. This was in accord with the prevailing taste of the time, and in the following century the Dominican Johann Nider, in his book on the twenty-four harps, imitated Otto. The different sections treat of God and how to find him, of repentance, confession and penitence, of the conscience, grace, faith, Holy Scripture, of the active and contemplative life, of prayer, etc. Very full are the sections on the Virgin Mary and the sacrament of the altar, where transubstantiation is fully treated. Where the author speaks of the contemplative life, he touches upon mysticism, but the book belongs rather to devotional than to mystical literature. It met a general need, as may be seen from the many manuscripts (twenty-eight) still extant. It was often printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and as late as 1836 Johann Manz published at Regensburg, under the title *Die Krone der Aeltesten*, a new edition in High German with changes answering to the prevailing taste. The book has historical interest, as it shows how at that time the older literature was used and read for its devotional merit and how Christian life was presented and brought home to larger circles. Books of its class mediated between theology, whose learned works were unintelligible to the laity, and the Christian life of the people; for the knowledge of the religious life in the Middle Ages they are more important than all dogmatical works of the schoolmen.

S. M. Deutsch†.

Bibliography: W. Wackernagel, *Kleinere Schriften*, ii. 189 sqq., Leipsic, 1873; *ADB*, xxiv. 741 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 1185 sqq.

OTTO, JOHANN KARL THEODOR VON: German Protestant; b. at Jena Oct. 4, 1816; d. at Dresden Jan. 11, 1897. Educated at the university of his native city, his prize essay *De Justini Martyris scriptis et doctrina* (Jena, 1841) prepared the way for his life-work, the *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum sæculi secundi* (9 vols., Jena, 1847–1872), a critical and exegetical edition of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athanagoras, Theophilus, Hermias, Quadratus, Aristides, Aristo, Miltiades, Melito, and Apollinaris. From 1848 to 1851, Otto, as extraordinary professor, lectured at Jena on church history and New-Testament exegesis; but in the latter year he was called to the Protestant faculty of Vienna as professor of church history. There he remained until his retirement from active life in 1887, being a member of the educational council in 1863–67 as well as royal councilor, and receiving knighthood with the conferring of the order of the Iron Crown. Besides the publication of the *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für die Geschichte des Protestantismus in Oesterreich* (Vienna and Leipsic, 1880 to 1893), to which he contributed *Die Anfänge der Reformation im Erzherzogtum Oesterreich* (vol. i., 1522–64) and *Geschichte der Reformation im Erzherzogtum Oesterreich unter Maximilian II.* (vol. x., 1564–76); he wrote *De Victorino Strigelio, liberioris mentis in ecclesia Lutheria vindice* (Jena, 1843), and *Die Konfession des Patriarchen Gennadios von Konstantinopel* (Vienna, 1864); and edited Baumgarten-Crusius' commentaries on Matthew (Jena, 1844), and Mark and Luke (1845). (G. Frank†.)

OTTO, RUDOLF: German Protestant; b. at Peine (20 m. s.e. of Hanover) Sept. 25, 1869. He was educated at the universities of Erlangen and Göttingen (Th.Lic., 1898); became privat-docent for systematic theology at the latter institution, 1898, and extraordinary professor, 1906. In theology he belongs to the historical and critical school, and has written *Die Anschauung vom heiligen Geiste bei Luther* (Göttingen, 1898); *Das Leben und Wirken Jesu nach historisch-kritischer Auffassung* (1901, 2d ed., 1902); *Naturalistische und religiöse Weltansicht* (Tübingen, 1904, 2d ed., 1909; Eng. transl., *Science of Religion*, London, 1906); *Kantisch-Fries'che Religionsphilosophie und ihre Anwendung auf die Theologie* (1909); and *Goethe und Darwin. Darwinismus und Religion* (Göttingen, 1909); besides editing Schleiermacher's *Ueber die Religion* (Göttingen, 1899).

OUDIN, ū″dan′, **REMI-CASIMIR:** French Reformed theologian; b. at Mézières (28 m. n.e. of Reims) in 1638; d. at Leyden in 1719. He entered the order of the Premonstrants in 1656, studied theology and church history at Verdun and Bucilly. He attracted attention to himself by a graceful extemporaneous compliment to Louis XIV. The general of his order saw in him the qualities necessary to fit him for a commission to gather all important data pertaining to history which existed in their cloisters, which commission he undertook in 1681, bringing him to the archives of eighty different monasteries in the Netherlands, Lorraine, Burgundy, and Alsace. In 1683 he came into touch with the Reformed theologian Jürieu and others, with the result that he wavered in his Roman Catholic faith. Accused of heresy, he fled to Holland in 1692, where he became a Protestant. Two years later he was made assistant librarian at the library of Leyden.

His principal work was *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiæ antiquis, illorumque scriptis adhuc exstantibus in celebrioribus Europæ bibliothecis* (published posthumously, Leipsic, 1722). Besides this he wrote *Supplementum de scriptoribus vel scriptis ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis* (Paris, 1686); *Le Prémontré défroqué* (Leyden, 1692); *Galliæ et Belgiæ scriptorum opuscula* (1692); and *Trias dissertationum criticarum* (1717).

(G. Bonet-Maury.)

Bibliography: Niceron, *Mémoires*, vols. i. and x.; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, x. 112–113.

OUEN (*Audœnus*), **SAINT:** Roman Catholic archbishop; b. at Sancy (near Soissons), in the department of Aisne, in 609; d. Aug. 24, 689. He was chancellor of Dagobert I., and founded, in 634, the abbey of Rébais, but entered afterward the service of the Church, and was in 640 appointed archbishop of Rouen. He wrote a *Vita Elegii*, which is found in L. d'Archery's *Spicilegium*, new edition, ii. 76–122 (Paris, 1723), and in *MPL*, lxxxvii. 479–594. This work is of great interest for the history of the seventh century.

Bibliography: Early *Vitæ* and legendary materials are collected in *ASB*, Aug., iv. 794–840. Consult: Petit, *Hist. de S. Ouen*, Rouen, 1860; J. Engling, *Der heilige Audoen*, Luxemburg, 1867; E. Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Ouen, évêque de Rouen*, Paris, 1902.

OVENDEN, CHARLES THOMAS: Church of England; b. at Enniskillen (72 m. s.w. of Belfast), Ireland, Sept. 11, 1846. He received his education at the Portora Royal School, Enniskillen, Mannheim, Germany, and Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1869; M.A., 1874; B.D., 1882; D.D., 1891); was made deacon in 1870, and priest the same year; was curate of St. Anne's, Belfast, 1870–72; rector of Dunluce, County Antrim, 1872–79; succentor of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and warden of the grammar-school, 1879–84; rector of Ballywillan, Portrush, 1884–86; precentor of Clogher, 1886–1903; chaplain to the lord lieutenant of Ireland, 1889–1903; dean of Clogher since 1903; also rural dean of Enniskillen since 1887. He has written: *In the Day of Trouble* (London, 1901); *Enthusiasm of Christianity* (1902); *The Face of Nature; popular Readings in elementary Science* (1902); *"To Whom shall we go?" an Examination of some Difficulties presented by Unbelief* (1902); *The Church Navy; Thoughts on the pioneer Work of the Church* (1903); *Foundation of a Happy Life* (1905); *Deep Questions* (1907); and *Popular Science for Parochial Evenings* (1909).

OVERBERG, BERNHARD HEINRICH: The theological head of a group of devout Roman Catholics usually known as the Gallitzin circle from Amalie, Princess Gallitzin; b. at Höckel (near Bersenbrück, 80 m. w.n.w. of Hanover) May 1, 1754; d. at Münster Nov. 9, 1826. Educated at the Franciscan gymnasium at Rheine-on-the-Ems (1770–74) and the theological seminary at Münster (1774–80), and at the same time being a private tutor in Münster and giving religious instruction at his home in the vacations, he was ordained priest in 1780. After three years as curate at Ewerswirkel, he was called to Münster as an instructor in the new normal school. Before entering upon his duties he made a tour of inspection of the schools of the diocese (1783–84), and then opened the normal school, which gave an autumn vacation course of two or three months, giving teachers the correct method of imparting instruction in religion and other subjects. Many teachers also took advantage of his lectures during vacations. At the same time, he conducted free catechizing throughout the year in the French cloister, summarizing each Sunday in his sermons the lectures he had given during the week.

Early Career as Scholar and Teacher.

In 1789 Overberg entered new surroundings which were to extend his influence not only through Roman Catholic circles in Germany, but also spread his fame among Protestants. His appointment as private chaplain to Princess Adelheid Amalie Gallitzin brought about this change. This lady (b. at Berlin Aug. 28, 1748; d. at Angelmodde, near Münster, Apr. 27, 1806), though educated a Roman Catholic, had become, partly through her Berlin associations as maid of honor to the Princess Ferdinand, practically a rationalistic Protestant. At the age of twenty she had married the Russian Prince Dmitri Alexeyevich Gallitzin (b. 1735; d. 1803), a friend of Voltaire, Helvetius, and

The Princess Gallitzin.

Diderot. After residing at the courts of Vienna, St. Petersburg, Paris, and The Hague, the Princess Amalie withdrew from society to devote herself entirely to the education of her two children, Dmitri (see GALLITZIN, DEMETRIUS AUGUSTINE) and Marianne, at the same time studying mathematics, classics, and philosophy with the non-Christian Frans Hemsterhuis. Even after her return to the Roman Catholic Church, Amalie continued her literary and scientific correspondence with Hemsterhuis, who, under the pseudonym of Diocles, addressed to her, as Diotima, his celebrated *Lettres sur l'athéisme* (1785). In 1799 she removed to Münster, where for four years she resisted all attempts of Von Fürstenberg, whom she highly esteemed, to convert her. In 1784, however, she fell seriously ill, and though she declined the services of the confessor whom Von Fürstenberg sent her, she promised that, if she recovered, she would at least make a serious theoretical study of Christianity. This was the more imperative since she had resolved to give her children a purely historical presentation of religion, that they might freely choose their faith; and to this end she devoted herself to the study of the Bible. She gradually became convinced of the power of Christianity, and on her thirty-eighth birthday received the communion. Her conversion was promoted also by reading the lectures of Hamann on Socratic memoirs and other subjects. After visiting Herder and Goethe she was easily overcome with the temptation to prefer esthetic philosophical attainments to the humble deeds of Christian service, but was again reclaimed by association with Hamann, whom, as also Hemsterhuis, she attended in his last illness (1788). After the death of these, the princess felt the need of some man to be her spiritual guide, and, having become acquainted with Overberg through Von Fürstenberg, she invited him (Jan. 10, 1789) to become her father confessor. Overberg accepted the invitation and removed from the episcopal seminary to the home of the princess. Here he took a prominent part in Amalie's literary and personal association with such men as Jacobi, Lavater, and Goethe, and also exercised a weighty influence in the conversion to Roman Catholicism of Count Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg (q.v.), which was finally realized on July 1, 1800.

Overberg after the Death of the Princess.

The next three years after the death of the princess Overberg remained in the house as confessor and guardian of her daughter. In 1809 he was appointed regent of the episcopal seminary, where he henceforth resided. He was at the same time synodical examiner, a member of the school commission, and director of the normal school in the autumn vacation. In 1816 he was created consistorial counselor and member of the royal administration of education, and shortly before his death was made supreme consistorial counselor. He was likewise honorary canon of Münster. Among his works special mention may be made of the *Biblische Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (1799); *Christkatholisches Religionshandbuch* (1804); *Katechismus der christ-katholischen Lehre* (1804); *Haussegen, oder gemeinschäftliche Hausandacht* (1807); and the posthumous *Sechs Bücher vom Priesterstande* (Münster, 1858).

Other Members of the Gallitzin Circle.

Besides Overberg, Von Fürstenberg, and the Princess Amalie, the Gallitzin circle was represented not only by Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg and Johann Theodor Hermann Katerkamp (qq.v.), but also by the three brothers Von Droste-Vischering: namely, Caspar Maximilian, bishop of Münster (1825–46); Franz Otto, canon of Münster (d. 1826); and Clemens August (see DROSTE-VISCHERING). Here, too, belongs Amalie's only son (see GALLITZIN, DEMETRIUS AUGUSTINE). Next to Katerkamp the most learned and prolific theologian of the circle was Johannes Hyacinth Kistemaker (b. 1754; d. 1884), professor at Münster, and the author, among other works, of the *Commentatio de nova exegesi præcipue Veteris Testamenti ex collatis scriptoribus Græcis et Romanis* (1806), the *Canticum canticorum illustratum ex hierographia orientalium* (1818), and a translation of and commentary on the entire New Testament (7 vols., 1818–25). He likewise published an edition of the Vulgate in 1824 in an unsuccessful attempt to counteract the work of Leander van Ess (q.v.). Others of the Gallitzin coterie were Anton Maria Sprickmann, professor at Münster after 1780; Johann Heinrich Brockmann (b. at Liesborn, near Beckum, which is 23 m. s.e. of Münster, 1767; d. at Münster 1847), professor of moral and pastoral theology at Münster after 1800, and the author of a life of St. Aloysius (1820) and other works; and Georg Kellermann (b. at Freckenhorst, near Münster, 1776; d. at Münster Mar. 29, 1847), chaplain and tutor to Count von Stolberg (1801–17), dean of St. Ludger's at Münster (1817–26), professor of New-Testament exegesis at Münster (1826–47), bishop-elect at his death (1847), and the author of pedagogical or edifying works, such as the prayer-book, *Gott meine Zuversicht* (1845). More transitory relations to the Gallitzin circle were sustained by Georg Hermes (q.v.), Clemens von Brentano, Johannes Michael Sailer (q.v.); such Protestants as Thomas Wizenmann, Johann Friedrich Kleuker (q.v.); and the historian Franz Bernhard von Bucholtz (b. 1790; d. at Vienna 1838), the author of a history of Ferdinand I. (9 vols., Vienna, 1831–38).

(O. ZÖCKLER †.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On Overberg consult: C. F. Krabbe, *Leben B. Overbergs*, Münster, 1831, Eng. transl., Derby, 1843; (J. Reinermann), *B. Overberg in seinem Leben und Wirken*, Münster, 1829; H. Herold, *Franz von Fürstenberg und Bernhard Overberg in ihrem gemeinsamen Wirken für die Volksschule*, Münster, 1893; A. Knöppel, *Bernhard Overberg*, Mainz, 1896; *ADB*, xxv. 14 sqq.

On the circle consult: The correspondence and diary of the princess, published Münster, 1874–76; J. T. H. Katerkamp, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben der Fürstin A. von Gallitzin*, Münster, 1828; W. Esser, *Franz von Fürstenberg*, Münster, 1842; C. F. Krabbe, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten über die höheren Lehranstalten in Münster*, Münster, 1852; J. Galland, *Die Fürstin Amalie von Gallitzin und ihre Freunde*, Cologne, 1880; J. Janssen, *Friedrich Leopold Graf zu Stolberg*, Freiburg, 1882; F. Nielsen, *Aus dem inneren Leben der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, i. 221–243, Carlsruhe, 1882; F. Nippold, *Kleine Schriften*, i. 209–258, Jena, 1899; *ADB*, viii. 232–244; *KL*, iv. 2087–91, vii. 366–367, 735 sqq.

OVERTON, JOHN HENRY: Church of England historian; b. at Louth (24 m. n.e. of Lincoln), England, Jan. 4, 1835; d. at Market Harborough (12 m. s.e. of Leicester), England, Sept. 15, 1903. He studied at Rugby, and at Lincoln College, Oxford (B.A., 1858; M.A., 1860); was ordained deacon in 1858, and priest 1859; was curate of Quedgeley, Gloucestershire, 1858–60; vicar of Legbourne, Lincolnshire, 1860–83; became canon of Stow Longa in Lincoln Cathedral, 1879; was rector of Epworth, diocese of Lincoln, 1883–98; rural dean of Axholme, 1883–98; select preacher at Oxford University, 1901; and Birkbeck lecturer in ecclesiastical history at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1902–03. He was the author of *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (in collaboration with C. J. Abbey, 2 vols., London, 1878); *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: A Sketch of his Life, Character and Opinions* (1881); *Life in the English Church (1660–1714)* (1885); *Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century* (1886); *Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln* (in collaboration with Miss E. Wordsworth, 1888); *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century* (1894); *John Wesley* (1895); *The Church in England* (2 vols., 1897); *The Anglican Revival* (1897); *The Nonjurors, their Lives, Principles and Writings* (1902); *The English Church: From Accession of George I. to End of Eighteenth Century (1714–1800)* (in collaboration with F. Relton, 1906).

OWEN, JOHN: The name of two prominent English theologians.

1. Independent scholar and Reformer; b. at Stadham or Stadhampton (5 m. s.s.e. of Oxford) in 1616; d. at Ealing (9 m. w. of St. Paul's Cathedral, London) Aug. 24, 1683. His father was a clergyman of Welsh extraction, tracing a descent from Gwegan ap Ithel, Prince of Glamorgan. The son was sent to Oxford when only twelve years of age, and studied classics, mathematics, philosophy, theology, Hebrew, and rabbinical lore (B.A., 1632; M.A., 1635); leaving Oxford in 1637. Laud was then powerful in the university, and endeavored to carry out his High-church (see CHURCH OF ENGLAND, II., § 8) plans, and Owen 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 took 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. Retiring to London, a sermon on the words "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" led to a spiritual decision. Soon after, Owen published a decidedly Calvinistic book, entitled *Display of Arminianism* (London, 1643), by which he identified himself with the Anti-High-church party, and was presented to the living of Fordham, Essex. There he preached with success, delivering a sermon before Parliament in 1646, and, rising in reputation, was promoted to the important incumbency of Coggeshall, near Fordham.

He then adopted the principles of Independency; and while parish pastor, and preaching from the parish pulpit, he gathered an Independent Church. Here also he published an exposition of Congregational church principles entitled, *Eschol; or Rules of Direction for the Walking of the Saints in Fellowship* (1648). During his residence at Coggeshall he further engaged in the Calvinistic controversy, and wrote his *Salus electorum, sanguis Jesu* (1648), a polemic against Arminianism. The antinomian tendency of this work elicited protests from Richard Baxter and John Horne. He also preached and published sermons to the Parliamentarians at Colchester and Rumford, entitled, *A Memorial of the Deliverance of Essex County and Committee* (1648). Thoroughly identified with the Parliamentarians, he was invited to preach before parliament on the day after King Charles' execution, when he acquitted himself with great prudence. Soon afterward he met with Cromwell, whom he attended in his expedition to Ireland. His sermons before parliament previous to his embarkation, and again on his return, on the spiritual state of Ireland, resulted in the reendowment of Trinity College, Dublin. He accompanied Cromwell to Scotland, and occupied Presbyterian pulpits there while the conflict was going on between parliament and the Scotch Loyalists. Owen returned to Coggeshall in 1651, and the House of Commons voted that he should be appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in the place of Dr. Reynolds, the Presbyterian.

His career at Oxford was remarkable. The university had fallen into great disorder during the civil wars, and the new dean acted as a vigorous and successful reformer. 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. Owen was made vice-chancellor in 1652, and preached before parliament the next year, at the thanksgiving for a naval victory over the Dutch. After the dissolution of the Long Parliament, in 1653, the university chose Owen as its representative in the House of Commons; but he was unseated on account of his orders. In the same year, he was one of the commissioners for ejecting and settling ministers, and in 1654 one of the Tryers, a body of Independents, Presbyterians, and Baptists, thirty-eight in number, authorized to inquire into the fitness of incumbents for the posts they held. Owen behaved with wisdom and moderation, and saved the celebrated Edward Pocock (q.v.), Arabic professor, from harsh and unrighteous treatment. When a conspiracy against Cromwell's government broke out in the West, in 1655, the vice-chancellor exerted himself to preserve the public peace, and raised a troop of sixty horse; and the same year attended a conference at Whitehall touching the treatment of Jews. The next year he preached a well-known sermon at Westminster Abbey entitled, *God's Work in founding Zion, and his People's Duty thereupon* (Oxford, 1656). Owen was replaced as vice-chancellor, in 1658, by John Conant. During this period he produced several theological treatises. He opposed the Socinians by deducing the absolute necessity of satisfaction for sin from the constitution of divine nature, in *Diatriba de Divina Justitia seu Justitiæ Vindicatricis Vindiciæ* (1658). The Arminians were again attacked in *Doctrine of* *the Saints' Perseverance Explained and Confirmed* (1654). Some of his best shorter treatises of this period were: *Of the Mortification of Sin in Believers* (1656); *Of Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each Person distinctly in Love, Grace, and Consolation* (1657), a piece of wire-drawn mysticism; *Of Schism* (1657), an ingenious attempt to exonerate the non-conformists from schism; *Temptation* (1658); and *Of the Divine Original Authority, Self-evidencing Light and Power of the Scriptures* (1659). Owen was unfriendly to Cromwell's assumption of the protectorship, and he took no part in his installation in that office. A meeting of the Independents, by Cromwell's permission, was held at the Savoy in 1658, when a declaration of faith was drawn up, for which Owen wrote the preface. While the Savoy meetings were going on, Cromwell died and his death made a great change in Owen's fortunes. The dean preached before the first parliament of the new protector. Owen was mixed up with consultations at Wallingford House, which ended in the fall of Richard, and the recalling of the Long Parliament. Owen preached before the members for the last time in May, 1659; and in Mar., 1660, the House of Commons discharged him from his deanery, and replaced Reynolds.

He now retired to his estate at Stadham and devoted himself to compiling *Theologoumena pantodapa* (1661), an encyclopedic Latin treatise on the history of religion and theology, from the Creation to the Reformation. While the Bill of Uniformity (see UNIFORMITY, ACT OF) was pending, he tendered a temperate protest, *A Discourse concerning Liturgies and their Imposition* (London, 1662); and on the Conventicle Bill (see CONVENTICLE ACT) he presented a minute to Parliament in 1671. By the former together with *Animadversions* (1662) and the *Vindication* of it (1664) he was thought to have rendered such a service to Protestant religion that Lord Clarendon offered him high preferment if he would conform to the Church of England. After being indicted for holding religious services in his house, and escaping imprisonment in 1664–65, he removed to London. He had powerful friends at court. The duke of York discussed the rights and wrongs of non-conformity with him, and Charles II. gave him private audience and a thousand guineas for the sufferers by the penal laws. Notwithstanding the Conventicle Act he was suffered to preach, and, after dallying with Baxter's project for a union of Presbyterians and Independents, he accepted, in 1673, a pastorate on Leadenhall Street. In his *Pneumatologia; or Discourse on the Holy Spirit* (1674); *Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ* (1677); *Christologia* (1679); *Church of Rome no Safe Guide* (1679) and *Union among Protestants* (1680) he bent his whole strength to the task of arresting the movement toward Rome on the one hand and rationalism on the other. He replied to an attack by Stillingfleet on dissenters by *Brief Vindication of Nonconformists from the charge of Schism* (1681) and an *Inquiry into the Original Nature, Institution, Power, Order, and Communion of Evangelical Churches* (1681), wherein he endeavored to prove that the ecclesiastical polity of the first two centuries was congregational. He published *Phronema pneumatos; or the Grace of Being Spiritually-Minded* (1681), *Of the Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer* (1682), and at his death, *Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ* (1696), a refreshing devotional book.

Owen remonstrated with the Congregationalists of New England for their intolerance and declined the presidency of Harvard College. In appearance he was tall and strong, and in disposition amiable. He was one of the most eminent of Protestant divines. He was a trenchant controversialist, and his learning was vast, varied, and profound; his mastery of Calvinism was complete. Other works should be noted: *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1668–84); *A Brief Instruction in the Worship of God and Discipline of the Churches of the New Testament* (1669); and also *A Complete Collection of Sermons* (1721). *Works of John Owen* have been edited by T. Russell, with best biography by W. Orme (28 vols., London, 1826); and by W. H. Goold, with *Life* by A. Thomson (24 vols., London, 1850–55; American edition by C. W. Quick, 17 vols., Philadelphia, 1865–69).

2. Church of England bishop of St. David's; b. at Llanegan (26 m. s.s.w. of Carnarvon), Carnarvonshire, Wales, Aug. 24, 1854. He was educated at Jesus College, Oxford (B.A., 1876; M.A., 1879), and was ordered deacon in 1879 and advanced to the priesthood in 1880. He was tutor, Welsh professor, and classical lecturer in St. David's College, Lampeter, Wales (1879–85); warden and head master of Llandovery College (1885–89); principal of St. David's College, sinecure rector of Llangeler, Carmarthenshire, and canon of Llanfair (first comportation) in St. Alban's Cathedral (1889–97); and in 1897 was consecrated bishop of St. David's. He was also dean of St. Asaph in 1890–92 and prebendary of Johannes Griffith in 1892–96.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On 1 consult, besides the lives in the *Works*, ut sup.; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, London, 1846; *DNB*, xlii. 424–428 (where scattering notices are indicated).

OWEN, ROBERT: English socialist and philanthropist; b. at Newtown (8 m. s.w. of Montgomery), Montgomeryshire, North Wales, May 14, 1771; d. there Nov. 19, 1858. The son of poor parents, he procured a situation in London at the age of fourteen, and subsequently had charge of the Chorlton Mills, near Manchester, and a cotton-spinning manufactory at New Lanark, Scotland. His benevolent schemes secured a radical change in the morals of the operatives of New Lanark, and accomplished the education of their children. The reputation of his success spread rapidly, and attracted the attention of many philanthropists and distinguished men. Owen published *New View of Society, or Essays on the Formation of Human Character* (London, 1813), in which he developed a theory of modified communism. In 1824 he visited the United States, where he purchased a tract of land on the Wabash in Indiana, and founded New Harmony (see COMMUNISM, II., 6). This communistic enterprise was a complete failure. Returning to England in 1827, Owen founded societies at Orbiston, Lanarkshire, and Tytherley, Hampshire, in which the principle of cooperation was put in practise. The founder's ample means enabled him to make these experiments on a liberal scale, but all resulted in failure. In 1828 he visited Mexico at the invitation of the government, with the view of establishing a communistic society, but returned to Europe without accomplishing anything. He continued to advocate his peculiar views to the day of his death. In 1829 he held a famous debate with Alexander Campbell at Cincinnati on the evidences of Christianity (he himself being an unbeliever). 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. Owen was a man of remarkable energy and decided ability, but visionary. He and his followers, called "Owenists," became, in 1827, active in the establishment of the labor leagues, in which the Chartist movement largely had its origin. Among Owen's writings are: *Discourses on a New System of Society, with an Account of the Society at New Lanark* (Louisville, 1825); *The Debate on the Evidences of Christianity . . . between R. Owen and A. Campbell* (Bethany, Va., 1829); and *The Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race* (London, 1849).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. L. Sargant, *Robert Owen and his Social Philosophy*, London, 1860; G. J. Holyoake, *Life . . . of Robert Owen*, ib. 1866; F. A. Packard, *Life of Robert Owen*, Philadelphia, 1868; A. J. Booth, *Robert Owen, the Founder of Socialism in England*, London, 1869; L. Jones, *Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen*, ib. 1889; F. Podmore, *Robert Owen*, 2 vols., London, 1906; R. E. Davies, *The Life of Robert Owen, Philanthropist and Social Reformer*, London, 1907; W. A. Hinds, *American Communities*, Chicago, 1908.

OXENDEN, ASHTON: Church of England bishop; b. at Broome Park, Canterbury, Sept. 20, 1808; d. at Biarritz (100 m. s.s.w. of Bordeaux), France, Feb. 22, 1892. He studied at University College, Oxford (B.A., 1831; M.A., 1859); was ordained deacon 1833, and priest 1834; was curate of Barham, Kent, 1833–38; from 1838–45 he retired from active work on account of ill-health; was rector of Pluckley, Kent, 1849–69; became honorary canon of Canterbury Cathedral, 1864; was bishop of Montreal and metropolitan of Canada, 1869–78; vicar of St. Stephen's, near Canterbury, 1879–84; and rural dean of Canterbury, 1879–84. He was the author of *The Cottage Library:* (1) *Baptism*, (2) *The Lord's Supper*, (3) *Hist. of the Christian Church*, (4) *Fervent Prayer*, (5) *God's Message to the Poor*, (6) *Story of Ruth* (6 vols., London, 1847–62); *Cottage Sermons: or, Plain Words to the Poor* (2 series, 1853–54); *The Pathway of Safety; or, Counsel to the Awakened* (1856); *Cottage Readings. The Barham Tracts Complete* (1859); *Sermons on the Christian Life* (1862); *Portraits from the Bible* (2 vols., 1863); *The Parables of our Lord Explained* (1864); *Our Church and her Services* (1866); *A Simple Exposition of the Psalms* (2 vols., 1872–73); *The Earnest Churchman* (1878); *Short Comments on the Gospels* (1885); *The History of My Life: an Autobiography* (1891); *Plain Sermons, With a Memoir and Portrait of the Author* (London and New York, 1893).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the *Autobiography*, and the *Memoir* in *Plain Sermons*, ut sup., *DNB*, xliii. 9.

OXENHAM, HENRY NUTCOMBE: Roman Catholic; b. at Harrow (5 m. n.w. of London), England, Nov. 15, 1829; d. at Kensington, London, Mar. 23, 1888. He studied at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1850; M.A., 1854); became curate at Worminghall, Buckinghamshire (1854), and later of St. Bartholomew's, Cripplegate, till 1857, when he joined the Roman Catholic Church; he was in the London Oratory, 1859–60; became professor at St. Edmund's College, Ware, 1860; and master at the Oratory School, Birmingham, 1861. Among his works may be named: *The Sentence of Kaira and other Poems* (Oxford, 1854); *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement: an historical Inquiry into its Development in the Church* (London, 1865); *Catholic Eschatology and Universalism. An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution* (1876); *Short Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Biography* and *Short Studies Ethical and Religious* (both reprinted from *The Saturday Review*, 1884–85). He was the translator of J. J. I. von Döllinger's *The First Age of Christianity and the Church* (1886); *The Pope and the Council, by Janus* (1869); and *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* (1872). He was translator and editor of vol. ii. of C. J. von Hefele's *A History of Christian Councils* (Edinburgh, 1876). Among his important contributions to *The Saturday Review* was a series of papers that appeared in 1870 on the proceedings at the Vatican council.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Manchester Guardian*, Mar. 31, 1888; *DNB*, xliii. 13–15; J. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics*, v. 228–231, London, n.d.

OXFORD: The county town of Oxfordshire, Eng., a cathedral city, the seat of a famous university and of a bishopric; situated at the junction of the Isis (Thames) and Cherwell (52 m. w.n.w of London); population 49,413 (1901). The university, though not founded by Alfred the Great, is a very old institution, and achieved very early a great fame. It probably originated from independent colleges founded in the place. Mention is made of what became the nuclei of the later university as early as the beginning of the twelfth century. The earliest charter recognising it as a single organisation dates from Henry III. (thirteenth century): the statutes date from 1629. At present the university comprises twenty-one colleges, some of which are very richly endowed, and there are also one college and three halls for women in the town, the students of which have the privileges of lectures, library, and examinations, though not of degrees and honors. The university library is the Bodleian, founded by Sir Thomas Bodley in 1602. The University of Oxford has been closely identified with the religious life of England. From the Restoration down to 1854, dissenters (see NON-CONFORMISTS) were debarred from the honors of the university. Now, however, all persons can receive its degrees, since subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles (q.v.) is no longer required. John Wyclif was professor at Oxford, and in 1555 Latimer and Ridley, and in 1556 Cranmer, were burnt at Oxford. In 1606 James I. prohibited Roman Catholics from "nominating to any free school"

In the civil war the University of Oxford melted its plate to help the Stuarts. Laud was chancellor and Charles I. held court at Oxford. Consequently the parliamentary party was indignant; and, when it took the city (1646), ejected all those who favored the king. Chief among these was John Fell (q.v.), dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor. To him succeeded Edward Reynolds the Presbyterian (q.v.), and then John Owen the Independent (q.v.) 1652, until 1660, when Reynolds was restored. In 1651 Cromwell was elected chancellor. During the Commonwealth, instruction was given as usual, although there was some confusion; and among the students were John Locke, Robert South, Philip Henry, Daniel Whitby, and Matthew Poole (qq.v.). Walton's Polyglot (see Bibles, Polyglot, IV.) was carried through the press during this period (1654–58), and in it Oxford scholars took a principal part. With the Restoration (1660) the university became as pronouncedly loyal to the monarchy as it had been to the Commonwealth and those who had been ejected were restored. It was insulted by James II. because it refused to countenance his Roman Catholic schemes; yet, under Queen Anne, strong Jacobite sentiment prevailed. In the eighteenth century, Oxford became the starting-point for the most remarkable religious movement in the annals of England: namely, Methodism (see Methodists); for John Wesley (q.v.) was student and fellow there, and "father" of the famous Holy Club, and there also George Whitefield (q.v.) studied. In the nineteenth century Oxford was also a religious center. It will be necessary to name only Edward Pusey, John Henry Newman, and John Keble (qq.v.) to call to mind the Tractarian movement (see Tractarianism) which stirred England so profoundly. A leader in quite a different school of religious thought was Benjamin Jowett (q.v.), master of Balliol, who headed, in a scholarly way, the Broad-church party (see England, Church of, II., § 8).

Several councils or synods have been held at Oxford. Two are of especial interest; one on Nov. 18, 1382, before which Wyclif was summoned to answer for his attack on the doctrine of transubstantiation. The council passed no condemnatory sentence, yet he was debarred from lecturing in the university. The second synod to be mentioned was presided over by Thomas Arundel (q.v.) and was held in 1408. It passed thirteen decrees against the Lollards (q.v.), the followers of Wyclif; of which the third, sixth, and seventh may thus be 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 Wyclif's may be read anywhere, unless it has been previously approved. The Bible must no longer appear in an English translation, and the Wyclifite translation must no longer be used.

The see of Oxford (embracing the three counties, Berkshire, Buckingham, and Oxfordshire) was established by Henry VIII. in 1542; and the cathedral was first the church of St. Frideswide which became Christ Church, Oxford, in 1546. Among the eminent bishops of Oxford may be mentioned Henry Compton, John Fell, Thomas Secker, and Samuel Wilberforce (qq.v.).

Bibliography: *Illustrated History of the University of Oxford, its Colleges, Halls, and Public Buildings*, 2 vols., London, 1814; V. A. Huber, *Die englischen Universitäten*, vols. i.–ii., Cassel, 1839–40, abridged Eng. transl., 2 vols., *The English Universities*, London, 1843; G. Smith, *A Plea for the Abolition of Tests in the University of Oxford*, London, 1863; idem, *The Re-organization of the University of Oxford*, ib. 1868; J. Parker, *Early History of Oxford, 727–1100*, Oxford, 1885; G. C. Broderick, *History of (Oxford) University*, London, 1886; A. Clarke, *The Colleges of Oxford; their Hist. and Traditions*, London, 1891; P. Dearmer, *The Cathedral Church of Oxford*, London, 1897; J. Wells, *Oxford and its Colleges*, London, 1904; G. F. Bridges, *The Oxford Reformers and English Church Principles. Their Rise, Trial and Triumph*, London, 1908.

OXFORD TRACTS. See Tractarianism.

OZANAM, ANTOINE FRÉDÉRIC: Roman Catholic scholar; b. at Milan Apr. 23, 1813; d. at Marseilles Sept. 8, 1853. He studied at 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 by means of a history of the Christian civilization; but he succeeded in realizing it only in a fragmentary manner: *Dante et la philosophie catholique au treizième siècle* (Paris, 1839); *Histoire de la civilisation* (1845; transl., *Hist. of Civilization in the 5th Century*, by A. C. Glyn, 2 vols., London, 1868); *Études germaniques* (Paris, 1847–49); and *Les Poëtes franciscains en Italie* (1852). A collected edition of his works in 11 vols. appeared (Paris, 1855–65).

Bibliography: His life was written by U. Legeay, Paris, 1854; J. B. H. D. de Lacordaire, ib. 1856; F. X. Karker, Paderborn, 1867; M. de Montrond, 1870; Kathleen O'Meara, Edinburgh, 1876; E. Hardy, Mainz, 1878; A. Ozanam, Paris, 1878; Mme. E. Humbert, ib. 1886; C. Huit, ib. 1888; and J. Laur, ib. 1895.

P

P: The symbol employed to designate the Priestly document which, according to the critical school, is one of the components of the Hexateuch (q.v.). See HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, II., § 4.

PACCA, pä'cä, **BARTOLOMMEO:** Cardinal; b. at Benevento Dec. 15, 1756; d. at Rome Apr. 19, 1844. At the Congress of Ems (see EMS, CONGRESS OF), in 1786, when certain princes of the Church in western Germany endeavored to secure for themselves a last vestige of ecclesiastical independence, Rome's answer was already framed in the founding of a papal nunciature at Munich, together with the despatch of the young diplomat, Pacca, to Cologne as nuncio. Thus every attempt in the Febronian direction (see HONTHEIM, JOHANN NICOLAUS VON) was nullified by Rome. And though the Rhenish prelates refused to receive the new nuncio, he nevertheless exercised an unrestricted authority of jurisdiction at Cologne, where he took skilful advantage of the discord between the citizens and the archbishop. In the Prussian districts on the left bank of the Rhine, he gained no less prompt recognition than in the dioceses of Hildesheim, Paderborn, Speyer, Liége, and the Bavarian domains. The Prussian diplomacy, then as afterward, proved all too accommodating in relation to the Curia. Indeed, Frederick William II. thereby reaped the advantage of having recognized by the Curia the royal title which the Prussian monarchs had borne since 1701.

The clever diplomatist Pacca was already in a very fair way to stifle all impulses of ecclesiastical independence in western Germany, when the French Revolution (q.v.) broke out. Its army, invading the German border in 1794, interrupted further proceedings. His experiences acquired at Cologne availed Pacca, in the next place, as nuncio at Lisbon, 1795–1800. His method was to assume the appearance of concession, yet prosecute his demands to their utmost limits by presenting them repeatedly in diversified form. His " Memoirs," which belong to the most interesting state papers of his time, cover his sojourn in both Germany and Portugal, and have appeared in various languages and editions (Pesaro, 1830, Orvieto, 1843, Paris, 1883, 1884, etc.). Returning to Rome in 1801, Pacca took his place at the front of the radical party, and, in 1808, thrust out the temporizing Consalvi (q.v.) from the leadership of affairs of State. On July 6, 1809, he was abducted in the same carriage with Pope Pius VII. (q.v.) and continued in French custody until 1813. In 1814 he accompanied the pope in his triumphal entry into Rome. Though the subsequent course of events restored his opponent Consalvi to the leading place, Pacca nevertheless remained the effective influence to which the papacy owed its restoration. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult Pacca's *Memorie Storiche del Ministero . . . del Card. B. Pacca*, 2 vols., Orvieto, 1843, Eng. transl., *Notes on the Ministry of Cardinal B. Pacca*, Dublin, 1843; and his *Historical Memoirs*, 2 vols., London, 1850; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, vol. ii., Gotha, 1882; F. Nippold, *The Papacy in the 19th Century*, pp. 22, 26, 36, New York, 1900.

PACCANARI, NICOLO: Roman Catholic, founder of the Society of the Faith of Jesus (Baccanarists, Paccanarists); b. at Val Sugana (near Trent, 80 m. s.w. of Innsbruck) about the middle of the eighteenth century; d. after 1809. Originally a merchant, he came under the influence of the Jesuit Gravita at Rome and was inspired, though a layman, to attempt the restoration of the Society of Jesus (see JESUITS), which had been dissolved by Clement XIV. With a few companions Paccanari accordingly founded his society in 1797, imitating the Jesuit organization in detail, and himself being chosen superior. The society was confirmed by Pius VI. in 1798, and the fathers, originally twelve in number, at first resided near Spoleta. By letters to various ecclesiastical princes of Italy, and by entrusting to the society the education of the students of the propaganda driven from Rome by the French republicans, Pius VI. aided in the rapid growth of the organization. In 1799 the organization was united with the French society of the Holy Heart of Jesus which had taken refuge in Austria, and Paccanari became general superior of the united body, and in 1800 was ordained priest. Though the order spread rapidly from Austria and Italy to France, Belgium, Holland, and England, it soon began to decline. Paccanari lacked administrative ability, and his imperious temper opposed union with the Russian branch of the Jesuits. In 1804, therefore, a number of Italian members went over to the Jesuits who had been restored in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. At the same time the fathers of the society in Holland and England began to migrate to Russia to become Jesuit novices; while the French members of the order fell away from their incapable founder and chose Varin, the second superior of the old Society of the Holy Heart of Jesus, as their head. In 1808 Paccanari was deposed by the holy office from the general superiorship and condemned to ten years in prison. He gained his liberty in the following year, when the French again invaded Rome, but he had lost his importance and henceforth remained unknown.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Speil, *Leonor Franz von Tournely und die Gesellschaft des heiligen Herzens Jesu*, pp. 269 sqq., 313 sqq., Breslau, 1874; A. Guidée, *Vie du . . . Joseph Varin*, pp. 72 sqq., 169 sqq., Paris, 1860; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 88 sqq.

PACE, RICHARD: English ecclesiastic, diplomatist, and man of letters; b. at or near Winchester, about 1482; d. at Stepney, in the east of London, 1536. 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 at the end of 1509. In May, 1510, he became prebendary of South Muskham, Southwell. In 1514 he became archdeacon of Dorset, in 1519 dean of St. Paul's, and in 1522 dean of

Exeter. Meanwhile he had attracted the notice of Henry VIII. and Wolsey. In 1521 he was sent to the strong republic of Venice and again in 1523 to promote Wolsey's election to the papacy. Wolsey was believed to be jealous of his influence; more probably his health, both physical and mental, was failing, and upon the doge's request, he was recalled in 1525. In 1527 he retired from St. Paul's to Sion near Twickenham. Pace was an amiable and accomplished man, the friend of More, Erasmus, and Colet. 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).

Bibliography: H. H. Milman, *Annals of St. Paul's*, pp. 179 sqq., London, 1869; J. S. Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, i. 112 sqq., ib. 1884; *DNB*, xliii. 22–24.

PACHOMIUS, pa-cō'mius: Egyptian monk and founder of monasteries; b. near Esneh (25 m. s. of Thebes) about 292; d. probably at Peboou, north of Tabennæ (the latter 35 m. n.w. of Thebes), May 9, 346 (*ASB*, May 14, 348). The son of heathen parents, he was a recruit in one of the Egyptian wars of Constantine (probably 314), and was converted to Christianity at Esneh. Free to return to his home after Constantine's victory, he was baptized at Chenoboscion (Shenesit). After dwelling for a short time in a little chapel at Chenoboscion, he resided for a considerable period in the hermit colony of Palæmon. He then built at Tabennæ, on the east bank of the Nile, the first monastery, replacing the scattered cells of the hermits by a house with many cells, the structure being surrounded by a wall. This proving too small, a second monastery was built at Peboou, which, in Pachomius' lifetime, became the center of nine monasteries and two nunneries. Accused of having visions by the bishops at a synod held at Esneh, he hardly escaped with his life from the bloody turmoil between priests and monks. He early enjoyed the favor of Athanasius, who visited his monasteries in 330, and whose orthodox teachings he zealously upheld. Pachomius was a skilful organizer. The entire group of monasteries became a great productive society under his administration, buying the raw materials and selling the finished products. A general reckoning was held semiannually at Easter and on Aug. 13. In 351, five years after the death of Pachomius, an attempt was made by Apollonius, abbot of Temoushons, to break up this closely organized system; but the threatened schism of the monastic union subsided when Theodore became the coadjutor of Horsiisi, who had succeeded Patronius, Pachomius' short-lived successor, in 346. Theodore built three new monasteries and one new nunnery; and the number of Greek monks increased rapidly, Pachomius having admitted foreigners and built a special house for Greek monks. In 404 Jerome reckoned the monks who attended the general accountings at the exaggerated number of 50,000; Cassian estimated them at only 5,000; while Palladius and Sozomen speak of only 7,000 monks of Tabennæ. About 460 a church was erected in honor of Pachomius by Martyrius, abbot of Peboou.

In his establishment of monastic life, Pachomius prepared a rule which required absolute obedience, checked individual caprice, and prescribed certain exercises and abstinences binding on all members of the community. According to the oldest form of the rule, which apparently goes back to Pachomius himself and which is preserved by Palladius (*Hist. Lausiaca*, xxxviii.) and other sources, each of the numerous cells in a monastery was to accommodate three monks. All the monks were to wear a linen undergarment, a leather girdle, and a white sheep skin or goat skin; the skin and the girdle being laid aside only when the monks received the Eucharist on Saturday and Sunday. Their headdress was the cucullus. By night the skins were to serve to cover the monks, who slept on low, sloping benches of masonry. The common meals were to be taken with covered head and in absolute silence. A three-years' novitiate was required before admission to the monastery. The earliest traces of the hours are found in this first of monastic rules; twelve prayers were to be recited by day, three at nones, twelve at twilight, and twelve at the midnight vigils, each prayer being preceded by the singing of a psalm. The monks were divided into twenty-four divisions according to the letters of the alphabet, the classification being based on the correspondence of the character of each monk to the mystical signification attached to the individual letters of the alphabet. This latter classification was soon replaced by a division according to the manual duties of the monks; and the requirement of the three-years' novitiate was abolished.

The rules of Pachomius, which have passed through many recensions in Coptic, Ethiopic, Greek, and Latin, exercised a powerful influence in the later development of monasticism. The Ethiopic monasteries were modeled after them; Athanasius brought them to the west during his exile in 340–346; Jerome translated them in 404 for his monastery at Bethlehem; and Benedict of Aniane (q.v.) selected them in his reform of Frankish monasticism. Anselm of Havelberg (q.v.) in the twelfth century found more than 500 monks living in a monastery at Constantinople according to the rules of Pachomius. Coptic fragments of sermons of Pachomius and Theodore and of four letters of Horsiisi have also survived, as well as the latter's *Doctrina de institutione monachorum*, also probably translated by Jerome. (G. Grützmacher.)

Bibliography: The *Vita*, by an unknown Greek author, in Lat. transl. by Dionysius Exiguus, is in *MPL*, lxxiii. 227–272, and in *ASB*, May, iii. 295–334. Fragments of other lives in Coptic and Arabic are given in *Annales du Musée Guimet*, xvii (1889), 1 sqq., 295 sqq., 337 sqq., and *Mémoires de la mission archéologique française au Caire*, iv. 2–3, 521 sqq.; one in Syriac is in Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, v. 121 sqq., Paris, 1895. Other sources are Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, chaps. vii., xx., xxxviii.–xlii., xlviii.; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, viii.–ix. Consult: E. Amélineau, *Étude historique sur S. Pachôme*, Cairo, 1887; G. Grützmacher, *Pachomius und das älteste Klosterleben*, Freiburg, 1896; P. Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme Pakhomien*, Louvain, 1898; S. Schiwietz, in *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, 1901-03; *DCB*, iv. 170–171.

PACHOMIUS RHUSANUS: Greek theologian; b. in Zante, one of the Ionian islands, 1510; d. about 1553. He was a monk first in his native island and then on Mt. Athos, and in his numerous writings, mostly practical in tendency, he touched upon many problems of theology. He was a bitter opponent of Joannikios Kartanos (q.v.), and assailed the lifeless ceremonialism of his church in his work "Against the Hellenizers." He also sought to reform the monasticism of his time in a series of writings; especially, "On the Advantage from the Sacred Writings"; and he was likewise the author of the first Greek polemic against Luther. Besides these, he wrote a series of dogmatic and practical treatises. A partial collection of his works may be found in *MPG*, xcviii. 1333–60.

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, i. 231 sqq., Paris, 1885; P. Meyer, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im 16. Jahrhundert*, pp. 38 sqq., Leipsic, 1899; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 593.

PACIANUS: Spanish theologian of the fourth century; d. about 390. The chief source for a knowledge of his life is Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, cvi., cxxxii.; *Contra Rufinum*, i. 24). He was the father of the Flavius Lucius Dexter to whom Jerome dedicated his *Catalogus virorum illustrium* in 392, who in later life became bishop of Barcelona. Besides a lost work *Cervus* (apparently a penitential sermon or an admonition against a public amusement by that name then popular in Gaul and probably also in Spain), Pacianus wrote a *Contra Novatianos*, of which three letters have been preserved (ed. Tilius, Paris, 1537; Gallandi, *Bibliotheca patrum*, vii. 257–267; *MPL*, xiii. 1051–82; H. Hurter, Innsbruck, 1878; and P. H. Peyrot, Zwolle, 1896). These are addressed to a certain Sympronianus or Sempronianus, who was in danger of adopting Novatianism. The first letter, "On the Catholic Name," defends the Catholic position; the second "On the Letters of Sympronianus," answers certain questions and objections; the third, "Against the Tractates of the Novatians," refutes the erroneous doctrines and abuses of the sect (*MPL*, xiii. 1051–82). Pacianus was likewise the author of a *Parænesis ad pœnitentiam* (ib., p. 1081) and of a *Sermo de baptismo* (ib., p. 1089). These works are more distinguished for correct Latinity and clear and pleasing presentation than for originality, representing the essential practical point of view of traditional orthodoxy. According to Jerome, Dexter, the son of Pacianus, wrote a history which has never been published, the *Chronicon Dextri*, alleged to have been discovered by the Jesuit Hieronymus Romanus de la Higuera (ed. Saragossa, 1619; *MPL*, xxxi. 55–572), being a forgery. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASB*, March, ii. 44; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, viii. 539; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, ii. 1, pp. 318–324, 334–336, Regensburg, 1864; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, p. 1074, Leipsic, 1890; *DCB*, iv. 171.

PACIFICATION, EDICTS OF: The name generally given to those edicts which from time to time the French kings issued in order to pacify the Huguenots. The first of the kind was that issued by Charles IX. in 1562, which guaranteed the Reformed religion toleration within certain limits; the last was the famous Edict of Nantes. (See NANTES, EDICT OF.)

PACIFIC ISLANDS: See SOUTH SEA ISLANDS.

PADDOCK, ROBERT LEWIS: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Eastern Oregon; b. in Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 24, 1869. He was educated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (B.A., 1894), and Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. (from which he was graduated in 1897), and was ordered deacon in 1897 and ordained priest in the following year. He was in charge of St. Paul's Mission, Southington, Conn. (1897), and secretary of the Church Students' Missionary Association and assistant minister of St. Paul's, Cleveland, O. (1897–1898). As vicar of the pro-cathedral, New York City (1898–1901), and rector of Holy Apostles', New York (1902–07), he distinguished himself by his fight against the immorality flagrant in his parish. In 1907 he was consecrated missionary bishop of the newly erected see of Eastern Oregon.

PADERBORN, BISHOPRIC OF: An ancient bishopric in the present kingdom of Prussia. In the assignment of the Saxon mission field to various Frankish dioceses, the district around Paderborn was designated as belonging to the bishopric of Würzburg, probably at the diet held in Paderborn itself in 777. At the conclusion of the Saxon war, Charlemagne made it an independent diocese, appointing to it Hathumar, a Saxon by birth and a priest of the Würzburg diocese. This was probably in the first decade of the ninth century. The new see was subject to the metropolitan jurisdiction of Mainz. (A. HAUCK.)

The second bishop, Badurad (815–852), was influential in public affairs, and as envoy of Louis the Pious persuaded Lothair to submit to his father. Among the best known is Thomas Oliver (1223–25), crusader and historian, later cardinal-bishop of Sabina. Under Eric of Brunswick (1508–32) the doctrines of the Reformation made headway in the diocese, and the see was next held by Hermann von Wied, the reforming archbishop of Cologne. In 1802 the bishopric was secularized, and the temporal jurisdiction assigned to Prussia, to which, after a short period as part of the kingdom of Westphalia, it returned in 1814. By the bull *De salute animarum* of 1821 the diocese was not only maintained as a spiritual entity, but enlarged by the jurisdiction of the former bishoprics of Corvey, Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Merseburg, and Naumburg, as well as portions of some others, thus becoming the second largest in Germany.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature under MUENSTER, BISHOPRIC OF; Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 438 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, vol. ii. passim; M. Gorges, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hochstiftes Paderborn im 17. Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1892; F. Philippi, *Zur Verfassungsgeschichte der westfälischen Bischofsstädte*, Osnabrück, 1894; F. X. Schrader, *Leben und Wirken Meinwerks Bischof's von Paderborn, 1009–36*, Paderborn, 1895; J. Falter, *Der preussische Kulturkampf 1873–80, mit Berücksichtigung der Diöcese Paderborn*, ib. 1900.

PÆDOBAPTISM (Gk. *paidos*, "of a child," and *baptismos*, "baptism"): The baptism of little children, commonly called baptism of infants (see BAPTISM).

PAGAN, PAGANISM. See HEATHENISM, § I.

PAGE, HARLAN: American philanthropist; b. at Coventry, Conn., July 28, 1791; d. in New York Sept. 23, 1834. From 1825 to his death he was New York agent of the general depository of the American Tract Society. He was a most devoted Christian, and employed every agency to do good.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Memoir* was by W. A. Hallock, New York, 1835.

PAGET, FRANCIS: Church of England bishop of Oxford; b. at London, Mar. 20, 1851. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1873), where he was senior student (1873–83) and tutor (1876–83). He was vicar of Bromsgrove (1883–85); regius professor of pastoral theology at Oxford and canon of Christ Church (1885–92); dean of Christ Church (1892–1901); and was consecrated bishop of Oxford (1901). He was also Oxford preacher at Whitehall in 1881–83, examining chaplain to the bishop of Ely in 1878–91, and chaplain to the bishop of Oxford in 1899–1901. He has written *Concerning Spiritual Gifts* (London, 1881); *The Redemption of Work* (1882); *Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Disbelief* (1887); *The Hallowing of Work* (1888); the essay on the sacraments in *Lux Mundi* (1889); *The Spirit of Discipline* (1891); *Studies in the Christian Character* (1895); *Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1899); *The Redemption of War* (1900); *Christ the Way* (1902); and *The Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline* (1906).

PAGI, ANTOINE: Roman Catholic Church historian; b. at Roques in Provence (southeastern France) in 1624; d. at Aix (17 m. n. of Marseilles) in 1699. He entered the order of the Cordeliers, 1641; was four times elected provincial; distinguished himself as a preacher; and published *Critica historico-chronologica in Annales Baronii* (4 vols., Paris, 1689–1705). In the execution of that work he was helped by his nephew, François Pagi (1654–1721), who was also a Cordelier, and who wrote *Pontificum Romanorum gesta* (4 vols., Antwerp, 1717–53) in a strongly marked ultramontane spirit.

PAINE, LEVI LEONARD: Congregationalist; b. at Holbrook (formerly East Randolph), Mass., Oct. 10, 1832; d. at Bangor, Me., May 10, 1902. He received his education at Yale College (B.A., 1856), and at the divinity school of that institution (graduated 1861); was tutor in the college, 1859–1861; pastor at Farmington, Conn., 1861–70; and professor of ecclesiastical history at Bangor Theological Seminary from 1871 till his death. He was an example of a devoted teacher whose concentration of energies upon the work of teaching was so complete that he found little time for literary work. Accordingly it was not till near the close of his life that he published more than occasional addresses and sermons. He then issued *Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism* (Boston, 1900); and *The Ethnic Trinities and their Relation to the Christian Trinity* (1901).

PAINE, THOMAS: Political and deistic writer; b. at Thetford (28 m. w.s.w. of Norwich), England, Jan. 29, 1736–37; d. in New York City June 8, 1809. His parents were Quakers. He left school at thirteen and till eighteen worked at his father's trade of stay-making, when he went to sea in a privateer. In Apr., 1759, he settled at Sandwich as a master stay-maker, and in September of that year married. Not prospering he removed to Margate the next year and there soon after his wife died. In 1761 he entered the excise branch of the government service and remained there till 1774, with the exception of a couple of years when, probably owing to his lax conduct, he was out of the service. He was restored but again dismissed, and finally, on the charge of smuggling. In 1771 he married Elizabeth Ollive, daughter of his landlord. 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 Salary: humbly addressed to the Members of both Houses of Parliament*. It was the first public exhibition of his power as a writer, but it gave offense to the upper officials and probably was the occasion of his dismissal on a trumped-up charge. Shortly after this he and his wife were formally separated.

By advice of Benjamin Franklin, whom he met in London, he came to America and at once found employment for his pen. He was a contributor to the first issue of the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, published in Philadelphia in Jan., 1775, and soon after its editor and so continued for eighteen months. From Aug., 1776, to Jan., 1777, he was a soldier in Washington's army, and it was while at the front that he wrote the first number of *The Crisis* which so powerfully heartened the country for the struggle. Thus introduced to the notice of the patriots he had employment as opportunity offered and was considered as a person worthy of substantial rewards. In 1777 he became secretary to the Congressional Committee of Foreign Affairs, but was obliged to resign on Jan. 7, 1779, because in the heat of a newspaper controversy with Silas Deane he divulged state secrets. In Nov., 1779, he was clerk to the general assembly of Pennsylvania. In 1781, in association with Col. John Laurens he negotiated in France a loan of 6,000,000 livres. He returned on Aug. 25. In Feb., 1782, he was engaged by the secretary of foreign affairs at what was then called the handsome salary of $800 per annum. In 1784 the state of New York gave him a house and 277 acres of land at New Rochelle, in 1785 Pennsylvania 500 pounds sterling, and in Oct., 1785, Congress gave him $3,000. The several amounts were sufficient to make him financially independent. From 1787 to 1802 he was in Europe, most of the time in France. His *Rights of Man*, published in London in 1791, attracted the attention of the French liberal party, and he was made a citizen of France 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 the prison of the Luxembourg on Dec. 28, 1793, and there he remained until Nov. 4, 1794, when, on the solicitation of James Monroe, minister to France, he was released. He tells himself of his marvelous escape from the guillotine, which was solely due to the fact that his door in the prison opened outward. It had been marked in token that the occupant of the room was to be executed, but his door being closed for the night the mark was of course not seen by those going through the prison in the early morning to drag out their victims.

On Oct. 30, 1802, he landed once more in America. He found that his friends had so managed his property that it would yield him an income of 400 pounds sterling. So he felt quite rich. But what cut him deeply was to find that the reputation he had made as a patriot had been almost forgotten and it was as the author of *The Age of Reason* he was known. So great was the popular execration of that book that many who would gladly have shown their appreciation of his great services to the country refused to countenance him on account of it. Hooted upon the streets, lampooned in the newspapers, deserted by his political associates, he lived a wretched existence. He was buried on his farm in New Rochelle, but his remains were removed to England in 1819 by William Cobbett. What became of them is unknown.

If Paine's writings had been only political, he would have been held in honor as a bold and vigorous friend of human liberty. He was extraordinarily fertile in ideas, and broad-minded and progressive. He was in fact a great genius. His power of speech has always been admired. To him is to be traced the common saying, "These are the times that try men's souls," which is the opening sentence of the first number of *The Crisis* (which was printed in the *Pennsylvania Journal*, Dec. 19, 1776). His pamphlet, *Common Sense* (Jan., 1776), was one of the memorable writings of the day, and helped the cause of Independence. His *Rights of Man; being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution* is a complete statement of republican principles. But it is as the author of *The Age of Reason*, an uncompromising, keen, 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, Mar., 1794; the second part, composed while in prison, Dec., 1795; the third was left in manuscript.[1] "His ignorance," says Leslie Stephen, "was vast, and his language brutal; but he had the gift of a true demagogue,—the power of wielding a fine vigorous English, a fit vehicle for fanatical passion." Paine was not an atheist, but a deist. In his will he speaks of his "reposing confidence in my Creator-God and in no other being; for I know no other, nor believe in any other." He voiced current doubt, and is still formidable; because, although he attacks a gross misconception of Christianity, he does it in such a manner as to turn his reader, in many cases, away from any serious consideration of the claim of Christianity. His *Age of Reason* is still circulated and read. The replies written at the time are not. Of these replies the most famous is Bishop Watson's (1796).

The personal character of Paine has been very severely judged. Nothing too bad about him could be said by those who hated him for his opinions, and even his friends are compelled to admit that there was foundation for the damaging charges. Comparison of the contemporary biographies, both of friends and foes, seems to show these facts: Paine was through life a harsh, unfeeling, vain, conceited, 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 doubtless unfounded; but that he was in his old age penurious, uncleanly, and drunken, may be accepted as true. He did a great service for the United States in her hour of peril; but he lived to forfeit the respect of the Christian world.

His complete *Works* have been several times published, e.g., 3 vols., Boston, 1856; New York, 1860; London, 1861. But the edition which supersedes all others and is really exhaustive and satisfactorily edited is *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, collected and edited by Moncure Daniel Conway (4 vols., New York and London, 1894–96). His *Age of Reason* has been repeatedly published, e.g., New York, 1876; and his *Theological Works* (complete), New York, 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Life* has been written by F. Oldys (pseudonym for George Chalmers), London, 1791, continued by W. Cobbett, 1796 (abusive); J. Cheetham, 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); T. C. 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, 1860 (a thoroughgoing defense 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). But the definitive life is by Moncure Daniel Conway, 2 vols., New York and London, 1892, Fr. transl., which supplies some additional information, Paris, 1900. It is the work of a historian, who greatly admired Paine, but is not blind to his faults in later years. In it is printed the sketch of Paine found among the papers of William Cobbett which corrects that noticed above and is laudatory. Consult also: G. J. Holyoake: *Essay on the Character and Services of Paine*, New York, 1876; L. Stephen, *History of English Thought*, i. 458–464, ii. 260–264, 2 vols., London, 1881; J. B. Daly, *Radical Pioneers of the 18th Century*, ib. 1886; *Life and Writings af Thomas Paine, Containing a Biography by T. C. Rickman, and Appreciations by Leslie Stephen, Lord Erskine, Paul Desjardins, R. G. Ingersoll, Elbert Hubbard, and Marilla M. Rieker.* Ed. D. E. Wheeler, New York, 1909.

PAINE, TIMOTHY OTIS: Theologian; b. at Winslow, Me., Oct. 13, 1824; d. at Boston Dec. 6, 1895. He was graduated from Waterville College (now Colby University), in 1847. After 1856 he was pastor of the Swedenborgian Church at Elmwood, Mass.; and in 1866 became teacher of Hebrew in the theological school of the General Convention of the New Jerusalem Church in the United States, now located at Boston, Mass. He applied himself closely to the study of Scripture, in the attempt to reproduce the allegorical forms or types. He is the author of *Solomon's Temple, or the Tabernacle; The First Temple; House of the King, or House of the Forest of Lebanon; Idolatrous High Places; The City on the Mountain* (*Rev. xxi.*); *The Oblation of the Holy Portion; and The Last Temple* (Boston, 1861); and *Solomon's Temple and Capitol, Ark of the Flood and Tabernacle, or The Holy Houses of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Septuagint, Coptic, and Itala Scriptures* (Boston and New York, 1885). *Selections from Poems* was published posthumously (New York, 1897).

---

[1] It was never published in its entirety, but out of it was made two separate publications, *Answer to the Bishop of Llandaff;* and *Examination of Prophecies* (in Conway's ed., iv. 258–289, 368–420).

PAINTING, DECORATIVE AND ILLUSTRATIVE ART, CHRISTIAN.

- I. Early Christian.
  - Catacombs and Manuscripts (§ 1).
  - Mural Mosaic (§ 2).
- II. The Carolingian and Othonian Period
- III. Byzantine.
- IV. The Middle Ages.
  - Miniatures and Books (§ 1).
  - Mural Decoration (§ 2).
  - Glass (§ 3).
- V. The Modern Period.
  - The Renaissance; Florence and Rome (§ 1).
  - The Netherlands (§ 2).
  - Germany; Dürer (§ 3).
  - Germany; Sixteenth Century and After (§ 4).
  - Other Countries (§ 5).

Painting has ever formed the favorite form of art in Christianity. Both in the early and in the medieval church sculpture was subordinate, and though the Renaissance broke through this principle, its most important contribution to religion was its paintings, even architecture occupying a secondary place. In the Middle Ages painting was practically confined to frescoes and the adornment of manuscripts, but in the course of the Renaissance it was applied to large canvases.

1. Catacombs and Manuscripts.

I. Early Christian: Christian painting previous to Constantine is known only from its connection with places of burial. This sepulchral art begins late in the first or early in the second century (catacombs of San Gennaro in Naples), and is contained in the catacombs of Rome, Naples, and Syracuse, as well as elsewhere, until these catacombs ceased to be used in the fourth or fifth century. The art here preserved was an increasingly Christian adaptation of pagan materials, with slight claim to merit, and aiming merely at simple illustration of definite ideas of practical religion. The sources were the Old and the New Testament, sometimes in symbolic form, religious and secular life, and reproduction of classic concepts and legends either directly or in Christianized adaptations (see MITHRA, MITHRAISM). In nearly every instance there is allusion to death and resurrection. Even Biblical material is chosen with reference to its adaptability to the resurrection, as in the favorite theme of the good shepherd as the lord and protector of the dead. Early Christian painting was not, however, restricted to the catacombs, for not only allusions in literature but also the discovery of a Christian private house on the Cælian Hill show that it was employed both in private life and in divine worship. Early Christian miniatures were equally dependent on classic ideals. The use of miniatures to adorn Biblical manuscripts seems to have arisen in the third century and was practised skilfully by the beginning of the fourth, as is shown by the miniatures of the Quedlinburg fragments of the Itala. About a century later come the charming miniatures of the Vienna Genesis, but with the fifth century distinctly Christian motifs tend to displace the pagan elements, the oldest representative of the transition apparently being the Rossano Codex purpureus of the Gospels. Here artistic freshness is killed by conventionality, and the same general tendency, though in less exaggerated form, is seen in the Syriac manuscript of the Gospels of Rabbula (end of the sixth century). The last phase of the struggle between old and new may be traced in the miniatures of a Cosmas Indicopleustes of the Justinian period, where classic influences are seen in complete subjugation to ecclesiastical art; while the final echoes of early Christian miniature painting are to be found in a Cambridge Latin evangelary of the seventh century and in the almost contemporary Ashburnham Pentateuch.

2. Mural Mosaic.

A far greater task than in miniatures was demanded of painting in the adornment of the churches built during and after the reign of Constantine. Painting had long been used in embellishing these edifices, as is shown by canon xxxvi. of the Synod of Elvira (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 170, Eng. transl., i. 151, and Fr. transl., i. 1, p. 240, the bibliographical notes to which are very useful), but now the necessity arose of rivaling the richly adorned temples of the conquered faith. The special form of art here adopted was the mosaic, now first widely employed for mural decoration in contradistinction to its classic use mainly for pavements. The earliest specimen, the fragments of the mausoleum of Constantine's daughter, Constantina, on the Via Nomentana before Rome, still is prevailingly pagan in motif, though, as in sepulchral art, Christian elements steadily gain the upper hand. Pagan elements are still essential, even though only as a framework, in the fifth-century baptistry of Naples and the oratory of San Giovanni Evangelista near the Lateran, as well as in the slightly later baptistry of the Lateran, the mausoleum of Galla Placidia, and the orthodox baptistry of Ravenna; but in the great mosaics of the basilicas the classical elements almost entirely disappear. The glorified Savior, surrounded by apostles and saints amid the wonders of Paradise, with the holy city in the background, and angels or the symbolic figures of the four apostles as a frame, filled the vaulted apse. On the walls of the arcades were scenes from the Bible, or solemn processions of the sanctified toward the apse. Only seldom are scenes from the present world portrayed, as in the Church of San Vitale at Rome. Mosaics are preserved in the churches of San Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, and Santa Maria Maggiore and Santa Costanza at Rome, and reach their culmination in Justinian's great structure of St. Sophia at Constantinople. Closely akin to mosaic was mural painting proper. This was probably used in the more humble churches, and the few scanty specimens extant are chiefly from Egypt, some of them showing a curious similarity to the miniatures on Egyptian papyri.

II. The Carolingian and Othonian Period: The western peoples that came into contact with Roman culture possessed a distinct type of art which consisted in developments of the spiral, the use of animal figures belonging to a later period. This art was exemplified chiefly in miniatures, shown in such Irish manuscripts as the Lindisfarne Evangelary, the Book of Kells, and the Cathach Psalter. The object was purely calligraphic, and the artistic significance lies in the fantastic development of the ornamentation and the delicate sense of color. Anglo-Saxon miniature painting is almost identical in spirit with Irish, while the Frankish miniatures show a certain approximation to early Christian art. This influence is first perceptible in the reign of Charlemagne, as in the Evangelary of Godescalc at Paris, the Ada manuscript at Trèves, and the Evangelary of Charlemagne at Vienna; it first becomes potent in the reign of Louis the Pious, enriched by Syriac influence and typified in the Bibles of Alcuin; and it reaches its acme in the Bible of Charles the Bald at Paris. The school is characterized by a happy blending of the national and the classical, by originality and imagination, and by admirable coloring and fantasy in combination of picture and ornamentation. Tours, Metz, and Reims were the chief centers, and the court itself took part. The general effect is one of uniformity, though in more remote places, as St. Gall, Fulda, and Corvey, a certain degree of independence and naturalism is perceptible. The fall of the Carolingian power rendered it possible for painting to develop freely, and under the German Othos it transcended its former development, reaching its pinnacle in the reigns of Otho III. and Henry II. The chief centers, with their principal productions, were not only Treves (where Archbishop Egbert fostered artistic life), Cologne (the Aachen Otho manuscript), and Echternach (the Echternach Evangelary at Gotha), but especially the Reichenau (the Codex Egberti at Treves and the Psalterium Egberti at Cividale) and Regensburg (Evangelary of Abbess Uota at Munich). The technic is early Christian, and delicate shading is rare. Literary sources show that mural painting was also employed with great frequency, though no specimens from the Carolingian period have been preserved, and but few from the succeeding period. To the latter belong, however, the mural paintings of the Church of St. George at Oberzell in the Reichenau, apparently dating from the late sixth century and unmistakably influenced strongly by primitive Christian art. At the same time there is here a directness and truth, combined with a breadth of concept, which make these mural paintings second to no others of the early Middle Ages in importance for the history of art.

III. Byzantine: Unlike the West, with its political vicissitudes, the eastern empire maintained a continuity with classic culture; and in this very fact lies the distinction between the medieval art of Byzantium and of the Latin and Teutonic lands. Even the storms of the iconoclastic controversy (see IMAGES AND IMAGE WORSHIP, II., §§ 2–3) could not destroy the artistic spirit, typically pan-Hellenic and uniting classical and Christian motifs, which had grown up from the very foundation of Constantinople, and especially after the reign of Justinian. The exact reverse was the case, for at the very time when the West saw the triumph of national over classical art, the East, under the Macedonian dynasty (beginning with 867) witnessed a wonderful renaissance of classicism. Evidence of all this is furnished by the miniatures, especially those of a Psalter, probably of the tenth century, and a still earlier manuscript of the homilies of Gregory Nazianzen, written for Basil, the first of the Macedonian dynasty (867–886)—both in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Gr. nos. 139 and 510). Here the characteristics are fresh grasp of theme, careful execution of detail, magnificent coloring, and classical influence, only the conventionality in drapery betraying the copyist. Toward the end of the eleventh century a decline in artistic creativeness set in, conventionality in figure and theme appeared, and naturalism gave place to lofty pomp; but even so, classical art remained potent down to the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders, and Byzantine art came to an end without breaking with the past. Mural paintings of the Byzantine period are no longer extant, though a surrogate is furnished by the paintings on Mt. Athos after the sixteenth century. Mosaics are rare. Almost all those of St. Sophia, now hidden under the later wall covering, seem to belong to the early Macedonian period, while mosaics from the twelfth and thirteenth century respectively are preserved in the monastery churches of Daphni near Athens and Chora in Constantinople. The last phase of Byzantine art is closely connected with the " Painter's Book " of Mount Athos, the author of which, the monk Dionysius (flourished after 1500), doubtless used older materials, although chance elements and personal preferences may be perceived. Byzantine art exercised scant influence on the West, even though exceptional instances may be traced, especially in Italy, as in the Capella Palatina and cathedral of Palermo, the cathedral of Cefalù, and St. Mark's in Venice.

IV. The Middle Ages: Until long after the zenith of the Middle Ages art was courtly and clerical. Secular themes were deemed of secondary importance and were comparatively rare. Under Henry II. miniature painting was in full bloom, but about the middle of the eleventh century a tendency to mere imitation, devoid of real sympathy with its models and their spirit, led to a sudden decline. Technic deteriorated and coloring became coarse, while body colorings were often neglected entirely, and pen drawings were deemed sufficient, specimens of this decay being the Wyschehrad Evangelary in Prague and the Antiphonary in the abbey of St. Peter at Salzburg (first half of the twelfth century). About the middle of

1. Miniatures and Books.

the eleventh century, however, the change set in which was to dominate the Middle Ages until their end—the rise of the knights and burgers, with a resultant increasing tendency to secularize and popularize art. The figuration now became more slender and delicate and in better proportion; psychological processes were more clearly expressed; and pen drawings were found to be better adapted to the new style of art than body coloring. This transformation, with its commingling of lay and clerical art, was best exemplified in the *Hortus deliciarum*, completed about 1175 (destroyed in the siege of Strasburg in 1870). Non-religious manuscripts were now also illuminated, the result operating to the advantage of religious art; and the whole was fostered and promoted by the rise of Gothic art. The favorite subjects of the new popular art were chronicles and devotional works which directly touched the interests of the people, as well as the *Biblia pauperum* (see BIBLES, ILLUSTRATED, § 4). Side by side with this popular art went the courtly art which, inspired by the French illuminations which had come into vogue with Louis IX., fostered the spiritual interests of more cultured circles. Here pen drawings were discarded in favor of the French plastic modeling, while in the school founded by Charles IV. at Prague and extending to Vienna, Treves, and elsewhere, there was a characteristic framing of initial letters or miniatures by rich and involved tracery. With the beginning of the fifteenth century, however, German illumination entered upon a decline which soon ended in utter extinction. See DANCE OF DEATH.

2. Mural Decoration.

The rise of Romanesque architecture afforded a welcome opportunity for mural painting. The scanty specimens now extant show, on the one hand, a break with Carolingian and Othonian conventionality with a consequent uncertainty, and, on the other hand, an increasing individualism of treatment and keenness of insight. The most conspicuous examples of this style are the mural paintings in the Unterkirche of Schwarzrheindorf near Bonn (1151–56), the frescoes of the chapter-hall of Brauweiler (a few decades later), the mural decorations of the cathedral at Brunswick, and the paintings of the nuns' choir of the cathedral of Gurk in Carinthia. Gothic architecture checked this development, however, by cutting up the mural spaces and the vaultings, so that in the Gothic period mural paintings are the exception, though specimens may be seen in the apse of the church at Brauweiler, the church of Ramersdorf, now translated to Bonn, and the crypt of the minster of Basel. A new element, moreover, was introduced in this cycle by the dance of death, inspired by the terrible pestilences of the fourteenth century; and here the theme afforded the artist, as at Basel, Berlin, and Lübeck, full scope for the exercise of unrestricted individuality. In France illumination and mural painting were inferior to German productions during the Romanesque period, but in the second half of the fourteenth century the Latin country reached a high degree of true artistic merit, as in the two Psalters of the duke of Berri.

3. Glass.

Though prevented by Gothic architecture from attaining full development, painting was still able to manifest itself in works on canvas and glass. The former occurs sporadically in the Romanesque period, as in antependiums, but its real existence begins only toward the close of the Middle Ages. The German centers were Prague (established, as already noted, by Charles IV.), Nuremberg (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), Soest (Master Conrad, first half of the fifteenth century), and especially Cologne (Master Wilhelm and Stephan Lochner, fourteenth and fifteenth century respectively). Stained glass was used almost contemporaneously in the second half of the tenth century at Tegernsee in Germany and St. Remy in France, serving originally as a substitute for the tapestries formerly adorning the walls and curtaining the windows, so that the tapestry designs are still preserved. The oldest specimens of glass paintings, or rather of glass mosaics, of this type are five individual figures in the cathedral of Augsburg, dating from about 1000, each bit of colored glass being joined by lead and having a simple outline and modeling of black lead. While at first the figure alone was considered, a wealth of ornamental detail was soon introduced, as in the twelfth-century Cistercian monastery of Kremsmünster. The large windows demanded by the Gothic style, moreover, gave a new impulse to stained glass both in the thirteenth century (Strasburg and Freiburg) and in the fourteenth (Regensburg, Oppenheim, and Cologne cathedral), especially as the technic had been improved, particularly by the discovery of overlaying of glass and the extension of the color scale. Toward the end of the fourteenth century, however, rivalry with painting caused the glass mosaic to be superseded by stained glass, and in the fifteenth century the original form had been entirely given up. The finest examples of this latter phase are the glasses in St. Sebald and St. Lorenz in Nuremberg, while France (Chartres, Le Mans, and Bourges) also contains excellent specimens. Italy, on the other hand, here presents little of interest. In the latter country mosaic painting attained modest proportions, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries enjoyed a marked development, as shown by the Roman churches of San Clemente and Santa Maria in Trastevere. The sources for the themes of medieval painting were primarily Biblical, with a marked influence of the traditions of the Church and the metaphorical exegesis of medieval theologians. The cult of the Virgin likewise gave scope for allegory and typology, while legend, liturgy, folk-beliefs, and scholarly subtleties combined to give richness and diversity to the painter's art.

V. The Modern Period: Medieval art was essentially based upon tradition, but with the fourteenth century came, especially in Italy, a veritable revolution in the rise of individualism not less in art than in the spheres of politics and learning. The leader here was the brilliant republic of Florence. The beginning is marked by Giotto (b. about 1266; mural paintings in Assisi and Padua), and a distinct advance is seen in Masaccio (d. 1428) and Masolino (d. about 1447). The ex-monk Filippo Lippi (d. 1469), a master of coloring, represented sacred history on a secular plane, though without losing the magic of religious feeling, and his example was followed by his son, Filippino Lippi (d. 1504), and Sandro Botticelli (d. 1510).

1. The Renaissance; Florence and Rome.

The early Renaissance in Florence closed with Domenico Ghirlandajo (d. 1494), though tradition again found at least a partial defender in Giovanni da Fiesole, or Fra Angelico (d. 1455). Umbria also followed, though with more adherence to medieval ideals. Here the great names are Piero dei Franceschi (d. 1492) and his pupil, the dramatist Luca Signorelli (d. 1523; eschatological paintings at Orvieto), and the more independent Pietro Perugino (d. 1524), the teacher of Raphael. In upper Italy, finally, mention must be made of the Milanese Andrea Mantegna (d. 1506) and the Venetian Giovanni Bellini (d. 1516). The way was now prepared for the High Renaissance, wherein Florence gave place to Rome, while an art was developed which aimed at the monumental and massive, in which composition and modeling were deemed more important than coloring. Artists thought themselves the leaders of mankind, and princes and prelates were rivals. The High Renaissance, which, though exalting the present over the past, yet recognized its kinship with the antique, finds its culmination in three artists: Leonardo da Vinci (d. 1519), Raphael Santi (d. 1520), and Michelangelo Buonarrotti (d. 1564), whose influence was felt throughout Italy, with the exception of Venice, where Bellini still remained supreme. Venice, indeed, was realistic rather than classical, but its fine coloring attained a higher perfection through this very limitation, as is shown by the productions of the masters of the Venetian school, Giorgione (d. 1510), Palma Vecchio (d. 1528), Titian (d. 1576), and Paolo Veronese (d. 1588). Apart from the Venetians stood the great Correggio (d. 1534), belonging to the school of Ferrara and Bologna. The Renaissance presented to its artists enormous tasks in fresco painting, and in this branch the greatest results were achieved. But at the same time canvases now became widely popular, and herein the Renaissance marks the beginning of a new epoch.

2. The Netherlands.

In the course of the fifteenth century the Netherlands developed, independent of Italy, a *genre* which, though inferior to Italian art in modeling, was superior both in realism and in coloring, exceptionally aided by high technic in the use of oils. The initial stages are unknown, but the painting of the Netherlands appears in fine development in the work of the brothers Hubert (d. 1426) and Jan van Eyck of Maaseyck (d. 1440), exemplified in the Ghent altar, completed in 1432 and preserved in Ghent, Brussels, and Berlin. This Flanders school was surpassed by the Brabant school, highly developed by Roger van der Weiden (d. 1464), who influenced the German Hans Memling (d. 1495), the painter of the dramatic Last Judgment at Danzig. Together with paintings on canvas, miniature painting reached a high degree of perfection in the Netherlands, and though in the sixteenth century Italian influence became increasingly powerful, the old traditions were worthily maintained by a native school which included Quinten Massys, Pieter Brueghel the elder, and Lucas van Leyden. The influence of the Netherlands spread to Germany, Cologne first of all. It was also potent in the Upper Rhine school centered in Kolmar, though the leader here, Martin Schongauer (d. 1491), proved his independence by a charming devotion to nature. The Swabian school reached its climax in Bartholome Zeitblom of Ulm (d. after 1517), the elder Hans Holbein of Augsburg (d. 1524), and Hans Burgkmair (d. 1531); but the Frankish school, with Nuremberg as a center, took only mediocre rank in painting with Michel Wolgemut (d. 1519), though in sculpture it stood preeminent.

3. Germany; Dürer.

In the first half of the sixteenth century German painting reached its zenith, not only in the German invention of copper-plate and in wood-cuts, but in painting proper. Here an epoch was marked by Albrecht Dürer (b. at Nuremberg May 21, 1471; d. there Apr. 6, 1528), whose wide travels gave him the inspiration that made him the real creator of the landscape, which had hitherto been a mere accessory. His first great work, fifteen wood-cuts in the *Heimliche Offenbarung Johannis* (in 1498), revealed him already a master, while his artistic perception was further evinced by his twenty pictures of the life of the Virgin, which he began to issue in 1504. For a long time he was also engaged on the Passion. The " Great Passion " (12 wood-cuts completed in 1511) is prevented from attaining full dignity by the coarseness of popular taste, and the artist is frequently balked by the wood-cutter, although the dramatic force is still powerful. The " Little Passion " (37 small cuts completed in 1511) aims at simplicity, as the "copper-plate Passion " (16 small plates, 1507–13) and the " Green Passion " (12 drawings in chiaroscuro on a green ground, done in 1504 and now in Vienna) successfully attain a mild and harmonious tone. Dürer attained his highest effect by a union of shading and realism. Among his best works are The Prodigal Son, The Madonna with the Ape, St. Eustache, Adam and Eve, Christ on the Cross, The Knight with Death and the Devil, Jerome in his Cell, Melancholy, and The Meditation of St. Anthony. He was also the founder of the copper-plate portrait (Melanchthon, Pirkheimer, Frederick the Wise, etc.); and the truth and care here displayed also characterize his paintings of Adam and Eve (at Madrid), The Adoration of the Trinity by all the Saints (in Vienna), The Adoration of the Three Kings (at Florence), and the greatest of all, The Four Temperaments.

Dürer inspired the far coarser painters Georg Pencz, Hans Sebald Beham, Barthel Beham, as well as such representatives of the Upper Rhein school as Matthias Grünewald (d. about 1529). The latter, an uncompromising realist, found a follower in Hans Baldung, commonly called Grien (d. 1545), while both Dürer and Grünewald influenced Albrecht Altdorfer (d. 1538), the head of the Regensburg school and the representative of a romantic movement. The bond between the Swabian school and the Italian Renaissance and the creation of a German Renaissance were effected by Hans Holbein

4. Germany; Sixteenth Century and After.

the younger (b. at Augsburg, 1497; d. at London, 1543). An intense realist and devoid of ethics, he excelled as a portrait painter, as of Erasmus, Amerbach, Archbishop Warham, and Georg Gisze, yet he was unrivaled among his compatriots as a colorist, as is shown by his Madonna of Burgomaster Meyer. In his passion pictures he lacked sympathy with his theme and is repellantly naturalistic, as in the Basel Christ in the Tomb, but in his ninety-four pictures to the Old Testament he reproduces the epic tone with admirable simplicity. As an ardent Protestant he furthered the cause of his doctrines not only by his Indulgence-Vender and Christ the True Light, but also by his satirical passion pictures in which monks and priests figure as judges and executioners of Christ, and here too belong, in a sense, his Dance of Death (forty-five plates executed about 1525). He broke entirely with tradition, but though surpassing Dürer in color and modeling, he is inferior in depth and nationality. Lucas Cranach the elder (d. 1553) formed a link between the art of Upper Germany and Saxony. Firmly Protestant, he painted portraits of Reformers and princes of his own type of mind, and also aided the Protestant cause by such paintings as the Crucifixion (at Weimar), Law and Gospel (at Schneeberg), and Passionale of Christ and Antichrist. His earlier works are rich in color and often sympathetic, but in his latter years he plied his art as a mere trade, an example in which he was followed by his son, Lucas Cranach the younger (d. 1586). Economic conditions in Germany were reflected in a decline in painting from the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century. The best work even of Daniel Chodowiecki (1726–1801) was in the minor *genre* of middle-class life. The classicism of the second half of the eighteenth century persisted in art until late in the nineteenth century, achieving its best results in landscape, as exemplified by Joseph Koch (d. 1839), Karl Rottmann (d. 1850), and Friedrich Preller (d. 1878), but it met a deadly opponent in the romantic school, which drew from medieval and Preraphaelite material. These "Nazarenes" (Friedrich Overbeck [d. 1869], Philipp Veit [d. 1878], Joseph Führich [d. 1876], and Eduard Steinle [d. 1886]) also influenced the Protestants Karl Gottfried Pfannschmidt (d. 1887), Bernhard Plockhorst (b. 1825), and Heinrich Hofmann (b. 1824), and in less degree Peter Cornelius (d. 1867) and Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld (d. 1872). While their work is deeply religious, their grasp is often weak, sentimental, and untrue. A sound principle, though often carried to extremes, is represented, on the other hand, by Eduard von Gebhardt and especially by Fritz von Uhde.

5. Other Countries.

Unlike Germany, Italy maintained a degree of art in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the idealism of Guido Reni (d. 1642; Aurora in the Palazzo Rospigliosi in Rome and Ecce Homo in Dresden) and of Carlo Dolci (d. 1686; St. Cecilia in Dresden) went parallel to or in union with the realism of Caravaggio (d. 1609) and Spagnoletto (d. 1656). In Spain painting first attained its full classical development in the seventeenth century, characterized by amazing technic and extraordinary sense of coloring. Side by side with the great realist Velasquez (d. 1660), preeminent as a portrait-painter, stands his younger contemporary, Murillo, whose visions, conceptions, saints, and Madonnas reveal the true Spanish Roman Catholic warmth of religious feeling. France likewise found its first great painter in the seventeenth century in Nicholas Poussin (d. 1665), who drew from classic models and inspired the landscape school which reached its zenith in Claude Lorrain (d. 1682), while Antoine Watteau adopted the rococo style both in form and theme. In this same century the Netherlands not only surpassed their own past, but attained a high place in art as a whole. The Flemish school, with its foundation of mingled Teutonic and Romance elements blended with the display of Spanish Jesuitism, is represented in the magnificent coloring and the keen sense of beauty of form, composition, and dramatic power of Peter Paul Rubens (b. probably at Siegen in Westphalia June 29, 1577; d. at Antwerp May 30, 1640). He is not, however, without a strain of the sensual, and his numerous religious canvases, the best known of which is the Descent from the Cross in the cathedral at Antwerp, are essentially secular in type. His best pupil was Antonius van Dyck (d. at London 1641), who excels in portraits but is weak in his religious paintings. The naturalism of Dutch painting adapted it particularly for portraiture, landscapes, and *genre* work. Religious themes were modernized and lost their loftiness, though these defects were veiled by the perfection of the Dutch development of chiaroscuro. Practically the sole religious painter of Protestant Holland was Rembrandt Harmensz van Reijn (b. at Leyden 1606; , d. at Amsterdam 1669), in which Dutch art reached its zenith. His numerous Biblical pictures are simple in their naturalism and are the more intelligible by the modernization of their figures and setting, even though the result sometimes involves the commonplace. Generally, however, as may be seen from his Christ at Emmaus (at Paris) and his Return of the Prodigal Son (at St. Petersburg), he remained true to the loftiness of his theme and achieved admirable artistic effects. Rembrandt was equally admirable in portrait-painting and etching, and the passing of years served only to increase the perfection of his art. His influence, powerful in the eighteenth century, was followed, early in the last century, by French classicism, which has recently been superseded in Holland, as elsewhere, by the historical school. In England it was not until toward the end of the eighteenth century that the first real attempts at native painting were begun by William Hogarth (d. 1764) and Joshua Reynolds (d. 1851). A school closely akin to the "Nazarenes" was founded by the Preraphaelites Rosetti, Millais, and Burne-Jones, who surpassed their German counterparts in depth, truth, and simplicity.

The intercommunication of modern times has tended to efface national peculiarities and sharply defined schools in painting, replacing them with eclecticism. The present condition is one of inchoateness, being restless and drawn hither and thither by the most diverse tendencies. The result has already been certain gains which can not be lost, but the ultimate outcome is still problematical. This entire process involves religious painting in its fortunes, and every attempt to separate this type of art from the rest, and to treat it as a distinct entity, has injured it instead of being to its advantage. (VICTOR SCHULTZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature under ART, CHRISTIAN, consult on the general subject: F. X. Kraus, *Synchronistische Tabellen zur christlichen Kunstgeschichte*, Freiburg, 1880; idem, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, 3 vols., Freiburg, 1896–1900; J. O. Westwood, *Palæographia sacra pictoria*, London, 1845; R. Garrucci, *Storia della arte cristiana*, 6 vols., Prato, 1881; J. P. Lundy, *Monumental Christianity*, New York, 1882; E. Ollier, *A Popular History of Sacred Art*, London, 1882; C. Ats, *Die christliche Kunst*, Bozen, 1884; A. W. C. Lindsay, *Sketches of the History of Christian Art*, 2 vols., London, 1885; E. Frantz, *Geschichte der christlichen Malerei*, 2 parts, Freiburg, 1887–94; A. de Champeaux, *Histoire de la peinture décorative*, Paris, 1890; F. Bournand, *Hist. de l'art chrétien*, 2 vols., Paris, 1891; A. Conti, *Religione ed arte*, Florence, 1891; F. Buettgenbach, *Die kirchliche Kunst in Monographien*, 2 vols., Aachen, 1890; W. Lowrie, *Christian Art and Archæology*, London, 1901; N. Bell, *The Saints in Christian Art*, 3 vols., London, 1901–04; J. Ficker, *Studien über christliche Denkmäler*, Leipsic, 1902; E. Gradmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, Calw, 1902; A. Lecoy de la Marche, *La Peinture religieuse*, Paris, 1902; R. Buerkner, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Kunst*, Freiburg, 1903; E. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, Paris, 1903 sqq.; J. P. Richter and A. C. Taylor, *The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art*, London, 1904; A. Michel, *Histoire de l'art depuis les premiers temps chrétiens jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris, 1905.

On early Christian art consult: J. N. Diepolder, *Theologie und Kunst im Urchristentum*, Augsburg, 1882; F. R. Salmon, *Histoire de l'art chrétien aux dix premiers siècles*, Lille, 1891; J. Wilpert, *Die Katakombengemälde und ihre alten Copien*, Freiburg, 1891; E. L. Cutts, *History of Early Christian Art*, London, 1893; F. Wickhoff, *Roman Art. Some of its Principles and their Application to early Christian Painting*, London, 1900; J. R. Allen, *Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian Times*, 1904; V. Schultze, *Die Katakomben von S. Gennaro dei Poveri in Neapel*, Jena, 1877; idem, *Die altchristlichen Grabstätten Siciliens*, Berlin, 1907; L. von Sybel, *Christliche Antike Einführung in die altchristliche Kunst*. Vol. ii., *Plastik, Architektur, und Malerei*, Marburg, 1909. For Byzantine art consult: N. Kondakoff, *Hist. de l'art byzantin*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886–91; J. Strzygowski, *Der Bilderkreis des griechischen Physiologus, des Kosmas Indikopleustes und Oktateuch*, Leipsic, 1899; idem, *Orient oder Rom*, ib. 1901; H. Brockhaus, *Die Kunst in den Athosklöstern*, Leipsic, 1891; W. R. Lethaby and H. Swainson, *The Church of Sancta Sophia*, London, 1894. On manuscripts and mural decorations consult: J. O. Westwood, *The Miniatures of Anglo-Saxon and Irish Manuscripts*, London, 1869; F. X. Kraus, *Die Wandgemälde der St. Georgs-Kirche zu Oberzell auf der Reichenau*, Freiburg, 1884; idem, *Die Wandgemalde von S. Angelo in Formis*, Berlin, 1893; G. Clausse, *Les Monuments du christianisme au moyen âge. Basiliques et mosaïques chrétiennes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1893; E. Male, *L'Art religieux du xii. siècle en France*, Paris, 1898; L. von Kobell, *Kunstvoll Miniaturen und Initialen aus Handschriften, 4.–16. Jahrhunderten*, Munich, 1890; A. Labitte, *Les Manuscrits et l'art de les orner*, Paris, 1893; H. V. Sauerland und A. Haseloff, *Der Psalter Erzbischof Egberts von Trier in Cividale*, Treves, 1901; W. R. Lethaby, *Mediæval Art*, London, 1904; G. von Kalcken, *Peintures ecclésiastiques do moyen âge*, Haarlem, 1910. For Italy consult: W. Lubke, *Geschichte der Italienischen Malerei*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1878; E. Montegut, *Artistes de l'Italie*, Paris, 1881; L. Scott, *The Renaissance of Art in Italy*, London, 1883; J. Burckhardt, *Der Cicerone*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1884; idem, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols., ib. 1885; B. Riehl, *Deutsche und italienische Kunstcharaktere*, Frankfort, 1893; G. Gruyer, *L'Art ferrarias à l'époque des princes d'Este*, 2 vols., Paris, 1897; J. Burckhardt, *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte von Italiens*, Basel, 1898; H. Wölfflin, *Die klassische Kunst*, Munich, 1899; idem, *The Art of the Italian Renaissance*, London, 1903; A. Philippi, *Die Kunst der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1905; S. Brinton, *The Renaissance in Italian Art*, 9 vols., London, 1907. For Germany consult: W. Wackernagel, *Die deutsche Glasmalerei*, Leipsic, 1855; A. Woltmann, *Holbein und seine Zeit*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1873–76; L. Grote, *Lukas Cranach, der Maler der Reformation*, Dresden, 1883; H. Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstarchäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1883–85; E. Paulus, *Bilder aus Kunst in Deutschland*, Stuttgart, 1883; R. Springer, *Kunsthandbuch für Deutschland*, Berlin, 1883; M. Thausing, *Dürer*, Leipsic, 1884; H. Thode, *Die Malerschule von Nürnberg im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*, Frankfort, 1891; A. Springer, *Albrecht Dürer*, Berlin, 1892; H. Janitschek, *Geschichte der deutschen Malerei*, Berlin, 1890; L. H. Cust, *The Paintings and Drawings of A. Dürer*, London, 1897; R. Borrmann, *Aufnahme mittelalterlicher Wand- und Deckenmalereien in Deutschland*, Berlin, 1897 sqq.; O. Doering and G. Voss, *Meisterwerke der Kunst aus Sächsen und Thüringen*, Magdeburg, 1905; M. Zucker, *Dürer*, in *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, vol. xvii (contains further literature). For France consult: F. Bournand, *Hist. de l'art en France*, Paris, 1891; L. Horsin-Déon, *Hist. de l'art en France*, Paris, 1891; P. Gélis-Didot, *La Peinture décorative en France du xvi. au xviii. siècle*, Paris, 1896–99. For other countries and special phases consult: H. Riegel, *Beiträge zur niederländischen Kunstgeschichte*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1882; F. Ewerbeck, *Die Renaissance in Belgien und Holland*, Leipsic, 1883–89; F. M. Tubino, *Estudios sobre el Arte en España*, Seville, 1886; P. Flat, *L'Art en Espagne*, Paris, 1891; P. Paris, *Essai sur l'art de l'Espagne primitive*, 2 vols., Paris, 1903-1904; C. von Lützow, *Geschichte des deutschen Kupferstiches und Holzschnittes*, Berlin, 1891; F. Lippmann, *Der Kupferstich*, Berlin, 1893; R. Muther, *Geschichte der Malerei im 19. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols., Munich, 1893–94; E. S. Prior, *A History of Gothic Art in England*, London, 1900; A. Venturi, *The Madonna. A pictorial Representation by Painters and Sculptors*, London, 1902; J. Meier-Graefe, *Entwickelungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst*, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1904.

PAJON, pā''jon', CLAUDE: French Protestant; b. at Romorantin (25 m. s.e. of Blois) in 1626; d. at Orléans Sept. 27, 1685. He was educated at Saumur under Amyraut, and at the age of twenty-four was appointed pastor at Machenoir. In 1666 he was called to Saumur as professor of theology, but his views that the presence of Christ and of his spirit in the faithful implied simply the presence of Christ's image and a corresponding frame of mind and that sins were due to ignorance, roused such controversy that, though supported by the verdict of the provincial synod in 1667, he resigned in 1668 to become pastor at Orléans. Though he disseminated his theories only in his correspondence and by word of mouth, his pupils did not observe an equal reserve. The rumor of Pelagio-Arminian heterodoxy at a time of dogmatic sensitiveness occasioned his examination in 1676 by Jean Claude, the Reformed preacher of Paris. This led to no mutual understanding, but in the following year a second conference resulted in the adoption of measures by the academies of Sedan and Saumur and the provincial synods against theological candidates who had adopted Pajon's tenets, in spite of the disavowal of Pelagianism by Pajon and his pupils. Throughout this period Pajon published nothing bearing on his special views; his two books—*Examen du livre qui porte pour titre Prejugez légitimes contre les Calvinistes* (Bionne, 1673), and *Remarques sur l'Avertissement pastoral* (Amsterdam, 1685)—being in defense of the French Reformed Church. His last months were embittered by the destruction of his church at Orléans, the conversion of his colleagues to Roman Catholicism, and the loss of his property.

In the main, Pajon's views were not different from the orthodox Reformed system. Pajon continually denied the charge of Pelagianism or Arminianism, and declared his allegiance to the tenets of Dort. The discussion with Claude first sought agreement on the questions of total depravity and irresistible grace, but passed over the main contention on the mode of operation of grace and the divine spirit. Presupposing the historical operation of universal grace on the individual, Pajon attempted to adapt the doctrine of divine operation to the moral sense of the time, not opposing the doctrine of the work of grace itself. The divine spirit never operates immediately, but always through the Word and human reason; this was the only escape from the Pietistic ecstasy. This theory aims entirely to declare the divine work of conversion in terms of morals rather than of mysticism. Furthermore, the powers of man are regarded as oppressed by ignorance rather than lost; but if the divine Word comes to men under proper and favorable circumstances, it is accepted by the reason, which, in its turn, is followed by the will. The doctrine of salvation exclusively by grace alone is avoided by the assumption that God has so ordered all things that in the elect illumination through the Word must necessarily occur. This God, however, is not present and living, but the remote Creator whose world moves in its appointed path. Pajon's views, permeated with a deistic spirit, thus lack the orthodox Calvinistic sense of personal contact with God; and his pupils, soon passing beyond their teacher's position, turned to Arminianism or even to Roman Catholicism. (E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: S. Lacheret, *Claude Pajon, sa vie et sa doctrine*, Geneva, 1883; E. A. Mailhet, *Claude Pajon, sa vie, son système religieux, ses controverses*, Paris, 1883. A list of the principal works called out by his teaching is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiv. 553.

PALAMAS, GREGORIUS: Greek mystic; b. at Constantinople in 1296; d. at Thessalonica Nov. 15, 1359. Brought up in a fervent religious atmosphere and thoroughly educated, he retired to a monastic life at the age of twenty-one, deeply influenced by the Hagiorite monks, one of whom, Macarius Chrysocephalus (later bishop of Philadelphia), had introduced him to mysticism. In 1318 Palamas joined the monks of Athos, was a cenobite in the monastery of Laura from 1321 to 1324, and the community of Glossia from 1324 to 1326, when he entered the community near Berœa, where he remained, with ten companions, until 1331, in which year he returned to Athos. Here he began his literary career in 1333, commencing with a biography of the Hagiorite Peter. He was later chosen protos of Athos, but soon after resigned. His peace was early broken, however, by the controversies with Barlaam (see Hesychasts, § 1), against whom he was chosen by his fellow monks as protagonist. Palamas accordingly resided for three years in Thessalonica. Suspicions of partizanship with Cantacuzenus against the Palæologi (possibly complicated by the temporary suppression of the Hesychasts in 1345) caused Palamas to be imprisoned for either two or four years. Nevertheless, in 1347 he was appointed archbishop of Thessalonica, a dignity which he held until his death. Though at first driven from the city by the opponents of Cantacuzenus and directed by the patriarch to discharge ecclesiastical functions in Lemnos, Palamas was soon enabled to enter upon his archiepiscopal duties at Thessalonica, where he was cordially welcomed. In 1351 he attended the last decisive synod at Constantinople. A year later he was seriously ill, and almost before he had recovered was called by the emperor to Constantinople on affairs of state, only to be captured by pirates on the coast of Asia Minor and held prisoner for a year (probably 1353–54). After his ransom he remained for a time in Constantinople, where he wrote against the Latins; and three years after his return home was again in controversy with Gregoras.

Palamas, who incorporated quietistic mysticism in the Greek theological system and repulsed Latin scholasticism, is, next to Marcus Eugenicus, the most influential figure in the later history of the Greek church, though viewed with extreme disfavor by the Roman Catholic Church. He was led by visions throughout his life and is said to have wrought miracles both before and after his death. He was regarded as a saint (though his day, Nov. 14, was never received in the calendar) as early as the patriarchate of Philotheus. The majority of Palamas' very numerous writings are still unprinted, those which have appeared being collected most conveniently in *MPG*, cl. 771 sqq., cli. 1 sqq., clxi. 244 sqq. Against the Western doctrine of the Holy Ghost are directed the two books of "Demonstrations" and the *Antepigraphai*. More is known of his Hesychastic writings, which include the dialogue of Theophanes and the treatises "On Sufferings and Virtues," "On Those who Dwell in Saintly Solitude," "Three Chapters on Prayer and Purity of Heart," and "One Hundred and Fifty Physical, Theological, Ethical, and Practical Chapters." Special stress should also be laid on his practical writings, particularly his forty-three homilies, in which the author's simplicity and earnestness are clearly manifest.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 103–105, 485–486 et passim; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, xi. 494–506, Hamburg, 1808; A. C. Demetracopulus, *Græcia orthodoxa*, Leipsic, 1872; F. J. Stein, in *Oesterreichische Vierteljahrsschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1873; and the literature under Hesychasts.

PALATINATE, REFORMATION IN. See Heidelberg Catechism.

PALEARIO, AONIO: Italian humanist and martyr; b. at Veroli (50 m. s.e. of Rome) c. 1500; burned at the stake at Rome July 3, 1570. He studied at Rome 1520 and after. At the storming of Rome in 1527 he forsook the city and the lasting associations which he had formed, particularly with Sadoleto (q.v.), Calcagnini, and Bernardo Maffei. His correspondence locates him at Siena after Oct., 1530, where for many years he displayed an eminent activity as teacher at the university. During that time he published a didactic poem, *De immortalitate animarum* (Lyons, 1536). About 1540 a reaction occurred in his religious views, and in 1542 a charge of heresy was lodged against him. Before the tribunal his enemies referred to his *Libellus de morte*

Christi, more exactly entitled: *Della pienezza, sufficienza e satisfattione della passione di Christo*. In a masterly oration Paleario refuted the accusations, but his enemies conspired to prevent his permanent appointment at Siena. In 1546 he obtained a professorship at Lucca. It may have been here that he completed a second tract against Rome: *Actio in pontifices Romanos et eorum asseclas* (Amsterdam, 1696; Jena, 1728) a caustic polemic on ecclesiasticism and dogmatics. Threatened at Lucca by the readiness of the Senate to gratify the demands of the Curia, he withdrew in 1555, finding a position at Milan. Although again accused by the inquisition (1559) he vindicated himself in a tract, *Pro se ipso*, and was acquitted. For the third time (1567), however, the Milanese inquisitor, Frà Angelo di Cremona, subjected him to prosecution; the points of accusation being, that he had taught justification by faith, denied the doctrine of purgatory, disparaged monasticism, and censured the practise of burying the dead within the churches. In 1568, by imperial mandate in response to the requisition of Pope Pius V., he was conveyed to Rome for judgment. For three years Paleario languished in the prison of Tor di Nona. The extract from his Roman trial proceedings (published by Fontana, in *Arch. storico della Societa Romana di Storia patria*, Rome, 1896) gives detailed information concerning this period of torture. In April, 1570, the man appears " mellowed," so that he professes to believe whatever the church believes. Then he was compelled to make a formal abjuration, the literal terms of which were first published by P .C. F. Daunou (*Essai historique sur la puissance temporelle des papes*, ii. 278, Paris, 1810). He addressed some touching letters to his wife and child on the day of his execution, which are preserved in the library at Siena, and are the last authentic witnesses on the subject of his religious attitude. They contain not one word in warrant of the assumption that he denied his convictions in the presence of death. His constancy is also corroborated by the sentence of June 30, declaring him " impenitent." In the journal of the Roman Brotherhood of S. Giovanni Decollato, whose members attended those who were condemned by the Holy Office, and were present during the last hours of one delivered for execution, taking special pains to draw some last word of repentance from the unfortunate victim, it is recorded that this devout humanist said he wished to die as a good Christian, which is not to be construed to mean in the Roman faith. An alleged portrait of this martyr came to light about 1870, an oil painting, in the municipal library at Veroli. Closer scrutiny revealed the fact that this portrait, even if genuine, had been so retouched that the original features are no longer recognizable.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: There are editions of his works at Leyden, 1552; Bremen, 1619; Amsterdam, 1696, and Jena, 1728. For his life consult: The sketch by Hellbauer prefixed to the Jena edition of the works; Mrs. M. Young, *Life and Times of Aonio Paleario*, 2 vols., London, 1860; T. McCrie, *Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy*, Philadelphia, 1856; J. Bonnet, *Aonio Paleario*, Paris, 1862, Eng. transl., London, 1864; W. M. Blackburn, *Aonio Paleario and his Friends*, Philadelphia, 1866; J. Stoughton, *Footprints of the Italian Reformers*, London, n. d.; Des Marais, *Aonio Paleario*, Rome, 1885. On the question of the authorship of the *Benefizio di Cristo* consult: C. Babington, *The Benefit of Christ's Death, probably written by Aonio Paleario*, London, 1855; K. Benrath, in *ZKG*, i (1876), 576–596; idem in *Rivista cristiana*, 1876, pp. 3–10; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, i. 383–384, Bonn, 1883. There is a translation in Blackburn's book mentioned above.

PALESTINE.

I. Names and Boundaries.
  Palestine and Canaan (§ 1).
  Other Names (§ 2).
II. Topography.
  In General (§ 1).
  The Negeb (§ 2).
  The Southern Mountain District (§ 3).
  The Middle Mountain District (§ 4).
  The Plain of Jesreel (§ 5).
  The Northern Mountain District (§ 6).
  The Plains between Mountain and Coast (§ 7).
  The Upper Jordan Valley; the Sea of Galilee (§ 8).
  The Lower Jordan Valley (§ 9).
  The Dead Sea (§ 10).
  Eastern Palestine North of the Yarmuk (§ 11).
  Eastern Palestine South of the Yarmuk (§ 12).
III. Minerals and Soil.
IV. Climate.
  Heat and Winds (§ 1).
  Rain and Moisture (§ 2).
V. Irrigation and Fertility.
VI. Flora.
VII. Fauna.
VIII. Roads.
IX. Political Divisions and Statistics.

I. Names and Boundaries: In general the name Palestine connotes the scene of Biblical, particularly of Israelitic, history, though it also includes the Mediterranean coast and the district east of the Jordan. It thus extends from the desert on the east and south to the Mediterranean on the west and Hermon and Lebanon on the north. To the south and east the boundaries vary with the vicissitudes of civilization. On the north Carmel (q.v.) might be regarded as a natural boundary, at least on the coast. Some thirteen miles north of Acre, however, the coast plain is cut off by the Jabal al-Mushakkhah, marking the beginning of the " Tyrian stairs." This mountain runs eastward to the western range of hills of Upper Galilee, which, in its turn, runs first north, and then northeast, to the Wadi al-Ḥajeir north of Tibnin. From this point a series of hills extends to the Jabal Hunin, which merges on the north in the Jabal al-Ḍahr. This forms the watershed between the Litany and the Jordan; and thus leads to the foot of Hermon, which ends this natural boundary of Palestine on the north.

1. Palestine and Canaan.

The name Palestine is a Hellenization of *Pelesheth* (" Philistia ") (Isa. xiv. 29, 31), and thus connotes " land of the Philistines." It is clear from Herodotus (cf. ii. 104, iii. 5 with i. 105) that the name of the Philistines on the coast was extended to the inhabitants of the interior. Philo, on the other hand, applies " Palestine " to Canaan; but Josephus generally restricts it to the Philistines, applying it but seldom to the land of the Israelites or of the Jews (*Ant.* I., vi. 4, XX., xii. 12). The Christian use of the term is shown by Jerome, who speaks, commenting on Ezek. xxvii., of " the land of Judea, which is now called Palestine." This implies the land inhabited in general by the Israelites or Jews, obviously with special reference to the land west of the Jordan. In the Old Testament the land is called Canaan (see CANAAN, CANAANITES). The northern boundaries of this region were left undefined (Gen. x. 15–19), or were extended to the Euphrates (Gen. xv. 18; Ex. xxiii. 31; Deut. xi. 24); while a distinction was drawn between the districts of Canaan conquered by the Israelites (Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7) and the land which they had not yet subdued (Josh. xiii. 2–6). The formula "from Dan to Beersheba" (II Sam. xxiv. 2, 15; I Kings iv. 25), therefore, implies simply the northern and southern limits of the region actually occupied by Israel. Attempts at more exact delimitation are found in Num. xxxiv. 1–12 and Ezek. xlvii. 15–20, xlviii. 1 sqq. (cf. Josh. xv. 2–4). In Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28 the southern boundaries are given as Tamar, Meribath-kadesh (see NEGEB), and the "brook of Egypt." The "brook of Egypt" (cf. I Kings viii. 65; II Kings xxiv. 7; II Chron. vii. 8) is doubtless identical with the modern Wadi al-'Arish. The same boundary, partly under other names, is implied by Num. xxxiv. 3–5 and Josh. xv. 2–4. The western boundary is given as the Mediterranean, "unto the entering in of Hamath" (Num. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 6–8; Josh. xiii. 5; I Kings viii. 65; Ezek. xlvii. 20; Amos vi. 14). The northern boundary of Canaan, accordingly, is to be sought near the plain of Emesa, either in the Nahr al-Kabir (between Lebanon and the Nusairi mountains) or in the district of al-Rastun, the classical Arethusa (ten hours north of Riblah and four hours from Hamath). The determination of all the individual sites mentioned in the passages giving this western boundary is no longer possible. The northern boundary is given as running from Hamath to the east of Baal-gad at the foot of Mount Hermon (Josh. xiii. 5), thus comprising "all Lebanon" (cf. Num. xxxiv. 8–9; Judges iii. 3; II Kings xiv. 25; Ezek. xlvii. 15–17; Amos vi. 14). Hazar-enan, mentioned as the eastern extremity of the northern boundary in Num. xxxiv. 9–10 and Ezek. xlvii. 16, can not have been far from the Orontes, especially as the eastern boundary described in Num. xxxiv. 10–12 and Ezek. xlvii. 18, excludes the territory west of the Jordan. It is a problem whether these boundaries were based upon topographical conditions or on ethnographical distinctions. At all events, it is noteworthy that the land east of the Jordan was evidently no part of Canaan, although large portions of it were Israelitic before the Exile.

2. Other Names.

Besides the name Judea (q.v.), the land was also called Idumæa, especially by Roman poets, who extended the term to the entire country, though primarily it was restricted to Hebron and its vicinity. Greek writers, on the other hand, extended the name Phenicia to the more southern land. The oldest Assyro-Babylonian designation of Palestine is A-mur-ru, which comprised Palestine and Phenicia (see PHENICIA, PHENICIANS) with parts of Cœle-Syria. In the time of the Amarna Tablets (q.v.) A-mur-ru was restricted to the district of the Lebanon and northern Phenicia, the southern portion of the country, as in the Egyptian inscriptions, being called Canaan. The inroads of the Hittites led the Assyrians, beginning with Tiglath-Pileser III., to term Syria and Palestine the "land of the Hittites." Another general designation arose later, *'Ebhir nari*, "(the land) beyond (i.e., west of) the river (Euphrates), and this name was applied to the Syrian satrapy of Persia from the reign of Darius I. (cf. Ezra viii. 36 and often). Other appellations of Palestine have a more restricted connotation. Here belong "land of Israel" (I Sam. xiii. 19), "land of the Hebrews" (Gen. xl. 15; Josephus and Pausanias), "the land of Yahweh" (Hos. ix. 3), "the house of Yahweh" (Jer. xii. 7), "the holy mountain of Yahweh" (Isa. xi. 9, lxv. 25), "the holy land" (Zach. ii. 16; II Macc. i. 7), and "the land of promise" (Heb. xi. 9). The Israelites were also held to dwell in the center of the nations and in the navel of the earth (Ezek. v. 5, xxxviii. 12). This was due, in part at least, to the position of Palestine between the lands of the Tigris and Euphrates to the north and Egypt to the south, as well as between the desert on the east and the sea on the west; also, in some measure, to the high table-land possessed by Israel, as well as to the fact that the nation was to be a center for the dissemination of true religion to the Gentiles (cf. Isa. ii. 1–4).

1. In General.

II. Topography: The topography of Palestine is conditioned by a gigantic geological rift, running from the Bay of Elath apparently to Hermon, though it really continues to the valley of the Orontes and finally disappears north of the ancient Antiochia. This rift, which reaches its greatest breadth and depth in the Dead Sea, divides the chalk plateau between the Syrian desert and the sea into two parts, designated as the districts east and west of the Jordan. As far north as the promontory of Ras al-Naḳurah the recession of the Mediterranean has left the present coast plain; while from this promontory in the north to the desert in the south there extends, between the mountains and the sea, a plain of varying breadth increasing southward and broken only by the range of Mt. Carmel. Between this plain, however, and the mountains proper comes a low hill country which frequently breaks the level stretches of the region. The mountain system east of the Jordan falls abruptly to the valley of the river, but the western slopes are more gentle. The watershed is thus of great importance, especially for southern Palestine, furnishing the natural means of communication for the inhabitants of the mountain region, and also affording numbers of small plateaus valuable for cultivation. This mountain district can be reached from the east and west only by narrow valleys hemmed in by precipices. On the south, on the other hand, it is more easy of access. To the north the mountain region spreads to the foothills of the ranges of Gilboa and Carmel, then gradually sinks to the triangular plain of Jezreel, and finally rises to the plateau of Galilee, which forms the approach to Lebanon and Antilebanon. Here again access to the mountain district is relatively easy in at least two places. The land east of the Jordan rises in terraces from the valley of the river and reaches a general level higher than that of the mountains west of the Jordan. The highest point (c. 3,990 feet) is near Hermon, and to the east the slope merges imperceptibly into the Syro-Arabian desert.

2. The Negeb.

The ridge of the western mountain district proceeds in the south from a plateau which rises to the west above the Wadi al-'Arabah, south of the Dead Sea. This arid and barren plateau is about 70 miles in length and between 37 and 50 in width. The southern portion, or Jabal al-Maḳrah, reaches an elevation of c. 3,240 feet. Its chief wadis, or beds for the winter rains to the east, are, from south to north, as follows: Ghamr, al-Jirafah, Raman, Abu Taraimah, al-Fiḳra (in its upper course called Wadi Marrah), and al-Muhauwat. As to the west and northwest, into the Wadi al-Shara'if (apparently the middle portion of the Wadi al-'Arish) empties the Wadi al-Ḳuraiyah, which, with its supposed tributaries the Wadi al-Muzairi'ah and Wadi al-Mayin, drains the southern side of the plateau. The Wadi Jarur (the "valley of Gerar" of Gen. xxvi. 17) and the valleys of 'Ain Ḳadis, 'Ain al-Ḳadirat, 'Ain al-Ḳaseimah, and 'Ain al-Muwileiḥ also empty westward into the Wadi al-Shara'if. It is possible, however, that the more northerly of these wadis empty, into the Wadi al-Saram, and thus, through the Wadi al-Abyaḍ, into the Wadi al-'Arish. From the north of the highland proper comes the Wadi Rakhamah, which, as the Wadi Sani, unites with the Wadi Ghazzah. The sources of Wadi al-Milḥ lie in the Ras al-Zuweirah and it receives the 'Ar'arah from the south, the Ḳaryatein from the north, and the al-Khalil from Hebron. Passing to the west under the name of Wadi al-Saba' (and probably also of Wadi Farah), it curves into the Wadi Ghazzah south of Gaza. The plateau divides into two parts, that to the south of the Wadi Marrah being called Jabal al-Maḳrah, and that to the north Jabal Hadhira (probably the Hezron of Josh. xv. 25). The Wadi Rakhamah is conjectured to be the early home of the Jerahmeelites. The eastern declivities are barren and composed chiefly of white limestone, nor does reddish sandstone appear until the 'Arabah. On the plateau, between the "ascent of Akrabbim" and Kadesh lay the Zin of Numbers xxxiv. 4 and Josh. xv. 3 (cf. Num. xx. 1, xxvii. 14, xxxiii. 36; Deut. xxxii. 51). The boundary between Israel and Edom accordingly traversed the southern portion of the plateau (cf. Num. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 3; Josh. xv. 1). South of the Wadi Marrah rises the Jabal Madarah, often identified with Mount Hor, where Aaron died (Num. xx. 22 sqq.). The Mount Halak of Josh. xi. 17 is newly discovered on the northern slope above the Wadi al-Marrah. A portion of the region to the south of the plateau, draining into the Wadi al-'Arish, anciently belonged to the desert of Paran (q.v.). The upper southern portion of this wadi cut sharply to the south into the peninsula of Sinai, this barren region being called the Badiyat al-Tih, "desert of the wandering." The region becomes less monotonous as one passes northward to the mountainous district already mentioned. On its southwest corner between the Wadi al-Ḳuraiyah and the Wadi al-Mayin, arises the Jabal 'Araif, and the first signs of early permanent settlement appear. To the west of this mountain are the Jabal Iḥrimm, the Jabal Yalaḳ, and the Jabal Magharah, and to the northwest the Jabal Hilal. To the west and the northwest, however, the mountains are replaced by barren plains extending to the Mediterranean and to the delta of the Nile. See Negeb.

Forming the connection between the mountain district of the Negeb and that of Palestine, the watershed runs parallel with the coast of the Dead Sea northward from Tell 'Arad (16 m. s. of Hebron).

3. The Southern Mountain District.

Crossing or joining this watershed in a northeasterly direction from the plains of Tell al-Milḥ and Beersheba are three parallel lines of hills. The first of these begins near Tell al-Milḥ, crosses the watershed at Khirbat bir al-'Add, and runs along the Wadi al-Wa'ar or Wadi al-Malaḳi. The second begins at Khirbat Salanṭaḥ and joins the watershed at Tell Zif. The third rises north of Beersheba, and, forming the watershed between the Wadi al-Shari'a and the Wadi al-Khalil, changes its northern direction to the west and meets the main watershed in the Ẓirat al-Balla'. This main watershed, encircling Hebron to the east, bends sharply to the north (w. of Ẓirat al-Balla') and keeps this direction to al-Khadr, east of Bethlehem. From Khirbat beit 'Ainun, between Bani Na'im and Ẓiratal-Balla', runs the lofty range of Kanan al-Za'faran to Taḳu'ah. The southernmost of the fertile plateaus formed by these three ranges of hills is that of Hebron (Gen. xxxvii. 14), which slopes to the south and early became a natural point of crossing for the highways of the country. The more northern plateau is the well-watered plain of the Wadi al-'Arrub, which, as the Wadi al-'Areijah, empties into the Dead Sea south of Engedi. The second division of the southern mountain district, that of Jerusalem, begins at the al-Khadr mentioned above. Here a range from the west, between the Wadi al-Ẓarar and the Wadi al-Sanṭ, meets the watershed, which it diverts to the east for a short distance, after which it turns toward the north. The region is characterized by hills and smaller plateaus, the latter stretching from al-Birah and Ramallah to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. Southwest of Jerusalem it is called al-Baḳ'a or al-Buḳi-'ah, and has been identified since the sixteenth century with the valley of the giants of Josh. xv. 8 and other passages. All these plains drain into the Wadi al-Ẓarar. From the plateau of the Wadi Bet Ḥaninah several ranges of hills run to the west which have long been used for communicating with the coast, such as from al-Jib (Gibeon) and Nabi Samwil (apparently the Ephron of Josh. xv. 9). About 13 miles west of the watershed the plain of Ajalon, now called Marj ibn 'Umer, stretches southwest of Beth Horon along the Wadi Salman. The third division, the mountain district of Bethel, is a narrow broken district. The "Mount of Beth-el" (I Sam. xiii. 2) is apparently the ridge stretching north from Beitin to Tell 'Aẓur. The northern boundaries are the Wadi deir Ballut (emptying into the sea) and the Wadi al-'Aujah (flowing into the Jordan). West of the watershed certain valleys running north and south have long been the road from Sichem to Jerusalem. The Wadi al-Jib is flanked on the south by the Burj Bardawil, and on the east by the

Burj al-Lisanah. Still farther to the west are a number of isolated peaks between the wadis running to the coast; while from 'Ain Sinya and Jifna is a range whose summit formed the Roman road from Jerusalem to Cesarea, passing Tibnah, apparently the Timnah of the Old Testament. The entire southern mountain district falls away to the east to the Dead Sea and the Jordan Valley, the first and second group in three terraces and the third (at Beitin) in two, practically parallel with the watershed between the Jordan and the Mediterranean. Since the crest of the range is from 2,775 to 3,100 feet above the Mediterranean, and the basin of the Dead Sea over 1,200 feet below the Mediterranean, while the air-line distance from the crest of the Dead Sea is only fifteen miles, there is a slope of extreme abruptness. The water flowing over such a surface can only denude it, not irrigate it. On the western slope of the watershed the first and second groups are remarkable for having, toward the west, a very clear boundary in a series of side valleys running almost vertically north or south, parallel with the great geological fault which determines the present topography of Palestine. This system of side valleys begins at the southern edge of the Wadi Malaḳah, about five miles northwest of Beit 'Ur al-Taḥta, continues southward in the Wadi al-Miḳtali, and at the Wadi Salman broadens out into the plain of Ajalon. In the south of this valley the Wadi al-Najil forms the boundary between the plateau proper and the western foothills, as does the Wadi al-Ẓur south of the Wadi al-Sanṭ. Even farther south there are traces of an elevated edge of the foothills running toward the coast, as Idna, Bet 'Auwa, Khirbat Jeimar, and Tell Khuwileifah. At the latter hill the border is reached between the Wadi al-Shari'a and the Wadi al-Khalil; and the low hill country formed by this intersection is the Shephelah, or "plain," of the Old Testament.

4. The Middle Mountain District.

The middle mountain district, bounded on the north by the plain of Jezreel, falls into two groups. The southern of these extends from the Wadi deir Balluṭ in the west and the Wadi al-'Aujah in the east to the Wadi al-Sha'ir in the west and the Wadi al-Ḥumr in the east. Here again the declivity to the bed of the Jordan is very steep and precipitous. The numerous side valleys (running north and south) of the first terrace are markedly fertile. Some three miles north of Tell Aẓur, the great watershed bends to the east, but resumes its northern course after three miles to the peak of al-Tuwanik, whence it runs westward to the Jabal al-Ṭor, the Gerizim of the Old Testament. Again running to the north, it passes the site of the ancient Sichem and includes the Jabal Aslamiyah, the Old-Testament Ebal. The aridity of Ebal together with its northern position explain why the curses were given from Ebal and the blessings were pronounced from the relatively fertile Gerizim (cf. Deut. xi. 29; Josh. viii. 33). The northern group of the middle mountain district runs from al-Tuwanik and the Wadi al-Sha'ir to the plain of Jezreel. The watershed approaches the valley of the Jordan, being within ten miles of it at the Ras Ibziḳ and the Jabal Fuḳu'ah (the Gilboa of I Sam. xxxi. 1 and II Sam. i. 21). First running north, it bends northwest and falls away steeply to the plain of Jezreel. The eastern terrace system stops at al-Tuwanik, its place being taken by four parallel ridges running southeast, enclosing beautiful open valleys. The largest of these valleys is the Wadi Far'ah, which includes the fertile plain of al-Makhnah, probably the Michmethah of Josh. xvii. 7. But with Jabal Fuḳu'ah these valleys stop, and the region between the watershed of the Jordan becomes traversed by short valleys cutting through the plain of Beisan, the Beth-shean of Josh. xvii. 11 and Judges i. 27. West of the watershed fertile plains are scattered among the hills, especially along the upper and middle Wadi Salḥab south of Janin. The latter plain is called Sahil 'Arrabah and contains the Tell Dotan, the Dothan of Gen. xxxvii. 17. The heights at Kafr Kud and the hill country of Bilad al-Ruḥah loosely connect the middle mountain district with Carmel (q.v.).

5. The Plain of Jezreel.

The plain of Jezreel is a right-angled triangle, its hypotenuse running from Janin to the southeastern foot of Carmel, its eastern side defined by Jabal Fuḳu'ah and Tabor, and the north by Tabor and Carmel. The plain lies 185–230 feet above the Mediterranean, into which it drains through the Nahr al-Muḳaaṭṭ', the Kishon of Judges v. 21 and I Kings xviii. 40. The edges of the plain being higher than its center, the middle is often marshy, so that only the edges of the plain are habitable. The soil is extraordinarily fertile on account of early volcanic deposits; the watershed is in the east, in the deep valleys which open the way to the valley of the Jordan on either side of the Jabal al-Daḥi. In the south the valley is traversed by the Nahr Jalud, which runs beside an important ancient route from Zar'in to the Jordan. The much narrower valley of the north is drained by the Wadi al-Sharrar or the Wadi al-Birah.

6. The Northern Mountain District.

The northern mountain region is divided into the districts of Lower and Upper Galilee. The former extends from the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee in the east to the plain of Acre in the west, and from the plain of Jezreel in the south to the heights of al-Ramah and the Wadi al-'Amud on the Sea of Galilee in the north. It falls into several ranges of hills running parallel from west to east and divided by small plains. The southern group, commonly named after Nazareth, begins with wooded hills, and northeast of Nazareth Tabor reaches an elevation of 1,730 feet. The second range of hills includes the Jabal Ṭur'an, the Ḳarn Ḥaṭṭin, and the so-called Manarah ("watch tower") on the Sea of Galilee. The southern plain, or Wadi Rummanah, is small; but the northern, or Sahal Baṭṭof, is larger, and may correspond to the valley of Jiphthah-el on the boundary between Zebulun and Asher (Josh. xix. 14, 27). The third range of hills is the al-Shaghur, which begins in the west at the village of Shafa 'Amr and rises with ever-increasing breadth toward the northeast and east until it ends in the precipitous heights (especially the Jabal al-Daidabah, the Jabal Ḥanzirah, and the Ras

Kruman) between the Wadi al-Ḥammam and the Wadi al-Rabaḍiyah on the lake of Gennesaret. From the western foot of Tabor the watershed proceeds west until near Nazareth, when it turns northeast to the volcanic peak of Ḳarn Ḥaṭṭin. It then resumes its western direction to the center of the district, when it again turns to the east, and joins the Jabalat al-'Arus, the southern boundary of the mountain district of Upper Galilee. It then stretches north to the vicinity of Marun al-Rase when it turns to the east, unites with the northerly range on the eastern border of Upper Galilee, and ends in the Jabal al-Ḍahr, which separates the Nahr al-Ḳasimiyah from the Nahr al-Ḥaẓbani. The range which forms the southern boundary of the plateau of Upper Galilee begins near 'Akka and runs eastward via the Nabi Haidar, the Jabalat al-'Arus, Ẓafad and the Jabal Kan'an to the Jordan below the Jisr Banat Ya'ḳub. The eastern range is rather wide in the south, including the Jabal Ẓafad (which includes Mairon, the "waters of Merom" of Josh. xi. 5, 7), and the Jabal Jarmaḳ, the highest mountain of Galilee (nearly 3,700 feet.) From the Jabal Ẓafad several roads run to important points. Near the ancient city of Kadesh the line of hills divides into several parallel chains, but near Mais it unites with the watershed and thus reaches the plateau of Marj 'Ayun and the Jabal al-Ḍahr. The western border of Upper Galilee begins in the south at the village Kisra and runs parallel to the coast to Khirbat Salam on the Wadi al-Ḥajair. This range is pierced by certain valleys which afford communication between the plateau and the coast. The northern boundary is formed by the heights between Khirbat Salam and Hunin. Within the irregular quadrangle of the plateau of Upper Galilee two ranges of hills run northwest, the one from Jabal Jarmaḳ to Khirbat Balaṭ, and the other from Jabal al-Ghabiyah (s.w. of Kadesh) to Khirbat al-Yaḍun near Tibnin. Between the two ranges are fertile wooded plateaus.

7. The Plains between Mountain and Coast.

The plains between the mountains and the coast begin immediately south of Ras al-Naḳurah or Jabal al-Mushaḳḳaḥ. The first is the plain of Acre stretching to the northern foot of Carmel, the northern portion being fertile; the center a marshy district between Acre and Shafa 'Amr watered by the Nahr Na'aman (the classical Belus); and the southern part constituting the vicinity of the Lower Kishon. The plain to the west of Carmel is narrow, though fertile. Near the ruins of Ṭanṭurah were the heights of Dor (Josh. xi. 2; I Kings iv. 11). South of the Nahr al-Zarḳa begins the plain of Sharon distinguished for its vegetation (Cant. ii. 1; Isa. xxxv. 2). It extends southward to the mouth of the Nahr Rubin and westward to the foot of the mountain district, its length being about forty-three miles and its width reaching twelve miles at Jaffa. It is, in general, level, though small groups of hills are not infrequent. In the north considerable portions are used only for pasturage, but between Jaffa and al-Ramlah the plain is well settled. Near the coast runs a range of sandy hills which holds the water that collects in the plain, thus forming numerous marshes. South of the plain of Sharon stretches the Shephelah, or "plain." Between this and the plain of the Philistines there is no natural boundary, and it is evident that the Shephelah was extended far westward (cf. Josh. xv. 33 sqq.). Nor is there any strict delimitation of this region even to the west. On its eastern edge, on the other hand, various ranges of hills run west and northwest, forming the watershed between the numerous valleys of the irregular country. Large plains are found near 'Aḳir (Ekron), Jabna (Jabneh), Asdud (Ashdod), and 'Araḳ al-Manschiyah. Near Asdud begins a range of hills gradually increasing in height to the east and southeast, dividing the region of the Nahr Sukrair from the Wadi al-Ḥasi, while farther south they turn to the west for some twelve miles. Another range runs from Asdud parallel with the coast south to Sumsum and Dair Asnaid; but at the Wadi al-Shari'a this hill country ends, and farther south the Negeb begins. A shephelah of the northern mountain district of Israel is mentioned once in Josh. xi. 16, but this district is not noted elsewhere. Of the coast little need be said. It runs fairly straight from Tell Rafaḥ to Carmel, in places rising abruptly from the sea, as at Ascalon, Jaffa, Ṭanṭurah 'Atlit, and Acre. The sole natural harbor of Palestine is the bay between Acre and Haifa; but this harbor is now so choked with sand as to be practically useless.

8. The Upper Jordan Valley; the Sea of Galilee.

The name of the river Jordan (Heb. *Yarden;* Arab. *Urdun*, more commonly Shari'at al-kabirah, "Great Watering-place") is of uncertain etymology and meaning. It arises at the foot of Hermon from three springs: the Nahr al-Ḥaẓbani, the Nahr al-Laddan, and the Nahr Baniyas, the first rising half an hour north of Hazbaiya, the second on Tell al-Ḳadi, and the third at Baniyas. These three sources unite five miles s. of Tell al-Ḳaḍi c. 130 feet above the sea. The river then flows rapidly through a small plain, the Arḍ al-Ḥulah, fifteen miles long by six wide, fertile and richly watered both by the Jordan and by many small streams from the east and west, but very unhealthy. The end of this swampy district is formed by the pear-shaped Baḥrat al-Ḥulah, which has evidently decreased greatly in size since the days of Josephus (cf. *War*, IV., i. 1). The river is here some six feet above the level of the Mediterranean. Issuing from the Baḥrat al-Ḥulah, the Jordan flows south over a rocky bed hemmed in by high cliffs of basalt. A little over a mile south of the lake is the ford of the old "way of the sea" (Isa. ix. 1) from Damascus, and the river is here forty feet below the surface of the Mediterranean. The Sea of Galilee (Lake of Gennesaret) is the most beautiful part of the Jordan valley, except the sources at Mount Hermon. It is twelve miles long, and five wide at Tiberias; its waters are sweet, fairly clear, and extremely rich in fish. It is, however, exposed to violent wind storms from north, northwest, and southeast (cf. Mark iv. 35–41). It seems always to have been named after some neighboring locality. In the Old Testament it is called the "sea of Chinneroth" or "Chinnereth" (Num. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xii. 3, xiii. 27), this being the name of a city north of Rakkath (Josh. xix. 35; cf. I Kings xv. 20); and in the New Testament, the "lake of Gennesaret" (Luke v. 1; cf. Matt. xiv. 34; Mark vi. 53) from a small district on its northwest shore (Matt. xiv. 34; Mark vi. 53); the "sea of Galilee" (Matt. iv. 18, xv. 29; Mark i. 16, vii. 31); and the "sea of Tiberias" (John vi. 1, xxi. 1), the latter giving rise to its modern Arab name, Baḥr Ṭabariyah.

9. The Lower Jordan Valley.

From the southwestern corner of the Sea of Galilee the Jordan flows west, then turns southward and preserves this general course to the Dead Sea, receiving, among other streams, the Nahr Yarmuk, and the Nahr al-Zarḳa (the Jabbok of the Old Testament). From the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea the distance is nearly seventy miles, and the fall of the Jordan between these points is 570 feet. The bed of the river becomes a loose marl and loam, and the water changes to a dirty yellow. The region along the banks is divided into two parts, the general district being called al-Ghor ("depression"), this including the entire basin, while the river bed itself and the rich vegetation near its shores are comprised under the name al-Zor. Generally the water of the river is hidden under a mass of vegetation, but after the rainy season it frequently covers the trees on its usual bank (cf. I Chron. xii. 15; Ecclus. xxiv. 26). The western bank, which alone is thus far well known, varies greatly in breadth. South of the Sea of Galilee a plain begins with a breadth of one and a half to three miles, widening out near the old Beth-shean, where the Nahr Jalud discharges. It thus presents the form of a triangle, its northern side measuring from thirteen to fifteen miles and its eastern side, to the mouth of the Wadi Maliḥ, eleven miles. The entire region is rich in water and shows numerous traces of ancient canals. The plain east of the Jordan is here about two miles broad. Between the Wadi al-Maliḥ and the Wadi Abu Sidrah the last foothills of the western mountain district confine the river to its bed. South of the Wadi Abu Sidrah the plain again reaches a breadth of five to seven miles. In the vicinity of the Ḳarn Sarṭabah the Ghor penetrates deeply into the open valley of the mountain district. The heights on the western bank are so firm that frequently the Jordan tributaries are obliged to run parallel to the main stream for a considerable distance, this being the case especially with the lower course of the Wadi Far'ah. In winter, moreover, the entire vicinity to the east becomes a large lake, called Waṭaṭ al-Khatalin. In the immediate neighborhood of Jericho, beginning with the Wadi al-Nuwai'imah, is a level plain sloping to the Jordan, its lower part traversed by the Wadi al-Ḳalt. From this point, however, to the Dead Sea the soil becomes barren; and this region, "the valley of Achor," is in the Old Testament an example of a desolate wilderness (Isa. lxv. 10; Hos. ii. 17; cf. Josh. xv. 7). At Ḳaṣr al-Yahud the marl hills bend back from the Jordan and are lost in the hill country. At several places, as near Jericho, a second shore, about fifty feet above the present bank of the river, rises at a distance from the stream. On this elevation spreads the arid region sometimes called 'Arabhah in the Old Testament (Deut. iii. 17; II Sam. ii. 29; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 3; Josh. xiii. 27), though this generally connotes the district north and south of the Dead Sea. The topography east and west of the Jordan above the Dead Sea is practically the same. The oasis of Jericho, with the wells 'Ain al-Sulṭan and 'Ain Duk, on the east corresponds to the Abel-shittim of Num. xxxiii. 49 (cf. Num. xxv. 1; Mic. vi. 5); while the western district was called the plains of Jericho (Josh. v. 10; II Kings xxv. 5), and the eastern the plains of Moab (e.g., Num. xxii. 1). The land immediately surrounding the Jordan, perhaps from the Jabbok to the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah, was termed the "plain of Jordan" (I Kings vii. 46; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 3), though elsewhere the name is restricted to the vicinity of Jericho (Neh. iii. 22, xii. 28).

In summer the Jordan can be crossed in a number of places, there being five fords between the Baḥrat al-Ḥulah and the Sea of Galilee, and fifty-four between the latter and the Dead Sea. These are very unequal in their distribution. On extremely rare occasions, as in 1267, the river bed becomes dry through land-slides, thus explaining the event recorded in Josh. iii. 13–17.

10. The Dead Sea.

The Dead Sea is generally termed in the Old Testament the "salt sea" (cf. Num. xxxiv. 3, 12; Josh. xv. 2, 5), a phrase used to explain the older name, "sea of the plain" (Deut. iii. 17; Josh. iii. 16). It is likewise known as the "east sea" (e.g., Ezek. xlvii. 18) in contradistinction from the western sea, or Mediterranean. Called the Salt Sea or the Sea of Sodom in the Talmud, and the Sea of Asphalt by Josephus and Pliny, its designation of Dead Sea is found in Pausanias and Justin, and especially in Jerome. The Arabs term it Baḥr Luṭ, or "Sea of Lot." Its surface is about 1,290 feet below that of the Mediterranean, its length is about forty-six miles, and its maximum breadth (from 'Ain Jidi, or Engedi, to the mouth of the Arnon) is about eleven miles. Its depth varies from 1,310 feet in the north to eighteen feet in the south. The northern and southern shores are flat, the latter being practically a salt marsh and receiving the water of several wadis, among them the Wadi al-Ḳuraḥi, which apparently corresponds to the "brook Zered" of Num. xxi. 12; Deut. ii. 13–14. The "brook of the willows" (Isa. xv. 7) may be the lower part of this same wadi. The western and eastern shores of the Dead Sea are bounded by steep hills, the peak north of the Wadi al-Sayal being 2,295 feet above the Dead Sea. These mountains do not, as a rule, fall away abruptly to the water on the western coast, but on the east, where some of the hills are over 4,300 feet in height, the coast is extremely precipitous, especially north of al-Lisan. The water of the Dead Sea is a concentrated lye, its salts including chlorid, bromid, natrium, magnesium, kalium, and calcium. The salinity varies in parts of the surface and also in proportion to depth. This lye of the sea is due to two causes: the minerals carried down by the rivers flowing into the sea; and the constant evaporation in the hot, dry air which hovers over the deep basin of the Dead Sea. The high specific gravity of the water, which is six times more salt than the ocean, both prevents organic bodies from sinking in it, and also renders animal life impossible in its waters. Nevertheless, on its surface and in the slime of the northern shore pathogenic bacteria have recently been found; and in less salty portions, as at Engedi and the mouths of the eastern wadis, even fish may survive. The shores are barren, except in the fresher districts just mentioned. In Gen. xiii. 10, and xix. 25, the origin of the Dead Sea is connected with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah; while in Gen. xiv. 3 the name of the plain now covered by its waters is given as Siddim. The geological view is that the Dead Sea is a continuation of the fault of the Jordan valley, this rift dating from the end of the tertiary period. The sea was then more shallow than at present, but already strongly impregnated with mineral salts; and is conjectured to have extended from the present peak of al-Rishah in the Wadi al-'Arabah to the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee. Six periods are distinguished by geologists in the history of the Dead Sea, the last, accompanied by an earthquake and occurring early in the historical alluvial period, being held to include the destruction of the "cities of the plain." These cities, which comprised, besides Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Zoar (Gen. xiv. 2, 8; cf. Deut. xxix. 22; Hos. xi. 8), were "overthrown" by God (Deut. xix. 22; Isa. xiii. 19; Jer. xlix. 18; Amos iv. 11). Zoar, which escaped destruction, was situated on the southeast shore of the sea in the vicinity of the Khirbat al-Ẓafiyah, and in its neighborhood (cf. Gen. xix. 20 sqq.) lay Sodom and Gomorrah. The allusions to brimstone, fire, and smoke (Gen. xix. 24, 28; cf. Wisd. x. 6, 7) doubtless refer to the spontaneous combustion of the masses of asphalt and petroleum, mingled with inflammable gases, emitted by the earthquake.

11. Eastern Palestine North of the Yarmuk.

The land east of the Jordan is essentially a continuous plateau, merging on the east into the desert and on the west into wadis, and rising in the center into long ranges of hills. The region falls into four chief divisions. The first is the district north of Yarmuk, including the Jaulan, the Nuḳra, the Lejah, and the Jabal Ḥauran; the second is the 'Ajlun between the Yarmuk and the Nahr al-Zarḳa; the third the Balḳa between the Nahr al-Zarḳa and the Wadi al-Mojib; and the fourth al-Karak between the Wadi al-Mojib and the Wadi al-Ḥasa. The first division extends much farther toward the east than do the others. The most northern division has never had a uniform name, a fact readily explicable from the varying conformation of the districts belonging to it. These, proceeding from west to east, are as follows. Above the upper course of the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee rises the plateau of the Jaulan, so-called from the Golan of Deut. iv. 43, etc. (see Gaulanitis). It begins at the southeastern foot of Hermon and slopes to the south and southwest. Its average height is 2,275 feet; and in the northeast are a series of extinct volcanoes along the west bank of the Wadi al-Ruḳḳad. The northern and middle portions of the Jaulan are stony and barren, but the southern part, covered with dark brown earth of volcanic origin, is extraordinarily fertile. While the stony region is rich in springs, the remainder is not well watered, its springs being mostly on the declivities, where the villages are situated. The slope to the Jordan, as far as the Baḥrat al-Ḥulah, is quite steep. The valleys opening on the Lake of Tiberias are relatively short, and some of them are extremely deep and steep. The general slope of the plateau to this lake and to the Yarmuk is steep at first, but later becomes more gentle. East of the upper Wadi al-Ruḳḳad stretches the plateau of al-Jaidur, which forms the watershed between the region around Damascus and the Jordan. Bashan (q.v.) is doubtless the region called Nuḳra by the Bedouins (see Bashan). The Nuḳra is joined on the east by the Lejah, a rough and almost inaccessible region (see Trachonitis). The lava which abounds in it comes from the Jabal Ḥauran or the Jabal al-Drus (the "mountain of Bashan" of Ps. lxviii. 15), which farther south forms the eastern boundary of the Nuḳra. The name Ḥauran is also applied to the fertile plain to the west, so that the Ḥauran and the Nuḳra coincide. The Ḥauran of Ezekiel xlvii. 16, 18, however, is not to be sought in this region, but in the northeastern corner of the boundary of Canaan as delimited by the prophet. South of the Jabal Ḥauran and the Nuḳra stretches the steppe of al-Ḥamad, clearly distinguished by its yellow soil from the volcanic land of the Nuḳra. Much of its soil, however, consists of pulverized silicate, and running water and springs are entirely lacking, the very vegetation showing that here the desert begins. Farther to the west rises a group of hills, called al-Zumal, about 300 feet above the plain of Darʿa or Darʿat (the Edrei of Num. xxi. 33) and 2,150 feet above the Mediterranean. The northern portion of the Ḥamad lies between Ṭurrah, Darʿa, and al-Ramtah; and the southern stretches beyond al-Afdain. The greatest breadth is about seven miles and the length thirty-five miles. Only the northern edges are cultivated, for the soil is arid and barren. Except for the shorter valleys of the Jaulan which empty into the Jordan or the Sea of Galilee, all the streams of this northernmost portion of the East Jordan district flow into the Yarmuk or Shari'at al-Manadirah.

The 'Ajlun, the second district of the land east of the Jordan, extends from the Jarmuk southward to the Nahr al-Zarḳa, or Jabbok. Along the lower course of the Yarmuk, 540 feet below the Mediterranean, a small kettle-shaped plain contains six hot springs, five on the right bank and one on the left.

12. Eastern Palestine South of the Yarmuk.

The highland of the 'Ajlun forms the watershed between the Jordan on the west, the Yarmuk on the north and northeast, and the Nahr al-Zarḳa on the south; and is called in the north Jabal 'Ajlun and in the south Jabal Mi'raḍ. From al-Ḥiṣn the ridge bends southward, the peaks Ras Haraḳla, Ras Imnif, Umm al-Daraj, Ras al-Fanadik, and al-Manarah marking the watershed between the Jordan wadis and the tributaries of the Wadi Warran, which, under the name of Wadi al-Shallalah, drains into the Yarmuk from the south. The range is densely wooded, and is continued from near Sakib by the Jabal Mi'raḍ to the southwest, ending near the Tulul al-

Dahab, whose two peaks fall away abruptly to the Nahr al-Zarḳa. Toward the east the Jabal 'Ajlun changes into a rolling hill country which finally reaches the Nahr al-Zarḳa. Its breadth from east to west varies from seven to ten miles, and at Tell al-Ḥanaẓirah and the more southern Riḥab it merges with the Ḥamad. The southern portion has a number of wells, but the northern is waterless. The declivities toward the Nahr al-Zarḳa are in part wooded and watered, but are often bald; and the middle portions are less steep than either the uppermost or the lowest parts. West of the Jabal 'Ajlun and the Jabal Mi'raḍ stretches a highland pierced by numerous wadis and with many springs, still bearing remnants of once rich forests. The closer the Jordan is approached, the balder are the declivities, and the steeper, stonier, and deeper the valleys. The chief tributaries of the Jordan, from north to south, are the Wadi al-'Arab, Wadi Yabis, Wadi Kafrinji (or Wadi 'Ajlun), and Wadi Rajib. The district of al-Balḳa lies between the Nahr al-Zarḳa and the Wadi al-Mojib. Stretching south from the former, the land rises with considerable steepness to the Jabal Jil'ad (evidently the Gilead of the Old Testament; see PERÆA). This range reaches its highest point in the western Jabal Osha' (3,380 feet), from the summit of which a panorama of Palestine may be obtained from the Dead Sea to Hermon. In the east the range sinks to the plateau of al-Buḳai'ah, sloping away north and east, and on the south merging in the watershed which separates the sources of the Nahr al-Zarḳa from the wadis which empty into the Jordan. From this watershed a ridge extends southward to Ma'in. The southern part of the plateau is traversed by the Wadi Haidan, or Wadi al-Walah, and falls away to the bed of the Wadi Mojib, which at 'Ar'āir is 300 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

III. Minerals and Soil: Palestine is mostly calcareous in formation; though Nubian sandstone occurs in the faults near the Jordan valley east of the Dead Sea. Beneath this sandstone lie permo-carboniferous limestone and sandstone, resting on an old volcanic crystalline formation with veins of porphyry and diorite. Several varieties of marble are found, as well as basalt (from the tertiary period) and lava (from the later diluvial age). Though there is no evidence of volcanic action since the age of man, the Tell al-'Ajjul on the Jabal al-Daḥi is an old crater, and tufa and other volcanic products are found northeast of Tabor, between Nazareth and the Sea of Galilee and as far as the plain of Jezreel. Volcanic basalt likewise occurs in Moab (as at Diban and Jabal Shiḥan); while flint is seen in the desert of Judah, near Jerusalem, and in 'Ajlun. The hills both east and west of the Jordan abound in caves, as in the vicinity of Bit Jibrin and in Mount Carmel (cf. Amos ix. 3). Earthquakes are not uncommon in Palestine, but are non-volcanic (I Sam. xiv. 15; Amos i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5; and Matt. xxvii. 51); prophets and poets often picture the terrors of earthquake to heighten the appearance of God in judgment (Ps. xix. 8, 16, cxiv. 4, 6–7; Isa. xiii. 13; Ezek. xxxviii. 19 sqq.; Mic. i. 3–4). Two earthquake zones may be distinguished: one from Diarbakr on the upper Tigris, running, by way of Edessa, Mambij on the Euphrates, and Aleppo, to Antioch, where it turns south and parallels the Syrian coast to Ascalon and Gaza; and the other from 'Ain Ṭab in northern Syria, crossing the first zone at Aleppo, and coinciding with the Biḳa' between Lebanon, Antilebanon, and the rift of the Jordan. The remains of ancient iron mines have been discovered in the district east of the Jordan; and the minerals of the Dead Sea and its vicinity are of distinct commercial value. On its shores are found petroleum, pure asphalt, and cretaceous asphalt. The latter is found in large quantities in the desert of Judah, together with cretaceous phosphates containing remains of fossil fish. The water of the Dead Sea, moreover, occasionally casts up masses of asphalt. Phosphates of high percentage are found east of the Jordan; and in the so-called lower terraces are rock salt, chromoxid, and sulfur. The "slime pits" of Gen. xiv. 10 probably imply the emergence of masses of petroleum and asphalt through the diluvial formations of the higher and lower terraces. The arable soil of Palestine varies greatly in formation. Present conditions west of the Jordan are unfavorable to the production of humus; but east of the Jordan, where the arborage is more abundant and the rocks consequently more covered, circumstances are far better. Here, when the upper surface of the rock breaks up under the influence of air and moisture, a red, loamy earth is left which, when properly irrigated, well repays agriculture. Still more fruitful is the soil produced by decomposition of lava. In many places, however, as on the coast plain and in the Jordan Valley, the soil is composed of a marl or sand which defies all attempts at irrigation.

IV. Climate: The land west of the Jordan, lying between 31° and 32° north latitude, belongs to the northern subtropical region and agrees generally in climate with the Mediterranean countries. The year thus falls into a hot, rainless period, and a cool, rainy season.

1. Heat and Winds.

On the coast the climate is mild and even; in the mountains it is more inclement and variable; the Jordan valley approximates tropical conditions; and east of the river the vicinity of the desert is not without influence. The mean temperature on the coast is 20.5° C., but at Jerusalem 17.1°. In the mountains the heat increases rapidly from April to May from 14.7° to 20.7°, reaching 24.5° in August, falling to 15.5° in November, and being at the minimum, 8.8° C., in February. The hottest days (generally in May, June, and September) range from 37° to 44° C. in the shade; the coldest (in January) sink to −4° C. The temperature frequently varies greatly during the day, ranging from 7.4° to 7.7° C. in December, January, and February, and from 12.8° to 13.1° C. from May to October. This variability is due to the sudden cooling of the air by the strong radiation from the surface of the ground. The unhealthful consequences of this variability are lessened by the low humidity, even in the hot months. East of the Jordan the contrast between the temperature of day and night seems to be still greater than west of the river. The winds of Palestine are closely connected with those of other Mediterranean countries. From May to October dry winds from the northwest, west, and north prevail at Jerusalem and in the western mountain district; but in September and October frequent east and southeast winds increase the heat. In winter west and southwest winds prevail and bring rain (cf. Luke xii. 54–55). Except for these phenomena, the land west of the Jordan has a tolerably regular alternation of land and sea breezes, divided partly into annual and partly into daily interchanges. In the hot season the Syrian mountains are heated much more rapidly than the Mediterranean. The hot air consequently rises to the upper atmosphere and passes to the sea, while the cooler layers from the water go toward the land. In the winter the reverse is the case; and these alternations are repeated daily on a small scale. At times, however, the meeting of the air currents produces severe whirlwinds which last an hour, or even longer. The north wind is cold (Job xxxvii. 9); the west wind moist; the east wind dry; and the comparatively rare south wind warm. The east wind is refreshing in winter, but in summer its heat, dryness, and dust are distressing. The most destructive and unhealthful wind, however, is the sirocco from the southeast, especially as it is often violent and productive of severe whirlwinds (cf. Job i. 19; Jer. xviii. 17; Ezek. xvii. 10; Jonah iv. 8).

2. Rain and Moisture.

The rainy season, from October to May, falls into three divisions. The first of these is the early rains (James v. 7), which extend from October or November to the middle of December and prepare the parched ground for plowing. The second division, from the middle of December to the middle or end of March, saturates the ground and fills the wells, pools, and cisterns. The third division, or late rains of April and May, permits the wheat to ear. These divisions are separated by a series of rainless days; and the description of spring in Cant. ii. 11–12, refers to the time after the close of the winter rain. The annual precipitation is very uneven, 67.5 per cent falling in December and January. From May to September there is scarcely any rain, but the place of rain is taken, to some extent, by the dew brought by the sea breezes, especially in the spring, though rain falls in abundance in September and October (cf. Job xxix. 19; Cant. v. 2). There is frequently a heavy mist at dawn, which is gradually dissipated by the sun. But with the hot sirocco, all moisture, and even the dew, vanishes. In summer there are no storms, so that the thunder and rain in the wheat harvest, mentioned in I Sam. xii. 17–18, produced terror. Storms are frequent, however, in the other months, especially in April and May. Snow falls almost every winter, but seldom remains more than a few days. Hail likewise falls in winter (cf. Job xxxviii. 22; Isa. xxx. 30; Hag. ii. 17). The climatic conditions of the Jordan valley are little known. The temperature, however, seems to be high, and the precipitation relatively slight. Snow is apparently unknown in Jericho, though it occasionally falls at Tiberias. In the Jordan valley south winds blow in summer, and north winds in winter, these phenomena seemingly being due to barometric conditions over the Dead Sea. There is no reason to suppose that the climate of Palestine has changed in the historic period, though the heavy woods mentioned in the Bible (cf. Josh. xvii. 15; Isa. ix. 18; Jer. iv. 7, 29) have greatly diminished. It is probable that the mountains west of the Jordan were once densely wooded, and it is not impossible that deforestation has caused a diminution of the rainfall, though with little general effect on the climate. It may also be conjectured that the opposition of the seasons has been intensified; though here, again, no alteration of the mean annual temperature can be assumed.

V. Irrigation and Fertility: The few permanent rivers of Palestine are not of a character available for irrigation, even the Jordan having too deep a bed for a source of a system of canals. The other rivers, such as Kishon and the Nahr al-'Aujah, run in low-lying plains near the coast, so that their waters are not available for the mountain districts, where the only sources of water supply are the wells and the rain. Some portions of Palestine are by no means lacking in springs, which appear mostly in the valleys or at the foot of the mountains. They are most frequent in eastern Galilee, tolerably numerous on the southern and southeastern borders of the plain of Jezreel, and not rare in the vicinity of Nablus (Sichem). From the latter point to the south, except in the neighborhood of Hebron, the wells are scarcer and scantier. Though they have been of the utmost economic and strategic importance in the history of Palestine, they are seldom cared for, as at Nazareth, though the remains of ancient structures attest the protection formerly afforded them. Little attention is given to collecting the rain water in pools, though more care is taken of the cisterns in the mountain district. The greater part of the rain water is thus wasted, and flows either into the Jordan and the Dead Sea, or forms marshes (as in the plain of Sharon) or underground waters in the coast plains, where it can be utilized by trenches (cf. II Kings iii. 16) or wells. It thus becomes evident that the prosperity of the land is conditioned by the yearly rainfall, the ultimate source of the wells. If the rain fails, the wells dry up; man and beast suffer from thirst (Ps. xlii. 1); the parched land can not be plowed; and general famine is the sequence of the failure of the crops (cf. II Sam. xxi. 1; I Kings xvii.–xviii.; Jer. xiv. 2–6; Amos iv. 7–8). The wells include a number of hot springs, especially south of Tiberias, where there is a temperature of 63° C. In the valley of the Wadi Zarḳa Ma'in in Moab there is a number of hot springs, one with a temperature of 62.8° C. and others occur at the entrance of the same wadi into the Dead Sea. These hot springs may date from the end of the diluvial period, and it is probable that many springs now cold were originally hot, the transition being shown by numerous warm springs near the Jordan valley. For the fertility of Palestine see Agriculture, Hebrew. The phrase "flowing with milk and honey" (Ex. iii. 8, 17, xiii. 5; Num. xiii. 27; etc.), applied also to Egypt (Num. xvi. 13), does not refer to agricultural fertility, but to adaptability for pasturage, and to abundance of wild honey (cf. Deut. xxxii. 13 and often).

VI. Flora: The Palestinian flora ranges from tropical vegetation in the Jordan valley to flora of the steppes and desert. Many varieties of the present flora have been introduced in historic times. The original forest trees of the cretaceous plateau can not be determined until the forestry of the east Jordan district is more fully known. West of the Jordan small woods are found on Carmel and to the southeast, as well as on Tabor and in upper Galilee. These trees are mostly oaks (*quercus coccifera* and *quercus ægilops*), though they also include the turpentine tree (*pistacia terebinthus*), the cypress (*cupressus sempervirens*), the fir east of the Jordan, and the Aleppo pine (*pinus halepensis*). Mention should also be made of the poplar (*populus alba*), mastic (*pistacia Lentiscus*), arbutus (*arbutus unedo* and *arbutus Andrachne*), carob (*ceratoria siliqua*), tamarisk, and white poplar (*populus euphratica*) in the vicinity of the Dead Sea. The majority of these trees grow in dense thickets, as on the upper Wadi al-'Arrub north of Hebron, on Carmel, and on the southern and western declivities of Tabor. Here, too, are found the *Phillyrea media*, storax (*styrax officinalis*), hawthorn and blackthorn, Judas-tree (*cercis siliquostrum*), rock-rose (*cistus*), furze (*genista*), laurel, wild olive, myrtle, caper-bush (*capparis spinosa*), and many varieties of willow. The swamps along the coast, like the Baḥrat al-Ḥulah and the region of the wells near the Jordan, are filled with reeds and papyrus, while along the brooks grow oleanders and Abraham-trees (*vitex agnus castus*). There are no meadows, in the strict sense of the term, in Palestine, nor is it customary to cut grass for hay. At the same time, large stretches of land are covered with perennial grasses, and diversified with flowers and herbs. Among these flowers are many representatives of the *liliacei*, *leguminosi*, *umbelliferi*, and *labiati;* while meadow-saffron, hyacinths, buttercups, tulips, anemones, adonises, irises, chrysanthemums, geraniums, and orchids commingle their colors. Gardens of varying size are found almost everywhere. For the trees most frequent see Fruit Trees in the Old Testament. Under fruit trees may be comprised the Christ's-thorn (*zizyphus spina Christi*) with its small apple-like fruits, the zizyphus lotus with its plum-shaped fruit, and the *cratægus monogyna* with pulpy, deep-red fruit. The region of the vegetation of the steppes and desert is the Jordan valley with the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, the Negeb, and the desert edge of the district east of the Jordan. Here trees are almost wholly lacking, their place being taken by small thorny bushes, including the *poterium spinosum*, and several varieties of *astragalus*. The broom abounds, like varieties of artemisia and such acacias as *acacia tortilis* and *acacia Seyal;* while the *juniperus phœnicea* and *juniperus oxycedrus* also occur.

VII. Fauna: The fauna of Palestine is as diverse as the flora, the mammals of northern Palestine belonging to the palæarctic region, and those of the southern part to the Ethiopic region. The boundary between the two runs approximately from the southern end of Carmel to the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. The palæarctic mammals of Palestine included the roe, fallow deer, arvicola, dwarf marmot, dormouse, squirrel, ground squirrel, mole, ermine, stone marten, swamp lynx, badger, and bear. To the Ethiopian fauna belong various rodents, the porcupine, rock rabbit, steinbock, gazel, wild cat, the desert cat (*felis maniculata*), caracal, panther, Nile fox, shrew mouse, hedgehog, ichneumon, genet, and wild boar. Rats are very numerous. Many of the birds of Palestine are migratory, though some of them breed in the warmer parts of the country. Thrushes and nightingales are found in many varieties, as well as grass warblers, titmouses, nuthatches, wrens, wagtails, pipits, orioles, shrikes, swallows, finch, sparrows, buntings, starlings, ravens, larks, goat-suckers, kingfishers, hoopoes, and cuckoos. The birds of prey and carrion include owls, vultures, eagles, falcons, sparrow-hawks, and kites; while among the aquatic birds mention must be made of herons, storks, pelicans, flamingoes, wild geese, swans, coots, snipes, lapwings, cranes, bustards, gulls, petrels, and grebes. On the eastern border of Palestine the ostrich is occasionally found. Thirty-three varieties of serpents are found in Palestine, including the cobra and other venomous snakes; and there are forty-four varieties of lizards, including *psammosaurus scincus* and *monitor niloticus*. The crocodile is found in the swamp of the western Nahr al-Zarḳa. There are tortoises both on land and in the water, as well as frogs and toads. The waters of Palestine are rich in fish, these comprising forty-three varieties, especially carp, tench, barbel, silure, and blenny. Insects are abundant, as in all warm countries, and include spiders, scorpions, wasps, bees, flies, gnats, and fleas. While many of the varieties of locust, which number more than forty, are harmless, the migratory locust (*œdipoda migratoria*), which comes chiefly from Arabia, works fearful devastation in the fields and gardens (cf. Joel i.–ii.). The varieties of locust enumerated in Lev. xi. 22 can no longer be identified.

VIII. Roads: The modern roads of Palestine generally follow the old highways, some of which may be traced to the Roman period. For earlier times only general statements are available. The Hebrew word for "highway" does not imply a paved street, but rather the formation of a road by embankments. A road was prepared for a personage of importance by leveling the path, filling depressions, and removing elevations (Isa. xl. 3–4, lvii. 14, lxii. 10; Jer. xxxi. 9). Such roads, however, were only temporary, and were soon destroyed by the torrents of the rainy season. There is no evidence of the existence of bridges in antiquity. Nevertheless, it is clear that well-known means of communication were maintained in Palestine (cf. Ps. cvii. 4, 7; Jer. ii. 6), this being confirmed by the building of the cities of refuge, the way to which must have been indicated in some manner (cf. Deut. xix. 13). The road was generally marked by stones set up as guide posts (Jer. xxxi. 21). The roads themselves were of great antiquity, and led, according to the conformation of the land, along the ridge of the watershed, past good springs, and through easy passes, open valleys, and firm lowland. Rocky declivities were ascended by steps, such as the "Tyrian Stairs," the stairs of the city of David in Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 15), and the stairs of the coast road at Carmel and of the descent to Engedi. In the Persian period a toll of some sort was levied (Ezra iv. 13, 20, vii. 24). Beggars and courtezans sat beside the roads (Luke xviii. 35; Gen. xxxviii. 14, 16). Cross-roads were in ancient times, as now, held to be the lurking-place of spirits, and were accordingly the scene of superstitious ceremonies. The road along the coast passed over the "Tyrian Stairs" from the domain of the Phenicians into the plain of Acre, running along the Mediterranean to Jaffa, where it seems to have turned into the interior to avoid the sand dunes. It then went, by way of Ascalon, to Gaza, whence it continued through Raphia and the narrow tongue of land between the Mediterranean and the Egyptian lake of Sirbonis. Its antiquity is proved by the inscriptions of Egyptian and Assyrian kings in the cliffs above the mouth of the Wadi al-Kalb north of Beirut. A second road from the north apparently ran through the Orontes valley by way of Hamath and Riblah, passing through the depression between Lebanon and Antilebanon, and reaching the "gates of the land" by way of the Jabal al-Dahr. Several roads ran from Damascus to Israel. Besides the road to Tyre, which passed through the sources of the Jordan at Hermon, an important highway led thence through the Aramæan district of Beth Maacha, crossing the Jordan south of lake Huleh, and then descending into the plain of Gennesaret. Leaving the shore of the lake at the Wadi al-Ḥamman, it gained the watershed at Ḳarn Ḥaṭṭin, and through the plain of al-Baṭṭof (or via Ṭur'an) reached Acre, thus being the "way of the sea" of Isa. ix. 1. At Ḳarn Ḥaṭṭin this road branched off in several directions inland. One branch ran south to Tabor, then turned west, traversed or skirted the plain of Jezreel, and passed through al-Lajjun to the plain of Sharon to Lydda, whence it reached the main road to Egypt. The second branch passed south from Tabor over the Jabal al-Ḍahi, reaching the plain of Sharon, where it reunited with the first branch, at Caparcotia (now Kafr Kud). These branches formed the bond uniting Damascus and Egypt. Still another road ran south from Damascus through the ancient Bashan, continuing along the ridge of the 'Ajlun, crossing the Nahr al-Zarḳa south of Burmah, and branching at al-Salṭ west to the Jordan valley, and east to Rabbath Ammon, the later Philadelphia. From this road a branch apparently ran from al-Ramtah and reached the watershed at Ajbaihat (cf. Judges viii. 11) where it seems to have divided, one road passing through Ma'an to South Arabia, and the other by way of Heshbon, Baal Meon, Rabbath Moab, and Kir Moab to the later Petra and to Elath. The former of these branches apparently coincides in its southern portion with the Roman boundary, as well as with the present route of the pilgrims to Mecca. Access to Palestine from the south was through the Negeb, the road from Elath running through the city of Salt to Hebron. From the Egyptian frontier fortress on the east of the delta a road led to Gerar and the vicinity of Kadesh, where it turned to the north and reached the watershed at Hebron by way of Beersheba. This is the "way to Shur" of Gen. xvi. 7. From Hebron the road followed the watershed through Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and Bethel to Sichem. From the east two approaches must be considered. The first, from the ancient Duma (now the oasis al-Jauf), passing through Salcah and Bozrah, traversed southern Bashan, crossed the Damascus road near Edrei and the Jordan near the present Jisr al-Majami', and then turned south to Beth-Shean. Thence it went partly westward over the modern Janin to the plain of Sharon, partly southwest to Sichem and partly south to Jericho. The other road from the eastern desert branched off from the one just described at al-Kaf, and reached the Israelitic region at the wells of Arnon in Moab.

IX. Political Divisions and Statistics: The divisions of Palestine and their history to the first century A.D. are discussed in Galilee; Gaulanitis; Judea; Negeb; Peræa; Philistines; Samaria; Trachonitis. After the suppression of the revolt of 66–70, Vespasian placed the Roman province of Judea under a prætorian legate. With Hadrian's crushing of the last Jewish uprising in 132–135, the province, now called Syria Palæstina, received a legate of consular rank. After Trajan had incorporated the Nabatæan kingdom with the Roman province of Arabia, the boundaries between the two frequently varied. Either Diocletian (285–305) or Septimius Severus (193–211) added to Arabia the cities of Philadelphia, Gerasa, Dium, Canatha, Philippopolis, and Phena; but, on the other hand, the district of Petra was united with Palestine either by Diocletian or shortly after his abdication. In 358, however, Petra, the Negeb, and the southern vicinity of the Dead Sea, were made a separate province, called Palæstina Salutaris (also termed Palæstina Tertia in the beginning of the fifth century). In 395–399 the remainder of Palestine was divided into Palæstina Prima and Secunda, the former embracing the districts of Judea and Samaria as far as Carmel with Cæsarea; and the latter comprising the plain of Jezreel, Galilee (except the coast, which belonged to Phenicia), Gaulanitis, and the land south of the Yarmuk (except in so far as it belonged to Arabia), with Scythopolis as the capital. When the Khalif Omar conquered Syria in 636, Palestine was divided into the Jund ("military district") Filasṭin and Jund al-Urdunn. The first of these comprised the Negeb, Judea, and Samaria west of the Jordan as far as the great plain, with Lydda, and later al-Ramlah, as the capital; and the second Jund embraced Galilee and the Jordan valley to the Dead Sea, with Tiberias as the chief city. In the tenth century there were ten districts in Syria, but this division was ended when the crusaders founded the kingdom of Jerusalem (1099–1187). After the restoration of the Mohammedan power, Syria nominally belonged to Egypt, though actually it was more or less in the possession of the descendants of Saladin and his brothers. About 1300 Palestine belonged to the kings of Damascus, Gaza, Kerak, and Safed; but about 1351 there were the districts of Filasṭin with Jerusalem as the capital, and of Ḥauran with Tiberias as the capital. In 1517 the Turkish sultan Selim I. ended the rule of the Egyptian Mamelukes, and Syria and Palestine were governed from Constantinople under local Turkish pashas. Their rule was marked by many uprisings, such as the reign of the Druse Far al-Din (1595–1634; see Druses) and of the Bedouin Ẓahir al-ʻAmr (about 1750–75). From 1832 to 1840 Palestine and Syria were ruled by the Egyptian Mohammad Ali, until England and Austria restored the land to the Turkish sultan. The present political division of Palestine is as follows. The southern portion of the West Jordan district, as far north as Sinjil near the Wadi Dair Balluṭ, forms the mutessarifat of Jerusalem; while the remainder of the west Jordan district, constituting the Sanjaks of Nabulus and Akko, belongs to the vilayet of Beirut (founded in 1888). The east Jordan district belongs to the vilayet of Damascus. Its northern portion, the Sanjak of Hauran, extends to the Nahr al-Zarḳa, with its capital at Shaikh Miskin; while the southern portion, or Sanjak Maʻan, formed in 1894 from the district of al-Salṭ and the northern part of the vilayet Ḥajaz, has for its capital al-Karak. The present area of Palestine, as considered in this article, is estimated at over 9,000 square miles, with an approximate population of 559,127. This population was doubtless larger during the centuries of Roman control and the early period of Arab dominion, probably the happiest ages of Palestine. In still earlier ages, however, it is improbable that the population was much greater than at present. See Cities in Palestine. (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: The most important books and guides on the bibliography and geography of Palestine are noted in this work, vol. i., p. xvii. In addition there should be consulted the lists of literature under the articles in this work dealing with the separate divisions and regions of Palestine, such as those noted in the text above, IX.; and under such articles as Damascus; Edom; Jerusalem; Lebanon; Moab, Moabities; especially Palestine Exploration Fund; and K. Baedeker's *Palestine and Syria*, Leipsic, 1906. A bibliography of works in English on the subject is given in J. F. Hurst, *Literature of Theology*, pp. 119–130, New York, 1896. More general lists in such journals as PEF, *Quarterly Statements; Revue biblique; Revue de l'orient latin;* and *ZDPV;* while a survey of recent literature is given in P. P. Thomsen, *Systematische Bibliographie der Palästina-Litteratur*, Leipsic, 1908.

For the story of excavation in Palestine consult: F. J. Bliss and R. A. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine*, 1898–1900, London, 1902; F. J. Bliss, *Development of Palestine Exploration*, New York, 1906; H. V. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century*, New York, 1903; P. H. Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente*, Paris, 1907 (excellent account); *Bericht über die 1903 bis 1905 . . . veranstalteten Ausgrabungen*, i. Band: *Fundbericht*, erstattet von G. Schumacher, ed. Prof. C. Steuernagel, A. Text, B. Tafeln, Leipsic, 1908; H. Gressmann, *Die Ausgrabungen in Palästina und das Alte Testament*, Tübingen, 1908.

The following is a selected list of works dealing with topography, geography, etc.: E. G. Rey, *Voyage dans le Haouran*, Paris, 1860; J. G. Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über den Hauran und die Trachonen*, Berlin, 1860; idem, *Das batanäische Giebelgebirge*, Leipsic, 1884; A. Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, Paris, 1868; V. Guérin, *Description géographique, historique, et archéologique de la Palestine*, 7 vols., Paris, 1869–80; H. T. P. J. d'A. Duc de Luynes, *Voyage d'exploration à la Mer Morte, à Pétra et sur la rive gauche du Jourdain*, 3 vols., Paris, 1871–76; L. Oliphant, *The Land of Gilead*, New York, 1881; T. Saunders, *Introduction to the Survey of Western Palestine; its Waterways, Plains and Highlands*, London, 1881; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1880–84; A. Henderson, *Palestine, its Historical Geography*, Edinburgh, 1884; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., London, 1886; O. Ankel, *Grundzüge der Landesnatur des Westjordanlandes*, Frankfort, 1887; G. Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*, London, 1886; idem, *The Jaulan*, ib. 1888; C. R. Conder, *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, London, 1889; idem, *Heth and Moab*, ib. 1889; E. Hull, *Mount Seir, Sinai, and Western Palestine* London, 1889; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, Freiburg, 1896; D. Zanecchia, *La Palestine d'aujourd'hui*, 2 vols., Paris, 1899; W. Sanday and P. Waterhouse, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, Oxford, 1903; G. A. Barton, *Year's Wanderings in Bible Lands*, Philadelphia, 1905; W. Libbey and F. E. Hoskins, *Jordan Valley and Petra*, New York, 1905; C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land*, London, 1906; *Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. M. N. Adler, London, 1907; H. W. Dunning, *To-day in Palestine*, New York, 1907; E. Grant, *The Peasantry of Palestine; the Life, Manners and Customs of the Village*, Boston, 1907; H. Guthe, *Palästina*, Bielefeld, 1907; A. C. Inchbold, *Under the Syrian Sun; the Lebanon, Baalbek, Galilee, and Judæa*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1907; P. Thomsen, *Loca Sancta. Verzeichnis der im 1 bis 6 Jahrhundert Erwähnten Ortschaften Palästinas*, vol. i., Halle, 1907; idem, *Palästina und seine Kultur in fünf Jahrtausenden*, Leipsic, 1909; G. Hölscher, *Landes und Volkskunde Palästinas*, ib. 1907; G. Cormack, *Egypt in Asia. A Plain Account of Pre-Biblical Syria and Palestine*, London, 1908; L. B. Paton, *Descriptive Geography of Palestine*, Chicago, 1908; S. A. Cook, *Religion of Ancient Palestine*, ib. 1909. Of cyclopedia articles especially worthy of mention is that in Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, parts xxiv.–xxx. But none can afford to overlook the constant contributions in the journals noted above, and the *Palestina Jahrbuch*, Berlin, 1907 sqq.

On the Dead Sea, consult: F. de Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*, 2 vols., Paris, 1853; U. J. Seetsen, *Reisen durch Syrien*, ii. 217–384, Berlin, 1854; F. Lynch, *Narrative of the U. S. Expedition to the . . . Dead Sea*, London, 1849; *Official Report* (of the same), Baltimore, 1852; O. Fraas, *Das todte Meer*, Stuttgart, 1867; L. Vignes, *Extrait des notes d'un voyage . . . à la Mer Morte*, Paris, 1871; M. Blanckenhorn, in *ZDPV*, xix (1896), 1–64, xxi. (1898), 65–83; L. Gautier, *Autour de la Mer Morte*, Geneva, 1901.

For the literature on fauna and flora, see under Fruit Trees in the Old Testament; Gardens, Hebrew; and the articles on the different animals of the Bible; and especially Lortet and A. Locard, *Études zoologiques sur la faune du lac de Tiberiade*, Lyons, 1883; H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, London, 1884; idem, *Natural History of the Bible*, ib. 1889; G. E. Post, *Flora of Syria, Palestina and Sinai*, Beirut, 1896; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthieren*, Berlin, 1902; C. Hart, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, London, PEF, 1904; F. Lundgreen, *Die Benutzung der Pflanzenwelt in der alttestamentlichen Religion*, Giessen, 1908.

For the political conditions consult: J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatverwaltung*, i. 419 sqq., Leipsic, 1881; T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v. 446–552, Berlin, 1885; P. de Rohden, *De Palæstina et Arabia provinciis Romains*, Berlin, 1885; G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London, 1890; V. Cuinet, *Syrie, Liban, et Palestine, géographie administrative*, 2 vols., Paris, 1896–1900.

On the climate use: J. Glaisher, *Meteorological Observations at Jerusalem*, London, 1903; E. Huntington, in *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society*, xl (1908), 513–521.

PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND: A society founded on June 22, 1865, on strictly scientific principles, having as its purpose "To help every one who cares to read the Bible intelligently, to lead those who care for it little to care for it much, to give light to dark places, and to narrow the bounds of controversy." Its aim is the accurate and systematic investigation of the archeology, topography, geology and physical geography, manners and customs of the Holy Land. The first impulse toward a scientific examination of the Holy Land is due to Edward Robinson, who still holds first rank among the scientific travelers in Palestine. Through the organization of this society, Dean Stanley being one of its founders, the work begun by Robinson—the identification of Bible sites—was continued by such men as Sir Charles Warren, Sir Charles Wilson, and Colonel Charles Reignier Conder of the Royal Society of Engineers, whose names alone are a guaranty of the accuracy of their work. By them a careful survey of Palestine was made and in 1867 the first excavations were begun in and near Jerusalem, showing that in some places the ancient city was buried to the depth of 100 feet in the débris of its own ruins. Since then valuable work has been done. At the present time important excavations are being made at Gezer (q.v.) under the charge of Robert Alexander Stuart Macalister.

Although the society has had limited funds at its disposal, it has done an immense work, and published the results in books, papers, maps, plans, photographs, and lantern slides for the benefit of all students of the Scriptures. The Raised Map of Palestine constructed from the surveys of the fund by George Armstrong should have special mention.

The society depends upon annual subscriptions and special donations to carry on its work. Those who subscribe not less than half a guinea or $2.50 annually receive the *Quarterly Statement* published by the fund free. This statement has been published from the beginning of the survey to the present time and has been the means of communicating to the world hundreds of discoveries and observations. In 1897 Rev. Theodore Francis Wright was appointed honorary general secretary and lecturer for the fund in the United States, and continued to hold these offices until his death in Nov., 1907. Through his efforts greater interest was taken in the work and many new subscribers secured.

Mary A. Wright.

The following is a list of the publications of the fund.

Volumes.

I. *The Survey of Western Palestine;* II. *Excavations at Jerusalem*, by F. J. Bliss and A. C. Dickie; III. *Tent Work in Palestine*, by C. R. Conder; IV. *Heth and Moab*, by C. R. Conder; V. *Across the Jordan*, by Gottlieb Schumacher; VI. *The Survey of the Jaulan*, by G. Schumacher; VII. *Mount Seir*, by E. Hull; VIII. *Syrian Stone Lore*, by C. R. Conder; IX. *Thirty Years' Work*, by Sir Walter Besant; X. *Altaic Hieroglyphs and Hittite Inscriptions*, by C. R. Conder; XI. *The Geology of Palestine and Arabia Petræa*, by E. Hull; *Names and Places, with Identifications*, by G. Armstrong; XIII. *History of Jerusalem*, by Sir W. Besant and Prof. E. H. Palmer; XIV. *The Bible and Modern Discoveries*, by Henry A. Harper; XV. *Palestine under the Moslems*, by Guy le Strange; XVI. *Lachish*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie; XVII. *Introduction to the Survey*, by Trelawney Saunders; XVIII. *The City and the Land*, Seven Lectures; XIX. *The Tell Armarna Tablets*, including the one found at Lachish; XX. *Abila, Pelia, and Northern 'Ajlun*, by G. Schumacher; XXI. *A Mound of Many Cities* (Tell-el-Hesy excavated), by F. J. Bliss; XXII. *Judas Maccabæus*, by C. R. Conder; XXIII. *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, by C. R. Conder; XXIV. *Index to the Quarterly Statements, 1869–1892 inclusive;* XXV. *The Survey of Eastern Palestine*, by C. R. Conder; XXVI. *The Fauna and Flora of Sinai and Petra*, by H. C. Hart; XXVII. *Archeological Researches*, by C. Clermont-Ganneau; XXVIII. *The Life of Saladin*, ed. C. R. Conder and C. W. Wilson; XXIX. *The Ancient Cubit*, by Sir Charles Warren; XXX. *Painted Tombs of Marissa*, by J. P. Peters; XXXI. *Excavations in Palestine, 1898–1900*, by F. J. Bliss; XXXII. *Meteorological Observations at Jerusalem*, by James Glaisher; XXXIII. *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre*, by Sir C. W. Wilson; XXXIV. *Table of Christian and Mohammedan Eras from July 15, 622–1900.*

Maps.

I. Old and New Testament Maps of Palestine in 20 sheets or mounted. II. Modern Map of Palestine in 20 sheets, with modern names only. III. Old and New Testament Map of Palestine in 12 sheets or mounted. IV. Modern Map of Palestine in 12 sheets; modern names. V. The Great Map of Western Palestine; scale one inch to the mile. VI. The Reduced Map of Western Palestine, showing water basins. VII. Plan of Jerusalem, showing the latest discoveries. VIII. Plan of Jerusalem, according to Josephus. IX. The Sections of the Country, North and South, East and West. X. The Raised Map of Palestine, 7½ feet by 4. XI. The Smaller Raised Map is half the size of the larger. XII. The Photo-Relief Map from the Large Raised Map.

Photographs.

Photos of Inscription from Herod's Temple and Moabite Stone, with translations; also of Jar found at corner of Temple Area, 80 feet below the surface, and of the Siloam Inscription with translation. Lantern Slides, a list of 200 special slides showing excavations, etc.

Casts.

Seal of "Haggai, the Son of Shebaniah." Inscribed Table, found at Lachish. Ancient Hebrew Weight, from Samaria. Inscribed Weight or Bead, from Palestine. Seal found on Ophel. The Siloam Inscription. Mount Sinai (large and small). Tablets from Gezer.

PALESTRINA, GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA: Founder of the modern style of church music; b. at Palestrina (22 m. e.s.e. of Rome) in 1526; d. at Rome Feb. 2, 1594. He went to Rome at the age of fourteen to sixteen and is supposed to have studied under Claude Goudimel. In 1544–51 he was organist of the principal church of his native city, and in the latter year became *magister puerorum* at St. Peter's, Rome. By his first compositions—three masses dedicated to Julius III.—he made so favorable an impression that he was appointed musical director of the Julian chapel. He held similar positions at various chapels and churches in Rome until his death; and by his compositions, which are very numerous—masses, motets, hymns, and others, of which only one-half have been published—he produced a complete revolution in the history of church music. As his masterpiece is generally mentioned, *Missa Papæ Marcelli*. See Sacred Music.

Bibliography: *Selections from the Works of Palestrina, Transcribed by E. C. Gregory*, were published, 4 parts, Oxford, 1903–05. His life was written by G. Baini, Rome, 1828; T. Nisard, Le Mans, 1866; and M. J. A. Lans, Leyden, 1882.

PALEY, WILLIAM: English theologian; b. at Peterborough (37 m. n.e. of Northampton) July, 1743; d. at Lincoln May 25, 1805. His mother was a keen, thrifty woman of much intelligence, and his father was a minor canon at Peterborough and a pedagogue. In 1758 Paley entered, as sizar, Christ College, Cambridge. He had been a fair scholar at his father's school, specially interested in mathematics. After taking his degree in 1763, he became usher at an academy in Greenwich and, in 1766, was elected fellow of Christ College, where he became an intimate friend of John Law and lectured successfully on metaphysics, morals, and the Greek Testament. He offered lectures on Locke, Clark's *Attributes*, and Butler's *Analogy;* and in his lectures on divinity took the ground maintained in his *Moral Philosophy* that the Thirty-nine Articles were merely articles of peace, inasmuch as they contained about 240 distinct propositions, many of them inconsistent with each other. He had been ordained a priest in 1767, and was appointed to the rectory of Musgrave in Cumberland, which he resigned in 1776, to take the vicarage of the two parishes, Appleby and Dalston. In 1780 he was installed prebendary at Carlisle, and resigned Appleby on becoming archdeacon in 1782. At the close of 1785, he became chancellor of the diocese and (1789–92) figured as an active opponent of the slave-trade. Presented to the vicarage of Aldingham in 1792, he vacated Dalston for Stanwix in 1793. In recognition of his apologetic writings he was given the prebend of St. Pancras in St. Paul's Cathedral; the subdeanery of Lincoln, in 1795; and the rectory of Bishop Warmouth in 1795; and transferred his residence to Lincoln shortly before his death.

Paley seems to have excelled as a writer of text-books. He is an unrivaled expositor of plain arguments but without much originality. His moral system, in which he is said to have anticipated Bentham, is the best statement of the utilitarianism of the eighteenth century. In theology and philosophy his common-sense method, which showed his limitations of intellect, by ignoring commonly perceived difficulties and by easily accepting conclusions, has been discarded. In the former he seems to have followed a liberal construction of orthodox views, sincerely convinced that his doctrines could be logically proved by rationalistic argument. His alleged plagiarism, even as to the classical illustration of the universe by a watch, must be understood in the light of his purpose in compiling text-books. Upon being urged by Law to expand his lectures he published *The Moral and Political Philosophy* (London, 1786). His most original work was *Horæ Paulinæ; or the Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced, by a Comparison of the Epistles which bear his Name with the Acts of the Apostles and with one another* (London, 1790; subsequent editions are by J. Tate, 1840; T. R. Birks, 1850; J. S. Howson, 1877; German ed. with annotations, H. P. C. Henke, Helmstadt, 1797). His prominent apologetic works are, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity* (London, 1794) and *Natural History: or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature* (1802): the first a compendium of the arguments against the eighteenth-century deists, and the second a clear account of the *a posteriori* argument from the facts of early Christianity. The *Natural Theology*, used for many years as a foremost text-book classic, has been superseded on account of the shifting of ground from the mechanical objective to the immanent subjective theory of the universe. Paley advances the teleological argument from design founded on the unity and adaptability of created things. This argument was based on rationalistic grounds; yet did not ultimately prove conclusive to rationalists themselves, and has not been able to survive criticism. His analogical method has run its course; the idea of a complex, perfected organism dropping suddenly amidst foreign surroundings, as illustrated by the finding of a watch, was the dogmatic externalism the rebound from which gave birth to the subsequent hypotheses of natural selection and adaptation to environment and the theory of evolution as a whole. In the *Evidences*, Paley proceeds along historical lines to affirm the truth of Christianity by two propositions; namely, 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 that " other miracles than those of the Gospel are not satisfactorily attested." To these he appends " auxiliary " arguments drawn from the " morality of the Gospel," " originality of Christ's character," and others. The argument is one-sided on account of its disregard of the field of Christian consciousness.

Paley published also *Reasons for Contentment; addressed to the Laboring Part of the British Public* (1793). Individual sermons which may be mentioned are: *Dangers Incidental to the Clerical Character* (1795); *Assize Sermon at Durham* (1795); as well as the compilations *Sermons on Several Subjects* and *Sermons and Tracts* (1808). The first collected edition of the works of William Paley appeared in 1805–08; one by A. Chalmers with biography (5 vols., London, 1819); one by E. Lynam (1825); and one by his son, E. Paley (1825).

Bibliography: The two principal accounts of Paley's life are by his son in his edition of his father's *Works*, and by G. W. Meadley, London, 1810; the latter is the usual source of the sketches presented in the various editions of Paley's books. Consult further: S. A. Allibone, *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, ii. 1486–90, Philadelphia, 1891; *DNB*, xliii. 101–107.

PALIMPSEST: A manuscript which has been written over (hence frequently called *codex rescriptus*), the original writing usually having been expunged by rubbing, whence the name (Gk. *palin*, " again," and *psaein*, " to rub "). The reason for the existence of this class of manuscripts was the scarcity in the Middle Ages of writing-materials, and the consequent desire to make use of material already at hand by obliterating existing writing and so making papyrus or parchment available for the then present need. But the porous nature of the parchment or papyrus made it impossible to eradicate completely the earlier writing. As a result, it is often feasible to recover the original writing by the use of chemical reagents, among the best of these being hydrosulfureted ammonia. In some cases the agent used was corrosive, and the result was the destruction or further defacement of the manuscript. In some palimpsests the original writing was not erased, but the newer writing was inserted between the lines of the old or was written across.

This work of effacing the older text and using the manuscript again was often done in the monasteries, the purpose being to employ the material for some patristic work or some writing of more present interest than the original text. While palimpsest manuscripts are not confined to Biblical texts, those of concern in this work are manuscripts which carry in the earlier writing some portion of the text of the Bible. Illustrations of manuscripts of this kind employed as noted above are Codex Ephraem (C), which contains as the earlier or lower writing parts of the Septuagint and also parts of the New Testament, and as the upper or later writing parts of the works of Ephraem Syrus; and Codex Nitriensis (R), in which the lower writing is a portion of Luke's Gospel, over which is written in Syriac a comparatively unimportant work by Severus of Antioch.

The most important palimpsests are, for the Greek of the Old Testament: Codex Ephraem (C), at Paris; Petropolitanus (H), at St. Petersburg; a Leipsic set of fragments (K), in the university library of that place; the Dublin codex (O), fragments at Trinity College; some fragments found by Tischendorf, known as Z; Codex Cryptoferratensis (Γ). Besides these there are some fragments of the version of Aquila, part of these from the Cairo genizah. Of the Greek New Testament the more important palimpsests are: Codex Ephraem (C), ut sup.; Petropolitanus (I), at St. Petersburg; Guelferbytanus, I. and II. (P_1, Q_1), at Wolfenbüttel; Nitriensis (R_1), in the British Museum; Neapolitanus (W_b), at Naples; Dublinensis (Z), at Trinity College, Dublin; Porphyrianus (P_2), at St. Petersburg; Codex Zacynthus (Ξ), with the British and Foreign Bible Society, London; and Patiriensis ($\beth_2$), in the Vatican Library at Rome. These New-Testament manuscripts are more closely described under BIBLE TEXT (vol. ii., pp. 103–106 of this work). Of the Syriac New Testament there are the important Sinaitic Syriac (described in BIBLE VERSIONS, A, III., 1, § 3); and some important fragments from the genizah at Cairo. Several palimpsests contain fragments of the early Latin (Itala) version, including: Bernensia fragmenta (t), at Berne; Fleury Palimpsest (h) at Paris; Bobiensis (s) at Vienna; Guelferbytanus (gue), at Wolfenbüttel; and two other fragments, one at Würzburg and the other at Munich. One palimpsest of the Vulgate in the Escurial in Spain contains part of Numbers and of Judges; and there is also a fragment containing a part of the Acts of the Apostles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament*, p. 100, New York, 1883; F. H. A. Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, i. 25, 141, London, 1894; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxx., cols. 2053–57.

PALLADIUS: Bishop of Helenopolis and Aspona, b. in Galatia about 368; d. at Aspona, Galatia, about 430. About the age of twenty he went to Egypt because of his admiration of the ascetic life, and after sojourning with various monks in the vicinity of Alexandria, he resided about nine years in the Nitrian desert, forming a lasting friendship with Evagrius Ponticus (q.v.), who increased his attachment to the teachings of Origen. Palladius also seems to have visited the Scetic desert and the Thebaid, but ill-health compelled him, probably in 400, to return to Alexandria, and thence, by way of Palestine, to Asia Minor. Soon afterward he was consecrated bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia by John Chrysostom, then patriarch of Constantinople, but was involved, after 403, in the anti-Origenistic attacks on his patron. He probably visited Rome about 405 to gain the support of the Emperor Honorius for Chrysostom and himself; but after his return to Asia Minor (about 408) he was exiled by Arcadius to Syene in Upper Egypt, where he was subjected to ill-treatment and deprivation. At last, however, he was released, and (date unknown) exchanged his see of Helenopolis for that of Aspona.

To Palladius are ascribed two works: the *Historia Lausiaca* (so called because dedicated to a certain Lausus), a collection of instructive histories of monks; and the *Dialogus de vita Sancti Johannis Chrysostomi*. The *Historia Lausiaca* (ed. in Latin by G. Hervetus, Paris, 1555; and by H. Rosweyde in his *Vitæ Patrum*, Antwerp, 1628) exists in two Greek recensions; the shorter and more original called *Palladii Helenopolitani Historia Lausiaca* (ed. J. Meursius, Leyden, 1616; also several recensions of the same text, known elsewhere as the *Paradisus Heraclides*), and the more comprehensive (ed. with omissions by F. Ducæus, in *Auctarium bibliothecæ patrum*, vol. iv., Paris, 1624; emended by J. Cotelerius, in *Monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ*, vol. iii., Paris, 1686; reprinted, *MPG*, xxxiv. 995–1260), interpolated with a *Historia monachorum in Ægypto*. The history is further interpolated in the Syriac recension (ed. P. Bedjan, in his *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, vol. vii., Paris, 1897), and the textual problems are still more complicated by fragments of Armenian and Coptic versions. Nevertheless, the *Historia Lausiaca* is of great value as history, for in spite of all its coloring and its exaggerations for purposes of edification, and overwhelming admiration of the ascetic fathers, there is no evidence of wilful or legendary invention, especially in view of the accurate and concrete accounts of the lives, words, and deeds of the saints described.

The "Apothegms of the Fathers," appended by Rosweyd to the *Historia* as an alphabetic monastic lexicon, are of later date and contain many apocryphal additions side by side with much genuine and ancient material. Whether the "Dialogue" (ed. E. Bigot, Paris, 1680; conveniently reprinted in *MPG*, xlvii. 5–82) was written by the Galatian Palladius who wrote the *Lausiaca* (who may not have been the same as the Helenopolitan Bishop Palladius) has been questioned. At the same time, the similarity of style and the warm admiration of the author of the *Lausiaca* for Chrysostom and Olympias are in favor of the identity of authorship, though no certain external evidence can be adduced to determine the problem. It is clear, however, that there is no basis for the hypothesis which identifies the author of the "Dialogue" with the deacon Palladius sent by Celestine I. to Ireland about 430 (see CELTIC CHURCH, I., 2, § 3).

A small treatise, *De gentibus Indiæ et de Brachmanis* (ed. Camerarius, in his *Liber gnomologicus*, Leipsic, n.d.; Bissæus, London, 1665), also ascribed to Palladius, was probably written by a later author, though the grounds for this assumption are not decisive. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A worthy addition to the literature of the Lausiac History is *The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers*, Eng. transl. from the Syriac with notes and Introduction by E. A. W. Budge, London, 1907. Consult: E. Preuschen, *Palladius und Rufinus*, Giessen, 1897; F. Lucius, in *ZKG*, vii (1885), 163 sqq.; E. Amélineau, *De historia Lausiaca*, Paris, 1887; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, pp. 217–220, Frankfort, 1897; C. Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, Cambridge, 1898; J. O. Hannay, *The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism*, pp. 277 sqq., London, 1903; *DCB*, iv. 173–176.

PALLADIUS THE DEACON: Alleged first missionary to Ireland. See CELTIC CHURCH IN BRITAIN AND IRELAND, I. 2, § 3.

PALLAVICINO, pȧl'lȧ'-vî-chî'nō **(PALLAVICINI), SFORZA:** Italian cardinal; b. at Rome Nov. 20, 1607; d. at the same place June 5, 1667. He was ordained priest in 1630, entered the Society of Jesus in 1637, and two years later was made professor of philosophy at the Jesuit College at Rome, and in 1643 became professor of theology. He took part in the congregation convened by Innocent X. to examine Jansenism, and in 1659 was created cardinal by Alexander VII., whose life he wrote. The most important of his works was the *Istoria del concilio di Trento* (2 vols., Rome, 1656–57; best later edition by F. A. Zaccaria, 6 vols., Faenza, 1792–99; Lat. transl. by G. B. Giattini, 2 vols., Antwerp, 1670). This work was inspired by Cardinal Bernardino Spada between 1651 and 1653, in part to refute the history of the same council by the Venetian Servite monk, Paolo Sarpi; and it is naturally strongly colored in the papal interest.

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For his other writings, cf. *KL*, ix. 1310–12. Interesting details are given in Ranke, *Popes*, i. 88 et passim, ii. 331, 334, 374, iii. nos. 22, 130, 165. Consult further: *The New Politick Lights of Modern Romes Church-Government, or the New Gospel according to Cardinal Palavicini Revealed . . . in his Hist. of the Council of Trent*, London, 1678, another version of which is *The Policy of Rome; or, the true Sentiments of the Court and Cardinals there concerning Religion and the Gospel*, ib. 1681.

PALLIUM: An ecclesiastical vestment, consisting of a white woolen scarf, a handbreadth wide, bearing six black crosses, either embroidered or superposed in silk. It is draped over the breast and shoulders, and is worn when the possessor is officiating pontifically. Both its origin and its significance are disputed. Some derive it from the high-priest's frontlet, or his mantle; others from the official scarf of secular dignitaries; others from the mantle of the Greeks. The mystical interpretation is most in favor, that the pallium denotes the successors of the Lord who seeks the lost sheep, and when he has found it, bears it on his shoulders. The pallium passed over from the East to the West, where the bishop of Rome bestows it on his associated metropolitans. The independent exercise of pontifical acts in his archdiocese is not lawful for the metropolitan before obtaining the pallium; though none of his rights of jurisdiction are thus forbidden, save the convening of a synod. When the pallium is conferred, the archbishop who receives it must render the usual oath of obedience to the pope. The pallium designates the supremely personal relationship of the archbishop as head of a definite ecclesiastical province; hence when a new province is acquired, a new pallium must be requested. It is not transferable and is buried with the possessor. In the papal documentary acts of bestowal, the days are indicated on which the pallium may be worn, though the pope himself wears it on all due occasions. The archbishop may wear the pallium only within his ecclesiastical province, and even there only in the churches. See AGNES, SAINT; and VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mann, *Popes*, i. 413–419; I. G. Pertsch, *De origine, usu, et auctoritate pallii archiepiscopali*, Leipsic, 1754; T. H. Passmore, *Sacred Vestments*, chap. xvii., London, 1899; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, passim, London, 1904; and the literature under VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

PALLOTTI, VINCENZO, PALLOTTINIANS: Roman Catholic priest and the order which he founded for the maintenance, extension, and promotion of Christian piety and Christian belief. Vincenzo Pallotti was born at Rome Apr. 21, 1795; d. Jan. 22, 1850, buried at Onda (10 m. w.s.w. of Castellón de la Plana), Spain. He distinguished himself early by his humility, self-abnegation, and exercise of charity, and was ordained priest in 1818. Though a secular priest, he followed the discipline and fasting of the Capuchins. After a vision in 1835, he determined, in view of the decline of the devotion to God among Christians and the enormous multitude of heathen, to found a communion which, under the guardianship of Mary, should promote the salvation of mankind to the utmost. Gregory XVI. approved the society in 1835 and granted special privileges which Pius IX. in 1847 indorsed and extended. In 1904, Pius X. approved the statutes for a period of six years.

The society comprises three classes. The first class includes common priests subject to the statutes of Pallotti, secular priests not under a vow, and lay-brethren. The members retain their private property which is administered for sacred objects. The novice pledges himself (each year temporarily until the third, and then permanently) to live in community; to poverty, celibacy, and obedience; and to remain in the communion. The object is, above all, self-sanctification, and then the dissemination of the sacraments, preaching, catechizing of boys, the conduct of public missions and exercises, the conduct of houses of discipline and retirement, and finally foreign missions. The habit is a black robe with attached mantle, to which is added, for outside use, a black outer garment and a Roman hat. The lay-brethren render a vow of celibacy to their confessor for a certain time, perform domestic tasks, attend to the instruction of boys, and render assistance in the foreign mission. At the head of the first class stands the rector-general elected for a term of three years, with reelection permissible.

The second class consists of the sisters of the apostolate who live so far as possible according to the statutes of the Pallottinians, but particularly according to the third rule of St. Francis. Their duties are the instruction of youth in schools and assistance in the foreign mission. Their number is more than 200. The third class, the so-called " Aggregated," constitute a brotherhood which any one may join who will support the order by an annual gift, or, if too poor, by his prayer for the work. Particular obligations are the special observance of the feast and octave of Epiphany in Saint Andrea della Valle in Rome; the conduct of worship and preaching in different languages; the distribution of books; the establishment of asylums for the poor and sick and the support of dependents; the provision of mission stations with tracts, devotional books, and the like; the erection and maintenance of free schools; the care of the imprisoned; and the conduct of public missions and discipline, especially for first communicants.

The Pallottinians first spread in Italy, eventually they extended to foreign fields. In 1904 there labored a total of 103 priests, 16 alumni, and 125 lay-brethren in Europe, South America, Africa, and Australia, to which 31 priests have since been added. In the German province alone there are 340 members. The first Pallottinian foreign missionaries, five in number, went, in 1890, to Kamerun (west equatorial Africa), and now there are seven stations with 4,386 communicants, 1,500 catechumens, and 1,750 children in the schools. The full name of the congregation is Congregazione e pia società dell' Apostolato cattolico sotto la protezione della regina degli Apostoli. Its organs are published at Limburg, Germany, and at Rome.

Bibliography: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 474, 484 sqq.; L. Niderberger, *Leben und Wirken . . . Vincenz Pallotti*, Limburg, 1900; *KL*, i. 1122, viii. 1600.

PALM SUNDAY. See Holy Week, §§ 2–3.

PALM-TREE. See Fruit-trees in the Old Testament, § 6.

PALM, JOHANNES HENRICUS VAN DER: Dutch Protestant; b. at Rotterdam July 17, 1763; d. at Leyden Sept. 8, 1840. He was educated at the Staten-College at Leyden (1778–84), and in 1785 was called as pastor to Maartensdijk in the province of Utrecht. On account of his participation with the so-called "Patriots" in the drill of the home-guards in preparation against the Prince of Orange and his fright at the triumph of the latter, he fled in 1787. All attempts to induce him to return failed, and in the following year, after being formally released, he was made librarian and chaplain of Baron van de Perre at Middelburg. When this city was invested by the French, Van der Palm was one of the leaders of the revolutionary movement and was appointed a member of the new government. In 1796 he was made professor of oriental languages and sciences at Leyden, but three years later resigned when appointed minister of public instruction. In this capacity he distinguished himself by energy and wisdom, and was the author of the school law of 1806. In the latter year he resumed his professorship at Leyden, where he was appointed university preacher in 1807, though not a member of the theological faculty. In 1833 he was made professor emeritus, but continued to lecture until 1838.

Van der Palm was primarily an exegete and pulpit orator. In his exegetical work he wrote especially for the educated laity, as evinced in his *Ecclesiastes philologice et critice illustratus* (Leyden, 1784); *Salomo* (3d. ed., 9 parts, Leeuwarden, 1834-1841); *Jesaias vertaald en opgehelerd* (3 parts, Amsterdam, 1805); *Bijbel voor de jeugd* (24 parts, Leyden, 1811–34); and *Liederen van David en Asaf* (1815). He likewise made a new annotated Dutch translation of the Bible (1818–30) which won much favor in Holland. As a preacher he was tasteful and sympathetic, and his style was simple though powerful, appealing both to the heart and the head. Many of his sermons, which were decidedly Evangelical, were published during his lifetime, and all were collected posthumously under the title *Al de leerredenen van J. H. van der Palm* (16 parts, Leeuwarden, 1841–45). He was a favorite orator on special occasions, his addresses being collected in *Verhandelingen, redevoeringen en losse geschriften* (5 parts, Amsterdam and Leeuwarden, 1810–46). His chief prose production was the *Geschied- en redekunstig gedenkschrift van Nederlands herstelling* (Amsterdam, 1816). (S. D. van Veen.)

Bibliography: H. F. T. Fockens, *J. H. van der Palm als Bijbeluitlegger, redenaar en schrijver*, Leyden, 1841; N. Beets, *Leven en karakter van J. H. van der Palm*, ib. 1842; C. J. van Assen, *Voorlezing over J. H. van der Palm*, Dort, 1844; B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, iii. 58–70, 's Hertogenbosch, 1856.

PALMER, BENJAMIN MORGAN: Presbyterian clergyman; b. at Charleston, S. C., Jan. 25, 1818; d. at New Orleans May 25, 1902. He was graduated at the University of Georgia (1838) and at the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C. (1841); became pastor at Savannah, Ga. (1841), Columbia, S. C. (1843), and New Orleans (1856). He was professor of church history and polity at Columbia, S. C., 1853–56; and one of the founders of *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, of which, after 1847, he was editor and contributor. He was the author of *The Life and Letters of Rev. James Henley Thornwell* (Richmond, 1875); *Sermons* (2 vols., New Orleans, 1875–76); and *The Family; in its Civil and Churchly Aspects* (New York, 1876). He was the glory of the Southern pulpit.

Bibliography: T. C. Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, Richmond, 1907.

PALMER, CHRISTIAN DAVID FRIEDRICH: German Lutheran divine; b. at Winnenden (17 m. n.e. of Stuttgart) Jan. 27, 1811; d. at Tübingen May 29, 1875. He was educated at Schönthal and Tübingen; after three years of pastoral work as an assistant in the country, he came back to the university as a lecturer (1836). In Jan., 1838, he was named assistant of the Predigerinstitut, and in the following autumn appointed second deacon of Tübingen; he was deacon at Marbach (1839–43), then returned to his former position, to be promoted in 1848 to the office of first deacon, and in 1851 to that of pastor and dean. He began his literary career soon after graduation by contributing to various periodicals. A pamphlet called forth by the Pietistic controversy, *An Freunde und Feinde des Pietismus* (1839), is deserving of mention; and he also took part vigorously in the discussions about a new liturgy and hymn-book for the church of Württemberg. He was specially interested in homiletics, in which field he issued a revised edition of the *Evangelische Homiletik* (Stuttgart, 1842), and a new and important *Evangelische Katechetik* (1844). He was chosen in 1852 to fill the chair of ethics and practical theology at Halle, which he held for nearly twenty-two years, teaching in this period nearly every branch of practical theology, as well as Protestant church law. His deep scientific interest in his subjects, his wide and varied reading, his combination of personal conviction with perfect fairness to opposing views made his lectures strikingly useful. He was rector of the university in 1857 and 1858. In spite of all his varied activities, however, he found time for much important literary work. He added to his earlier publications *Evangelische Pädagogik* (1853–54), taking a middle course between a godless pseudo-humanism and an exaggerated pietism; *Evangelische Pastoraltheologie* (1860); *Die Moral des Christenthums* (1864), a work which offers the results of thoroughly scientific thought in language free from the narrowness of theological formulæ; *Evangelische Hymnologie* (1865); two volumes of sermons, *Ein Jahrgang evangelischer Predigten* (1857), and *Predigten aus neuerer Zeit* (Tübingen, 1874); *Geistliches und Weltliches für gebildete christliche Leser* (1873). From 1856 he was one of the editors of the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*. His theological and ecclesiastical standpoint was that of the moderate school which, under Nitzsch's leadership, had its best period in his days—a sound Bible faith and an Evangelical church doctrine without narrow limitations. He was opposed to rationalism and to ecclesiastical scholasticism, and is to be counted among those who, though following Schleiermacher in the main, sought a deeper penetration into the inner meaning of Scripture and a fuller, more intense application of its teachings to human life.

(J. KNAPP†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Worte der Erinnerung an Dr. Palmer*, Tübingen, 1875; K. Weizsäcker, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, iii (1875), 353–370.

PALMER, EDWARD HENRY: English orientalist; b. at Cambridge Aug. 7, 1840; murdered by the Bedouins in the Wady Sudr, Desert of Al-Tîh, Sinaitic peninsula, Aug. 11, 1882. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1867; went with the British Ordnance Sinai Survey Expedition in 1868–69; and in 1869–70, in company with C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake, explored the Desert of Al-Tîh and Moab, having acquired perfect familiarity with the language and manners of the Bedouins. On his return he was appointed Lord Almoner's professor of Arabic at Cambridge, in 1871. At the outbreak of the war between Egypt and England in 1882, he volunteered to dissuade the Bedouins of the peninsula from rising against England and to induce them to oppose the rebels; but he and his companions were taken and shot by a force acting under the Turkish governor at Nahl. Palmer was a remarkable linguist, and performed very valuable services to literature. His works, bearing directly upon Biblical and religious studies, were, *The Negeb, or South Country of Scripture and the Desert of El Tîh* (London, 1871); *The Desert of the Exodus; Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wandering* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1871); *History of the Jewish Nation from the Earliest Times* (London, 1874); *Outline of Scripture Geography* (1874); *The Qur'ân* (1880).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Besant, *Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer*, London, 1883; *DNB*, xliii. 122–126.

PALMER, EDWIN: Church of England; b. at Mixbury (18 m. n.n.e. of Oxford), England, July 18, 1824; d. at Oxford Oct. 17, 1895. He studied at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1845; M.A., 1850; D.D., 1878); he was fellow in Balliol College, 1845–1867; philological lecturer, 1858–66; tutor, 1866–1870; became Corpus professor of the Latin language and literature in the University of Oxford, 1870–78; was ordained deacon, 1854; and priest 1868; was select preacher to the University of Oxford, 1865–66 and 1873–74; and became archdeacon of Oxford and canon of Christ Church, 1878. He wrote *Bishop Patteson, Missionary Bishop and Martyr* (London, 1872); and was a member of the New Testament Company of Revisers of the Authorized Version (1873–81; see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV. § 7). He was the editor of J. Riddell's *Apology of Plato, with English Notes* (1867); and of the *Greek Testament, with the Readings Adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version* (Oxford, 1881).

PALMER, HERBERT: b. March 29, 1601, at Wingham, County Kent, Eng.; entered St. John's College, Cambridge, March 23, 1615 (16); he took the master's degree in 1622; became fellow of Queen's College, July 17, 1623; ordained to the ministry in 1624; was made lecturer at Alphage Church, Canterbury, in 1626; removed to the vicarage of Ashwell by Archbishop Laud in 1632; and in the same year was made university preacher at Cambridge. In 1643 he was appointed a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and was chosen one of the assessors in 1646. Soon after, he became minister of Dukes-place Church, London, and was subsequently transferred to the larger field of the new church, Westminster. Apr. 11, 1644, he was made master of Queen's College, Cambridge. He died Aug. 13, 1647, in the prime of life. Palmer was a devout man, scholarly, moderate, and a powerful preacher. He was especially devoted to catechizing. He prepared several forms, the most mature of which is his *Endeavour of Making the Principles of Christian Religion, namely, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, Plaine and Easie*, 6th ed., 1645. The peculiarity of his method is a double series of answers; first, either yes or no, then a definite proposition summing up replies to several questions. This catechism became the basis of the Westminster Catechism, as the minutes of the Westminster Assembly clearly show. Palmer was chairman of the committee on the directory of worship, and the subject of catechizing was especially committed to him. He then became chairman of the committee on the catechism, and acted as such until his death, when Anthony Tuckney was appointed in his place. Palmer was also earnest for sabbath observance. He united with Daniel Cawdrey in composing one of the best works on the sabbath in existence, *Sabbatum redevivum*, London, 1645–52, 2 vols., 4to. He was a moderate Presbyterian, and hesitated about the divine right of ruling elders, and favored a presiding bishop. He was appointed by Parliament one of the Committee of Accommodation in 1645. His deep piety is manifest in his *Memorials of Godliness and Christianity,* in three parts, 1644, 11th ed., 1673, 13th, 1708, including the Christian Paradoxes, wrongly ascribed to Lord Bacon [reissued, with introduction, memoir, and notes by A. B. Grosart, with title *Lord Bacon not the Author of "The Christian Paradoxes": being a Reprint of "Memorials of Godliness and Christianity,"* Edinburgh, 1865]. This work is equal if not superior to Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living.* He frequently preached before Parliament. His sermons exhibit eloquence and power. He was an excellent linguist, especially in French and Latin, and was intrusted with drawing up the correspondence of the Westminster Assembly with the various churches of the Continent. He was a man of wealth, and used his means especially in the aid of candidates for the ministry. He was one of the noblest spirits among the Westminster divines.

C. A. BRIGGS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the memoir in Grosart, ut sup., consult: Samuel Clarke, *Lives of Thirty-two English Divines,* pp. 183–184, London, 1677; D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans,* ed. J. Toulmin, 5 vols., Bath, 1793–97; B. Brooke, *Lives of the Puritans,* iii. 75–76, London, 1813; A. F. Mitchell, *Westminster Assembly,* ib. 1883.

PALMER, RAY: Congregationalist, hymnist; b. at Little Compton, R. I., Nov. 12, 1808; d. at Newark, N. J., Mar. 29, 1887. He prepared for college at Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.; graduated from Yale College 1830; taught the higher classes in a private seminary for young ladies in New York City, 1830–31; was associated with Prof. E. A. Andrews in the New Haven (Conn.) Young Ladies' Institute, 1831; studied theology 1830–33; was pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Bath, Me., 1835–50; and of the First Congregational Church, Albany, N. Y., 1850–66; and secretary of the American Congregational Union at New York, 1866–78. He took an active interest in education and literature; and from 1878 he lived in literary retirement at Newark, N. J. For the higher periodicals he wrote many critical, philosophical, and miscellaneous articles, and made rich contributions to the leading religious papers. While he obtained eminent success in the ministry and in the general field of literature, he is best known as a hymnist. His most famous hymn, "My faith looks up to Thee," was written in 1830, and published, to the tune of "Olivet" by Lowell Mason, in 1833 in the *Book of Spiritual Songs for Social Worship;* this hymn has been translated into more than twenty languages. Besides this his "Jesus these eyes have never seen" and "Lord, Thou on earth didst love Thine own" are noteworthy. His most important books are *Spiritual Growth, or Aid to Growth in Grace* (Albany, 1839), republished and entitled *Closet Hours* (1851); *Remember Me, or The Holy Communion* (Boston, 1855); *Hints on the Formation of Religious Opinions* (New York, 1860); *Hymns and Sacred Pieces* (1864); *Hymns of my Holy Hours* (1867); *Home, or The Unlost Paradise* (1868); *Earnest Words on True Success in Life* (1873); *Complete Poetical Works* (1876); *Voices of Hope and Gladness* (1881).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns,* pp. 361–363 et passim, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology,* pp. 877–878; N. Smith, *Hymns historically Famous,* pp. 183 sqq., Chicago, 1901.

PALMER, ROUNDELL. See SELBORNE, ROUNDELL PALMER, EARL OF.

PALMYRA. See TADMOR.

PALTZ, pâlts, **JOHANN JENSER (GENSER) VON:** German Augustinian; b. probably at Palitz (s.e. of Eger, 92 m. w. of Prague), less probably at Palzem (near Saarburg, Lorraine, 40 m. e. of Nantes); d. at the monastery Mühlheim, Ehrenbreitstein, Mar. 13, 1511. In 1462 he matriculated at Erfurt, and five years later entered the Augustinian monastery of the same city. He was sent as prior to Neustadt on the Orla in 1475, and was later employed by his vicar to reform the monastery of Herzberg (1491). As visitor he restored order in the monastery of Mühlheim in 1499, and in 1505 was in Mecklenburg to promote the prosperity of the new monastery at Sternberg. After teaching for two decades at the monastery of Erfurt he was transferred, in 1507, as prior to Mühlheim. Paltz's learning and orthodoxy won recognition outside his order. He was one of the board of judges of heretics at Erfurt in 1488; and in the following year traversed Saxony, Meissen, Thuringia, and Brandenburg as a commissary of indulgences. He likewise converted many heretics in Brux, Cadan, and other cities of Bohemia; while in 1502 he was again a preacher of indulgences. During this period he collected many of his sermons under the title *Cœlifodina* (Erfurt, 1502), followed in 1504 by a *Supplementum.* He likewise wrote two tracts: *De septem foribus seu festis beatæ Virginis* (1491) and *Hortulus aromaticus gloriosæ Virginis.* A small tract, *De conceptione sive præservatione a peccato originali . . . Virginis Mariæ,* is in manuscript in the university library at Leipsic.

Paltz is important not only as representing the type of study pursued at Erfurt in the time of Luther (who was one of his pupils), but as illustrating the final development of the doctrine of indulgences, besides describing the ceremony employed in granting them. At the same time, he shows that the Augustinian order was not the home of a liberal Evangelical theology when Luther entered it, nor is the latter's attitude toward the indulgence controversy completely intelligible without a study of the *Cœlifodina.* (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. E. Kapp, *Kleine Nachlese,* iv. 424 sqq., Leipsic, 1783; T. Kolde, *Die deutsche Augustiner-Kongregation,* pp. 174 sqq., Gotha, 1879; idem, *Das religiöse Leben in Erfurt beim Ausgange des Mittelalters,* pp. 34 sqq., 54 sqq., Halle, 1893; N. Paulus, in *ZKT,* xxiii (1899), 48 sqq.; W. Köhler, *Dokumente zum Ablassstreit,* pp. 50 sqq., Tübingen, 1902; *ADB,* xxv. 112 sqq.

PAMPHILUS: Presbyter in Cæsarea; b. at Berytus, Phenicia, c. 240; d. at Cæsarea Feb. 16, 309. Of his life little is known, the comprehensive biography by Eusebius being lost. He was of noble birth and wealthy, and after studying philosophy in his native city he turned to theology and entered the catechetical school at Alexandria, attaining high renown for his zeal and learning. Later he was ordained presbyter at Cæsarea and followed in the steps of his great model, Origen. Giving all his possessions to the poor, he lived only for learning, conducting a theological school, and increasing the library left by Origen, many of whose exegetical works he himself copied. On the outbreak of the persecution by Maximinus, Pamphilus was seized, tortured, and imprisoned for two years, after which he was beheaded with eleven other martyrs.

The sole writing of Pamphilus was a defense of Origen in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth. Since this contains numerous excerpts from Origen which Pamphilus could scarcely have gathered in prison, Eusebius seems to have collected for him the material which he wove into his work, so that the product could thus be regarded as the joint work of Pamphilus and Eusebius. It was designed to refute, from Origen's own statements, the charges brought against him, but only the first book, in a garbled Latin translation by Rufinus, has survived. Besides this apology, he wrote only letters. The special attention of Pamphilus was devoted to the text of the Bible, at least so far as it had been critically edited by Origen. How far he treated the portions of the New Testament unredacted by Origen is more problematical. He may have compared the manuscripts with the statements prefixed by Origen to his exegesis; or he may merely have had those manuscripts copied which came from Origen's library and harmonized with the statements in question. One manuscript ascribes to Pamphilus an argument prefixed to Acts, which, however, is not his in its present form.

(Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: The remains of his works are collected in M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iii. 487–499, iv. 339–392, Oxford, 1846–48; *MPG*, x. 1529–58, xvii. 521–616. An Eng. transl. of a fragment, with an introduction, is in *ANF*, vi. 165–168. Early information is to be found in: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VI., xxxii. 3, VII., xxxii. 35, VIII., xiii. 6; cf. *TU*, xiv. 4 (1896), 74 sqq., xvii. 4 (1899), 13 sqq. Consult: *ASB*, Jan., i. 64 sqq.; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, ii. 242 sqq., Freiburg, 1903; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 543 sqq., ii. 2, pp. 26 sqq., 103–106 et passim; Krüger, *History*, 253–255; *DCB*, iv. 178–179.

PAMPHYLIA. See Asia Minor, VIII.

PANAGIA ("ALL-HOLY"): The usual (though not official) title of the virgin in the Greek Church; and also the later Greek designation of the consecrated bread. The latter usage is derived from the monastic custom of placing, on certain occasions, a triangular portion of the bread with a cup of wine before the icon of Mary and successively censing, elevating, dividing, and eating it. This ceremony, called "elevation of the all-holy," was performed before meals or before undertakings which required special protection. The most accessible account of the rite is in "The Great Prayer Book" of the Greek Church, pp. 584 sqq. (Venice, 1851).

(Philipp Meyer.)

PANAMA: A republic erected from one of the states of Colombia in 1903, consisting of the isthmian strip of land about 420 miles long and from 31 to 118 miles wide, extending from Costa Rica, Central America, southeast to Colombia, South America; area, 32,380 square miles; population (1909) about 419,029, including Indians. A treaty was concluded with the United States in 1904 which guaranteed the independence of the republic and in return for $10,000,000 Panama granted in perpetuity a zone of land for the construction (now in progress) and operation of a canal, of the width of ten miles, with sovereign rights within the strip. Schools are established in the larger cities. The religion of the civilized elements of the population is Roman Catholic, while the Indians are in large part still heathen. Panama is a Roman Catholic suffragan bishopric under the metropolitan of Cartagena, Colombia. Protestant missions are supported by the Jamaica Baptist Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the South American Missionary Society. These agencies report (1907) 11 missionaries, 13 stations, 493 communicants, and 993 professed Evangelical adherents.

PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD. See Lambeth Conference.

PANEGYRICON: The term applied in the Greek Church to collections of panegyrics of the saints and ecclesiastical festivals. Collections derived from the ninth century were arranged according to the days and months of the year, or on some other principle. A collection of panegyrical discourses are reckoned by Allatius and Suicerus as among the books of the Greek ritual, though it is doubtful whether this view can now be held. Collections of panegyrics have often been published; as, by M. Chrysocephalus (Vienna, n.d.), C. Daponte (Venice, 1778), and J. Kornelios (ib. 1788). These did not pass over into official usage; and lately the term Panegyricon has been applied by P. Kerameus ("Jerusalem Library," iv. 208–212, 1899) to collections of ancient spiritual addresses, some of which are not panegyric in character.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, consult Index; Leo Allatius, *De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis Græcorum*, pp. 93–94, Paris, 1646; R. Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*, pp. 344–345, Leipsic, 1885.

PANIS LITERÆ: An order ("bread certificate") to a spiritual institution to take a certain person under its charge for subsistence. The existence of such benefices sprang from the same source as the ancient right of secular persons of rank to entertainment in cloisters and ecclesiastical foundations during their journeys (S. Sugenheim, *Staatsleben des Klerus im Mittelalter*, i. 361 sqq., Berlin, 1839). The distribution of such bread benefices prevailed throughout Europe. E. Sehling.

PANORMITANUS: The name usually applied to Nicholas de Tudeschis, archbishop of Palermo; b. at Catania, Sicily (31 m. n.n.w. of Syracuse) in 1386; d. at Palermo Feb. 24, 1445. In 1400 he entered the Benedictine order and in 1405 or 1406 betook himself for study to Bologna, where he devoted himself to the subject of canon law under the direction of the celebrated Franciscus Zabarella, which subject he then taught at Parma, Siena, and at Bologna. In 1425, Pope Martin V. bestowed on him the abbey of Maniacum, in the diocese of Messina; and Nicholas was afterward commonly called *abbas*, or even *abbas recentior* (in distinction from *abbas antiquus*). In 1433, the pope summoned him to Rome, and promoted him as auditor of the Rota Romana and referendarius apostolicus; but the next year he entered the service of King Alphonso V. of Sicily, as consiliarius; and became archbishop of Palermo in 1435. The king sent him as royal legate to the Council of Basel, where Nicholas supported Pope Eugenius IV. In 1440, he was advanced by Felix V. to the rank of cardinal, whose cause against Eugenius he advocated until his death.

As canonist, and especially by reason of his "Comments," Panormitanus won just renown, and obtained the honorable appellation of "lamp of the law." (E. Sehling.)

Bibliography: J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Litteratur des canonischen Rechts*, ii. 312–313, Stuttgart, 1877; G. M. Mira, *Bibliografia siciliana*, pp. 397 sqq., 2 vols., Palermo, 1873–81; R. Sabbadini, *Storia documentata della . . . università di Catania*, pp. 10 sqq., Catania, 1898; E. Seckel, *Beiträge zur Geschichte beider Rechte im Mittelalter*, vol. i., Tübingen, 1898; *KL*, ix. 340.

PANTÆNUS: Presbyter and first teacher of the catechetical school of Alexandria; d. before 200. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, V., x.) speaks of him as a worthy man and zealous missionary, who extended his travels to "India" (by which South Arabia is meant), where he found disciples of Bartholomew in possession of the Gospel of Matthew. He had been trained under the Stoics, and under Commodus, after 180, he was at the head of the Alexandrian school. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, V., xi. 2, VI., xiii. 2) further says that Clement of Alexandria, in his *Hypotyposes*, claims Pantænus for his teacher, and understands that Clement means Pantænus when in his *Stromata* (I., i. 11) he calls one of his teachers "the Sicilian bee" (without giving his name) because he "gathered the spoil of the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow, and engendered in the souls of his hearers pure honey of knowledge." If Clement here refers to the birthplace of Pantænus, the statement of Philip Sidetes that he was born at Athens can hardly be credited. Since Clement still further speaks of Pantænus as "that spirit full of grace" (*Stromata*, I., i. 14) who seems to have passed away, the death of Pantænus must have occurred before 200. Eusebius cites also a letter of Alexander of Jerusalem as referring to Pantænus (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., xiv. 8), and notes references to him by Origen and Pamphilus. The tradition that Pantænus wrote many commentaries hardly represents the facts given by Eusebius. (G. Krüger.)

Bibliography: Fragments are collected in J. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i. 373–383, and *MPG*, v. 1327–32, and translated in *ANF*, viii. 777. Consult: Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, xxxvi.; T. Zahn, *Forschungen*, iii. 156–176, Erlangen, 1884; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, ii. 13–15, Freiburg, 1903; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 291–296, ii. 2, passim; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 559–560; Krüger, *History*, p. 162; *DCB*, iv. 181–184. Further literature is indicated in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 115–116.

PANTALEON, SAINT. See Helpers in Need.

PANTHEISM.

Definition and Character (§ 1).
Hylozoistic and Stoic Types (§ 2).
Eleatic Pantheism (§ 3).
Spinoza (§ 4).
Kant and Fichte (§ 5).
Schelling's Pantheism (§ 6).
Hegel and Schleiermacher (§ 7).
Evolutionistic, Emanationistic, and Scholastic Pantheism (§ 8).
English and American Pantheistic Thought (§ 9).

1. Definition and Character.

The theory of the identity of the Godhead with the All, or the universe, is very old, occurring (although in an undeveloped form) in extremely ancient speculations both eastern and western. The name is comparatively modern, being used for the first time, so far as is known, in Toland's *Socinianism Truly Stated* (1705). Since that time it has been employed in contradistinction to Theism (q.v.), which accepts the personality of God and his necessary connection with the world, and even to Deism (q.v.), although, like the latter, it conceives of God as impersonal and rejects the idea of a revelation in the narrower sense. All pantheism is monism; but monism includes more than pantheism. Owing to the difficulty of reaching a satisfactory final definition of pantheism, it has been usual to qualify the term by a variety of predicates expressing various aspects of it. Thus there is a materialistic pantheism, taught especially by Frenchmen of the school of Holbach, but including also the hylozoistic views of the ancients, particularly the Stoics (see Stoicism); a cosmological pantheism, found in the Eleatic school, but including the doctrine of emanation in other forms; a psychological pantheism, according to which God is the soul of the world, though the content of the universe is not exhausted by the idea of God. An attempt has been made to go further and classify the pantheism of Spinoza as ontological, of Fichte as ethical, of Schelling and Hegel as logical; and on this basis it would be necessary to make still another class, the mystical pantheism of Eckhart and his school. But all these divisions are only partial and transient; the pantheism, e.g., of the Eleatic school might as well, if not better, be described as ontological instead of cosmological.

2. Hylozoistic and Stoic Types.

In a historical survey, the materialistic view, in so far as it is pantheistic, appears as the simplest and most unreflecting. A tendency to pantheism shows itself among the hylozoists. They assume a principle the various permutations of which constitute the individual objects of the universe; and although this is not definitely called God by them, yet the expressions of Thales and Anaximander point in that direction. A more decided pantheism appears in Heraclitus, whose primitive substance, the eternal living fire, is evidently conceived as equivalent to the Godhead, although he seldom speaks definitely of the latter. This sort of pantheism meets with the difficulty of explaining how, while all particulars are but permutations of the Fire-Logos and are under the general law of the universe, yet most of them are irrational. Heraclitus gives no adequate answer to this difficulty. The solution later attempted by the Stoics and Neoplatonists, that the harmony of the universe includes evil as the complement of good, just as the shadow goes with the light, may be traced in his doctrine of harmony, which, however, he does not apply to the ethical and intellectual declension of mankind. In fundamental agreement with the hylozoists was Diogenes of Apollonia, who set up his monism possibly in conscious opposition to the dualism of Anaxagoras. According to him the primal matter is air; this, which rules all things, he plainly calls God. It is omnipresent; not a thing exists which has no part in it, though all do not partake of it equally. Pantheism finds definite expression with the Stoics, who in the physical department followed Heraclitus in the main, asserting an organic or dynamic materialism in contrast with the mechanical materialism of Democritus and Epicurus. The primal matter, the Godhead or the divine fire, changes, in order to the creation of worlds, into air and water, and a part of the latter again into earth. In the process of creation and development fire and air are the more active elements, water and earth the passive—so that at times the Stoics almost seem to fall into the Platonic-Aristotelian antithesis of matter and form, i.e., into dualism; but this is really not the case. When, after Marcus Aurelius, Stoicism became extinct as a school, some of its teachings (as that of the *rationes seminales*, with which the *lumen naturale* is connected) had a continued existence in Christianity, and also exercised some influence on the development of philosophy. A connection may be traced with Toland, who in his *Pantheisticon* (1720) sketched a pantheistic religion of the future, with a cultus of truth, freedom, and sanity, and in his *Letters to Serena* (1704) taught a hylozoistic pantheism with many reminiscences of Stoicism. Matter is not inactive, but endowed with motion; thus there is no need of an external power to produce particular phenomena, nor of a soul as distinct from the body. The particular originated from the whole, and this whole is one, infinite, and rational. The law of nature, the soul of the world, is God, but not to be separated from the universe any more than the human soul from the human body.

3. Eleatic Pantheism.

In contrast with the form of pantheism hitherto considered, in which matter is living, in fact generally rational life, stands the form marked by a belief in rigid, lifeless matter, which first shows itself clearly in the Eleatic school. Xenophanes was the first Greek philosopher who decidedly and explicitly taught monotheism, rejecting all anthropomorphic conceptions of the Godhead, with which he identified the universe; according to Aristotle, "looking out upon the whole world, he said that the One was God." This Godhead exists absolutely without beginning, fills all space, and knows no motion or change. The formula *hen kai pan* ("One and All"), or more properly *to pan hen* ("All is One"), though often quoted as a characteristic expression of pantheism, is not so, strictly speaking, as it makes no mention of God; but that Xenophanes identified this All-One with the Godhead is expressly attested by Theophrastus. As much can not be said of Parmenides, who insisted strongly on the unity of abstract being and denied the real existence of anything outside of it. Of his All he predicates the following qualities: it is without beginning and indestructible; it is a whole, a unit, without motion and without end; it was not and will not be, but is continuously, always like itself and everywhere the same; being can not be attributed to any one part of it more than to another. It is thus evident that Parmenides' conception of being was material and limited, almost corporeal; that he was a monist or a materialist, though not perhaps in the usual sense, but hardly with strictness to be called a pantheist. And it is all the more remarkable that God is never mentioned in the extant fragments of his works, because he assuredly knew the poems of Xenophanes, his predecessor in the doctrine of the All-One, which are full of references to the Divinity. The same omission is noticeable in Melissus, the last of the Eleatic school; in both the Godhead is absolutely equivalent to that which is, so that it is possible to call them pantheists, laying due stress on the absence of the religious coloring which appears in the thought of Xenophanes. Owing to their fundamental belief in the immobility of the All, there was no room in the teaching of the Eleatics for development after it had received its definite shape with Parmenides. At most their belief in unity and immobility was capable of being carried out in an opposition to the knowledge of the world of phenomena, as with Plato, with whom, to be sure, the unity was forced soon to resolve itself into plurality. Nor could it logically lead to any ethical teaching, since the individual was incapable of assuming a position apart from the All, such as would be necessary to any moral action. The teaching of the Megarian school, undoubtedly based on that of the Eleatic, can not be regarded as a further development of it, but is marked by a mere change, under the influence of the Socratic ethics, in the designation of the One, which Euclid called "the Good," "intelligence," "God," "reason."

4. Spinoza.

There is a certain resemblance between the Eleatic philosophy and the monism of Spinoza, with whom substance is the only thing that really exists. It can thus only be one, and may be designated equally well as God or nature. Since everything is either extended and external or spiritual and internal, these are the two forms in which the eternal Being comes to our consciousness. Theoretically there are endless attributes of substance or God, from the postulate of infinity; but extension and thought are the only ones cognizable. Thus is set aside the dualism of Descartes, who assumed the existence of two distinct substances in the world of phenomena, the extended and the thinking, and placed above them God as the creator. Particular things were for Spinoza only forms or modes of these attributes. Each mode is such in both attributes at once; thus man on his bodily side is a mode of extension, on his mental a mode of thought. The strictly mathematical and eternal deduction of all things from God does not, indeed, explain actuality. This is the great difficulty of most metaphysical systems, which are unable to explain how becoming arises out of being—one which Spinoza's intellectual kinsmen of the Eleatic school did not touch, as they opposed nothing but deceptive appearance to being. According to Spinoza there can not really be any becoming or true motion, nor any really operative cause; yet he calls God the first cause of the universe, the origin and preserver of all things—but an immanent, not a transcendent cause. Everything in the world is determinate, including man; and even God himself is determined by the necessity of his own being and can not voluntarily do anything or leave it undone. His freedom consists in the fact that he is determined only by himself. And not only is it impossible to predicate understanding and will of God, but he has also no individual existence, since this would constitute a limitation, and every limitation is a negation, which can not apply to God. It follows from the divine infinitude that everything which is, the attributes as well as all their modes, is in God. Thus Spinoza is neither a materialist nor a spiritualist, but both at once; he is not an atheist nor an acosmist (as he has been called), but in the strict sense of the word a pantheist. The task which had been impossible for the Eleatic school, the establishment of a system of ethics, became Spinoza's principal aim. In his greatest work he begins, indeed, with the definition of God, but gives it there because God must be known in order that man may be freed from his passions and able to attain happiness. When man understands that all depends, in an unchangeable order, upon God, that nothing exists for itself but all alike rest in God, he will no longer be disturbed by external happenings or carried away by his passions. The perfection of man lies in his realization of himself and all things in God; and this brings joy with it, joy based on the intellectual love for God which is the mystical cornerstone of Spinoza's system. The doctrine of the *modi* allowed him to develop an ethical system; particular things, although they have no independent existence, yet, as individualistic elements within his monism, possess a sort of nature of their own by virtue of which men are subject to conditions of passion that must be suppressed before they can find their perfection in God.

5. Kant and Fichte.

The pantheism of Spinoza was bitterly attacked until late in the eighteenth century, and it was long before any one came forward to defend him from the common accusation of atheism; but in consequence of the controversy between Jacobi and Mendelssohn as to the Spinozism of Lessing a reaction took place which resulted in his being highly honored. Herder, and later Voigtländer, even undertook to prove that he was not a pantheist but a theist, although of course without success. Kant's critical system was intended to turn definitely away from pantheism and show no connection with Spinoza. Reason, he asserted, is bound to believe in a God, in a cause of all nature which is itself distinct from nature, satisfying the moral sense and possessing intelligence and will. But there is not a little in his philosophy that lends it a pantheistic coloring. This is particularly noticeable in his ethics. According to him the practical reason gives the moral laws; this reason is that of men, and of all men, or moral laws could have no universal validity. Man is thus autonomous, the lawgiver in the practical field. Religion comes into existence only when duties, which are the commands of reason, are recognized as commands of God. Then the same laws take their origin alike from our reason and from God; but there can not be two sources of law; therefore reason must also be God. The idealistic systems which followed Kant have been called more or less pantheistic; but they get this quality less from Kant than from Spinoza, like whom they regard the whole content of being as the essence of the absolute or the divine. Spinoza's influence was probably least felt by Fichte, who, however, in his treatise *Ueber den Grund unseres Glaubens an eine göttliche Weltregierung* (1798) gives utterance to a sort of pantheism when he says that the living moral order is God; that man needs, and can conceive, no other; that the notion of God as a separate substance is impossible and unthinkable. Every individual has a destined place in this world-order, i.e., in God. In his doctrine of the Ego, connected with Kant's transcendental apperception, the absolute Ego from which what is individual must be deduced is equivalent to the Godhead; and later, as in his *Anweisung zum seligen Leben* (1806), the absolute is the general point of departure of his speculation. Here God is the alone really Existent, who through his absolute thought places external nature, as an unreal non-Ego, over against himself.

6. Schelling's Pantheism.

Starting from Fichte's doctrine of the Ego, Schelling transformed it by combination with Spinozism into his system of identity. Spinoza's doctrine of the immobility of substance was thrown into the background by his conception of development. Object and subject, real and ideal, nature and spirit are for him identical in something higher, which is neither subject nor object, nor both together, but absolute identity as the principle of true idealism. This original unity passes into the polar opposites of positive or ideal and negative or real being. The negative or real pole is nature, in which resides a vital principle, uniting, by virtue of a general continuity of all natural causes, all organic and inorganic existences in one complete organism. Schelling terms this vital principle the soul of the world. History, like nature, forms a complete whole; and in both it is possible to recognize the gradual revelation of the absolute. Pantheism appears also in Schelling's later views, as set forth in the *Philosophische Untersuchungen über die menschliche Freiheit* (1809). Following here the lead of Jacob Boehme, he distinguishes in God three *momenta:* indifference, the primordial basis or " abyss " of the divine nature; differentiation into cause and existence; and the identity or reconciliation of the differentiated. Unity of the particular will with the universal will is goodness; separation of the two is evil. Man is the redeemer of nature, through whose mediation God receives nature and makes it divine.

In Hegel the influence of Spinoza is less appar-

7. Hegel and Schleiermacher.

ent, but pantheism is more evident, in spite of his objection to the name. The self-development of the absolute is the self-development of God. The absolute reason externalizes itself in nature; but this self-estrangement, this becoming other, which is in a sense a declension, is a necessary stage to the return into itself in spirit. The divine idea is distinguished into three forms: (1) being eternally in and with itself, the form of universality, God in his eternal idea in and for himself, the kingdom of the Father; (2) the form of manifestation, of particularization, Being-for-other in physical nature and in the finite spirit, the eternal idea of God in the element of consciousness and mental representation, the kingdom of the Son; and (3) the form of return out of manifestation into self, the process of reconciliation, the Idea in the sphere of the religious community or the kingdom of the Spirit. It is easy to see from this how the followers of Hegel split into right and left wings, the former regarding theism as supported by his teaching and yielding more or less assent to Christian doctrines, while the latter laid stress on his conception of God as the eternal and universal substance, coming first to self-consciousness in humanity, and thus followed Hegel as a pantheist. The next speculative philosopher with a pantheistic trend is Schleiermacher, who, like Spinoza, finds the infinite (God) in the midst of the finite, to which he attributes objective reality. The totality of all existing things is the world; the unity of the universe is the Deity. He is not identical with the world, but can not be separated from it. In contrast with Spinoza, Schleiermacher emphasizes the dignity of the individual, which weakens the effect of his pantheism, and acknowledges a living God instead of a lifeless and immovable one, though he does not reach the conception of a personal God.

8. Evolutionistic, Emanationistic, and Scholastic Pantheism.

A marked distinction exists between the doctrine of Evolution (q.v.), which characterizes the materialistic pantheism originating with the hylozoists and the later followers of the Eleatic school, and the doctrine of Emanation (q.v.). In the former the whole principle is included in the development and a progress from less to more perfect is usually assumed; in the latter, the principle remains unchanged in its unity and allows the universe to stream forth from it, becoming in successive stages less perfect. But the emanationist systems are to be called pantheist in so far as they assume that all things were originally contained in God. A brief survey of them is therefore in order. Such pantheism as is found in India is mostly connected with the idea of emanation. The expressions of the Upanishads as to Brahma, the only absolutely existing One, The Atman, the nucleus of all being, are distinctly pantheistic, but are not brought into relation in a logical system. Among the Greeks the Neoplatonists taught emanation definitely, regarding the highest principle, the One, as over-full, so that it is forced to overflow without any breach of continuity. In their doctrine of reabsorption into the One as the highest goal of human endeavor a pantheistic tendency is clearly visible. Following out Neoplatonist ideas, the pseudo-Dionysius, while he does not definitely teach emanation, is distinctly pantheistic; and, influenced by both these sources, Scotus Erigena reached a still more complete pantheism. His twofold process, first of analysis, or the descent from the universal to the particular, the proceeding of all things from God the highest principle, and then of reversion or deification, the return through the assembling of individuals into classes until the simplest unity is once more reached in God, shows a wide departure from the doctrine of the Neoplatonists, especially Proclus. In Proclus the end of the process is the extreme of distance from the source; in Erigena God is not only the beginning but the middle and the end. Yet he remains unmingled in his own essence, at once immanent in the world and transcendent. Numerous pantheistic ideas run through the heresies and the mysticism of the Middle Ages, largely drawn from Erigena (see Scotus Erigena, Johannes), who specially influenced Amalric of Bena (q.v.), the teacher of the identity of the Creator and the creation. David of Dinant (q.v.) taught that there was only one substance of all bodies and all souls, God himself. The Church took strong measures against such teachings, and condemned a large number of propositions from the writings of the famous mystic Eckhart (q.v.), tending in the same direction. There is much in common between him and Nicholas of Cusa (see Cusa, Nicholas of), who combined the most various ideas and interests and contrived to hold the doctrine of the creation of the world together with pantheistic beliefs, such as that God comprehends all things in himself, even opposites, and that God with his being and his power is everywhere present in the animate, ordered totality of the universe, so that everything in its species has a certain perfection. Nicholas had no slight influence on the development of philosophy, though not so much as Giordano Bruno (q.v.), who depended on him in numerous points. Traces of Bruno's influence are found in both Spinoza and Leibnitz; but he was too much of an eclectic to put together a well-rounded and consistent system. Although he allowed individualism its place, his pantheism is a good deal like that of the Stoics. Space fails for the examination of theistic views with a partially pantheistic coloring, among which might be named those of Plato and Aristotle in the earlier time and of the occasionalist school in the later. Even in Leibnitz (q.v.), thorough individualist though he was, there are traces of the same thing—as when he calls God the "center everywhere" and conceives the single monads as an *effulguration* of the Godhead. This only shows how difficult it is, without going into avowed dualism, to exclude pantheism altogether; and in fact, while complete pantheism may not be tenable, the deeper Christian consciousness can not forget the two propositions that in God we live and move and have our being, and that God is in us.

(M. Heinze†.)

While a thorough-going pantheism has been precluded among English and American thinkers by a practical, common-sense quality of mind, yet it has appeared in a veiled or partial form in several connections.

9. English and American Pantheistic Thought.

(1) Calvinism (q.v.) has provided a congenial soil for its growth. Essentially pantheistic elements are found in its thought of God—his absolute sovereignty and his will as the ultimate cause of all. It is also pantheistic whenever it has identified providential conservation with continuous creation of the world, and has denied the will as the cause of its own action. It is significant that Jonathan Edwards' early notes on the mind, in which he advocates an absolute monism, bear fruit in two of his most mature essays, on *Original Sin* and on the *Freedom of the Will*. In Emmons this position is pushed to its extreme limits in his doctrine of the divine efficiency. Until a recent period the same principle underlay the doctrine of election, sin, and regeneration in the Congregational, Baptist, and Presbyterian teachings of Great Britain and America (cf. *The Westminster Confession;* A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, New York, 1878; W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ib., 1888. W. Hastie, *The Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles*, Edinburgh, 1904). (2) In its earliest emergence as a modern movement Universalism (q.v.) sprang from the same postulates as Calvinism, excepting that its doctrine of election and atonement was universal instead of partial. And even now, wherever the "larger hope" rises to dogmatic assertion its background is pantheistic. (3) So-called Ethical Monism has been advocated on two principles: metaphysical, a Logos doctrine in which the immanent, universal, omnipotent, and indestructible energy of God is affirmed; ethical, according to which the human will is free to realize or to reject its responsible ideals. In the actual treatment of these elements, however, the result is not unity but the ancient dualism (cf. A. H. Strong, *Christ and the Creation and Ethical Monism*, Philadelphia, 1899; idem, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., ib. 1907–09). (4) In the philosophy of religion the Cairds have developed a doctrine of God by the aid of the Hegelian metaphysics (cf. Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*). Reality as a whole is an organic unity, the several moments of which are God, nature, and the finite mind. On the one hand, the absolute Spirit is presupposed in all finite existences, and, on the other hand, as the idea of the Infinite contains in it the idea of the finite, so the real Infinite contains the existence of the finite. Thus while the finite will is absolutely dependent on God, it is characterized by a relative independence by which it may both deny all purely finite, individual interests and aims and identify itself absolutely with the Universal Will or God (cf. J. Caird, *Philosophy of Religion*, New York, 1881; E. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, ib. 1893; J. Watson, *Philosophical Basis of Religion*, ib. 1908). (5) In the idealistic monism of Josiah Royce, the fundamental propositions are that the Absolute Reality is an absolutely organized experience to which finite experience is related as fragments to an organic whole. Accordingly, the divine self-consciousness is constantly inclusive of the human self-consciousness, and the individual self is an identical part of the all-embracing divine will, sustaining toward it a relation not unlike the elements of the individual consciousness to the consciousness itself. The reality thus postulated is not baldly pantheistic, since it is not unconscious, nor the Spinozistic substance, nor an ineffable mystery. The difficulties which confront this particular form of theistic pantheism center in its doctrine of the personality of God, of the world—whether it is in a true sense other than God, of a moral order in which evil and sin are real or only illusory, and of a city of God in which selves are personal and free (J. Royce, *The Conception of God*, New York, 1893; idem, *The World and the Individual*, ib. 1899–1901; cf. also F. H. Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, London, 1893; A. E. Taylor, *Metaphysics*, New York, 1907). (6) In literature as in religion a pantheistic tendency has gone hand in hand with mysticism. Since Goethe and the birth of romanticism, it has been represented by Coleridge, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Arnold, Emerson, and Carlyle.

C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: For the pantheism of India consult the literature under BRAHMANISM; BUDDHISM; INDIA; HINDUISM. For pantheism in the West consult the works on the history of philosophy by J. E. Erdmann, 3 vols., London, 1892–98; W. Windelband, New York, 1893; F. Ueberweg, ed. Heinse, 4 vols., Berlin, 1901–05. Also the following: G. B. Jasche, *Der Pantheismus nach seinen verschiedenen Hauptformen, seinem Ursprung und Fortgange, seinem spekulativen und praktischen Wert und Gehalt*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1826–32; F. W. Richter, *Ueber Pantheismus und Pantheismusfurcht, eine historisch-philosophische Abhandlung*, Leipsic, 1841; T. B. Mayer, *Theismus und Pantheismus mit besonderer Rücksicht auf praktische Fragen*, Freiburg, 1849; E. Boehmer, *De pantheismi nominis origine et usu notione*, Halle, 1851; J. Buchanan, *Modern Atheism under its Forms of Pantheism*, etc., Boston, 1856; G. Weissenborn, *Vorlesungen über Pantheismus und Theismus*, Marburg, 1859; E. Saisset, *Manual of Modern Pantheism*, Edinburgh, 1862; M. Dix, *Lectures on the Pantheistic Idea of an Impersonal Substance-Deity*, New York, 1864; F. P. Cobbe, *Studies New and Old*, London, 1865; W. H. Mill, *Pantheistic Principles*, London, 1866; T. B. Fellens, *Le Pantheisme; principe de la morale universelle*, Paris, 1873; A. Jundt, *Hist. du panthéisme populaire au moyen âge*, Paris, 1875; J. A. Picton, *The Mystery of Matter*, London, 1878; G. Späth, *Theismus und Pantheismus*, Oldenberg, 1878; W. Weesenberg, *Theismus und Pantheismus*, Vienna, 1880; W. Driesenberg, *Theismus und Pantheismus. Eine philosophische Untersuchung*, Vienna, 1880; G. E. Plumptre, *General Sketch of the History of Pantheism*, 2 vols., London, 1881; S. Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development of Religious Belief*, London, 1884; J. Hunt, *Essay on Pantheism*, London, 1884; idem, *Pantheism and Christianity*, ib. 1884; G. M. Schuler, *Der Pantheismus*, Würzburg, 1884; R. Flint, *Anti-Theistic Theories*, Edinburgh, 1885; T. Desdouits, *Le Panthéisme*, Paris, 1897; B. Galleth, *Panteismo*, Palermo, 1897; W. Dilthey, in *Archiv für Geschichte und Philosophie*, xiii (1900), 307–360, 445–482; J. A. Picton, *Pantheism, its Story and Significance*, London, 1905; P. Paulsen, *Der moderne Pantheismus und die christliche Weltanschauung*, Halle, 1906.

PAPAL STATES.

Church Estates Prior to Pippin (§ 1).
The Donation of Pippin (§ 2).
The Donation of Charlemagne (§ 3).
Curtailment of Papal Domains (§ 4).
The Final Stages (§ 5).

The original meaning of *patrimonium* was "patrimonial estate," and *patrimonium beati Petri* meant the possessions of the Church until at least the twelfth century, at which time the pope assumed or claimed sovereign rights over the region known in the eighth century as the *ducatus Romanus*, and in the ninth to the eleventh as the *terra* (*territorium*) *Petri*, to which the term in question was then applied. In the thirteenth century the term covered all which became the " States of the Church."

1. Church Estates Prior to Pippin.

By Constantine's Edict of Milan of 321 the Church was enabled to hold property, and from that time its possessions rapidly increased, the estates being in all Italy, Sicily, Corsica, Sardinia, Dalmatia, Gaul, and Africa, each estate being administered by a Roman cleric as rector. Through these estates the Church was the principal landowner and the chief financial force in Italy. But in the eighth century, through political misfortunes, a great part of these possessions were lost, and out of what remained in central Italy the *patrimonium Petri* was constituted. The political situation of the papacy was critical. With the Byzantine emperor the Church was at odds both on account of the Monothelitic and the image controversies (see MONOTHELITES; IMAGES AND IMAGE WORSHIP, II.), and through this very disagreement the Church had lost its most valuable possession. The result was that the Church managed its estates near Rome with the greater care as a sure source of income. In this patrimony the pope was already master in the eighth century, though the emperor remained for some time nominal sovereign. Such popes as Gregory II. and III. (qq.v.) not only admitted but emphasized this on occasion, as when they were assailed by the Lombards. At the beginning of the eighth century Liutprand as king of the Lombards had overthrown the duchies and had formed a strong foreign policy; the popes then found themselves in a difficult situation, and the spiritual means employed by them had but transient results. When Gregory III. stirred up the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento against Liutprand, the latter beat them both and assailed Rome; the appeal to Charles Martel had no results; but the effects of the diplomacy of Pope Zacharias (741–752) were not only the recovery of many estates but the acquisition of four places in Tuscany. The pope received these as " donations," and no account was taken of the Byzantine emperor as sovereign; the former assumed the rights which formerly had belonged to the emperor. This is recognized as the time when the pope was first regarded as a temporal sovereign and political power; this is the prime significance of the " donation " of Liutprand. Of course the action of Liutprand was not inspired by love of the pope. His attack on Ravenna may be taken to indicate that he supposed that Zacharias had been obligated to give him a free hand against that city; but he must have seen that he had deceived himself as soon as he undertook a campaign against the exarchs, upon which Zacharias remonstrated in the name of the emperor. When Aistulf succeeded Liutprand in 749 as king of the Lombards, the papal diplomacy ceased to be effective, and Aistulf took Ravenna and essayed to annex the whole *ducatus Romanus*.

2. The Donation of Pippin.

When Aistulf stretched out his hand against the Roman duchy, in 752, Stephen (II.) III. (q.v.) turned to Pippin, and there followed the celebrated meeting at Ponthion and Kiersy, the result of which, according to the papal claims, was not merely protection from Aistulf and restitution of the property wrested from the Church, but the so-called donation of Pippin, the documentary proofs for which are practically confined to the *Liber pontificalis* in the *Vitæ* of Stephen II. and Hadrian I. The " life " of Stephen reports an oath by Pippin to restore the exarchy of Ravenna and accompanying rights to the pope, the nobles being obligated to carry out this arrangement. Indefiniteness characterizes the terms used, and the Byzantine emperor is ignored; practically the engagement was for Pippin to help the pope to win back his rights. The " life " of Hadrian adds a special promise given at Kiersy to the same purport as that by Charlemagne in 774. The comprehensiveness of this engagement has long made the account of it the object of attack as spurious, though in modern times it has been stoutly defended. The defenders assume an agreement to divide, in case of victory over the Lombards, the territory thus gained between the pope and Pippin; but no direct evidence is given that such an arrangement was made to divide a yet unconquered territory, and the matter must remain under suspicion. The pope had other cares than the increase of property; he was concerned with salvation from external danger, and it is doubtful whether Pippin thought of the overthrow of the kingdom of the Lombards, since the era of French world politics began with Charlemagne. The complaints of the pope (in the *Codex Carolinus*) are specific, and look to the restitution of certain definite domains, namely, the cities of Faenza, Imola, Ferrara, and Bologna in the north, and Osimo, Ancona, and Umana in the south. The region affected by the treaty of peace of 754–756 and given over to the Roman Church included apparently four districts: Rome with its *ducatus*, Southern Tuscany, the duchy of Perugia, and Northern Campania (L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i. 478, 493, Paris, 1886). Here the popes appear as sovereign, indicate the policies, name office-holders and judges, call out the armed forces; but there is a sort of recognition of Pippin and his successors as overlords, who are called at Ponthion *patricii* of the new republic, though the meaning of this title is debated. It was borne by the exarch of Ravenna, at Rome it conveyed the idea of supreme rights, also of the deputy of the emperor; Hadrian I. welcomed Charlemagne by this title. Moreover, the popes regarded the emperor as their overlord, and dated their documents by the regnal year of the emperor. Yet the title took on a different content, and came to convey the idea rather of duties than of rights, especially the duty of protecting the popes against the Lombards.

Pippin died 768; in the ensuing contest between Charlemagne and the Lombard Desiderius Hadrian I. took the side of Charlemagne; Desiderius assailed the exarch, took a number of cities, and marched on Rome. The pope bade the Frankish king come to the help of the oppressed Church of

God, but says nothing of the restoration of an agreement regarding the division of territory.

3. The Donation of Charlemagne.

The situation of 752 is repeated in 773, when Hadrian needed to be saved by Charlemagne as Stephen II. needed help from Pippin. So in later correspondence the pope speaks of the restoration of the duchy of Spoleto, and of the possession by Leo, archbishop of Ravenna, of part of the exarchy, especially the cities Imola and Bologna, Spoleto having, in 773, put itself under the pope of its own accord. While the pope was recognized as sovereign in Spoleto, 774–775, in January of 776 Charlemagne was so recognized; in other words, within the assumed " donation of Pippin " Charlemagne is evident as lord. A developed political situation appears later, when, in 787, he yielded to his ally the pope several cities of Lombardic Tuscany and of the duchy of Beneventum, though a great part of this donation was never realized, since under the stress of a severe campaign with Greek South Italy Charlemagne became reconciled with Duke Grimoald of Beneventum, and left him in peaceable possession of the greatest part of the territory given to the pope. The complaints of Hadrian from this period relate to the non-fulfilment of this promise. But through this donation the territory of the " sacred republic of the Roman Church of God " was actually enlarged, and cities like Viterbo, Toscanella, Soana, Orvieto, and others to the south came into possession of the Church. But the question arises how it is that the biography of Hadrian mentions so frequently the donation, in spite of the fact that such a donation was not realized. It must be recalled that this was the period when the story of the Donation of Constantine (q.v.) was fabricated, and Hadrian knew of the document containing it (*Carolinæ epistolæ*, lxi.). The " donation " fixed the political program of the Curia as that which seemed attainable. Yet the Curia met with little success from Charlemagne, who, on the basis of the title of patricius, both directed the external policy of the " Roman republic," and seized upon control in internal matters. The difficult position in which Leo III. (q.v.) found himself enhanced this assumption of power. The fact that Leo sent the keys to Charlemagne and begged him to receive the oath of allegiance of his Roman subject sets forth with lucidity the relation which the Frankish king sustained to the " republic." It was only a natural consequence of this that on Dec. 23, 800, Charlemagne sat in judgment above the lord of that republic, and the reception of the crown on Dec. 25 did not alter at all this situation; the new title of emperor perhaps only emphasized what was already known—the dependence of the pope upon the Frankish king.

After the death of Charlemagne the relation of the emperor to the " Roman republic " changed. While many compacts were entered into between pope and emperor, the reports regarding them are not extant and but little is known. That of the year 817 is important, referring as it does to the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily as gifts of Charlemagne, according to the so-called *Ludovicianum*. But this reference is not trustworthy.

4. Curtailment of Papal Domains.

Louis the Pious was intent upon maintaining the earlier relationship, and in 824 sent his son Lothair I. to Rome to remind the new Pope Eugene II. of his relations as feudal subject. An important document was the *Constitutio Romana* of Nov., 824, which not only arranged for the selection of the pope but for the relationship of the emperor and the " republic." Imperial delegates were with the papal to have oversight of the conduct of the business of the republic, and the names of judges and officers were to be reported to the emperor. But the victory of Gregory IV. at Colmar in 833 was the beginning of the end of the Carolingian control of the " Roman republic." But from the " republic " one part after another was cut off—by the archbishops of Ravenna in the north, by the dukes of Spoleto in the east, by those of Benevento in the south, and gradually from the papal domain grew a little state ruled by Alberic as " prince and senator of all the Romans." The author of the *Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma* (*MGH*, *Script.*, iii. 719–722, 1839) bewails the fall of the republic and sighs for a Charlemagne to check the pride of the nobility. The longed-for emperor came in the person of Otho I., who on entering Rome promised to guard the pope's rights and the integrity of the " sacred territory of Peter." When Otho came into possession of Rome, his action was energetic; the pact of 962 recognized clearly the imperial overlordship in the papal domain, while the words of the *Vita Hadriani I.* regarding the donation are repeated here. After the short rule of Otho III., there followed a period of decline of papal dominion, and even the period of Gregory VII. brought few changes, though Gregory's claims were made as large as possible. While Robert Guiscard received Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily from Pope Nicholas II., and Richard took Capua, both recognized these dominions as the pope's. The claims of Gregory made possible the realization of possession of these regions for later popes who lived in more fortunate times. Indeed, the gift of the patrimony of Countess Matilda of Tuscany, which ought to have fallen to the pope, did not come under his actual control, but was administered by imperial margraves in the name of the emperor. After the death of Otho I. the exarchy was in possession of the archbishop of Ravenna; later the cities became independent until the time of Frederick I. Pentapolis appertained to the duchy of Spoleto, which was itself at first under the Lombards and then in possession of various dukes. The *terra sancti Petri* itself, based on the donation of Pippin, was for the most part under little princes whose names are unknown. Of a sovereignty of the pope in this period there is hardly a trace.

The victory of Alexander III. (q.v.) brought at first no essential change even in the very patrimonium itself. Henry VI. made his brother Philip duke of all the papal possessions; but after the death of Henry, the popes began to make effective their claims upon the " patrimony of the Blessed Peter." To this the national reaction against external control, especially in Central Italy, was a help, and the earlier patrimony of Peter came into papal hands; so particularly Spoleto and the most of Pentapolis.

5. The Final Stages.

The fall of imperial power in Italy and the strife over the crown in Germany worked to papal advantage. Otho IV. confirmed to Innocent III. (q.v.) the grant of the old "patrimonium Petri," Ravenna, Pentapolis, Ancona, Spoleto, the lands of the Countess Matilda, the county of Bertinoro, with their adjoining territories, and Sicily; and this grant outlined the later extent of the "patrimonium." This is the first imperial recognition of the validity of the papal claims based on the Constantinian and Carolingian donations. To be sure, Otho and Frederick II. still exercised their powers in this territory; but after the death of the latter and in consequence of the victory of the papal party at Benevento in 1266, the pope came into full possession of all except Sicily. But again, toward the end of the thirteenth century, there came evil days upon the papacy. The parties of the Colonna, Orsini, Gætani, Frangipani, Rienzi, and others fought out their quarrels in the chief cities, and some of the cities made themselves independent, while nobles in other parts of the territory seized possessions. After the death of Cola di Rienzi, Cardinal Albornoz attempted a reorganization of the papal lands by dividing them into vicariates; but little dynasties settled themselves in the various cities, fighting and defying the pope. Nicholas V. and Alexander VI. (qq.v.) began to reclaim these lands for the papacy, while Julius I. was the founder of the real Church-State, and the popes began to base their finances upon the financial strength of this Church-State. The times when the popes supported the costs of the Curia by levies upon the faithful come to an end. Paul III. (q.v.) levied a direct tax on the Church-State, and this Sixtus V. (q.v.) increased. The great bankers begin to be a part of the financial system; the great landowners did away with the little landowners, and the centralization of power wholly impoverished the population, which even yet is the poorest in Italy. The external history of this state from the time of Alexander VI. to the end of the eighteenth century is practically that of a number of families out of which the popes were chosen. Through their interest with the popes, these families sought first increase of power and later of wealth, while little gifts, like Parma and Piacenza to the Farnesi, lessened the area of the papal domain but little in the long run, as some of these gifts lapsed again to the Church. Napoleon in 1800 detached Ferrara, Bologna, and the Romagna from the Papal States, and undertook to do away altogether with the States of the Church. The Congress of Vienna reestablished them in 1814. In 1860 the greater part of the territories of the Church fell to the newly erected kingdom of Italy; Rome and its environs, secured for the Church only by France, became Italy's through the fall of Sedan in 1870, and papal dominion came to an end. Since then it has become clear how much harm temporal power has done the Church. The times of temporal prosperity through temporal rule have been the periods of the Church's greatest weakness. The "prisoner of the Vatican" is more respected than the temporal ruler of the "patrimony" once was. The old "patrimony of Peter" is at an end; the new one rules beyond land and sea. (A. Brackmann.)

Bibliography: Of sources the chief is the *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, 2 vols., Paris, 1886–92, and T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, vol. i., Berlin, 1898. Other sources are found in *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed. P. Jaffé and W. Wattenbach, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1885–88; *MGH, Epist.*, Berlin, 1887 sqq.; *Codex Carolinus*, in *Monumenta Carolina*, ed. P. Jaffé, Berlin, 1867; and the *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed. A. Potthast, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874–75. A guide to the literature is Wattenbach, *DGQ*. Very rich sources are laid open in the *MGH* in its various departments, dealing with the history of the empire; A. Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis sanctæ sedis*, Rome, 1861; *Liber censuum sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ*, ed. P. Fabre, part. i., Paris, 1889, part ii., ed. L. Duchesne, 1902; L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, and *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi*, Milan, 1723–51 (sources for the later Middle Ages). For the later period, the best material for the English reader is Ranke, *Popes*, while for the earlier period there is available the translation of Gregorovius' great work, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 8 vols., Stuttgart, 1886 sqq., the Eng. transl., London, 1901 sqq. Consult further: S. Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates*, Leipsic, 1854; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, Elberfeld, 1868; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, Gotha, 1880; P. Lanfey, *Hist. politique des papes*, Paris, 1880; J. Friedrich, *Die constantinische Schenkung*, Nördlingen, 1889; W. Martens, *Die falsche Generalconcession Constantins*, Munich, 1889; L. Duchesne, *Les Première Temps de l'état pontifical (754–1073)*, Paris, 1898; F. Fournier, *La Papauté devant l'histoire*, chaps. xxviii., xxxviii., xlix.–lii., xciv.–xcv., Paris, 1899; W. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII.*, London, 1902; Mann, *Popes*, i. 2, pp. 301, 410–411, 467, iii. 293–294; the literature under the articles on the popes and other worthies named in the text. The earlier literature on the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne is given in L. Oelsner, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter König Pippin*, p. 129, Leipsic, 1871; S. Abel, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches*, ed. B. Simson, i. 156 sqq., ib. 1888; and W. Martens, *Die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen*, pp. v.–ix., Stuttgart, 1881. Discussions of the genuineness of the donations named in the life of Hadrian I. are: J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, ii. 329 sqq., Innsbruck, 1869; T. Sickel, *Das Privilegium Ottos I.*, pp. 132 sqq., Innsbruck, 1883; P. Scheffer-Boichorst in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, iv (1885), 193–212; L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i. 234 sqq., Paris, 1886. A large literature on the subject is indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiv. 767–769.

PAPEBROCH, pā'pe-broн" (VAN PAPENBROEK), DANIEL: The second collaborator of Bolland in the compilation of his *Acta Sanctorum* (see Bolland, Jan, and the Bollandists); b. in Antwerp Mar. 17, 1628; d. there June 28, 1714. He made his vows as a Jesuit at Mechlin in 1648, and, after some years spent in teaching, was ordained priest in 1658. He was destined for the post of professor of philosophy at Antwerp, but had held this office only a year when he was called to assist Bolland in the work which was to occupy him for half a century. The greater part of the biographies from March to June inclusive are his work. He became involved in a controversy with the Carmelite order by his denial of its foundation by the prophet Elijah, which led to a denunciation of the *Acta Sanctorum* at Rome and before the Spanish Inquisition. He left a manuscript history of Antwerp from its foundation to the year 1200 (published at Antwerp, 5 vols., 1845–48).

PAPHNUTIUS: The name of several men prominent in the early Christian Church. (1) Bishop of a city in the upper Thebaid. He was a distinguished member of the first ecumenical council at Nicæa in 325, where, although he was himself a celibate, he protested against the proposed prohibition of clerical marriages, and succeeded in maintaining a *status quo* by which the bishops, priests, and deacons were permitted to live with wives they had married while still laymen. He also attended the Synod of Tyre in 335, where he opposed the majority in his unsuccessful plea for Athanasius. During the persecution of Maximinus, one of his eyes was put out, the left knee-tendon was severed, and he was condemned to labor in the mines. According to Sozomen, he was able to heal the sick and exorcise demons. The date of his death is unknown; he was venerated as confessor and martyr. (2) Abbot in the Scetic desert. At the age of ninety, he was visited by Cassian. He lived a life of meditation, leaving his cell only on Saturday and Sunday to attend church five Roman miles distant, and to replenish his water-supply. His humility and self-denial led Cassian to make him the spokesman in the third collation, *De tribus abrenuntiationibus*. When in 399, Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, opposed anthropomorphic concepts of God, Paphnutius was the only priest who dared to read his letter publicly.

Other men named Paphnutius are enumerated by Rosweyd (*MPL*, xxi. 435 sqq.) and a Paphnutius also composed the *Vita Omphrii* (*MPL*, lxxiii. 211).

(G. Grützmacher.)

Bibliography: F. Piper, *Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal*, pp. 57–59, Philadelphia, 1879; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 244, 626; *DCB*, iv. 184–185.

PAPIAS, pē′pi-as.

Work of Papias (§ 1).
Argument Concerning Presbyter John (§ 2).
Contents of the Work (§ 3).
Papias' Method and Testimony (§ 4)
Later Critics and the Fourth Gospel (§ 5).
Other Fragments of Papias (§ 6).
Characterization (§ 7).
Misdating of Papias by Irenæus (§ 8).
Testimony of the De Boor Fragments (§ 9).
The Apostles and Elders of Papias (§ 10).
The Elder John (§ 11).
Content of the Traditions (§ 12).

1. Work of Papias.

Papias, according to the common understanding a disciple of John the Apostle, and bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, was born probably between 50 and 60 A.D.; d. a martyr, a little after the middle of the second century. He occupies a place of special interest in the history of the Church on account of the "Exposition of the Words of Jesus" in five books, which was extant in manuscript as late as 1218, but has entirely disappeared. A few of the fragments have come down through Irenæus and Eusebius, and others, more or less spurious, through later ecclesiastical writers; and though of extraordinary interest, yet are they so problematical and obscure that it is impossible to derive safe conclusions from them. Two fragments have occasioned most discussion: one from the preface and the other from some unknown place in the work. In the preface, Papias writes:

> "But I shall not hesitate also to include with the interpretations whatsoever things I have at any time well learned from the *presbyteroi* and well remembered, giving assurance of their truth. For I did not, like the multitude, take pleasure in those who speak much, but in those who speak the truth; not in those who relate strange commandments, but in those who deliver the commandments given by the Lord unto faith and springing from the truth itself. If, then, any one came, who had been a follower of the *presbyteroi*, I questioned him with regard to the words of the *presbyteroi*; what Andrew or what Peter said (*eipon*), or what Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion, and the *presbyteros* John, the disciples of the Lord say (*legousi*). For I assumed beforehand that what was to be gotten from books would not profit me as much as what came from the living and abiding voice."

2. Argument Concerning Presbyter John.

The entire problem revolves about the term *presbyteroi*. It is seen that the name John is used twice. Are both names of one and the same person? Irenæus states (*Hær.*, V., xxxiii. 4; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 563) that Papias was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp. Immediately after citing this, Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. i.; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 170) asserts that the words of Papias in the preface by no means imply that he was a hearer and an eye-witness of the Apostles but that he heard the doctrines from those who were their friends. Eusebius made the first known effort to determine the presbyter John to be not the apostle but another. Later opponents allege that Eusebius had need to create the presbyter John in order to ascribe to him the authorship of the Apocalypse, because his repugnancy to the literalness with which Papias interpreted it made Eusebius unwilling to admit the Apostle John as the author who instructed Papias. (It may be added, here, that Eusebius ardently defends the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel; ut sup., xxiv.) Efforts have been made to emend the text, especially by those who would break the chain that supports the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. Renan would read, in the last instance, instead of "disciples of the Lord," "disciples of disciples of the Lord"; Bacon, "disciples of these"; while Mommsen would regard the phrase as an interpolation. There seem to be two interpretations of the term *presbyteroi*. According to one it refers to a distinct office of elders in the early congregations. On the other hand, the term is referred to a limited class of persons, of the first traditional rank after Christ, included with the apostles as his disciples; according to Rothe, men identified with the birth of Christianity and regarded with veneration by the following generation; the first class being a crystallization of the second, following the first plastic period. In the sense of the second class *presbyteroi* is to be rendered "Apostolic Fathers." Were the *presbyteroi* of Papias these or the former? It has been suggested by Stilting that *presbyteros* with John at the end of the fragment can signify nothing else than what *presbyteroi*, which precedes three times, signifies. However, if the others were of the first traditional rank after Christ, then John presbyter was likewise of the same, and was therefore John the Apostle. So also Aristion. If, however, the name *presbyteroi* was a fixed term, applying to a definite class of men in the first Christian period, it could nevertheless not be identical with the name of the second rank of the church office, but must refer to an upper traditional rank with Papias as well as with Irenæus; but with this difference, that, as early as the time of Irenæus, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias were *presbyteroi*, while in that of Papias only one traditional rank intervened between him and Christ. Therefore in the sense of Papias, *presbyteroi* is rendered "Apostolic Fathers" in contrast with those of the succeeding rank who might call themselves brethren.

3. Contents of the Work.

The contents of the work of Papias are not so uncertain, being explanations of the words of the Lord. Under the term *logia*, Papias did not only include the sayings of Christ; but, with reference to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the acts are included as well. Besides Matthew and Mark, he knew also the Gospel to the Hebrews, and he made use of I John and I Peter. It will remain uncertain whether he knew Luke; or, what is more probable, whether he knew and employed all five gospels as the basis of his work, supplemented from other sources. His purpose was not so much to complement, from oral sources, the words of the Lord as laid down in the Gospels as to obtain material for the elucidation of the words of Jesus. The first source was his own memory of what he had heard from the apostles, Aristion, and other first disciples. The second source was indirect: he inquired of the pupils of the first disciples wherever he met them what of the words of Jesus these had reported, and from a time when disciple and pupil dwelt in personal association; and also of pupils of Aristion and John while they were yet alive. From the present tense (*legousi*) it is deducible that Papias commenced to gather his material before the end of the first century. The necessity for making inquiry presented itself whenever pupils of John and Aristion chanced to come to Hierapolis. The recurrence of the name of John in the fragment is met by the explanation that reports from the Jerusalem period of John's life required the aorist, *eipon;* while those of the Ephesian period require the present, *legousi*. Eusebius endeavors to make *eipon* refer to the followers of the apostles, and *legousi* to contemporaries of Papias; namely, Aristion and the presbyter John, thus removing the latter farther from the apostles, notwithstanding that the titles *presbyteros* and *presbyteroi* are the same in form and that Irenæus may have joined the two in *Hær.*, IV., xxvii. 1 (Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 498), and xxxii. 1 (Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 507).

It is uncertain whether the material obtained from oral tradition consisted merely of elucidations of the words of Jesus or included such words themselves; but the former is the more probable. It is also problematical whether the first clause of the fragment was not preceded by an adversative clause, as if the succeeding oral traditions were contrasted with preceding written ones; or the Lord's own words of elucidation preceding were contrasted with those of others following; or if the sources themselves are discussed. Evidently, Papias placed special value upon the oral tradition held in living remembrance by eye-witnesses, the word "abide" being in constant use. Besides this, Eusebius imparts very little of the work of Papias, evidently because the explanations of *logia* furnished nothing for his historical purpose; excepting where he quoted some of the illustrations by which Papias had illumined his explanations.

4. Papias' Method and Testimony.

Such were the accounts of a daughter of Philip raised from the dead, one Justus Barsabas drinking poison without harm, certain parables and didactic words not found in the Gospels, and the mention of a woman in the Gospel to the Hebrews, who was accused before the Lord. From what has been said, what is important is that he constructed and elucidated sayings of Jesus; the question is not whether he knew all the canonical Gospels and how he employed them. One fragment shows that he knew Matthew and Mark; the same is found in Irenæus, and Eusebius reproduces it with the statement that Papias referred it to the presbyter John. It reports that Mark was the interpreter of Peter and that he wrote down from memory, exactly, though not in the original order, all that Peter had related of the words and the deeds of the Lord; and that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, which each one translated the best he could. These two references have been the subject of a vast amount of discussion since the time of Schleiermacher. Eusebius was concerned to communicate from Papias the origin of these two Gospels, from a sufficient reason, which must have been external and not internal; for the manner in which Papias used this and other Gospels is of no interest to him. Perhaps, by his silence as to Papias' testimony to other Gospels, he would suggest that Papias knew no other. Eusebius, indeed, asserts the use of other sources but explicitly only I John, I Peter, and the Gospel to the Hebrews, as written sources. His purpose in doing this is obviously to support his view that the first epistle of each only is genuine, while the second of each is not, and the third of John is doubtful. In the same passage, Eusebius places the Gospel to the Hebrews among the antilegomena. But, if the object of Eusebius is, with reference to the selection of excerpts, to expose the untrustworthiness of Papias; and, on the other hand, it is his purpose, with reference to his investigations and communications concerning presbyter John, to set him forth as another than the apostle, then, the deductions which have been made from the silence of Papias as to the Fourth Gospel have been rather precipitate. It is not Papias who is silent, but Eusebius, and not only concerning the Fourth Gospel, but also the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and the Epistle of James, no doubt because these contributed nothing to that phase of Papias which he had in mind to represent. Eusebius does not state expressly that Papias knew and used the Apocalypse, but this is implied when he refers to the chiliastic utterances of Papias and condemns him for taking the mystical sense of the words literally. On the same ground Andreas of Cæsarea calls upon Papias as his chief authority for the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse. It might be concluded from Eusebius that because Papias used the Apocalypse so frequently, the former attempted to force the authorship upon the presbyter John.

5. Later Critics and the Fourth Gospel.

The later critics have concluded that Papias did not know the unmentioned books, and that therefore the Fourth Gospel did not yet exist; that Papias must have heard John in his early years, yet when he wrote this book he either knew nothing of the Fourth Gospel or did not care to know. Here is an *argumentum e silentio,* to which the following may be opposed: (1) the fact that citations made from another point of view do not mention the Fourth Gospel does not argue that Papias did not know the Gospel itself and cite from it; (2) from the circumstance that Eusebius does not mention that Papias knew two Gospels only and that he does not mention that Papias used the two Gospels, it can not be concluded that the latter knew and used not the other two. And to this *argumentum e silentio* and to the other that in vindicating so strenuously the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, Eusebius would without hesitation have snatched up the mention of it in all the vast work of Papias, may be rejoined in similar kind, that in all the writings of the early Church Eusebius is the solitary one who sets up the presumption of a presbyter John, though the person so designated is too prominent in Papias to meet with such universal silence. Nay, rather Eusebius cites from the great work of Papias not what is in accord with the Gospels, but rather what is foreign and untrustworthy in order to depreciate the value of the writings. This suggests another important consideration. In *Hist. eccl.,* III., xxiv. (Eng. transl., *NPNF,* 2 ser., i. 154) he authenticates the Gospel as well as I John positively, "as accepted beyond dispute both now and in ancient times." In view of such a universal acceptance, he omits to mention the earlier witnesses just as he almost never produces citations for accepted writings. There is no wonder, then, that he did not cite Papias to the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, and he would not have accepted him if his work had abounded in citations. But it would have fitted the purpose of Eusebius if Papias had used only the Gospel to the Hebrews, Matthew, and Mark, and had made no mention of Luke and John. He would by no means have neglected to announce it in order to lay a new premise for the limitation and one-sidedness of Papias. And how preeminently could he have used this advantage to declare the alleged discipleship of Papias to the apostle, supported as it is by Irenæus, to be inconceivable: "Papias does not even know the Gospel of John and he is said to have been his disciple!" Nay, silence of Eusebius on the manner of employment by Papias of the four Gospels, and especially of the last, can not be otherwise taken than that Papias used them all and, indirectly, that the Fourth Gospel is authentic. There is also an attempt to establish the acquaintance of Papias with the Gospel of John by internal evidence. A certain utterance by elders in Asia Minor in which John xiv. 2 is cited seems to bear the character of Papias' view and Scripture interpretation so as to be included under Papianistic fragments without hesitation; and Dorner thinks it not unlikely that the use which that utterance made of the work of Papias constituted the source from which Irenæus derived his testimony. To this, Corssen would deduce from the acquaintance of Papias with I John, as reported by Eusebius, that he knew also the Fourth Gospel. The order of the names of the apostles in the fragment corresponds to that in the first chapter of John; the words "from the truth itself" are characteristically Johannine; the peculiar word of Christ reported by the elders and retained by Irenæus corresponds to John xiv. 1; above all the statement in Papias' work that Christ taught at a later age than that of thirty, which appears to point to Papias having known John viii. 57.

6. Other Fragments of Papias.

There remains yet a consideration of the fragments preserved elsewhere than in Eusebius. From the first book of Papias, Maximus in his scholia to *Dionysii Areopagitæ de cælesti hierarchia,* ii. 32 (Antwerp, 1634) has preserved the notice, "they called them children who practised guilelessness toward God," a custom for which he cites Clement of Alexandria as well as Papias for authority (possibly attached to Christ's words in Matt. xviii. 3, xix. 14). In the chronicle compiled by Georgius Hamartolos, in the ninth century, it is stated as represented in the second book of Papias that John the brother of James was killed by the Jews at Ephesus, and, for substantiation, reference is made to Christ's prophecies (Matt. xx. 22 sqq.; Mark x. 38) and to the commentary on Matthew by Origen (*Opera,* iii. 719 sqq.). But the passage from which the citation is made is preserved and contains no such statement, and the tradition is generally discredited because so contrary to the representations of the Fathers. This reference was used, however, by Hausrath to deny that John sojourned in Asia Minor but that he suffered martyrdom with James the Just at Jerusalem 62 A.D. Irenæus communicates a saying of Christ received from the elders who knew John, the authenticity of which he supports by Papias from the fourth book of his work (ut sup., V., xxxiii. 3, 4; Eng. transl., *ANF,* i. 562–563). This passage pictures the blessedness of believers in the millennium. Maximus Confessor also refers it to the fourth book of Papias directly (ut sup., vii.); and Eusebius refers to it indirectly (*Hist. eccl.,* iii. 39; Eng. transl., *NPNF,* 2 ser., i. 170–173) where he asserts that Papias accepted the teaching of chiliasm in a sensual way and misunderstood the statements of the apostles in that he failed to recognize the parabolical and mystical sense of the words, and blames him for leading Irenæus and other writers of the Church astray. Other fragments are recognized by a certain preference of Papias for typical-allegorical Scriptural interpretation; cf. Anastasius Sinaita, *Anagogicarum contemplationum in Hexaemeron,* i.; ed. M. de La Bigne, *Bibliothecæ veterum patrum,* i. 223 (Paris, 1609); also, Eng. transl., *ANF,* i. 155. A fragment that treats of the final illness of Judas Iscariot and that departs from Matthew and Luke belongs to the fourth book; cf. *Catena in Acta Sanctorum Apostolorum,* ed. J. A. Cramer, p. 12 sqq. (Oxford, 1838), and Theophylact, on the Apocalypse, i. 18 sqq.; and Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 155. This seems neither an attempt to merge the two canonical accounts (Zahn), nor proof that Papias knew not the Gospel of Matthew and the Acts of the Apostles; but it shows that he had a third, a more widely dispersed, oral tradition whose untrustworthiness he failed to suspect. Evidently to some other Papias the fragment of the four Marys is to be ascribed; cf. Grabe, *Spicilegium sanctorum patrum ut et hæreticorum seculi*, II., i. 34 (Oxford, 1800), and Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 155. To be mentioned is the notice in the preface of the Fourth Gospel in a Vulgate manuscript of the Vatican which declares Papias to be the writer of the Fourth Gospel, and is supported by the *Catena patrum Græcarum in Sanctum Johannem* (ed. B. Corderius, Antwerp, 1630) which declares that John dictated to Papias. This tradition is unsupported.

7. Characterization.

The verdict of Eusebius on Papias is obscure. The characterization "of limited understanding" (III., xxxix. 13; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 172) seems to have only localized reference to Papias on account of his chiliastic views. The passage "a man most learned in all things and well versed in the Scriptures" (III., xxxvi. 2; Eng. transl., *ANPF*, 2 ser., i. 166, note) is declared to be an interpolation. That in the succeeding centuries Papias was highly regarded appears in the foregoing discussion; nevertheless, in the absence of his works, he can not be properly estimated. (K. Leimbach†.)

8. Misdating of Papias by Irenæus.

It has long been known that the surprisingly early date which Irenæus assigns (see § 2) to Papias, his written authority for "words of the elders," was based on a confusion. Eusebius, though he had himself in his *Chronicon* (220) adopted the view and even the language of Irenæus, became convinced of the error; after careful examination of the entire work of Papias, a small volume of only five "books" (= the modern "chapter") admitted by Irenæus to be "the only work written by him," he cited in his "History" (III., xxxix.; see above, § 1) the passage which he considered to have given rise to it. Eusebius' critical insight had been sharpened meantime by study of the controversy of Dionysius of Alexandria (q.v.) with the Chiliasts. In this Dionysius had so far borrowed the weapons of Caius, bishop of Rome (q.v.), in the latter's "Dialogue with Proclus" as to reject Revelation as a non-apostolic writing, attributing it to "some other John." Eusebius shows a strong disposition to agree on this point with Dionysius, though of course not with Dionysius' predecessor Gaius in rejecting all the "Johannine" writings. As completing Dionysius' argument against Revelation the discovery that Irenæus, in using Papias, had confused John the Apostle with "another John" was welcome to Eusebius. He gives accordingly a painstaking demonstration of Irenæus' mistake from the work of Papias itself, contrary to the entire ecclesiastical interest and prepossession of his time. Against this it is useless in the absence of the work of Papias to revert to the statements of so inaccurate and prejudiced a writer as Irenæus, when among those who possessed it for centuries, and would gladly have answered Eusebius if they could, not one whisper was raised in his defense. The most that can be said for Irenæus is that his copy of Papias may already have contained the clause "the disciples of the Lord" repeated after the names of "Aristion and John the Elder." Eusebius' copy already did so, and most of our own copies still do. If so, it was not altogether unnatural for a careless reader of the passage to disregard the distinction between things which had been said by the apostles, and the things which were being said by "Aristion and John the Elder." The clause, however, as applied to these obscure persons involves at least "a chronological difficulty," as even Lightfoot conceded (*Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion*, p. 150, London, 1889); hence a number of ancient texts either cancel or alter it. The two letters τῶ which would give "(disciples) of these" (i.e., the apostles just named) have probably been assimilated to κυ ("of the Lord") in the similar clause of the preceding line. In fact Eusebius, who alone has taken the witness' deposition on this point, and who declares that Papias was largely dependent on Aristion and the Elder John, tells us that he "confesses that he had received the words of the apostles from those who had followed them" (*Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 7); and again, "Papias himself . . . by no means declares that he himself was a hearer and eye-witness of the holy apostles, but shows by the language which he uses that he received the matters of the faith from those who were *the disciples of these*" (III., xxxix. 2). Modern efforts to reinflate the Irenæan characterization of Papias as "a hearer of John (the Apostle) and an associate of Polycarp, a man of the earliest times" after the Eusebian puncture are therefore hopeless. Irenæus is probably misled by the same passage when, in recording the tradition regarding Jesus' age (§ 6), he boasts that "some of them (the Asian elders) saw not only John but others also of the apostles and testify (a written witness is implied by the present tense) to the aforesaid." The date of Papias' birth must consequently be placed in more reasonable relation to that of his death traditionally fixed in 165 A.D.

9. Testimony of the De Boor Fragments.

The new fragments of Papias published by De Boor (*TU*, v. 2, 1889) confirm Eusebius' charge of antedating. One fragment seems to have been the heading of a chapter, "Concerning those raised from the dead by Christ, how that they lived until the times of Hadrian." Not only would it be unnatural for one himself living under Hadrian (117–138 A.D.) to speak thus, but the statement itself appears to be an exaggeration of that made by Quadratus (q.v.) in the *Apology* delivered by him in person to that emperor. The statement as Quadratus made it would be perfectly credible, viz., that "some of" those healed and raised from the dead by Jesus "survived even to our day" (Euseb., *Hist.*, IV., iii. 2). As Papias makes it, it shows the distortion of a later hand, writing not earlier than under Antoninus. Harnack, accordingly, dates the work of Papias in 145–160 A.D. The earlier limit is probably better, for while there is more trace than in Justin Martyr of acquaintance with the Johannine writings, Papias seems to recognize but two Gospels (Matthew and Mark) as authoritative, whereas Justin adds that of Luke. Another fragment, attested by two authorities as from Papias' "second book," asserts that John the Apostle "was killed by the Jews" (*not* "in Ephesus" as stated in § 7). The sense of the fragment is fiercely contested, but it probably implies residence of this apostle in Jerusalem until his martyrdom at some time before 70 A.D.

10. The Apostles and Elders of Papias.

Except for its bearing on the apostolic authorship of Revelation Eusebius is as much prepossessed in favor of the Irenæan tradition of apostles and elders in (proconsular) Asia as Irenæus himself. So understood, Papias supplied the missing link to Dionysius' theory of "another John," who in Asia could write "I, John, am he that heard and saw these things." Did not Papias acknowledge dependence on a John whom he distinguishes from the apostle previously named by the title "the Elder"? As applying to this John Eusebius therefore still clings to Irenæus' notion of a direct discipleship of Papias. If, however, in reading the extract, that lens of the Irenæan spectacles be discarded which Eusebius retains as well as that which he discards, it will be apparent that Papias knows nothing of apostles and elders in Asia. He is in perfect agreement with Polycarp (110–117 A.D.), Ignatius (110–117), and all the early writers who throw light upon conditions there in 90–150 A.D. All imply the absence of any apostolic authority whatever in that region save Paul. So with Papias also. However faithful and devout the "teachers" from whom he had imbibed "the truth," their teaching was that "from books." To get at "the living and abiding voice" of oral tradition, which Papias, like his colleague Polycarp, esteemed a bulwark against the vain talk of the multitude and the false teachings" ("To the Philippians," vii.), he was obliged to resort to travelers who "came his way" from the recognized seat of apostolic tradition. In short, apart from the legends of 150–200 A.D. by which Ephesus later sought to obtain a reversion of the ecclesiastical leadership once conceded to Jerusalem and maintained by that ancient mother church until (135 A.D.) it was scattered to the four winds in the war of Bar-Kokba (q.v.), there is not the slightest reason for understanding by the "apostles and elders" of Papias any other than "the apostles and elders" of his earlier contemporary "Luke" (Acts xv. 2, 23, xxi. 18). His later contemporary Hegesippus still regards the same group as occupying the seat of authority in religion. The very admission of Eusebius, "at all events (*goun*) he mentions them (Aristion and the Elder John) frequently by name, and records their traditions," shows a consciousness of overstatement. Aristion and John were indeed (or at least had been) Papias' contemporaries, but his only access to them had been through chance-comers, from whom he learned by inquiry what they "were saying," just as he learned from similar sources what the apostles "had said."

11. The Elder John.

Throughout the extract all four occurrences of the important word "elder" receive thus the same sense, always sharply distinguished from that of "disciple of the Lord," or first-hand authority. The paragraph is framed to defend the appending of "words of the elders," which would not of course enjoy such esteem as those of "Matthew," or even of "Mark." Papias considers, however, that from his own caution in selection of sources—persons who had been followers of "the elders"—and from the nature of his questions—what had been said (as reported in Jerusalem) by the apostles, and what "was being taught by Aristion and John the Elder," this material was worthy to be appended to his "expositions." At the time of his inquiries (110–117 ?) sayings of the apostles were current only as tradition. Those of "the elders the disciples of these" were "living and abiding" in the person of two survivors. Of Aristion (q.v.) nothing whatever is known. "John the Elder" has been reasonably identified by Schlatter with the elder of that name who stands midway in Eusebius' list of the Jerusalem succession of 70–135 A.D. (*Hist. eccl.*, v. 3) and whose death is dated by Epiphanius in 117 A.D.

12. Content of the Traditions.

The extant examples of Papias' "traditions of the elders" confirm this result. They are strongly tinged with Jewish midrash, and, as Eusebius remarks, "of a rather mythical character." That deserving of most respect is the "story of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord"; for it is probably the story inserted by some texts in John vii. 53–viii. 11, in others after Luke xxi. 38. Eusebius found it in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Papias had it from "the elders." There is no reason whatever to suppose that Papias himself knew this Aramaic writing, or could have used it; but "the elders" probably did.

BENJ. W. BACON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The collections of the fragments of Papias, aside from those given in the text, are indicated in the literature given under APOSTOLIC FATHERS (q.v.), to which must be added M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, i. 3–16, Oxford, 1846. Very much of the literature on the Gospels as a whole and on those of Matthew, Mark, and John, as also on the Canon of the New Testament and on Biblical Introduction, contains discussions concerning Papias. The literature about Papias earlier than 1885 is indicated by E. C. Richardson in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 19–21. Especial attention should be called to *Supernatural Religion*, i. 444–485, ii. 320–336, iii. pp. xxi.–xxiii., 19–21, and to the reply in Lighfoot's work cited in the text, pp. 142–216. Consult further: C. L. Leimbach, *Das Papiasfragment*, Gotha, 1875; G. Bickell, in *ZKT*, iii (1879), 799–803; A. Hilgenfeld, *ZWT*, xxix (1886), 257–291; T. Zahn, in *TSK*, xxxix (1886), 649–696; ib. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 2, pp. 849–903, ii. 2, pp. 790–797, Leipsic, 1888–92; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. passim, ii. 1, pp. 335 sqq., 356 sqq., 658 sqq.; Krüger, *History*, pp. 46–48; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 693–698; *DCB*, iv. 185–190; A. S. Barnes, in *Dublin Review*, cxxxvi (1905), 1–11; and especially B. W. Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate; . . . Essays on Problems concerning . . . Writings attributed to the Apostle John*, New York, 1910.

PAPPUS, JOHANN: German Lutheran; b. at Lindau Jan. 16, 1549; d. at Strasburg July 13,

1610. He was a student at Strasburg (1562–64) and Tübingen (1564–66), and after being a private tutor for a year, resumed his studies at Strasburg. He was then vicar of Reichenweyer for a short time, but in 1570 was again in Strasburg, lecturing on Hebrew and serving as preacher. In 1573, he resumed his lectures on exegesis and church history at Strasburg, where he was appointed minister, preacher, and professor of theology in 1578, having been made a canon in 1575. The church in Strasburg was at that time dominated by the rigid Lutheran Johannes Marbach (q.v.), who had caused the departure of Peter Martyr and Hieronymus Zanchi, and the dismissal of the pastor of the French congregation. He was opposed, however, by most of the teachers at the high school, of which Pappus had been scholarch since 1573; Marbach's chief antagonist being Johannes Sturm, who was earnestly seeking a *modus vivendi* with the Reformed. The magistracy wavered between the two factions, and in Mar., 1578, Pappus proposed sixty-eight theses to show that it was not contrary to Christian charity to condemn erroneous doctrines and to separate from heretics. On Apr. 5, 1578, after a passionate defense of Calvinism by a young Pole, J. Mirisch, Sturm laid his *Antipappus primus* before the assembled scholarchs, professors, and clergy, and was answered by Pappus. Henceforth the controversy was continued in writing, Sturm fulminating his second, third, and fourth *Antipappus*, and Pappus replying with an equal number of *defensiones*, while Osiander and the young adherent of Sturm added to the dispute, and Sturm wrote his *Epistolæ eucharisticæ* and an attack on Osiander, and directed an edition of the Tetrapolitan Confession which the magistrates forbade to be sold in Strasburg.

To sum up the controversy, Sturm claimed that not Pappus' contention that there was no violation of love in condemning doctrines which subvert salvation but the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist was the point at issue, and that if the Augsburg Confession were properly understood, the Calvinists could adhere to the same. He, too, is in favor of the union of all Evangelical churches but not on the Formula of Concord, whose doctrine of ubiquity was in contradiction with that of the ascension and was provocative of schism. Pappus, on the other hand, declared that the doctrine of ubiquity emphasized the divine omnipotence and the union of the human and divine in Christ, and deplored the fact that the Formula was not forthwith signed. While the struggle thus continued, the magistrates remained firm in refusing the Formula of Concord, but the violence and turmoil increased so that, on Apr. 23, 1581, further controversy was forbidden. On account of an attack of bitter invective on Jacob Andreä (q.v.), Sturm was retired to private life. Pappus had already succeeded Marbach as head of the *Kirchenkonvent* early in 1581, and, though the Formula of Concord had not yet been formally adopted, rigorous measures against the Reformed in accordance with its spirit were now taken. All efforts at appeal were in vain, and on Mar. 24, 1598, the new church constitution was adopted by the council which included the acceptance of the Formula, thus marking a triumph for Lutheranism. Never ceasing his efforts for the overthrow of Calvinism, Pappus still found time to attend the debate between Roman Catholics and Lutherans convened by Margrave Jacob of Baden at Emmendingen in June, 1590; where he assumed the onerous charge of proving that the Church Fathers had taught doctrines essentially Evangelical. The result of this debate was his *Confessionis Augustanæ et Augustinianæ parallela* (Frankfort, 1591). Among his writings, besides many controversial pamphlets and sermons, mention should be made of *Epitome historiæ ecclesiasticæ* (1584); *Commentarius in Confessionem Augustanam* (1589); *Articuli præcipui doctrinæ Christianæ in theses digesti* (1591); and *Contradictiones doctorum nunc Romanæ Ecclesiæ* (1597).

(K. HACKENSCHMIDT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Horning, *Johannes Pappus*, Strasburg, 1841; H. Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, iii. 314 sqq., iv. 312 sqq., 4 vols., Marburg, 1853–59; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, i. 266 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; and the literature under STURM, JOHANN.

PAPYRUS, PAPYRI.

The Plant and its Manufacture (§ 1).
Character of the Documents (§ 2).
Their Importance (§ 3).
Biblical and Christian Fragments (§ 4).
Their Utility (§ 5).

1. The Plant and its Manufacture.

The etymology of the word " papyrus " is as yet uncertain. De Lagarde raised the question whether papyrus was the article manufactured at Bura on Lake Menzaleh, of which the Egyptian name was *pa*. Another derivation offered by Bondi (*Zeitschrift für aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, 1892, p. 64) and supported by W. M. Müller (*EB*, iii. 3556) is the Egyptian *pa-p-yor*, " the product of the river," or " the river plant." The plant is known outside of Egypt, for example, in Sicily, and in Italy by Lake Thrasymene, and is now cultivated in many botanical and private gardens; its botanical name is *Cyperus papyrus*, and its habitat shows that it requires a warm climate. It may be transplanted and is propagated by seed or by slipping the stalks. Its use as writing-material is very old. According to Kenyon the earliest inscribed papyrus dates back to the period of King Assa (c. 2600 B.C.), and from that time till the Arabic occupation of Egypt papyrus was the ordinary material upon which to write in the land of the Nile. In spite of its apparent fragility, it seems to be nearly as indestructible as the pyramids or obelisks, and to this quality is due in no small degree the resurrection of ancient Egypt in the present day. The method of manufacture is often wrongly described, as when it is asserted that it was made from the " bast " of the plant. An account of the method of preparation is given by Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, xiii. 11–13; cf. G. Ebers, *The Writing Material of Antiquity*, in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, Nov., 1893), and the following is the account of Kenyon (*Palæography of Greek Papyri*, p. 14, London, 1899): " the pith of the stem of the papyrus plant was cut into thin strips and these strips were laid side by side together, vertically, in the form of a sheet of paper. Over this layer another was placed horizontally, and the two layers were joined together by a sort of glue of which the water of the Nile was supposed to be a necessary constituent. The layers were put under pressure and then dried in the sun, after which they were polished to remove any unevenness of surface, when the material was ready for use." This method of preparation is known to have been in use in Sicily as late as 1902. Of course the size of the leaf varies, and measurements have been collected by Kenyon (ut sup., pp. 16–17). For most non-literary purposes a single leaf sufficed; for longer texts, especially those of a literary character, the required number of leaves were formed into a roll, and this last is the classical form of ancient productions of the pen. The side was commonly used on which the fibers ran horizontally (*recto*), the other side (*verso*) was used only exceptionally; from this it follows that when a piece of papyrus carries writing on both sides in different hands, that is usually the earlier which is on the *recto*. In the later centuries of antiquity the book or codex appeared, and finally superseded the earlier or roll form; the assertion that the book form is due to the use of parchment is incorrect. Numerous fragments of papyrus books are known, some of which go back to the third century of the Christian era; the Logia fragments are in this form.

2. Character of the Documents.

The papyrus plant is spoken of in the Old Testament, Job. viii. 11; Isa. xxxv. 7 (*gome;* Septuagint, *papyros*); Job xl. 21 (*bizzah*); Isa. xix. 6 (*suph*); and in Ex. ii. 3 mention is made of little papyrus arks or boats (see also NAVIGATION). John's second epistle also names papyrus (verse 12, "paper" is probably papyrus); while II Tim. iv. 13, "the books," surely refers to papyrus, since "parchments" are especially mentioned. But the justification for this article lies not merely in these references, but rather in the fact of the great importance of recent recovery of papyrus fragments for the study of the Bible and of early Christianity. Since the year 1778, when an unknown European dealer in books bought from some Egyptian peasants a papyrus roll of the year 191–192 A.D. and watched these same peasants burn some fifty or more other fragments to enjoy the aromatic odor, the land of the Nile has furnished an immense number of inscribed papyri in all possible languages and covering a period of over a thousand years. In the second and third decades of the nineteenth century quite a number of papyri from Memphis, Letopolis, This, Panopolis, Thebes, Hermonthis, Elephantine, and Syene had reached European museums, but were little noted or studied. But from the year 1877 date the richest acquisitions from the Fayum, numbering thousands of precious leaves and fragments. Most of these have been unearthed by the spade; and this has become the method of search for this valuable material. That the fragments found are from the waste heaps of ancient cities is of itself indicative. What has been found is not the remainder of great archives, but simply the residue of rubbish heaps cast out from public and private offices, torn books and leaves discarded to receive a valuation never conceived by those who threw them away. The great mass of the papyri are of a non-literary character —law papers of various sorts, leases and loans, bills and receipts, marriage agreements and wills; there are also letters and notes, copy-books, magical texts, horoscopes, diaries, and the like. The earliest reach back into the time of the Ptolemies, one indeed as early as the fourth pre-Christian century; the latest come far down into Byzantine days.

3. Their Importance.

The changing history of Greco-Roman Egypt is reflected in these fragments. One can not estimate too highly the value of these finds of Greek writing alone—to say nothing of other bits containing writing in demotic, Coptic, Arabic, Latin, Hebrew, and Persian—for the light they throw upon antiquity; they represent a resuscitation of a large part of ancient life. Their testimony to the past is so true, warm, and vital that they are a more trustworthy witness almost than the words of an author telling of the period, and certainly have more of life than inscriptions which are not seldom as cold as the marble on which they are. The papyrus carries autographs, it shows peculiarities of handwriting, it reveals the personal life of the writer. The revelations it gives seem like the flow of fresh warm blood contributed, e.g., to the history of law, but not merely to this, for they enliven and illumine the history of culture and of the history of language. Indeed, these unliterary papyri have a value for the science of history not possessed by literary works more pretentious just because they come not from ancient art but out of the daily life of the past, dug as they are from the peasants' fields. It is to be hoped that not only the fragments of literary works may be published—reverently as may be, indeed—but that also all the non-literary bits may be made known, since what seems a trivial lease may contain a form of speech which shall prove to be a long-wanted connecting link between the lingua franca of the period and a form developed therefrom in a New-Greek dialect. What may appear to one as unimportant may to another prove an inestimable prize. Mention is pertinent here of another class of finds nearly related to the papyri —the ostraca (cf. U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1899; W. E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*, London, 1902).

4. Biblical and Christian Fragments.

It is not at all surprising that theological research should deem especially important the fragments recovered from Biblical or early Christian literature; and there is reason for gratitude for all that contributes to knowledge of sources. The most important of Greek fragments in this department are herewith noted.

1. Gen. xiv. 17, British Museum papyrus 212.
2. Genesis fragments in the collection of Archduke Rainer in Vienna, and in vol. iv. of the Oxyrhyncus papyri (see under EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND).
3. Ps. x (xi.) 2–xviii (xix.) 6; xx (xxi.) 14–xxxiv (xxxv.) 6, British Museum papyrus 37.
4. Ps. xi (xii.) 7–xiv (xv.) 4, British Museum papyrus 230.
5. Ps. xxxix (xl.) 16–xl (xli.) 4, Berlin Museum.

6. Fragments of Pss. v., cviii., cxviii., cxxxv., cxxxviii., cxl., in Amherst papyri 5–6.
7. Fragments of the Psalms in the Rainer collection, in the Louvre and the National Library in Paris.
8. Job i. 21–22, ii. 3, in Amherst papyrus 4.
9. Cant. i. 6–9, Oxford, Bodleian MS. Gk. g. 1 (P).
10. Isa. xxxviii. 3–5, 13–16, Rainer collection, no. 8024 (guide no. 536).
11. Ezek. v. 12–vi. 3, with the diacritical signs of Origen, Oxford, Bodleian MS., Gk. d. 4 (P).
12. Zech. iv.–xiv.; Mal. i.–iv., twenty-seven leaves written on both sides, now in the Heidelberg library (ed. Deissmann in *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*, vol. i., Heidelberg, 1904).
13. Gen. i. 1–5, Amherst papyrus 3c.
14. Several fragments having to do with the history of Egyptian Judaism, in Berlin, Paris, London, Gizeh, and in the Oxyrhyncus Papyri.
15. Fragments of Philo, in the National Library, Paris.
16. Matt. i. 1–9, 12, 14–20, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 2.
16a. Matt. i.–ii., idem, no 401.
17. Fragments of Matt. in the National Library, Paris, at the end of the Philo fragment.
18. Fragments of Matt. in the Rainer collection.
19. Luke v. 30–vi. 4, in the National Library, Paris, at the end of the Philo fragment.
20. Luke vii. 36–43, x. 38–42, in the Rainer collection, no. 8021 (guide no. 539).
21. John i. 23–32, 33–41, xx. 11–17, 19–25, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 208.
22. Fragments of the Gospels, in the Rainer collection.
23. Rom. i. 1–7, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 209.
24. I Cor. i. 17–20, vi. 13–18, vii. 3, 4, 10–14, in the library of Bishop Porfiri Uspensky at Kief.
25. I Cor. i. 25–27, ii. 6–8, iii. 8–10, 20, at Sinai.
26. Heb. i. 1, Amherst papyrus 3b. In the Louvre is an inedited fragment of the Epistle of Jude, and Oxyrhyncus papyri, vol. iv., has a large fragment from Heb.
26a. I John iv. 11–17, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 402.
27. An amulet containing passages from the Septuagint of Ps. xc (xci.), Rom. xii., John ii., in the Rainer collection, no 8032 (guide no. 528).
28. Fragments of an extra-canonical Gospel containing a part of the denial of Peter, in the Rainer collection.
29. The so-called Logia-Fragment, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 1, published by Grenfell and Hunt (see under Agrapha), and a second fragment published by the same, 1904.
30. Fragment of a Hebrew-Greek Onomasticum sacrum, in the library of the University of Heidelberg, published by Deissmann, ut sup., vol. i.
31. Shepherd of Hermas, Similitudes, ii. 7–10, iv. 2–5, in the Berlin Museum.
32. Fragment (from Melito of Sardis?) upon prophecy, contains a citation from the Shepherd of Hermas, Mandates xi. 9–10, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 5.
33. Fragment of a Gnostic (Valentinian?) writing, the same, no. 4 verso.
33a. Irenæus, *Hær.*, III., ix., the same, no. 405.
34. Fragments of Basil of Cæsarea, *Epist.* v., vi., ccxciii., cl., ii., Berlin Museum.
35. Fragments of Gregory of Nyssa, "Life of Moses," the same.
36. "Lives of the Saints," Paris, Musées nationaux, nos. 7403–05, 7408, and Fond du Faioum, no. 261.
37. Theological fragments, British Museum, papyrus no. 455.
38. The same, no. 113; neither this nor the preceding is fully made out.
39. Fragment of Cyril of Alexandria, *De adoratione*, in Dublin.
40. Fragments of Cyril, in the Rainer collection.
41. Letter of a patriarch of Alexandria to the Egyptian churches, with citations from Cyril's commentary on the Gospel of John, British Museum, no. 729.
42. Assumption of Isaiah ii. 4–iv. 4, Amherst papyrus no. 1.
43. Fragments of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, Oxyrhyncus papyrus no. 403.
44. An unidentified fragment, the same, no. 406.

Besides these, there are several liturgical and homiletical fragments. Of importance for theology are a number with Coptic writing carrying Biblical, Gnostic, and other early Christian writings, one of them the *Acta Pauli*, published by C. Schmidt in *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*, vol. ii., Leipsic, 1904.

5. Their Utility.

The non-literary papyri often contain details which have direct bearing upon Biblical and early Christian antiquity. Thus there are pieces which name Jews living in various parts of Egypt and so afford a view of Judaism from the times of the Ptolemies till the time of the Roman empire. Other papyri enable us to settle the date of the prefect of Egypt Munatius Felix and so to date Justin Martyr's Apology. The period of persecution is illumined by the libelli which have been found (see Lapsed). There is a letter from a presbyter in the Great Oasis to another presbyter concerning a banned Christian woman (cf. A. Deissmann, *Ein Original-Document aus der diocletianischen Christenverfolgung*, Leipsic, 1902; in English, *The Epistle of Psenosiris*, London, 1902). There are also legal documents of importance and interest for the history of Christianity, not all published, which will advance knowledge materially. Incidentally, light is thrown upon the Monogram of Christ (see Jesus Christ, Monogram of). While the papyri have value for general Greek philology, they are of especial importance for the Septuagint (see Hellenistic Greek). Until the discovery of the papyri there were few contemporary documents which illustrated that phase of the Greek language which lies open in the Septuagint and the New Testament. In those books what is found is the Greek of common intercourse of the times, both in vocabulary and in forms, and often also in syntax—this in distinction from the literary language of rhetoricians. The impression conveyed is that development of the language was still proceeding, and this impression might have been confirmed by reference to the few inscriptions of the period, which often show close affinities with Biblical Greek. But these had received little attention, and the opinion grew up and is even yet prevalent that Biblical Greek was a special type of the language. This theory has had great influence in exegesis, but will have to give way in face of the testimony of the papyri. One of the great gains from the recovery of these documents is that they show the relation of the Biblical texts to contemporary use of the Greek tongue and in a good sense "secularize" the Greek of the Bible. Among special points made clear by the papyri is the fact that the Septuagint is an Egyptian product. This is, of course, not new; but the Greek Bible can now be placed among a multitude of documents which are, so to speak, of its own nationality, and thereby it gains in vividness and in power to present to the imagination the environment in which it arose. Thus when the translators substituted "embalmers" for the "physicians" of the Hebrew text in Gen. l. 2, they reproduced in their rendering the influence of their surroundings. Again, the papyri make possible a more exact investigation of questions which concern orthography, morphology, and syntax. Thus the repetition of the numeral to express distribution as found in, e.g., Gen. vii. 15 and Mark vi. 7 is illustrated in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus No. 121 of the third Christian century; by this the later

Greek is connected with the Biblical Greek. Especially valuable are the contributions made to the lexicography of Biblical Greek. And a further service is done in giving a realistic sense of one of the fields in which the early seed of Christianity was sown, since the men of the period are made to live again, are shown at their work and under their anxieties, in their distance from God and in their sighing for him. This is especially true of the men of the lower and middle classes, among whom the Gospel found its chief success. To him who has more than a mere philological interest and whose eye is not content with a mere surface view of things, these documents will bring rich results in an enlarged knowledge of civilization and religion. Even technical theological science benefits when the historical background receives illumination.

(A. Deissmann.)

Bibliography: On the paleography consult: F. G. Kenyon, *Palæography of Greek Papyri*, Oxford, 1899; U. Wilcken, *Tafeln zur älteren griechischen Paläographie*, Leipsic, 1891; E. A. Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, London, 1893; C. Wessely, *Papyrorum Scripturæ Græcæ specimina isagogica*, ib. 1900. For introductory studies consult U. Wilcken, *Die griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, Berlin, 1897; idem, in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 1901, pp. 677–691. The most important works bearing on the relation of the papyri to the Bible and Christianity are G. A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien, Neue Bibelstudien*, 2 vols., Marburg, 1895–97, 2d ed., Tübingen, 1911, Eng. transl. of both volumes, *Bible Studies. Contributions chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the Hist. of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1901, 2d ed., 1903; to be noted also are his publications cited in the text, and his *Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel, ihr gegenwärtiger Stand und ihre Aufgaben*, Giessen, 1898; also *Licht von Osten*, Tübingen, 1908, 3d ed., 1909, Eng. transl., *Light from the Ancient East*, London, 1910; J. H. Moulton, in the *Classical Review*, xv (1901), 31–38; idem, in *The Expositor*, Apr., 1901, Feb. and Dec., 1903; idem, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. i., consult index, Edinburgh, 1906, 3d ed., 1908; G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, Cambridge, 1910; E. Buonaiuti, *Saggi di Filologia e Storia del Nuovo Testamento*, Rome, 1910. A journal is issued under the editorship of U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Leipsic, 1900 sqq.; cf. C. Wessely, *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde*, ib. 1901 sqq. The *Archæological Reports* of the Egypt Exploration Fund should also be consulted; also P. Viereck, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, xcviii (1898), III., 135–186, cii (1899), III., 244–311.

PARABLES OF JESUS CHRIST.

Meaning and Content of the Term (§ 1).
Non-Biblical Treatment (§ 2).
Synoptics' Use of the Term (§ 3).
Number and Character of the Parables (§ 4).
The Transmission Essentially Faithful (§ 5).
The Object of the Parable (§ 6).
Its Essential Characteristics (§ 7).
Principles of Interpretation (§ 8).
The Essential Value of the Parables (§ 9).
History of Interpretation (§ 10).

1. Meaning and Content of the Term.

Parable is a loan word taken over from the New Testament, where it is a derivative from *paraballesthai*, "to place beside," i.e., for purposes of comparison (Mark iv. 30 and the parallels). It is the usual designation of groups of illustrative or pictorial or gnomic teachings of Jesus, and occurs most frequently in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus himself used it (Matt. xiii. 18 and the parallels), and the compilers of the Gospels employ it, Matthew seventeen times, Mark thirteen times, Luke eighteen times. Elsewhere it occurs only in Heb. ix. 9, xi. 19. The Fourth Gospel does not use it, but has the synonym *paroimia*. It appears to be a word taken over from the Septuagint, since in Matt. xiii. 35, at the close of a group of parables that form of teaching is said to be a fulfilment of Ps. lxxviii. 2, where the Septuagint translates by the word the Hebrew *mashal*. Synonyms in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha are *paroimia, diēgēma, ainigma*. The early Christian lexicographers employed it in various senses, such as "riddle," "trope," "example," "aphorism," "proverb," "comparison." The word covers in the Septuagint a variety of forms of expression, such as the fables of Jotham (Judges ix. 7 sqq.) and Joash (II Chron. xxv. 18), the riddle of Samson (Judges xiv. 14), the teaching of Nathan (II Sam. xii. 1 sqq.), and the allegories of Ezekiel. In classical Greek the word has also a technical sense in logic and rhetoric, and was discussed by Plato and Socrates. The parable of Socrates and the "example" of Plato are parallel with the parables of Jesus. The essence of both is that the matter under discussion is illuminated by comparisons brought from some other realm of experience or fact. The difference between the fable and the parable is that the former is a creation of fancy, the latter a statement of relations based on observation of realities.

Aristotle's theory was all-powerful in ancient rhetoric, and it laid stress upon this form of expression as a means of proof or argument. Numerous examples of its employment are found in the older literature, the best-known of which is the fable of Menenius Agrippa. [Roman consul 503 B.C.; d. 493. His parable told of the insurrection of the other members of the body that arrayed themselves against the stomach, which they thought to be the idle consumer of nourishment, and so brought damage to themselves.] Its popularity may be illustrated by the fact that in Plato's Republic Æsop was given a place while one was denied to Homer.

2. Non-Biblical Treatment.

Socrates is famous for his use of the fable and the comparison, as, for example, in his use of the story of Prodikos (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, II., i. 21–34). In this last case the personification of virtue and lust, the use of Hercules out of mythology, and the purpose and method of the entire story give the whole narration the character of a parable. Seneca treats well of the parable (*Epist. ad Lucilium*, lix. 6), putting *imagines* and *parabolæ* side by side as methods of teaching by comparison. Cicero and Quintilian mean the same thing when they equate *similitudo* and *collatio*. And in this literature parallels to Christic teaching are abundant, as in Dio Chrysostom (*Oratio* xxx. 28–29) and especially in Epictetus. There is, of course, in the examples just adduced no question of literary dependence. They illustrate the dictum that in this form of discourse the truth underlies the argument, and only the form of narration is fictitious. Man thinks first in analogies and personifications, and he continues to think and illustrate his thoughts in these forms.

3. Synoptics' Use of the Term.

But in classic rhetoric the word parable had a more definite meaning than in the Old Testament; it is there differentiated from the fable, the allegory, the emblem, and the symbol; while in the Old Testament the word *mashal* covers all these varied forms of illustration. In the New Testament it is not to be overlooked that the word parable is not applied to all of the illustrative sayings of Jesus, though on the other side no other comprehensive term is applied. So that the term is not used in a sharply defined technical sense in the Synoptics. Thus in Luke iv. 23 a proverb is called a parable, and in Matt. xv. 15 Peter speaks of a principle which carries a direct conclusion as a parable. Other examples of this inexact usage are found in Matt. xii. 24 sqq., cf. Mark iii. 23 and Luke v. 36–38, with all of which may be compared Jas. i. 6, 23, in which the phrase "is like" is used. From cases like these are to be distinguished those in which the idea to be illustrated is, through characteristic formulas which are found neither in the Old Testament nor in classic literature, placed alongside the illustrative narratives by which the comparison is fully worked out. This may be done by means of a question (Matt. xxi. 28) which challenges a decision, or by a statement (Mark iv. 26), or by direct characterization as a parable (Matt. xiii. 3). Corresponding to this formula of introduction of idea and narrative is the application which by the word "so" binds together picture and idea (Matt. xviii. 35). This method of introduction, if one excepts Luke xvi. 19, serves to separate from the parables the gnomic sayings, proverbs, and examples in which the idea is closely connected with a concrete fact. These latter have a definite teaching purpose, but in a narrower range and a method other than those of the parables and allegories. They have their own individual existence alongside of their illustrative value, while the parable has only its illustrative value for the case in point. Allegory is rooted in metaphor, it is a carrying over of something into another sphere. The parable rests upon a comparison of two different quantities which are placed side by side but not bound together as subject and predicate. "I am a good shepherd" is allegorical: "The kingdom of God is like a good shepherd" is parabolic. When the question arises concerning the valuation of the parables of Jesus, rhetorically the answer is that they are in the same categories as the fable, the myth and the narrative of comparison; but from the point of view of their contents they have a specific character so that they differ from corresponding forms as Jesus differs from other teachers.

4. Number and Character of the Parables.

Joseppus in his *Hypomnēstikon biblion* (*MPG*, cvi. 138–139) reckons in all 29 parables, in which, however, he counts cases of gnomic sayings (Matt. x. 16), judgments (Luke xiii. 32), metaphor (Luke xvi. 6), etc., but passes by numerous pieces like that of the unrighteous householder. Gregory of Nyssa similarly makes no distinction between cited examples, mere comparisons and parables, and ascribes to Matthew seventeen parables, to Mark four, and to Luke twenty-two. A better statement is that the Synoptics have four in common (or five if Matt. ix. 15–16 be reckoned), nine are common to Matthew and Luke, peculiar to Matthew are ten, to Mark two, and to Luke thirteen. The parables common to the Synoptics treat of the kingdom of heaven, its strength, its worth, its realization. Three of them draw their material from nature or agriculture (Mark iv. 26–27), the fourth is based on the opposition between Israel's conduct and the promises of God. All are in essence prophetic. The parables common to Matthew and Luke deal with the relation of man to God, man's disposition, duties, and work, and not all are carried out to completion. Eschatological relations are treated, the material is drawn from social and family life. The parables peculiar to Matthew are in this class, while those of Luke are noted for their directness of teaching. An instance of this last class is the parable of the good Samaritan. The style and coloring of these narratives vary greatly. Most of them are simple, and the narrative is carried only so far as is necessary to convey the meaning. Others, especially those of Luke, are worked out more artistically and individually, though never to the point of mere elaboration. Matthew treats less than Luke the individual interest, is more epic in character, as illustrated by the respective treatment of the parable of the talents.

5. The Transmission Essentially Faithful.

If the fidelity to the truth of the transmission of the parables be considered, the position must be taken that no criticism can destroy the fact that Jesus taught in parables, and that the recollection of them was influenced by his experience. Not only is the material out of which they are formed (drawn from current life) testimony of this, but the inherent content and consistent point of view and the character of the observation which utilized them and its keen insight into the relations of man bear witness to the same. They thus become a means of insight into the inner life of Jesus himself. But between the Sunday on the Sea of Galilee or the days of conflict in Jerusalem and the time when these parables were set down in literary form in the Gospels there intervened the period of preaching and of personal oral exchange of narrative. The record is dependent upon personal recollection into which personal experience has been interjected. It results that the words in which the parables are set forth are not those of Jesus. Indeed, he spoke to the people in their vernacular, of which many traces remain, and Lazarus, the only personal name in the parables, is of Hebrew origin. Further, even in those parables which are common to the Synoptics individualistic points of treatment are abundantly visible. But the derivation of these from a common source is equally unmistakable. The individuality of each of the narrations, the variation in terms, the use of synonyms, all indicate, however, that the source of the writers was in the memory and not before the eye. In the parables common to Matthew and Luke the agreement is less close than that in the parables common to all the Synoptics. One makes additions not found in the other, the setting is often quite different, and sometimes the turn given to the teaching is also variant. Differences which appear and are noteworthy result from a variant origin given to the teaching, a point illustrated by a comparison of Luke xii. 48 with Mark xiii. 34. In some of these, gnomic sayings are mingled with parables, and the question arises in a comparison of the different records which is the original, the parable or the gnome. A solution of some of these problems which seems to be indicated is that in some cases there appears a hint of parables which have not gained entrance into the Gospel narrative (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 11). Nevertheless, the tradition of the parables, without detriment to the freedom and elasticity which belong to such a tradition, has not suffered deliberate perversion, fictitious interpolation, or material alienation of the original utterance of Jesus. The transmission of the literature of Æsop gives rich material for estimation of the valuation of the freedom and elasticity of form which are characteristic of such transmission. The essence is indestructible, the general working out and the chief points remain undisturbed; but the expression, the artistic setting, the intermingling of new material, are characteristic of the new narrator, though it must be admitted that the Evangelists sought to express so far as possible the utterances of Jesus in his own words.

6. The Object of the Parable.

The pictorial discourses of Jesus proclaim what he brought and what he was, their purpose was to instruct by illustrating. His material he found in nature and in human life, which mirrored for him the mysteries of the kingdom. It was in this spirit that he said: "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear" (Matt. xiii. 16). He would have men learn from nature to read the signs of the times (Matt. xxiv. 32). While many of the comparisons of Jesus are so plain that they are self-explanatory, the question has been raised and variously answered whether the parables proper are in this category. According to Matt. xiii. 10 the purpose of the parables is said to be the leaving of those estranged from God in that estrangement. The parables would be then an esoteric form of teaching with a negative purpose, and would remain a secret with no key to their teaching. On the other hand, it is said in Mark iv. 33 that Jesus taught the people in parables as they were able to hear. The fact, moreover, that he taught not only the people, but his disciples by this same means shows in comparison with the passage from Matt. xiii. that he distinguished between an esoteric and an exoteric form. If these two views stand opposed, it is the problem of the critic to determine which was the purpose of Jesus. And there can be no doubt that the thought that the parables were stumbling-blocks arose from a misunderstanding of his words and that explanations which appear in the Gospels are not in all cases to be traced back to Jesus. It is in the essence of the parable that to the essentially ethical and religious they come as teachings, that the characteristic of the hearer determines their value to him.

7. Its Essential Characteristics.

The distinguishing characteristic for the definition of the parable is the juxtaposition of idea and story. The story is of importance since it pictures an event, a definite consequence of facts. It deals therefore with a definite subject, not with "a man," but with the man, the woman, the king, the son; it is in the past tense, not in the present or the future. The artistic representation of parables illustrates this concreteness, pictures can take but an instance out of the whole parable. The relative independence of the parables shows also that the narrative is in itself full of meaning. It is their totality which is important, not the isolated particulars. They do not conceal at all that they put forth a fictitious event, which, however, has in itself an inner probability which carries conviction. The king who reckons with his servant or the woman who seeks her lost coin are everyday possibilities. But the display of mere creative ability is not the occasion of this narration; the discovery of the analogy, in which subsists the truth, gives the impulse to the narrative, which is uttered with purpose to instruct. In this respect the fable and the parable are akin. Where Socrates used the story of Hercules and his choice, Æsop would have employed the fable. Both spring from the living perception of the analogical relation, both employ fictitious narrative, the material of which is drawn from neutral ground. But the fable speaks for practical wisdom in ordinary life, while the parable has relation to religion and super-worldly ethics. The ironical strain of the fable is lacking in the parable.

8. Principles of Interpretation.

From the foregoing outline, it appears that the parable is in itself clear and comprehensible, and that it speaks in and for itself as a model and in its relation to and meaning for the truth which it is to illustrate. But does the parable furnish a clue in order that its interpretation may be recognized and how must it accomplish this? Narratives like those of the treasure in the field, the costly pearl, the two debtors, etc., are in themselves clear, but who would at once through them think of the kingdom of God or of the duties of children of God? Were the clue not given in some way, the interpretation of these would be like Nathan's parable to David—not till Nathan said "thou art the man" did the meaning flash upon David. So in itself the parable proves nothing, it has meaning only for him to whom ideal truth has meaning, and then indirectly and through analogy. A dictum of Flacius must here be quoted: Comparisons and parables are not to be explained with reference to their minutiæ but with reference to their central points. Each parable has its individuality both in content and purpose. Yet since the parable is an invented narrative the impulse to which comes from an ideal factor, it follows that the idea which is to be illustrated works in and through the various particulars, especially if the parable be elaborated. The parables of the tares among the wheat, the ten virgins, the wedding guest, and others exemplify this. In the Gospels there are four interpretations given by Jesus himself. Two of these are common to the Synoptics, two are peculiar to Matthew. The first of those common to the Synoptics relates to the parable of the sower, the two peculiar to Matthew expound the parables of the tares and the net (Matt. xiii. 36 sqq., 49–50); the fourth explains the purpose of the parable of the husbandman (Matt. xxi. 42 sqq. and parallels). These parables then are seen to vary in their meaning from invective through allegory to eschatological realism, the fact being that the method of the parables is a varied one according to the needs of the occasion, while the content and tendency define the meaning. But in the interpretation of the parables effort has been made to carry out an inflexible principle of interpretation. Undue stress has been laid upon the details, and often the unity of the illustration has been broken. But the parables are not subject to such inflexible methods since they differ from each other. The parable of the treasure in the field requires attention to the separate particulars, that of the wheat and the tares requires observation upon the effect as a whole. The relation of the parable to its significance corresponds to Goethe's description of a poem: " A poem is like a window-pane. If a man looks from the market into the church, all seems dark and gloomy within. But once the spectator is inside, all is beautifully clear, a splendid light is there and all is bathed in glory." It is the entrance which makes the difference, and of this Jesus spoke when he said that he hears who has ears to hear. He alone can understand a parable of the kingdom of heaven who has a burning desire to know that kingdom's secrets. In this light is to be taken the passage Matt. xiii. 10–17, which expresses the sum of the experiences of Jesus of the opposition to his teachings which he regarded as divinely purposed. Even this passage may illustrate how emphasis upon a single word and meaning of that word may influence the explanation, since the sense given to the ὅτι of verse 13 determines the relation of the event to the will of God.

9. The Essential Value of the Parables.

A proof of the essential correctness of the tradition of the parables as they exist in the Synoptics is their essential correspondence with the activity of Jesus in other respects. On the other hand, one should not overlook the difference between the truth which Jesus brought and the expectations of the people, so that this instruction by means of illustration appears as a proof of Jesus' wisdom and knowledge of man. If one asks concerning the essential worth of the literature of the parables, the answer comes that esthetically and rhetorically they belong to the literature of the world. If the matter of content is regarded, their incomparable clarity and power of illustration (no one who hears these parables ever forgets them) make the things of this world anchorage for eternal verity. If one looks at that which they illustrate, he sees that their like for the nourishment of the soul does not exist. The psalmist says that " the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Jesus shows how heaven and earth make known the will of God to lead all men to blessedness through the power of faith, of self-renunciation, of love and of humility and hope. He consecrates the earthly by revealing its relation to the divine. Jesus used the parable to test, to arouse, to educate. The space the parables occupy in the narrative of the Gospels show their importance in the gospel of Jesus. They reveal not merely the inner life of Jesus but also the purposes and views which guided his preaching and bore ever upon the future and were severely intent upon the ethical and the religious.

10. History of Interpretation.

The history of the interpretation of the parables, like that of the interpretation of the Apocalypse, mirrors the ecclesiastical, theological, and scientific interests which have emerged in the development of the Church and also illustrate the history of doctrine. From the time of Origen till the Reformation the subsumption of exegesis of the parables was the Scripture as the unapproachable deposit of the word of God. The idea of an inner sense was dominant, and stress was laid upon the minutiæ as well as upon the general teaching of the parables as revealing the " mysteries of the kingdom." As a consequence arbitrary fancy played all its freaks in the exposition of these illustrative teachings as in that of the Apocalypse. A stimulus to the exegesis of this literature came from the Gnostics, who read their *sophia* and their *æon* into the parables. The protests of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Hippolytus against this arbitrary proceeding did not deter others from pursuing the same path, which even Tertullian followed. Origen led in seeking ever new readings to discover in these narratives, and Chrysostom, Augustine, and generally the exegetes of East and West were agreed in developing the manifold sense of Scripture. The humanistic and theological movements during the Reformation gave a new turn to the conception of the parables. Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin from various standpoints plead for the recognition of the principle that Scripture is to be interpreted on the basis of the literal sense. Flacius emphasized the historical viewpoint, and Roman Catholic exegesis could not avoid the tendency to a historical-grammatical exegesis. Hugo Grotius worked in the spirit of humanistic philology. Soon after the Reformation, dogmatic interest again invaded, and found its proofs in the details of the parables. In more recent times Lessing and Herder led in the attempt to understand the parables in their essence, apart from dogmatic eisegesis. Herder's work is especially to be noted, since he introduced the psychological factor. G. C. Storr (1778) proposed the rule that the sense is attained through grammatical insight, through determination of the matter indicated in the parables, and through a recognition of the relation between the matter and the teaching-narrative. A. F. Unger made the distinction between the dress and the essence of the narrative, and he was followed by F. Greswell (*Exposition of the Parables*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1834–95), R. C. Trench (*Notes on the Parables*, London, 1857), and A. B. Bruce (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, London, 1882), whose work, while keen and learned, is not free from arbitrariness. Closely related to the work of Storr and Unger is the exegesis of C. E. Koetsveld (*De Gelijkenissen van den Zaligmaker*, 2 vols., Schoonhoven, 1869). Independent is the work of H. W. J. Thiersch (*Die Gleichnisse Christi*, Frankfort, 1875) and of J. P. Lange (Herzog, *RE*, 1st ed.), the latter of whom saw in the seven parables of Matt. xiii. " the entire history of the development of the kingdom of God from beginning to end." F. L. Steinmeyer's book (*Die Parabeln des Herrn*, Berlin, 1884) is full of spiritual and surprising combinations. A. Jülicher has opened up new paths, has taken up the problem of the transmission of the parables (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1899), and emphasizes the unity of the parable as a model in which the essence is in the *parathesis* or juxtaposition of religious verity. See EXEGESIS OR HERMENEUTICS. (G. HEINRICI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the theory and interpretation: G. C. Storr, *De parabolis Christi*, vol. i. of his *Opuscula academica*, pp. 89–143, Tübingen, 1796; A. F. Unger, *De parabolarum Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu scholæ exegeticæ historicæ*, Leipsic, 1831; J. L. S. Lutz, *Biblische Hermeneutik*, pp. 347–362, Stuttgart, 1849; B. Weiss, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft*, iv (1861), 309–338; C. Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, pp. 177, 209, 212, Gotha, 1864; A. Immer, *Hermeneutik des neuen Testaments*, pp. 176–188, Wittenberg, 1873, Eng. transl., Andover, 1877; H. C. Tamm, *Der Realismus Jesu in seinen Gleichnissen*, Jena, 1886; A. Jülicher, ut sup., vol. i.; *DB*, iii. 662–665; *EB*, iii. 3563 sqq. Exegetical literature is as follows: S. Bourn, *Discourses on the Parables*, in vols. iii.–iv. of his *Series of Discourses*, 4 vols., London, 1760–64; A. Gray, *Delineation of the Parables*, ib. 1777; N. von Brunn, *Das Reich Gottes, nach den Lehren Jesu Christi, besonders seine Gleichnissreden*, Basel, 1831; F. G. Lisco, *Die Parabeln Jesu*, Berlin, 1832, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1840; E. Buisson, *Paraboles de l'évangile*, Basel, 1849; A. Oxenden, *Parables of Our Lord*, London, 1868; W. Arnot, *The Parables of Our Lord*, New York, 1872; W. Beyschlag, *Die Gleichnissreden des Herrn*, Halle, 1875; H. Calderwood, *The Parables of our Lord*, London, 1880; M. Dods, *The Parables of our Lord*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1883–85; S. Goebel, *Die Parabeln Jesu*, Gotha, 1880, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1884; S. D. F. Salmond, *Parables of our Lord*, ib. 1893; W. H. Thomson, *The Parables and their Homes*, New York, 1895; B. W. Martin, *Practical Studies on the Parables of our Lord*, London, 1897; I. Stockmeyer, *Exegetische und praktische Erklärung ausgewählter Gleichnisse Jesu*, ed. K. Stockmeyer, Basel, 1897; C. A. Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu, mit einer Einleitung über die Methode der Parabeln-Auslegung*, Giessen, 1903; C. Ricketts, *Parables from the Gospels*, New York, 1903; P. Fiebig, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Tübingen, 1904; G. C. Morgan, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, New York, 1907; and literature on the Life of Christ, and the commentaries on the Gospels.

PARABOLANOI: A brotherhood at Alexandria in the fifth century devoted to the care of the sick. The (Greek) term means " those who expose their lives." The members of the fraternity possessed clerical privileges, and so many accordingly joined to escape public burdens that in 416 and 418 Theodosius II. forbade *honorati* or *curiales* to become *parabolanoi*, and limited their number to 500, later raising it, however, to 600 (*Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 2, *De episcopis*, 42–43). Their appointment was made by the bishop, and they practically formed an armed episcopal bodyguard. They gained an evil notoriety at the consecration of Cyril, the murder of Hypatia, and the synod of Ephesus in 449; and must at times have terrorized Alexandria. At Constantinople and elsewhere (as at Ravenna; *MPL*, cvi. 588) the parabolanoi found their counterpart in the college of deans. (H. ACHELIS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, III., ix., XXIII., iii. 7; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xiv. 276 sqq.

PARADISE: Name of a place or state. The Hebrew word *pardes* (Neh. ii. 8; Eccles. ii. 5; Cant. iv. 13; also the Targums and the Talmud) and the Greek word *paradeisos* (Septuagint), as well as the equivalent in Persian, whence the word has been adopted into all the other languages in which the Bible has appeared, means 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, of which Jesus spoke to the penitent robber (Luke xxiii. 43), to which Paul was caught up (II Cor. xii. 4), 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. First in consideration, it was taken allegorically. The chief representatives of this view are Philo (" Laws of Sacred Allegories "), Origen (*Homiliæ ad Genesim; Contra Celsum*, iv. 38–39, Eng. transl. in *ANF*, iv. 514–515; *De principiis*, iv. 14, Eng. transl. in *ANF*, iv. 362–363), and Ambrose (*De Paradiso ad Sabinum*). 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, Irenæus, Pantænus, Clement of Alexandria, in the Antiochian School, Epiphanius, and Jerome, and the majority of Christian writers of the time of Ambrose. 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 allegory the harmonization of the Mosaic and New-Testament conceptions. To Ambrose, the Pauline Paradise was the Christian soul. He also distinguished between the literal and the Pauline Paradise.

In the second place, Paradise was interpreted mystically. The Mosaic and the New-Testament representations of Paradise were considered identical, and place was found for it in a mysterious region belonging both to earth and heaven. The chief representatives of this interpretation were Theophilus of Antioch (" To Autolycus "), Tertullian (*Apologeticus*), Ephraem Syrus, Basil (*Oratio de Paradiso*), Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Cosmas Indicopleustes (" Christian Topography "), 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. In the poems of Ephraem (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 garden, divides itself into four streams, which, when they have reached the border of hell upon the lowest division, sink under hell, and, through underground passages, flow to the ocean and a part of the earth, where they reappear in three different localities, forming in Armenia the Euphrates and the Tigris, in Ethiopia the Nile (Gihon), and in the west of Europe the Danube (Pishon). Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth century) represents the divisions as rising in trapezoid form, and understands by "Pishon" the Ganges. Moses Bar-Cepha (tenth century) puts Paradise this side of the ocean, but behind mountains which remain inaccessible to mortals; 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 synagogue teachers, influenced first by Josephus, and later by the great medieval Jewish exegetes, in their commentaries upon Genesis and in some dictionaries, put Paradise in the very center of the earth, somewhere in the shadowy East, far removed from the approach of mortals. The four streams were Euphrates, Tigris, Nile, and Danube. "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 al Arab. The true Paradise was a future possession, on the other side of death. It is remarkable that the word "paradise" occurs but once (Luke xxiii. 43) in Christ's discourses. The explanation probably is, that it had become associated with sensuous ideas of mere material happiness. Paul uses the word only when speaking symbolically (II Cor. xii. 4); so also Revelation (ii. 7).

PARAGUAY: A republic south of the central part of South America, bounded on the north by Bolivia and Brazil, on the east by Brazil and Argentina, and on the south and west by Argentina; area 98,000 square miles; population 631,347 (1905) of whom 50,000 are Indians. Nearly all the people are Roman Catholics, due to the fact of the early intermingling of the Spaniards with the Guarani Indians, so that nearly the entire population constitutes a mixed race, and the Guarani language is generally the vernacular, though the official language is Spanish. It was conducive to the rapid Christianizing of the country, that increasing numbers of Jesuits settled there in 1609 and after. By the creation of a patriarchal and communistic state, which embraced a large part of present Paraguay, together with some neighboring districts, the Jesuits brought the Indians in general under religious and social control, as exercised through established centers and ecclesiastical precincts that went by the name of *reductiones*. When the society was expelled in 1767, and Paraguay became subject to the viceroy of La Plata, the civilizing progress could not be maintained. The secession from Spain was soon followed by an attack upon the Church, under the Dictator Francia (after 1816), unprecedented in brutality. This policy was continued to some extent by his second successor, Lopez, who proved far more detrimental to the country by the senseless war with the three superior neighboring republics (1864 to 1870), during which the population declined two-thirds, amounting, in 1872, to about 231,000. In 1870 Paraguay obtained its constitution, which stipulated in article 3: "The state religion is the Catholic Apostolic Roman." The head of the Church must be a citizen of the state. No other religion is to be prohibited within his jurisdiction. The bishopric of Paraguay was created in 1547. Since 1881 there has existed, subject to the bishop, a seminary for education of priests and teachers, directed by Lazarists. The school system, generally, comprising also the University at Asuncion, is controlled by the State, which supervises the intermediate schools, established in five cities, and the common schools. Instruction, since 1881, has been both free and obligatory. In 1903 there were 365 state schools with 858 teachers, and only a few private schools. Of course, there are not many Protestants. By continuous immigration, the Evangelical Christians of German nationality have reached the approximate sum of 1,150 souls, organized into two congregations. These are directed by the Evangelical Church and school administration and belong to the La Plata Synod. There is also a Presbyterian congregation at Asuncion. [Mission work among the Indians and others is carried on by the Inland South America Missionary Union, founded in Edinburgh in 1902 by Mr. John Hay, a layman. This mission is interdenominational, and its ultimate aim is to cover not only Paraguay, but all inland South America.]

WILHELM GÖTZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. G. B. C. Graham, *A Vanished Arcadia. Some Account of the Jesuits in Paraguay, 1607–1767*, London, 1901; A. de Alcedo, *Diccionario . . . de las Indias occidentalis*, iv. 73 sqq., 5 vols., Madrid, 1786–89, Eng. transl., *The Geographical and Historical Dictionary of America*, 5 vols., London, 1812–15; E. Gothein, *Der christlich-sociale Staat der Jesuiten in Paraguay*, Leipsic, 1883; E. J. M. Clemens, *La Plata Countries*, Philadelphia, 1886; J. S. Bazan, *El Dictador Francia*, Madrid, 1887; D. Pfotenhauer, *Die Missionen der Jesuiten in Paraguay*, 2 parts, Gütersloh, 1891; *Kurze Nachricht von der Republique von der Gesellschaft Jesu der Portugiessisch- und Spanischen-Provinzen*, ed. H. Baumgarten, Wiener-Neustadt, 1892; C. A. Washburn, *Historia del Paraguay*, Buenos Ayres, 1892; R. von Fischer-Treuenfeld, *Paraguay in Wort und Bild*, Berlin, 1903; W. Vallentin, *Paraguay, das Land der Guaranis*, Berlin, 1907.

PARAKLETIKE, PARAKLETIKON: A liturgigical book of the Greek Church which contains hymns, arranged like those in the *Oktoechos*, according to the eight tones of Greek church music, but differing from the *Oktoechos* in including hymns for week-days as well as for Sundays. The *Parakletike* is said to have been developed from the *Oktoechos* by Theodorus and Josephus of Studion. It was first printed by H. Geraldis at Venice in 1522, and has been edited under the title of *Parakletike etoi oktoechos e megale*, by A. Idromenos and I. Zerbos (Venice, 1897). (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 655 sqq.; W. Christ and M. Paranikas, *Anthologia Græca carminum Christianorum*, Leipsic, 1871; P. Meyer, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche*, p. 146, ib. 1899.

PARAMENTA.

I. Early and Western Church.
  The General Structure (§ 1).
  Separate Parts (§ 2).
  Ambo and Chancel (§ 3).
II. Eastern Church.
III. Protestant Churches.
  General Situation (§ 1).
  Specific Pieces (§ 2).
  Color Symbolism (§ 3).

I. Early and Western Church: By paramentum was meant in the Middle Ages the possessions of the churches in the shape of materials which served in the cultus, including the altar vessels and carpets and hangings. But in the course of time the word became differentiated and carried only the idea of textiles other than vestments.

1. The General Structure.

In the larger and richer churches large quantities of these materials accumulated, as inventories prove. In architecture the models for the early Church were found generally in classical antiquity, and these forms governed the development of the paramenta; the entrance first demanded treatment, then the intercolumnar spaces, then the choir, and so on, hangings being applied. This was very early. For the transition to the Middle Ages the *Liber pontificalis* (q.v.) is a rich source, showing, as it does, that, e.g., Adrian I. assigned to St. Peter's sixty-seven, to St. Paul's seventy-two, to S. Maria Maggiore's forty-four altar cloths, carpets, and hangings, and to other churches in proportion, the material being silk, half-silk, and linen. The orient was the source whence these materials were drawn, the ornamentation being of geometrical figures, plants, Biblical illustrations, and figures from hagiology, while the cross was especially affected. When architecture emancipated itself from the old models, adornment with these materials developed; the choir and the side chapels especially came in for ornamentation, though on festival occasions nave and entrance afforded place for carpets and hangings, while the Altar (q.v., III.) gave itself easily to treatment. When these materials were made in the West, the stuff used was wool or linen, fashioned upon earlier models, the monastic institutions being places of manufacture, while later the cities took it up. In the manufacture embroidery took a large, sometimes a luxurious part, at first upon oriental models, but afterward in more independent style. In the fourteenth century needlework on the Rhine, in Burgundy, and in Flanders reached its highest development. While naturally at first the models used were those from the East, in which the animals employed in decorations (griffin, peacock, eagle, lion) testified to the derivation, the tendency to independence was strong; so ornamentation based upon Scriptural stories, upon ecclesiastical material, and even drawn from common life, became usual. Some of the results are impressive, and follow the lead of Painting (q.v.). The Renaissance, too, had its influences both in weaving and in embroidery.

While the decoration of the structure as such was being developed, the individual parts also received attention. Naturally, among these the altar was emphasized. By early custom the altar table was covered with white linen, which fell with a greater or a lesser margin over the edge. This overhang easily lent itself to decoration either by embroidery or in the weaving.

2. Separate Parts.

In the development of the cloth covering of the altar there was by the Middle Ages the greatest advance, in the larger structures the materials being very rich—silks or cloth of gold, often richly figured. The general development was away from the early simplicity, and the structure itself of the altar and its appurtenances changed so that there were costly additions in the way of shelves and suspended parts made of gold or silver plate or leaf, adorned even with precious stones. In connection with these the hangings took on new importance and magnificence, were used often to set off the other decorations, and were hung between the pillars and at the sides. For the holding of the hangings framework of wood or iron was often employed. Present liturgical prescriptions of the Roman Catholic Church, which have their antecedents in the Middle Ages, require three linen altar cloths, two cover the altar table, while the third covers the entire altar and falls nearly to the foot. Upon the stone lies the chrismal, serving really as a protection for the other cloths. The service of the altar further requires the *palla corporalis*, a linen cloth about twenty-three inches square, used by the priest after the consecration of the bread to spread the latter upon and after to wrap it up. While it was formerly used also for the cup, the latter has now its own covering, the *palla calicis*, from which is to be distinguished the *velum calicis* which conceals the cup till the beginning of the offertory. Other pieces which have been employed were the *palla dominicalis* and the *purificatorium*, the latter a fine linen cloth for cleansing the cup.

In the Ambo and Chancel (qq.v.) the reading-desk was adorned with a narrow piece of cloth which hung down in front, in festal seasons the ornamentation was more elaborate.

3. Ambo and Chancel.

But in early and medieval times ambo and chancel were decorated rather with plastic material. In the early Church, as baptism was generally of adults and by immersion, the baptismal font was naturally enclosed by hangings; if the baptistery had columns about it, the hangings were suspended between the columns. The episcopal chair lent itself in festal seasons to this kind of adornment, especially after the thirteenth century when its position was changed. In the Middle Ages there was in use a large curtain shutting off the choir from the nave during fasting seasons, often ornamented with scenes from the passion. Carpets were a direct inheritance from early times and were used in the choir, and these were until a late period brought from the East or patterned after oriental models. The Western Church lacked prescriptions regarding all these adornments, and freedom in materials, color, and design was therefore exercised. The freedom of the early Middle Ages in all these matters has vanished before the growing restrictions of liturgical directions, with the result that a certain monotony has come in. This has in recent times, however, been relieved to some extent by a tasteful regard for the models of earlier times.

II. The Eastern Church: The history of paramenta in the East is naturally more brilliant than in the West. The East was the home and long the source of costly woven goods. Entirely natural, therefore, was the Byzantine predilection for display in divine service. But the looting of the East by crusaders and Turks has unfortunately left little of the great wealth of possessions of this sort once held by the Church there. The greatest use was made of hangings. The ikonostasis, which divides the choir from the nave, doubtless took its rise in curtains, while the choir itself made use of them on its walls. The ornamentation ran to the use of the cross and of figures of angels. The altar was especially the object of decoration, being practically concealed by coverings which hung around it and were spread upon its upper surface. In the service of the altar no less than four varieties of cloth paramenta are employed. The episcopal chair was also draped, and carpets were in use, there being no essential difference in usage in these matters between the West and the East.

III. Protestant Churches: The transformation of worship under Protestantism made a large number of paramenta useless, and the Reformed churches did away with them almost entirely; in the Lutheran Church for a time only the altar retained use of these materials. **1. General Situation.** Even what the older Lutheranism retained, Pietism and rationalism tended to do away with; so that the merest remnants of paramenta remained in use. The nineteenth century, however, witnessed a revival of interest and pleas for the employment of these adjuncts to worship, especially under the leadership of Heinrich Otte (q.v.), Martin Eugen Beck, and Moritz Meurer (q.v.), since when there has been in the Evangelical churches a larger use of paramenta either as liturgical ornament or in promoting liturgical-practical ends. While definite prescriptions as to the use of these materials is lacking, Lutheranism has built up a practical uniformity, but the Reformed churches have gone in an entirely different direction. In building up the practise, actual needs and artistic considerations have governed, and tradition has guided in the choice. Indispensable requirements are that the objects set forth be intelligible to the congregation and that the expression be appropriate to the purpose. Consequently all symbols and representations are excluded which are foreign to the consciousness of the congregation. The typology of the Middle Ages is passé and therefore unsuitable, and the same may be said of symbols used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Among the symbols permissible as ornamentation are the dove, the four symbols of the evangelists—angel, lion, bull, and eagle—the cross, and the lamb with the cross-standard. Models are not to be sought in nature or in painting, but the technical precedents found in the history of the art of the Church are to be followed.

2. Specific Pieces. Evangelical paramenta find their central point in the altar, the covering of which, of silk or cloth, should be simple and simply arranged. Only exceptionally does the covering of the rear wall come into question, since architectural or plastic adornment usually sets off this portion of the edifice. Suitable ornamentation is provided by the cross with ornamental setting or by the lamb with cross-banner or cup. The upper altar cloth may be of fine white linen, the principal covering having its borders ornamented with embroidery. The sacred vessels may be placed upon a corporale or cloth, the ends of which afford place for suitable adornment; the vessels are covered with a white cloth, and a napkin may be provided for cleansing the cup. The altar desk should be of such a form as to need no covering. For the chancel the covering of the desk is practically all that requires consideration, and the ornamentation here most suitable is the cross; harmony with the architectural situation is a desideratum. The baptistery does not easily lend itself to the use of paramenta, and in this case white is recommended if anything be used. The matter of altar carpet has remained within the province of free choice. Carpeting is indicated for the altar steps and the space about them, with geometrical or other technically warranted ornamentation. Wall hangings are seldom required. For direction in minor matters the works of Meurer, Bürkner, and Schäfer may be followed (see bibliography).

3. Color Symbolism. Early in the history of paramenta the symbolism of colors entered and remained fixed in the Roman Catholic cultus; in the Eastern Church the matter was not one of prescription but of custom and was simpler, and this latter is followed in the Evangelical churches. Color symbolism is only a part of ecclesiastical symbolism (see SYMBOLISM, ECCLESIASTICAL), in which paramenta have their part. While white was in early times fixed in use, in the twelfth century the general fixing of color symbolism must have taken place (cf. Innocent III., *De sacro altaris mysterio*, i. 64); in this four colors, white, black, red and green, are noted; cf. also the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* of Gulielmus Durandus, q.v.). The Lutheran has retained in some degree the usual customs in regard to the color scheme in connection with the Church Year (q.v.).

(VICTOR SCHULTZE.)

What is said above of the Lutheran and Reformed churches holds in general for the Evangelical churches of England and America, except that there is little to suggest that the use of paramenta is to be revived there. Protestant churches confine their employment of paramenta usually to embroidered book-marks for the Bible of the pulpit and white spread and coverings for the communion table and the sacred vessels. But in the Anglican Church and its branches a somewhat larger use is made of these objects, especially where High-church usages govern. This branch of Christendom also pays more attention to the color scheme of the church year, this usage accompanying a more elaborate use of vestments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For literary sources consult: A. Ilg, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kunst und Kunsttechnik aus mittel-*

alterlichen Dichtungen, Vienna, 1892; J. von Schlosser, *Quellenbuch zur Kunstgeschichte des abendländischen Mittelalters*, ib. 1896. For the general history of paramenta consult: F. Bock, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters*, 3 vols., Bonn, 1859–71 (fundamental); idem, *Die kirchliche Stickkunst*, Vienna, 1865; C. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, 8 vols., Paris, 1883–89; G. Semper, *Der Stil: I. Die textile Kunst*, Munich, 1878; F. Fischbach, *Geschichte der textile Kunst*, Hanau, 1882; B. Bucher, *Geschichte der technischen Künste*, iii. 335 sqq., Stuttgart, 1893; J. Lessing, *Wandteppiche und Decken des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1900 sqq. Some materials will be found in H. D. M. Spence, *The White Robe of Churches*, London, 1900; and concerning the usages much in J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, reissue, New York, 1903. For the Roman Catholic Church consult: V. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, vol. i., Freiburg, 1887; K. Atz, *Die christliche Kunst in Wort und Bild, Regensburg*, 1899; G. Jakob, *Die Kunst im Dienste der Kirche*, Landshut, 1901. For paramenta in the Evangelical churches consult: M. Meurer, *Altarschmuck: ein Beitrag zur Paramentik in der evangelischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1867; idem, *Der Kirchenbau vom Standpunkte und nach dem Brauche der lutherischen Kirche*, ib. 1877; V. Schultze, *Das evangelische Kirchengebäude*, ib. 1886; R. Bürkner, *Kirchenschmuck und Kirchengerät*, Gotha, 1892; T. Schäfer, *Ratgeber für Anschaffung und Erhaltung von Paramenten*, Berlin, 1897. For the symbolism of colors, besides the literature under SYMBOLISM, ECCLESIASTICAL, consult the works of Blunt and Thalhofer, ut sup.; J. C. W. Augusti, *Beiträge zur christliche Kunstgeschichte und Liturgik*, i. 180 sqq., Leipsic, 1841; W. Wackernagel, *Die Farben- und Blumensprache des Mittelalters*, in *Kleine Schriften*, i. 143 sqq., Leipsic, 1874; J. W. Legg, *Notes on the History of the Liturgical Colours*, London, 1882; J. Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes*, Freiburg, 1902.

PARAN: The name of a desert, mountain, or mountain range (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Hab. iii. 3), and probably also of a place (Deut. i. 1; I Kings xi. 18) mentioned in the Old Testament. Since the mountain of Paran is mentioned together with Sinai, Seir, and Kadesh, it must have been near the southern boundary of Canaan between Israel and Edom. The place of the same name would seem, from the obscure Deut. i. 1b and I Kings xi. 18, to have been situated between Midian (or Edom) and Egypt, possibly in the vicinity of the modern Ḳal'at al-Nakhl on the road from Suez to Ailah, the Biblical Elath. The desert of Paran was the home of Ishmael (Gen. xxi. 21), and also the place from which Moses sent the spies to Canaan (Num. xiii. 3, 26), so that it adjoined directly on the south. It is to be distinguished from the wilderness of Zin and from Kadesh (Num. xiii. 21, xx. 1a, 22). The wilderness of Paran must, therefore, be located south of Kadesh, Gerar, and the wilderness of Zin. It accordingly corresponds to the modern Badiyat al-Tih ("desert of the wandering"), which is bounded by the Jabal al-Maḳrah on the north, the watershed toward the peninsula of Sinai on the south, and the ranges bordering the Wadi al-'Arabah on the east, and the middle Wadi al-'Arish on the west.

The mountain Paran can not be so satisfactorily determined; whether a single mountain or a range is uncertain. In the former case it might be identified with the Jabal 'Araif or with the Jabal Ikhrimm in the western part of the wilderness of Paran; while in the latter case it might be identified either with the heights bordering the Wadi al-'Arabah to the east of the wilderness or with the chain to the south which forms the watershed toward the peninsula of Sinai. The latter is the more probable, especially as this southern range is now called Jabal al-Tih ("Mountain of the Wandering"). Wetzstein, however, like Palmer and Cheyne, identifies Mount Paran with the Jabal Maḳrah, but the interior of the mountain district is yet too little known to decide the problem. At the same time, it is possible that the southern part of Jabal Maḳrah, so far as it lay outside the borders of Canaan (Num. xxxiv. 4; Josh. xv. 3), was called Mount Paran. Finally, it should be noted that the El-paran of Gen. xiv. 6 if translated to mean grove is very possibly another and fuller name for Elath (q.v.); and as Genesis locates this place "by the wilderness" so the Arab geographers Ibn Ḥauḳal and Iṣṭahri also state that at Ailah (Elath) the desert begins in which the Israelites wandered. Euting has found the name Paran in the Sinaitic inscriptions in the forms Farran and Faran, and the new English map of Africa shows Jabal Faram at the s.e. edge of Jabal Makreh. The Paran of I Sam. xxv. 1 should be read, with the Septuagint, Maon (cf. I Sam. xxv. 2; Josh. xv. 55); for it is a city in the mountains of Judah, the home of the Calebite Nabal, the present Khirbat Ma'in. Nor does the valley of Pharan of Josephus (*War*, IV., ix. 4) refer to the Biblical Paran. In like manner, the Pharan of Pliny (*Historia naturalis*, v. 17) and the Phara of the Peutingerian Table (Leipsic, 1824) refer to the oasis of the Sinaitic peninsula now called Fairan.

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine in Connection with their History*, New York, 1883; H. C. Trumbull, *Kadesh-Barnea*, New York, 1884; *DB*, iii. 672–673; *EB*, iii. 3583–84; and the literature under NEGEB.

PARASHAH ("division," pl. *parashiyyoth*): The Hebrew name for the reading lesson taken from the Pentateuch and used in the synagogue on the Sabbath (cf. Acts xv. 21). Inasmuch as the intercalary Jewish year, when New Year falls on Thursday, has fifty-four Sabbaths, the entire Pentateuch is divided into fifty-four sections, the object being to provide a section for each Sabbath for the use of those Jews who read the Pentateuch through in a single year. The smaller sections employed by those who read the Pentateuch through in three years are called *sedarim* or *sedaroth*. In years when the number of Sabbaths was less than fifty-four, two of the parashiyyoth were read on the same day. Thus on the Sabbath immediately preceding the Feast of Tabernacles the last and the first sections were read, i.e., the reading of the Law was completed and begun again. The reading of the parashah precedes that of the Haphtarah (q.v.). The sections are known by the initial (or occasionally the first and the second) word; thus the name of the first parashah is "Bereshith" ("In the beginning," Gen. i. 1), and the second "Noah" (Gen. vi. 9), omitting the editorial note which begins the verse.

PARET, WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland; b. in New York City Sept. 23, 1826. He was educated at Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. (A.B., 1849), and after studying theology privately, was ordered deacon in 1852 and advanced to the priesthood in the following year. He was curate and rector at St. John's, Clyde, N. Y. (1852–54), Zion, Pierrepont Manor, N. Y. (1854–65), St. Paul's, East Saginaw, Mich. (1865–67), Trinity, Elmira, N. Y. (1867–69), Christ Church, Williamsport, Pa. (1869–76), and the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. (1876–85). In 1885 he was consecrated sixth bishop of Maryland. He has written *Pastoral Use of the Prayer Book* (Baltimore, 1904) and *Place and Function of the Sunday School in the Church* (New York, 1906).

PAREUS, DAVID: Reformed theologian; b. at Frankenstein (39 m. s. of Breslau) Dec. 30, 1548; d. at Heidelberg June 15, 1622. After attending the schools of his native town, he was apprenticed to an apothecary and again to a shoemaker. In 1564 he entered the school of the learned Christoph Schilling at Hirschberg, whom he accompanied to Amberg, in 1566; but immediately entered the Collegium Sapientiæ, at Heidelberg. On May 13, 1571, he became pastor at Niederschlettenbach and six months later a teacher in the Pædagogium at Heidelberg. On Aug. 24, 1573, he resumed the pastorate in the previously Roman Catholic village of Hemsbach; where, with the consent of the congregation, he reconstructed the church status along Reformed lines. Dismissed from his office after the death of Frederick III., Pareus was appointed, in 1577, by Palsgrave Johann Casimir, pastor at Oggersheim. Transferred to Winzingen in 1580, he cultivated intimate acquaintance with the teachers at the Casimirianum, in the neighboring Neustadt. After the death of Ludwig VI., Palsgrave Casimir, in Sept., 1584, called Pareus as teacher to the Collegium Sapientiæ, Heidelberg, the director of which he became in 1591, and, in 1598, he entered the theological faculty as teacher of the Old Testament and from 1602 until his death he taught the New Testament. His reputation as teacher increased from year to year, and attracted students from far and wide. From 1592, he belonged to the Palatinate church council. In his last years, Pareus was much afflicted with sickness. In Sept., 1621, as the Spanish troops approached the Palatinate, Pareus fled to Annweiler, and later to Neustadt. Then, when Elector Frederick V. returned temporarily to the Palatinate, Pareus returned to Heidelberg, May 17, 1622, where he passed away. He was survived only by his son Philipp (1576–1648), who issued his father's writings, to which he prefixed a life (Frankfort, 1647).

Pareus began his literary activity in mature years, with the tract against the doctrine of ubiquity, *Methodus ubiquitariæ controversiæ* (Neustadt, 1586). Some vexing polemical matter accompanied his issue of the *Neustadter Bibel*, 1587: an edition of Luther's translation, with appended table of contents and superscriptions. Jakob Andreä, in his *Christliche Erinnerung* (Tübingen, 1589), styled this publication an "arrant piece of knavery"; while Pareus, in *Rettung der Neustadter Bibel* (Neustadt, 1589), answered in a more moderate tone. Pareus further contended against Siegwart in *Sieg der Neustädtischen Bibel* (Neustadt, 1591), and with Ægidius Hunnius, in 1593–99, who accused him of the judaizing error of the Reformed party, with *Clypeus veritatis catholicæ de sacrosancta trinitate* and *Orthodoxus Calvinus*. He also issued various tracts against the papacy (1604–17). Despite these many literary battles, Pareus was by nature irenic, and much lamented the passionate wranglings of that age. His main task he assumed in positive, constructive activity; such as the many editions, after 1593, of his *Summarische Erklärung der Katholischen in der Churpfalz geübten Lehre;* and especially his numerous commentaries on the Old and New Testament Scriptures (published 1605–18). Significant also was his pronounced wish, in 1603, though denied by the strict Calvinists, that, in connection with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the Reformed Churches might use the terms *essentialiter et substantialiter*, so as to approach the Lutheran teaching. His irenic spirit, however, appeared at its best in the famous *Irenicum sive de unione et synodo evangelicorum liber votivus* (Heidelberg, 1614–1615). In this he proposes a general synod of all Evangelicals to unite the Lutherans and the Calvinists, who, he represents, were surely at one in every essential. On only one point, however, not affecting the foundation of belief, was there divergence. Why not forbear with erring brethren in love, and cease consuming one another in strife to the joy of the "papists"? But this yearning appeal of Pareus brought little response from his contemporaries, and his overture for peace was rudely rejected by the Lutheran theologians Hutter and Siegwart. In his biography, Philipp Pareus lavished almost excessive praise upon his father; yet impartial posterity regards him as a pure character and a distinguished theologian, who, during an age of narrow-mindedness, preserved a broad outlook, and both courageously uttered and capably represented the recognized truth. JULIUS NEY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The main source is the life by his son, prefixed to the collection of works, ut sup. Consult further, P. Bayle, *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, iv. 471–475, London, 1737.

PARIS POLYGLOT. See BIBLES, POLYGLOT, III.

PARIS, UNIVERSITY OF. See UNIVERSITIES, § 2.

PARISH AND PASTOR.

Pre-Parochial Period (§ 1).
Rise of the Parish (§ 2).
Nature and History of Medieval Parishes (§ 3).
Canonical and Protestant Theory (§ 4).
The Roman Catholic Parish and Rector (§ 5).
The German Lutheran Parish (§ 6).

1. Pre-Parochial Period.

Until the middle of the third century the one pastor of the faithful was the bishop, who controlled the churches in the cities, while those in the country were administered by the Chorepiscopus (q.v.), except in Egypt, which seems to have had a sort of presbyterial organization. About 250 Fabian divided the church at Rome into fourteen districts (corresponding to the "regions" of the city), each under a deacon or subdeacon, the primary object being the care of the poor; in the second half of the fourth century, there were more than forty churches in Rome. In this same century baptism could be administered only by the bishop, and by him only in the baptistery of the Lateran, and not until the end of the fifth century could baptism be administered in a number of other Roman churches. Some of these titular churches, however, the oldest of which were probably the successors of private houses in which Christians had gathered for worship in the pre-Diocletian period, seem to have been centers for divine service as early as the third century. Over them presided titular priests, who were later to become the cardinal-priests, but for many centuries they exercised no pastoral duties. In Rome, however, and probably in other cities, deacons and priests began, about 250, to be assigned to ecclesiastical subdivisions. This may well have begun in the rural districts, but as, in analogy with the spirit of Roman law, the country became subordinate to the jurisdiction of the city, the chorepiscopi of the East gradually gave place to priests dependent on the bishop. In the West, where there was no chorepiscopate, the graves of martyrs, etc., gave rise to a local clergy. The Synod of Elvira (305 or 306; canon lxxvii.; in Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 189–190, Eng. transl., i. 169–170, Fr. transl., i. 1, pp. 261–262) mentions deacons as directing rural communities without priest or bishop, although baptism administered by such a deacon was regarded as complete only when the benediction of the bishop had also been received; and the Synod of Arles (314; canon xv.; in Hefele, ut sup., i. 213–214, Eng. transl., i. 193, Fr. transl., i. 1, pp. 291–292) forbids deacons to administer the Eucharist, so that only the delegation of a priest could completely provide for religious needs. It was not, however, until the middle of the fifth century that the Church was fully organized in the rural districts (see Organization of the Early Church). Definite areas were now constituted which already contained numerous small places of worship, often with their own clergy. In these churches sermons might be delivered and mass might be celebrated, but on high festivals the parishioners worshiped in the main church. Furthermore, only the priest in charge of this main church was permitted to administer baptism at Easter (and probably at Whitsuntide), and such was his supervision of the neighboring clergy that after the middle of the sixth century he was called the "archpriest" (see Archdeacon and Archpriest). The main church came to be termed "diocese," "diocesan basilica," "parish," "parish church," and later "baptistery," etc. These churches gradually attained a degree of independence of the bishop, although their revenues were still paid to him or reckoned to his credit, and it was he who paid the clergy, the "parish churches" not gaining administrative freedom until long after they had received independence in pastoral care, the entire course of development being additionally complicated by the rise of the system of Patronage (q.v.).

2. Rise of the Parish.

It was only in the late Merovingian and the Carolingian periods that the parish, in the strict sense of the term, came into existence, whereby the inhabitants of a definite district were attached to a single church and its priest, who, exercising disciplinary powers, was, in his turn, strictly limited to the district in question and to its inhabitants, the whole development being powerfully aided by the state requirement of Tithes (q.v.). While at first the tithes appertained only to those churches which had the right to administer baptism and perform burial, they were greatly increased in scope by the rise of parish churches, beginning with the eighth century. Shortly after 800 Charlemagne enacted that a tithe of the fiscal lands should be devoted to the fiscal churches, exception being made in favor of non-royal churches only when these had had tithes since early times. While Charlemagne expressly guarded against diminution of the incomes of old churches by the foundation of new ones, this was essentially changed under Louis the Pious, the result being not only a powerful impulse to the colonization then regularly connected with the foundation of churches, but also the cause of the disappearance both of the old "baptismal" churches and of the archpriests. Even before these changes, such parochial confusion had arisen that no traces remained of the undoubted connection between these early "baptismal parishes" (the so-called "Merovingian great parishes") and Celto-Roman administrative divisions. In Germany, however, where these changes took place later, there were still relics of the ancient organization, which in Italy held its own until late in the Carolingian period.

3. Nature and History of Medieval Parishes.

A fully developed medieval parish thus presupposed a more or less definite district, the inhabitants of which were restricted, both for baptism and burial, to a specified church, to which they paid tithes and which had, for the discharge of pastoral care, an incumbent in priest's orders, deriving his income from the estates and incomes connected with that parish. The incumbent was seldom appointed by his bishop, being usually chosen by a temporal or spiritual lord or, more rarely, by the parish. As a consequence, the incumbent's position was, in the early Middle Ages, official rather than religious, while, on the other hand, the community in general took an active part in the administration of the parish, appointing the sextons and other minor officials, and frequently engaging and dismissing the assistant clergy. At the same time, the parish priest was an important figure, not only entitled to certain prerogatives and exempt from certain liabilities, but also, as the only man of learning, the scribe of his parish, and, in many places, a voluntary arbiter of justice. The system of parish endowment involved, however, some undesirable consequences. As in Teutonic law in general, there was no distinction between the private and the public aspects of the benefice, and it was accordingly assumed that the incumbent might have a substitute to perform his duties. As early as the ninth century many parish priests were represented by vicars, who were either paid a certain sum in money or in kind by the incumbent proper, or received certain incomes. These evil conditions were made still worse by the holding of Pluralities (q.v.), and were complicated by the development of Incorporation (q.v.). In the episcopal cities of Germany the cathedral long remained the only church, or at least the only one in which baptism was administered; but as early as the eighth and ninth centuries parish churches were introduced even in cities. At the same time, Patronage (q.v.) became an important factor, even in episcopal cities, when controlled by monasteries and collegiate churches, the rise of the city parish system being immediately connected with the latter. It would seem, however, that parish and baptismal rights were acquired by the collegiate churches only gradually, either in consequence of their own exertions or of episcopal transfer and division of older ecclesiastical districts. The cathedral or its baptistery accordingly often long retained either a concurrent or exclusive right of baptism, etc., the latter still being the case in some Italian cities, such as Bologna, Florence, and Parma. In the Middle Ages many of the German city parishes had no fixed boundaries, a situation which the Council of Trent sought to amend. Other conditions, such as the rivalry of collegiate churches, also tended to produce city parishes, which are found after the eleventh and twelfth centuries. These seem to have been served originally from the collegiate church, which still formed the center of parish worship; but in course of time the evils of non-residence appeared here also, especially as the parishioners not infrequently preferred vicars to the collegiate clergy. Finally, many city parishes, like large numbers of those in the country, became the property of monasteries, thus involving the principle of patronage. In cities containing a court, on the other hand, the right of patronage formed the foundation of the city parish, while the market churches both in the north and in the south of Germany were at once placed under the control of patrons. In yet other cases the citizens of a community built and endowed parish churches at their own expense, the patronage of the churches in question consequently belonging to the cities concerned, so that the pastoral care in such a municipality became a part of the civic administration.

4. Canonical and Protestant Theory.

In canon law the parish priest is simply the assistant and representative of the bishop, entrusted with pastoral care in a definite district, instituted by the bishop (or presented by a patron), dependent on his diocesan, and liable to deprivation (see DEGRADATION; and DEPOSITION) for due cause. In theory the parishioners are dependent on their parish priest for all means of grace excepting the sacraments of confirmation and ordination, which are the exclusive prerogatives of the bishop; but in practise the rights of the parish priest are subject to many exemptions (see EXEMPTION), especially in favor of the regular clergy, the mendicant friars being empowered to preach and to hear confession concurrently with the parish clergy. On the other hand, since the Lateran Council of 1215, all the faithful who have reached the years of discretion are bound to confess at least once each year to their parish priest, and to receive the Eucharist from him at Easter; and the decrees of the Council of Trent require the publication of the banns by the parish priest if the marriage is to be regular. Among the Reformers Luther and Zwingli took over the parish from Roman Catholic church law, although in both cases subsequent developments led to the formation of national churches in which the parishes remained the normal districts for pastoral care, subject in part to the parishioners both in the institution of the clergy and in the financial administration of the parishes. The suppression of monasteries, moreover, put an end to many abuses, as did the secularization of 1803, preventing, for instance, non-residence, and frequently giving a pastor an assistant in the form of a deacon, subject to the head of the parish in administration, but equal to him in ecclesiastical prerogatives. In like manner, the pastor is under the control of administrative officers, though the latter do not possess superior spiritual rank, so that the ecclesiastical functions formerly reserved to the bishop are abrogated. Calvinism, while not unacquainted with the concept of the parish in its administrative sense, has been debarred, by its stress on the Church as the " congregation," from any sympathy with the parochial system.

5. The Roman Catholic Parish and Rector.

In Roman Catholic church law a parish is that district, normally strictly delimited, in which a parish priest, subject to his bishop, exercises right and lawful pastoral care. The parish bounds may canonically be changed only by the bishop, and by him only in case of necessity or obvious utility. There are also "personal parishes," such as court or military chaplaincies, and missions are likewise movable and without definite boundaries in many cases, although in some places they are practically equivalent to regular parishes. A congregation is not recognized as a corporation by Roman Catholic church law, the legal personality being the parish, the parish church, or the benefice. Parishioners are those residing within a parish or possessing a quasi-domicile in it after a residence of six months. It is possible, therefore, to belong to more than one parish if the parishioner concerned has more than one domicile. Protestants who have been validly baptized are regarded by the Roman Catholic Church as heretical Catholics; but while theoretically such Protestants are held to belong to the parish, practically this tenet is now in abeyance. All Roman Catholics are, however, subject to the ecclesiastical control of their parish priest, who may forbid any other clergy to officiate in his parish unless possessed of papal or episcopal authorization, and has the exclusive right, except in urgent contingencies, of baptism, publication of the banns, marriage, the viaticum, extreme unction, burial, and Easter communion. Male religious orders and their institutions are exempt from parish control, and generally have papal privileges empowering them to exercise spiritual functions within the parish bounds. The head of the parish need not be a priest, though he must be ordained to the priesthood within a year; but if he be a deacon, such functions as require priestly ordination, particularly the celebration of mass, must be performed by a vicar in priest's orders. The parish priest is presupposed to be beneficed and to be perpetual, so that neither mission clergy, desservants (see Chaplain), nor subsidiary priests, are, strictly speaking, parish clergy. Where there is no right of patronage, the bishop presents to a parish in virtue of his "free collation," and even in other cases he gives at least "collative institution." The office of parish priest is not of divine right, and the attempt made by the Gallicans and by the Synod of Pistoja (1786) to trace the presbyteriate back to the disciples of Christ was formally condemned, as an Ario-Calvinistic heresy, in the bull *Auctorem fidei* (1794) of Pius VI. The privilege, and the duty, of the parish priest is the exercise of pastoral care, and residence is, accordingly, strictly enjoined. He has the right of jurisdiction as confessor of his parishioners even outside the limits of his parish, and must keep the parish records, as well as preach and catechize. On all Sundays and feast days he must offer the sacrifice of the mass, and, if he have charge of two parishes, this duty must be discharged by bination. He is likewise bound to supervise the schools of his parish and may have the usufruct of the income of his benefice, besides the surplice-fees which he receives. He may, in virtue of his "internal jurisdiction," exercise ecclesiastical discipline, but may not impose censures, since he does not possess "external jurisdiction."

6. The German Lutheran Parish.

In German Lutheran church law the parish is simply the district in which the official activity of the pastor is carried on, its boundaries being determined either by the ecclesiastical authorities, or by the State, or by topographical conditions, or even by personal considerations, although in exceptional cases the congregation may comprise several parishes. The Lutherans, like the Roman Catholics, hold that "whosoever is in the parish is also of the parish," but parochial control is practically restricted to the publication of banns and burial, since confession, the Lord's Supper, baptism, and confirmation may generally be requested, especially in the cities, from pastors of other parishes. The pastor is regularly considered a member of his own congregation, except where, as in the two Mecklenburgs and Coburg-Gotha, the congregations are not autonomous, in which case he is over his congregation. In ecclesiastical power all the clergy are held to be equal whether pastors, chief pastors, or deacons, even superintendents, ephors, provosts, and general superintendents having no superior spiritual functions, despite their relation to the administration of the Church. The Lutheran pastors are likewise beneficed and enjoy subjective perpetuity, being irremovable except for weighty reasons. The right of Patronage (q.v.) is an important factor, and, in general, the rights and duties of the Lutheran pastor in regard to preaching, teaching, keeping the records, etc., are analogous to those of the Roman Catholic parish priest. See Bishop; Deacon; Pastoral Theology; Patronage; and Priest.

(Ulrich Stutz.)

Bibliography: For the legal aspects of the subject, reference should be made to the works on ecclesiastical law (*Kirchenrecht*) by P. Hinschius, Berlin, 1869–97; E. Löning, Strasburg, 1878; A. L. Richter, Leipsic, 1886; E. Friedberg, ib. 1903; P. Schön, Berlin, 1903; J. B. Sägmüller, Freiburg, 1904; and U. Stutz, Berlin, 1904. Note particularly the literature under Canon Law.

On the general question much material will be found in the literature under Organization of the Early Church; and the various articles in this work to which reference is made in the text. A list of literature dealing largely with Germany is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 239–240. Of especial value are the works, noted under Church, the Christian, of E. Hatch, J. Cunningham, J. H. Rigg, and W. D. Killen. Consult further: J. Bannerman, *The Church of Christ . . . the Nature, Powers, Ordinances, Discipline and Government of the Christian Church*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1868; L. Duchesne, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, vii (1887), 217 sqq.; K. Rieker, *Die rechtliche Natur des evangelischen Pfarramts*, Leipsic, 1891; Lambert, *La Doctrine du ministère ecclésiastique d'après les livres symboliques de l'église luthérienne*, Paris, 1894; S. Rietschel, *Die Civitas auf deutschen Boden bis zum Ausgang der Karolingerzeit*, pp. 65 sqq., 82 sqq., 88 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; U. Stutz, *Geschichte des kirchlichen Benefizialwesens*, vol. i., §§ 4–5, 14–19, 21, Berlin, 1895; J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Entwickelung des Archipresbyterats und Dekanats*, pp. 29 sqq., Tübingen, 1898; A. Marignan, *Études sur la civilization française*, i. 200 sqq., Paris, 1899; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Origines religieuses de la France*, Paris, 1900; H. Grisar, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, i. 146 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; Zorell, in *Archiv für katholischen Kirchenrecht*, lxxxii (1902), 74 sqq., 258 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, i. 222 sqq., ii. 450, 714 sqq., iv. 19 sqq., 25 sqq., 382–383, 560–561.

PARITY: In canon law, a status of civil equality for various ecclesiastical societies. So long as the pre-Reformation heresy law in Germany was in force, there was no such thing as parity; but in 1555, after the peace of Augsburg, the German empire declared the heresy law to be no longer applicable. A distinction remains, however, to be drawn between the parity guaranteed by the German empire and the measures adopted by its constituent state governments: the empire never prescribed that the two confessional bodies should be placed on a footing of equality by the respective states. Parity signifies solely an equality of treatment for Roman Catholic and Protestant estates of the realm in matters of the empire's jurisdiction. As to the states of Germany, Brandenburg was the first to depart from the custom of recognizing the rights of only one Church; Elector Johann Sigismund in 1611 granted coequal standing with the Lutheran to the Roman Catholic Church in East Prussia, and in 1615 the same to the Reformed Church throughout his domain. For the rest of Germany, the act of the imperial deputies of Feb. 25, 1803, transferred many domains from Roman Catholic into Protestant hands, at the same time guaranteeing the exercise of the prevailing religion. Parity was next introduced by Bavaria (1803–18), Baden, and others. All the sundry Protestant states of the Rhenish Confederation were led by Napoleon to pledge to the Roman Catholics equal rights of worship with the Lutherans, and most of them fulfilled the promise. The act of the German Confederation did not touch upon the point, but confined itself to stipulating equality of civil and political rights for adherents of the various confessions as individuals. The complete civil and national equality of all Germans, without regard to religion and creed, was afforded by the law of the Confederation (now imperial) of 1869. The case is different with religious societies as such. That the three great Christian Confessions (Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed) everywhere enjoy a special measure of state privileges, is due to their historic position and their public importance. But in many of the German states, they alone possess the full measure of religious exercise. [For discussion of the subject in relation to other countries than Germany see LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS.] (E. SEHLING.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: See under LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS.

PARK, EDWARDS AMASA: American Congregationalist; b. at Providence, R. I., Dec. 29, 1808; d. at Andover, Mass., June 4, 1900. His father, Calvin Park, was a professor in Brown University, and the son graduated there in 1826; and, after a period of teaching, entered Andover Seminary, graduating in 1831. He then became colleague pastor of Richard Salter Storrs (2d) at Braintree, Mass., and during the next two years rose to the rank of one of the ablest preachers of the day; transferred, however, to Amherst College as professor of mental and moral philosophy, he became eminent as a teacher (1835–36). He was called to Andover in 1836 as professor of sacred rhetoric, which position he filled with great success and personal satisfaction till 1847, when, by a general demand of the students and friends of the seminary and the nomination of his predecessor, he was transferred to the chair of systematic theology, which he filled till 1881. Andover Seminary was in those days the chief seminary of the Congregational churches, and Professor Park made the New England Theology (q.v.), of which he was a consummate master and the greatest representative, the dominant school of thought in the Congregationalism of his time. That theology is summarily set forth in the creed of Andover Seminary (cf. his pamphlet, *The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary*, Boston, 1883), and also in his famous sermon upon *The Theology of the Intellect and that of the Feelings* (reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*). This sermon led to an epoch-making controversy with Prof. Charles Hodge of Princeton, which did much to bring the new school to a consciousness of itself and establish it firmly in the convictions and life of the churches. The long and laborious Andover life was broken by three seasons of travel in Europe and the orient, during which he greatly enlarged his acquaintance with German theology and philosophy, of which he was a master. In 1844, with Prof. B. B. Edwards, he founded the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of which he continued to be editor forty years. It was from the beginning a "sacred library" for the publication and preservation of valuable material not likely to be elsewhere attainable, a keen theological review, and an agency for the propagation of a sound theology. But his contributions to theological periodicals began much earlier and embraced a wide field. He wrote also a large number of memoirs of friends and of theological leaders, of which the most important are those of Samuel Hopkins (Boston, 1852) and Nathaniel Emmons (Boston, 1861). His other principal works were *The Sabbath Hymn Book* (in connection with Prof. Austin Phelps and Lowell Mason (New York, 1858), *The Atonement, Discourses and Treatises, etc., with an Introductory Essay* (Boston, 1860), and *Discourses on some Theological Doctrines as Related to the Religious Character* (Andover, 1885). From 1881 to his death, he lived in retirement in Andover, daily engaged in literary work, and largely occupied in the preparation of his theology for publication; but he seems to have destroyed his manuscript, for after his death nothing was found in condition for publication. The enthusiasm which he excited as a teacher was unequalled, and whatever his other claims to the memory of posterity, evidenced by his almost unexampled popularity in many different lines among his contemporaries, his greatest is the profound influence he exercised from the professor's chair. See NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY, V., § 3.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. H. Foster, *Genetic Hist. of the New England Theology*, chap. xvii., Chicago, 1907; idem, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, lx (1903), 672 sqq., lxi (1904), 61 sqq., 272 sqq., 511 sqq.; W. Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, New York, 1893; idem, in *American Church History Series*, vol. iii., ib. 1894; idem, *Ten New England Leaders*, passim, ib. 1901; *Professor Park and his Pupils. A biographical Sketch, with Letters received on his ninetieth Birthday*, Boston, 1899; and articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* as follows: lviii (1901), 187 sqq., by G. F. Wright; the same, pp. 338 sqq., by A. Hovey and J. Cook; and the same, pp. 540 sqq., by G. W. Boardman; lx (1903), 201 sqq., by J. E. Rankin.

PARKER, EDWARD MELVILLE: Protestant Episcopal bishop coadjutor of New Hampshire; b. at Cambridge, Mass., July 11, 1855. He was educated at Keble College, Oxford (B.A., 1878), and was ordered deacon in 1879 and priested two years later. He was a master at St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. (1872–1905) and was also priest in charge of St. John's, Dunbarton, N. H. (1881–1905). In 1906 he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of New Hampshire.

PARKER, EDWIN POND: Congregationalist; b. at Castine, Me., Jan. 13, 1836. He was graduated from Bowdoin College, 1856, and from Bangor Theological Seminary, 1859; became pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn., 1860, with which organization he has remained in active service ever since. He is the author of *Song Flowers for the Sunday School and Social Meeting* (Hartford, 1868); *Sunday-School Hymnal* (New York, 1880); *History of the Second Church of Christ in Hartford* (Hartford, 1893); and *Appreciation of Calvin Chapin, D.D., of Rocky Hill, Conn.* (privately printed, 1909), besides sermons of a commemorative or historical character. Of his hymns that beginning "Master, no offering costly and sweet," is perhaps most widely used.

PARKER, JOSEPH: English Congregationalist; b. in Hexham (20 m. e. of Newcastle), Northumberland, England, Apr. 9, 1830; d. in London Nov. 28, 1902. His father was a stone-mason, and his mother was distinguished for her simple faith and life. Through his father, young Parker had a strong infusion of Irish blood which accounted for much in his mental powers, his oratory, and life. His early education, received at three different schools, was supplemented by private study in mathematics, Latin, and Greek. From his earliest years he was under religious influence, and when in his teens commenced to preach in the village green. His powers as preacher and his genius soon became apparent and determined his future career. He attended no theological college, but read and thought by himself, seeking by every possible means to furnish his mind with all knowledge necessary to make him efficient as an expounder of the Bible. In 1852 he went to London and became assistant to John Campbell of Whitefield Tabernacle. His preaching power was soon acknowledged by persons of influence, who were charmed with his eloquence and suggestive utterances. He was much sought after, and in 1853 he received and accepted a call to a small congregation in Banbury, Oxfordshire. His success was marked. They had to enlarge the chapel, and ultimately to build a larger one, which was soon crowded. He remained in Banbury five years, when he received and accepted a call to Cavendish Street Congregational Church, Manchester, and began his ministry July 25, 1858. The church became a center of influence and the pastor was the originator of most of its institutions and movements. He started a college for the training of preachers, and did the most of the teaching himself. He edited religious periodicals, wrote some of his best books, took part in public movements, and attended to his pastoral duties punctually. His influence grew apace, and his power was felt far and wide in his denomination. In 1868 Parker received a pressing invitation to become the pastor of the Poultry Chapel, London, which was then in a moribund condition, but did not accept till the next year, beginning his pastorate Sept. 19, 1869. The old building soon became too small for the crowds which attended the services, and steps were taken to build a house of size and prominence, resulting in the erection of the City Temple, Holburn Viaduct, which holds upwards of 3,000 people. Dr. Parker commenced Thursday Noon Services in the Poultry Chapel and continued them in the City Temple till his death in 1902. These gatherings were unique, and no other single person ever sustained such a series of meetings for thirty-three years. They were held for one hour, and at every meeting ministers, students, professional and business men, workmen and women of all ages could be seen. Under his care the church grew as a power and his influence increased. He preached his last sermon Oct. 2, 1902.

Dr. Parker was a voluminous writer, his pen was never idle. His principal works are *Ecce Deus* (Edinburgh, 1867); *Springdale Abbey* (Manchester, 1868); *Hidden Springs* (London, 1864); *Ad larum* (1868); *Paraclete* (1874); *The Priesthood of Christ* (1876); *Tyne Chylde* (1880); *The People's Bible* (25 vols., 1884); *Family Prayer Book* (1889); *Some One* and *None Like It* (1894); *Paterson's Parish* (1898); *Preacher's Life* (1899; autobiographical); *Studies in Texts* (6 vols., 1901); *Pulpit Bible* (1901). Besides editing several periodicals he published in all over sixty volumes.

William Adamson.

Bibliography: W. Adamson, *Life of the Rev. Joseph Parker*, London, 1902; A. Dawson, *Joseph Parker, His Life and Ministry*, ib. 1901; G. H. Pike, *Dr. Parker and his Friends*, ib. 1904.

PARKER, MATTHEW: First Protestant archbishop of Canterbury; b. at Norwich, England, Aug. 6, 1504; d. in London May 17, 1575. He graduated from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (B.A., 1525; M.A., 1528); and was ordained priest in 1527. Already strongly influenced by the teachings of the German Reformers, he devoted himself at Cambridge to the study of the writings of Luther, qualifying them by a thorough knowledge of patristic literature, which was probably responsible for the comparative moderation which he showed in later life. In 1535 he was named chaplain to the new queen, Anne Boleyn, and to the king two years later, receiving also several rich benefices; in 1544 he became head of his old college, which had become the home of the new doctrines. As vice-chancellor of the university, he defended its revenues manfully against the king, who was tempted to extend to it his pillage of the monasteries. This danger past, he devoted himself to the promotion of the internal welfare of the university, for which his retiring and contemplative nature eminently fitted him. Even under Edward VI., he still sought to remain in his studious calm, and exchanged his university position only for the quiet deanery of Lincoln in 1552. Under Mary, he fell into disfavor by his support of Lady Jane Grey and by his marriage in 1547. Deprived of his offices, he remained in concealment until the accession of Elisabeth; he was then summoned, much against his will, to take part in public life, and was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 1559. The validity of his consecration has been disputed, the Roman Catholics regarding it as defective in both form and matter, Anglicans exerting themselves equally strenuously to demonstrate that every essential was scrupulously observed. The importance of the question lies in the fact that the new bishops chosen by Elisabeth, and thus the Anglican succession, derived their consecration from him.

Parker, at once Evangelical and conservative, was a fitting instrument for the carrying out of the queen's plans of compromise between the extreme parties whose strife threatened the peace of her realm. The situation was a difficult one. Bishoprics and parochial cures were either vacant or unworthily filled; great diversity prevailed in the conduct of divine worship; and ecclesiastical property had been in many cases diverted from its proper use. The kingdom was divided into three hostile parties; the Roman Catholic, with strong support at Oxford, among the lawyers, and to some extent at court; the Puritans, with their mainstay in the citizens of London, supported by the Cambridge divines, striving to enforce the Calvinistic ideals; and, between the two, the new primate with a feeble moderate conservative minority. In this passionate struggle, rendered more difficult by the uncertain and capricious attitude of Elisabeth, Parker stood for conciliation, and for the striking out of a distinctly Anglican line, a *via media* between Rome and extreme Protestantism. His hands were full; he had to train the new bishops in the system, to keep a watchful eye on the courts of justice and the universities (the Cambridge statutes of 1570 betoken a complete reconstruction of the academic constitution in an Anglican sense), to regulate the restoration of its rights to convocation, to bring order into the financial affairs of the Church, and to guard the bishoprics and other benefices against unworthy men. Together with convocation, in 1562 he recast the forty-two articles of religion into thirty-nine, and gave them their final shape in 1571. He took great interest in, and wrote the prefaces for, the Old and New Testament of the "Bishops' Bible," a version which was to supersede Tyndale's and the Geneva versions. The "Advertisements" drawn up by him (see ADVERTISEMENTS OF ELIZABETH) were not formally sanctioned by the queen, but he enforced their provisions with strictness as an irreducible minimum of decent ceremony in public worship.

His scholarly work brought him more happiness than his administrative. He was a pioneer in the study of English antiquities, especially of the Anglo-Saxon period. He employed the large means which in his later years were at his disposal for the collection and preservation of valuable ancient manuscripts in danger of destruction at the dissolution of the monasteries. A single agent of his, Stephen Batman, asserts that in four years he collected on the archbishop's account no less than 6,700 manuscripts in England and elsewhere. These priceless collections he left to his old college, where they are now the chief treasure of the library. On them are based the first editions of Gildas, Asser, Aelfric, Matthew Paris, the *Flores historiarum*, and other ancient chronicles; and Parker was the first to recognize the value of the Anglo-Saxon works for the study of English history, law, speech, and religious belief.

Among other works, he wrote, assisted by G. Ackworth and J. Josseline, *De antiquitate Britannicæ ecclesiæ et privilegiis ecclesiæ Cantuariensis* (London, 1572), a collection of various treatises; and independently *An Admonition to All Such as shall Intend hereafter to Enter the State of Matrimonie Godly, and Agreeable to Laws* (1605 [?]); and *Archbishop Parker's Prophecy . . .* (1715). He wrote a preface for and made additions to T. Martin's *A Defense of Priestes Mariages* (London, 1562 ?); and edited Aelfrics sermon *A Testimonie of Antiquitie Shewing the Ancient Fayth in the Church of England Touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord* (1566); and Mathew of Paris' *Historia Maior* (1571).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief work is J. Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, London, 1711, 3 vols., Oxford, 1821. Consult further: His *Correspondence*, ed. J. Bruce and T. T. Perowne for Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853; W. F. Hook, *Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. iv., 12 vols., London, 1860–76; J. Josselin, *Historiola collegii Corporis Christi*, ed. J. W. Clark, Cambridge, 1880; W. Bender, *War Parker ein gültig geweihter Bischof?* Würzburg, 1877; G. W. Child, *Church and State under the Tudors*, pp. 188 sqq., London, 1890; F. G. Lee, *Church under Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 30 sqq., London, 1896; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 435–439 et passim, London, 1897; W. H. Frere, *English Church (1558–1625)*, London, 1904 (full and valuable); *DNB*, xliii. 254–263; and, in general, the works on the ecclesiastical history of the period.

PARKER, THEODORE: American Unitarian; b. in Lexington, Mass., Aug. 24, 1810; d. in Florence, Italy, May 10, 1860. His father, an unprosperous farmer of active mind, held rationalistic views, while his mother had ardent religious feeling without doctrinal interests. Instinctively and sensitively religious, the child of four years heard the voice of conscience speaking "clear and loud," and before the age of ten was terrified by the preaching of eternal damnation. His early education was limited to a district school, with one term at the Lexington Academy (1826), but by extraordinary aptitude and the district teacher's help, he was able to win admission to Harvard College (1830), and was exceptionally allowed to take the annual examinations of the college class without residence and without a final degree. From 1827 he taught in district schools, working in the summers on the home farm. In Mar., 1831, he became assistant in a private school in Boston and a year later opened a private school in Watertown. Entering the Harvard Divinity School in Apr., 1834, he graduated July, 1836, already amazingly erudite and commanding twenty languages. After preaching in various parishes he married Lydia Cabot, Apr. 30, 1837, and was ordained June 21, as pastor of the First Parish (Unitarian) Church in West Roxbury, Mass. Though but little affected as yet by German Biblical criticism he had begun (1836) to translate De Wette's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. His early intellectual friendships were with Convers Francis, George Ripley, William Ellery Channing, and other members of the Transcendental Club, but he shrank from the pantheistic tendency of Emerson and wrote unfavorably of Strauss' "Life of Jesus" (*Christian Examiner*, 1840). Entering the discussion of Emerson's Divinity School address with a pseudonymous "Levi Blodgett" letter (1840), he professed belief in miracles but held them "not the sole or best evidence." Believing, however, that conservative Unitarians in reaction against Emerson were retreating to outworn positions, he boldly discussed "The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity" at an ordination in South Boston, May 19, 1841. The permanent essence of Christianity is the influence of Jesus and his religion, which is identical with "absolute, pure religion." It is its own evidence and needs no support from miracles, the reality of which is not denied. As a young man of boldly radical tendency Parker was at once refused exchanges in the Unitarian pulpits of his neighborhood, though laymen induced him to proclaim his views in lectures which were published in amplified form, *A Discourse on Matters Pertaining to Religion* (Boston, 1842). This was the theological crisis of his career. Refusing to withdraw voluntarily from the Boston Association of Ministers (Jan. 23, 1843), he was shunned by most of these associates and felt keen suffering in his isolation. There was no formal breach in his ecclesiastical standing. He remained permanently a member of the American Unitarian Association and of the Berry Street Conference of Ministers. After a year in Europe (Sept., 1843–Sept., 1844) he resumed his pastorate in West Roxbury with additional preaching in Boston, beginning Feb., 1845, in the Melodeon Hall. In Jan., 1846, he withdrew from Roxbury to be pastor of this Twenty-eighth Congregational Society of Boston which, after 1852, met in Music Hall and reached a membership of 7,000. In Boston he became a heroic leader of the antislavery crusade and a fervent advocate of temperance and prison reform and the education of women. Absorption in these social aims and pastoral work together with frequent lecturing throughout New England overtaxed an intellectual power which might have made an epoch in theological scholarship. His most exact work was an amplified revision in English of De Wette's work named above (1843). His intellectual toil amid distracting conditions was unparalleled and he was a prolific author of pamphlets, books, and articles in periodicals. Hemorrhage of the lungs compelled him to end his labor at the age of forty-eight. In Feb., 1859, he went to Vera Cruz and thence to Switzerland. After a winter in Rome he went to Florence, where he died and was buried in the Protestant cemetery.

Though unable to appreciate the motives of his conservative opponents, Parker thoroughly understood the genesis and bearings of his own views, as is shown by his lectures on " Transcendentalism " and the " Theological and Philosophical Development of New England " (*Matter and Spirit* in Centenary edition of his *Works*). New England thought had been controlled by sensational philosophy (" the original sin of the Anglo-Saxon people," *Matter and Spirit*, p. 353), and therefore rested religion on supernatural miraculous revelation. Political emphasis upon the inherent rights and the trustworthiness of man, the dissolvent effect of rationalism on dogma, and the growth of democracy produced the Unitarian and Universalist movements without producing at first a new philosophic system. Later the works of Coleridge, Wordsworth, Cousin, and Cudworth generated in minds like Channing and Emerson the conviction that man has an inherent spiritual element, nonmiraculous in its origin and operation. In opposition to this fresh thought the common Unitarianism, which had been simply an Arminian Biblicism, began to emphasize the miraculous historical evidences. Parker championed the new idealism without assenting to all the extravagances of the transcendental movement. Rich in historical knowledge he analyzed the total accretions of Christianity to an interior essence. This is identical with the essential religion of Jesus, whom Parker exalted with glowing eloquence (" the highest representative of God we know ") while he pointed out historic limitations in the ideas of Jesus and rejected all the traditional Christologies. Like the German mystics he saw in Jesus the supreme instance of man's experience of God, an experience not confined to Christianity though not elsewhere equalled in degree or in purity of expression. Hence Parker identified the essential Christianity seen in Jesus with " absolute religion." By this he did not mean a universal religion reached by generalizing elements common to all historic religions (though cf. Chadwick's *Theodore Parker*, p. 100) but the purest expression of the religious consciousness (*Discourse*, pp. 213, 214) as that is ascertained by abstract analysis (pp. 6–7) and self-inspection (ib. p. 5). Dormant or active in varying degrees, there belongs to every human being a specific religious consciousness irreducible and ultimate, acting spontaneously from diverse provocations, and in this religious consciousness the idea of God is immediately given to experience. Following Schleiermacher, Parker described this consciousness as a " mysterious sentiment of something unbounded " and the idea of God as simply the power which is the correlate to a sense of dependence.

But Parker did not adhere to this minimum relation of " dependence " and " power," and, using the terms of his own developed faith, described the religious sense as a reverence which normally culminates in trust, hope, love (ib. p. 32), or a voluntary obedience to the will of God. Similarly the " idea " of superhuman power given in the sense of dependence is soon transformed into the " conception " of God, " an infinite of power, wisdom, justice, love, whereon we may repose, wherein we may confide " (ib. pp. 141–142). While the term personality is defective as applicable only to finite human beings, impersonality could be used only to express a transcendence of limitations in the ground of all personal existence. " Infinite knowing must be his " (ib. p. 148). A sermon on " Communion with God " (*Ten Sermons*, 1853) describes a personal communion rising to rapturous blessedness, though without the mystic's ecstasy or absorption into deity. Parker often used the symbol of motherhood (*Theodore Parker's Prayers*, 1862) to denote the tenderness and unselfishness of God's love to man, and he opposed to the popular preaching of Calvinism an eloquent insistence on the infinite beneficence of God's character and providence: " love becoming a universe of perfect welfare." This optimism did not check Parker's impetuous and heroic conflict with social evils. Developing this conception of a perfect self-expression of God in the world, he championed with ardor the view of divine immanence in the world of matter and in the world of spirit, " while God yet transcends both and is limited by neither " (Weiss, *Life*, vol. i., Appendix, p. 470). Mere pantheism he regarded as " irreligious naturalism " (*Discourse*, p. 174, note). Reasoning from the theory of immanence and from the experiences of religious communion (204) he opposed to the traditional view of inspiration an affirmation of universal inspiration varying in degree with racial and individual capacity, but he did not clearly define the relation of such inspiration to man's own activity. The coldness with which these views were received in his own time and neighborhood has been succeeded by widespread sympathy in the churches of his communion and many others. FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Parker's *Works*, ed. Frances Power Cobbe, appeared in 14 vols., London, 1863–70; the centenary edition, Boston, 1907 sqq., contains hitherto unpublished material. An excellent selection from his writings is contained in *Views of Religion*, introduction by J. F. Clarke, ib. 1890. The best biography is J. W. Chadwick's *Theodore Parker*, Boston, 1900 (contains good bibliography). Consult further: J. Weiss, *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker*, 2 vols., New York, 1864; A. Réville, *Theodore Parker, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1865, Eng. transl., *Life and Writings of Theodore Parker*, London, 1877; O. B. Frothingham, *Life of Theodore Parker*, Boston, 1874; S. Johnson, *Theodore Parker*, Chicago, 1890:

J. H. Allen, in *American Church History Series*, x. 210–214, New York, 1894.

PARKHURST, CHARLES HENRY: Presbyterian; b. at Framingham, Mass., Apr. 17, 1842. He was educated at Amherst College (A.B., 1866); was principal of the high school in the same town in 1867–69; studied theology at the University of Halle in 1869–70. He was then professor in Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. (1870–71), after which he completed his theological studies at the University of Leipsic (1872–73); was pastor of the Congregational Church at Lenox, Mass. (1874–80), and has been pastor of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York City, since 1880. While serving as president of the Society for the Prevention of Crime (1891–1907), he manifested much activity, securing at one time not a little notoriety on account of his methods of securing evidence. He has written *Forms of the Latin Verb Illustrated by the Sanskrit* (Boston, 1870); *What would the World be without Religion?* (New York, 1882); *The Blind Man's Creed, and other Sermons* (1883); *The Pattern in the Mount* (1885); *The Question of the Hour* (1887); *The Swiss Guide* (1890); *Three Gates on a Side* (1891); *Our Fight with Tammany* (1895); *Talks to Young Men* (1897); *Talks to Young Women* (1897); *The Sunny Side of Christianity* (1901); and *Little Lower than the Angels* (1908).

PARMENIANUS. See Donatism, §§ 3–4.

PAROUSIA. See Millennium, Millenarianism.

PARSONS (PERSONS), ROBERT: English Jesuit; b. at Nether Stowey, near Bridgwater (30 m. s.w. of Bristol), Somersetshire, June 24, 1546; d. at Rome Apr. 15, 1610. He studied at St. Mary's Hall and Balliol College, Oxford (B.A. and fellow, 1568; M.A., 1572), and became tutor and dean. In 1574 he left Oxford, and began the study of medicine at Padua, but in July, 1575, joined the Jesuits at Rome, having embraced the Roman Catholic religion at Louvain while on his way to Padua, and was ordained priest, 1578. In 1580 and 1581 he was in England, making converts and printing much on a surreptitious press. When his associate, Edmund Campion (q.v.), was arrested Parsons escaped into Normandy (autumn, 1581). Thenceforth he was a persistent and unscrupulous plotter for the overthrow of the Protestant dynasty in England and the reestablishment of the papal supremacy there. From 1588 till 1597 he was in Spain and Portugal and at Valladolid, Seville, San Lucar, and Madrid established colleges for the training of missionaries to be sent into England. He also founded the English college at St. Omer (about 20 m. s.e. of Calais). From 1597 till his death he was rector of the English College at Rome. Parsons was an earnest and able man and an indefatigable worker. He wrote clear and vigorous English and had special skill as a controversialist. During his later years relations between him and other Roman Catholics were not always harmonious. He was hasty and self-willed, a victim of strong prejudices, and his statements of fact can not always be trusted. Of Parsons' numerous writings the more noteworthy were *A Brief Discourse containing Certain Reasons why Catholics Refuse to Go to Church*, published under the name of John Howlet (Douai [London], 1580); *The First Book of the Christian Exercise Appertaining to Resolution* ([Rouen], 1582), enlarged with the title, *A Christian Directory Guiding Men to their Salvation* ([London], 1585; often reprinted; modernized and Protestantized by George Stanhope, dean of Canterbury, London, 1700); *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crown of England*, under the name of R. Doleman ([St. Omer], 1594), which argued for the right of a people to change the succession for religious reasons and suggested the Infanta of Spain as the fit successor to Elizabeth. The book was approved by Allen and others, but raised a storm of indignation in England and was denounced by Roman Catholics there; *A Treatise of Three Conversions of England from Paganism to Christian Religion*, under the name of N. Doleman ([St. Omer?], 1603), an answer to Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.

Bibliography: Sources are: H. More, *Hist. provinciæ Anglicanæ*, St. Omer, 1660; D. Bartoli, *Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Giesù l'Inghilterra*, Rome, 1667; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, ii. 63–79, 4 vols., London, 1813–20. Two worthy sketches are: J. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics*, v. 273–287, London, n.d. (full on his works); *DNB*, xliii. 411–418 (detailed). Consult further: R. Simpson, *Edmund Campion*, London, 1867; *Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen*, ib. 1882; T. G. Law, *Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars*, ib. 1889; W. H. Frere, *The English Church (1558–1625)*, pp. 216 sqq., ib. 1904.

PARTICULAR BAPTISTS. See Baptists, I., 2.

PARTRIDGE, SIDNEY CATLIN: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Kyoto, Japan; b. in New York City Sept. 1, 1857. He was educated at Yale (B.A., 1880) and Berkeley Divinity School (graduated 1884), and was ordered deacon in 1884 and advanced to the priesthood in 1885. He was a teacher at St. John's College, Shanghai (1884–1887), and at Boone School, Wuchang, China (1887–1900), and in 1900 was consecrated missionary bishop of Kyoto.

PARVAIM (PARWAIM): A word used in II Chron. iii., 6 to describe the gold used by Solomon to line the walls in the interior of the temple (Hebr., *zehabh parwaim;* LXX., *chrusion to ek Pharouaim*). Without positive location, it may have been the name of a geographical region in Arabia, the land of gold for the Old Testament. A. Sprenger (*Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, pp. 54–55, Bern, 1875) seeks to locate it at Farwa, in southwestern Arabia, in the country of the Chanlan in Yemen. E. Glaser (*Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, ii. 347, Berlin, 1890) places it at Saḳ al-Farwain, in northeastern Arabia. Its location remains uncertain. (H. Guthe.)

PASAGIANS (PASAGII, PASSAGINI, PASSAGEROI): A sect of which various scattered notices occur from the latter half of the twelfth century. They were first condemned at the Synod of Verona under Lucius III. (1184), but without any definite statement of their peculiar tenets. The only places from which anything can be gathered as to these are in Bonacursus, *Manifestatio hæresi*

Catharorum (L. d'Achéry, *Spicilegium*, i. 212, Paris, 1723) and a treatise of Gregory of Bergamo, written about 1230, *Specimen opusculi contra Catharos et Pasagios* (L. A. Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ*, v. 152, Milan, 1738–42). Both assert that the Pasagians taught the literal obligation of the Mosaic law, enforcing circumcision, the Sabbath, and everything but the sacrifices, teaching that the doctrine of the Trinity was an error and Christ no more than the first and purest of God's creatures. Frederick II. called them " the circumcised " in his ordinance of 1224 concerning heretics. They seem to have maintained themselves until toward the end of the thirteenth century; Clement IV. (1267) and Gregory X. (1274) directed the inquisitors to punish as heretics Christians who had gone over to the Jewish rite. The sect originated in all probability from the intercourse of Christians with the Jews, who by their money and their learning had no little influence at this time, possibly in the first instance among Judaizing pilgrims returning from Palestine. The word *pasagium* was commonly employed to denote pilgrimages to the Holy Sepulcher.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, vol. iii., Stuttgart, 1850; C. Schmidt, *Hist. et doctrine des Cathares*, ii. 294, Paris, 1849; Molinier, in *Mémoires de l'academie des sciences . . . de Toulouse*, VIII., x (1888), 428; *KL*, ix. 1556–57; and the sources named in the text.

PASCAL, BLAISE.

Early Life and Scientific Discoveries (§ 1).
Conversion (§ 2).
Provincial Letters (§ 3).
Thoughts on Religion (§ 4).
Contents (§ 5).

1. Early Life and Scientific Discoveries.

Blaise Pascal, French philosopher, mathematician, and mystic, was born at Clermont-Ferrand (212 m. s.s.w. of Paris) June 19, 1623; d. at Paris Aug. 19, 1662. He was the son of Étienne Pascal, second president of the cour des aides at Clermont, who in 1631 resigned his post in order to go to Paris and devote himself to the education of his children. Here he found himself in a circle of friends whose center was the family of Antoine Arnauld (q.v.). The surroundings of young Blaise, as well as his natural inclinations, turned his attention early to scientific and mathematical problems, in favor of which he rather neglected the classical and humanistic. His attainments in mathematics are evidenced by his *Essai pour les coniques*, written before he was seventeen, and the calculating machine which he put before the public in 1642. But while a brilliant worldly future seemed to lie before him, his course was changed by an event of great significance for the entire family. An accident which befell Étienne in Rouen, where he was intendant of Normandy from 1640, brought him into contact with the absorbing problems of the spiritual life, as regarded from the Jansenist standpoint. He became acquainted with Cornelius Jansen's *Discours sur la réformation de l'homme intérieur*, Robert Arnauld's *De la fréquente communion*, St. Cyran's *Lettres spirituelles* (Paris, 1648), and similar works. The earnestness with which the Jansenistic piety rejected every compromise with the world was not without effect on young Pascal and the first impulse toward his conversion dates from this period. The spiritual effect of those writings on his sister Jacqueline (b. 1625) was even more marked. In the autumn of 1647 Blaise went to Paris with Jacqueline to seek the improvement of his health, impaired by overwork, being almost paralyzed and walking only by means of crutches. Here he was a constant auditor of the sermons of the Abbé Singlin, confessor of the community of Port-Royal. Jacqueline soon took him for her director, and desired to enter Port-Royal herself; but her father, who had returned to Paris in 1648, was unwilling to be separated from her. Pascal's first biographer, his sister Gilberte, recounts his conversion of the year 1646 as though it involved a complete breach with worldly interests; but this was not the case. The next few years saw his epoch-making discoveries and writings on scientific subjects, giving an account of the pressure of the atmosphere, nature's " horror of a vacuum," barometric measurements, and equivalent weights of fluids (*Nouvelles expériences touchant le vide* and *Préface sur le traité du vide*, Paris, 1647; *Traité de l'équilibre des liqueurs;* and *Traité de la pesanteur de la masse de l'air*, 1651). This is not the place to discuss his scientific achievements; but it may be noticed that even in this field he had a serious conflict with the Jesuits, who accused him of plagiarism and of giving out as his own the discovery of Torricelli as to the method of barometrical measurement. About 1649 he was of a divided mind between the conflicting attractions of religion and science, and for some years he could not arrive at a clear choice.

His father died Sept. 24, 1651; and Jacqueline was now free to carry out her cherished wish. On Jan. 4, 1652, she entered Port-Royal-des-Champs as a novice, and was professed June 5, 1653. Pascal now plunged for a time into worldly distractions in order to drown his sorrow at his father's death, finding his justification in the works of Montaigne, of which he was a diligent student at this time, as well as of Epictetus. But he did not neglect his studies, and his principal mathematical discoveries belong to the years 1653 and 1654. He wrote then the *Traité du triangle arithmétique*, the *Traité des ordres numériques* (Paris, 1665), and other smaller treatises. In these he discusses the laws of probability, as in the *Traité de la sommation des puissances numériques* he lays down the principles of the differential and integral calculus. The Jansenistic ideal paled for a while before his eyes; he thought of entering public life and marrying.

2. Conversion.

Suddenly, however, the old religious impulses awoke once more in his heart. He found the things which had appealed to him to be hollow and unsatisfying, and felt an intense longing for God and his grace. He paid frequent visits to Port-Royal, and related his sufferings to his sister. On one of these visits he heard a sermon from the Abbé Singlin on the beginning of the Christian life, describing it as a serious decision made in the presence of God involving a thorough breach with the world. The words seemed to Pascal to be spoken expressly for him. Two days later (Nov. 23, 1653) he had a remarkable experience, being made vividly conscious of the presence of God as if in an ecstacy. This is the date of his real conversion. He sought strength and protection for his new inner life in the solitude of Port-Royal, where his coming was welcomed with joy and taken as a signal mark of God's favor to the persecuted community. In spite of the advice of his physicians, he subjected himself to the strict discipline of fasting, vigils, and self-torture, although retaining his independence and frequently visiting Paris. He plunged into the study of the Bible and the Church Fathers, but did not refrain, on occasions, from opposing the elders of Port-Royal with his own convictions; such as the relation between knowledge and faith. His colloquy with Le Maistre de Saci (*L'Entretion avec M. de Saci*) shows that he neither shared the skeptical distrust of Singlin and de Saci for the theoretical reason nor admitted a complete separation between theology and philosophy. During this period he occupied himself with the plan of a great work in apologetics, which was to win to the faith the philosophers and atheists; but he was deflected from this path by the call to engage in the controversy between Port-Royal and the Jesuits.

3. Provincial Letters.

Early in 1655 the Abbé Picoté of St. Sulpice refused absolution to the Duke de Liancourt because he had received into his house a friend of Port-Royal, the Abbé de Bourgeois, and had allowed his grandchildren to be educated in the Port-Royal schools. This gave occasion to Arnauld to write his *Lettre à une personne de condition* (Paris, 1655), which was hotly attacked by the Jesuits, and followed up in July, 1655, by a *Seconde lettre à un duc et pair de France* (the Duke of Luynes). The Jesuits saw their opportunity to reopen the vexed question as to " fact " and " law " (see Jansen, Cornelius, Jansenism). Arnauld was cited before the Sorbonne and condemned on the point of " fact " by a majority of more than two to one. The Port-Royalists, anxious to bring the question before a wider tribunal, asked Pascal to treat it in such a way as to appeal to the lay public. This he undertook in the first of the " Provincial Letters " (*Lettres écrites à un provincial par un de ses amis*), published under the pseudonym of " Louis de Montalte," Jan. 23, 1656. The pretended author, knowing nothing of theological subtleties, asks for information on the controversy from a Thomist, a Jansenist, a Molinist, and a Neo-Thomist (see Thomas Aquinas; Molina, Luis; Jansen, Cornelius, Jansenism), and comes to the conclusion that Arnauld's offense consists in the fact that he has not used the expression *pouvoir prochain* (" prevenient grace "). Although some at Port-Royal had their doubts about the tone of the letter, it had an immediate success, and sixty friends of Arnauld's protested against the action of the Sorbonne. In a second letter, Pascal showed that the Neo-Thomists were really on the side of the Jansenists in the doctrine of " sufficient grace," and that only from fear of the Jesuits they had tempered " efficient grace " down to " sufficient grace." As was to be expected, Arnauld was condemned also on the point of " law " (Jan. 31, 1656). In his third letter (Feb. 9), Pascal utters his protest, asserting that Arnauld, although having St. Augustine and the Fathers on his side, yet was condemned. In the fourth letter (Feb. 25), he begins to attack the Jesuits directly, asserting that they are undermining morality; that they constitute the ethical ideal not according to what man ought to do, but according to what the average man is able to do; and that they degrade religion to politics, and morality to casuistry. On the day of publication of the fifth letter (Mar. 20), the community was required to leave Port-Royal, but before long was permitted to return. Meantime Pascal got fresh weapons by a study of Antonio Escobar y Mendoza (q.v.) and of Jesuit practise in the confessional. In the letters from the sixth to the tenth (Apr. 10 to Aug. 2), he deals blow after blow at the principles of probabilism, the method of justifying the means by the end, and the doctrines of equivocation of favorable circumstances and of mental reservation. In the eleventh (Aug. 18) he drops his mask and comes out under his own name against the enemy; in this and the two following letters (Aug. 18 to Sept. 30) dealing with charges brought against him by the Jesuits and quoting from their most approved teachers to show the havoc they have wrought to the moral sense by their teaching on almsgiving, simony, bankruptcy, and duelling. A week after Alexander VII. solemnly declared that Jansen had taught the five condemned propositions (*fait*) in a reprehensible sense, Pascal, leaving that question for the time, came out in a powerful philippic against the doctrine of the order on the question of murder (fourteenth letter, Oct. 23). Then in the last letters (fifteenth to eighteenth, Nov. 26, 1656, to Mar. 24, 1657), he returns to the Arnauld affair, and in the nineteenth, which ends abruptly, he attempts to strengthen his friends of Port-Royal in their resistance to the signature of the formula of submission proposed by the assembly of the clergy.

The whole series had an indescribable effect, and the Latin version made by P. Nicole (1658) circulated throughout Europe. The public conscience was with Pascal. At Rome the letters were condemned; and at Paris, burned by the hangman. They were morally a brave achievement. Though in the utmost physical agonies, Pascal yet stood boldly as the champion of freedom of conscience, of truth, and justice against the all-powerful Jesuits without fear of the Bastile or galleys. But the letters are also, in spite of their occasional character, a literary masterpiece possessing a high dramatic unity. In place of dry scholastic discussions on technicalities, Pascal has given vivacious dialogue, sparkling with humor. The figure of the genial Jesuit, expounding the secrets of his casuistical library with smug complacency to the curious Louis de Montalte, is worthy of Molière at his best; and the strong, clear, sober style makes the book one of the finest monuments of French prose. A collective edition appeared, *Les Provinciales ou les lettres* (1657); a late edition is by A. Molinier (Paris, 1891); Eng. transl., *Provincial Letters*, M. Villemain (London, 1847), T.

M'Crie (Edinburgh, 1847), and in *Temple Classics* (London, 1904).

4. Thoughts on Religion.

When its termination left him free to carry out his plan for a great apologetic work, his health was so increasingly feeble that he could do nothing more than leave a few scattered sheets to represent his thoughts. In 1661 a new attack upon Port-Royal gave him much pain, which was increased by what he thought the weakness of the submission of Arnauld and Nicole, and by the death of his sister Jacqueline (Oct. 4, 1661). His last few months were spent in retirement and in devotional exercises and works of charity. His remains were buried in the church of St. Étienne du Mont. The fragments found among his papers, representing his desultory preparations for the great work which was to have converted the atheists, were published by his friends under the title *Pensées de M. Pascal sur la religion et sur quelques autres sujets qui ont été trouvées apres sa mort parmi ses papiers* (Paris, 1670). Unfortunately Nicole and Arnauld felt obliged or authorized to alter the text almost out of all recognition; and it was not until the publication of Victor Cousin's *Des Pensées de Pascal* (Paris, 1843) that attention was drawn to the original. The first correct edition was that of M. P. Faugère, *Pensées, fragments et lettres de Blaise Pascal* (1844); Eng. transl., *Thoughts on Religion and Evidences of Christianity* (London, 1850). Other English translations are by Basil Kennett (1727, 1893), and C. K. Paul (London, 1885). G. Michaut, *Pensées disposées suivant l'ordre du cahier autographe*, aims to give a literal reproduction (Freiburg in Switzerland, 1896).

5. Contents.

Scientific studies, according to Pascal, leave the riddle of life unsolved, and the deepest cravings of the heart unsatisfied. Hence he turned to the study of man. Mathematical logic is incontrovertible but minus concrete truth. For scientific deduction God is cognizable only as a mathematical determination or concept of limitation. Only a single ethical effect follows the contemplation of the mathematical; through the conception of the infinitely small and the infinitely great, man comes to the realization of self and reverence before the infinite. The study to which man is called by his own constitution is the study of man. The first results are despairing; man is a chaos, a being full of inexplicable contradictions. But the very fact that he seeks and yet is helplessly weak, is proof that he once possessed a real happiness. He seeks in that which he has not the help which he finds not in that which he has, while neither the one nor the other is able to deliver him, because this infinite abyss is only to be filled by an infinite means. Mere philosophy can not bridge the chasm. Of the two fundamental types, Stoicism sets forth the grandeur of man but is blind to his misery and ethical impotence: skepticism recognizes his misery, but stumbles over his greatness. Philosophy points out the way of escape from the dilemma by preparing man for the receptivity of faith or leading to theology, the center of all truth. Reason affords a knowledge of God as a philosophical postulate but not as salvation; how God exists and how he is related to man must come by religious revelation. In the search for true religion, in the first place, reason is the only instrument: divine revelation must be cognizable by it, or at least not opposed to it. By miracle, prophecy, and the historic life of Jesus, Christianity reveals itself to reason as the true religion. The proofs are not "mathematically convincing," but they offer the Christian religion as a hypothesis that satisfies the reason. The doctrines of nature and grace, of the fall and of a divine-human Redeemer, are the necessary complement of experience as to the conjoint misery and greatness of man. But as the ungodly passions set themselves against the reasonable apprehension of God and his revelation, man can strengthen his faith by a second means; namely, habit. The habit of acting as though he believed, will reduce the frowardness of man's heart. Actual faith, however, is a gift of the divine grace; not indirectly through the reason but directly God inspires faith in the heart, whenever it suits his pleasure. The result is an absolute certainty and blessedness. The inspiration which makes the heart certain of the truth of religion proceeds from Christ, through whom alone we know God. Christian perfection consists for Pascal in the imitation of the self-denying life of Jesus—penitent self-contemplation, monastic mortification of the natural man, mystical surrender, and contemplative elevation are the means of sanctification. Thus his ideal of life is largely negative, the duty of charity toward the poor and suffering being the principal positive precept. This insistence on the inner life and personal sanctification is far removed from the Jesuit cosmopolitan morality; but it is almost equally far from the Evangelical conception of Christian perfection. There is nothing in all his work to show that he had any real understanding of or sympathy with Protestantism; yet he has been, like his contemporaries of Port-Royal, a stranger in the Roman Catholic Church to this day. Like Paul and Augustine, his great teachers, he has been a pathfinder to all those who were seeking God. A prince in the realm of science, he is even a greater than a prince in that of faith. (EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Noteworthy editions of the works of Pascal are: C. Bossut, 5 vols., The Hague, 1779; Abbé Maynard, 2 vols., Paris, 1851; C. Lahure, 2 vols., ib. 1858, with "Life" by Mme. Périer; J. de Soyres, Cambridge, 1880; L. Derome, Paris, 1885 sqq.; P. Faugère, Paris, new ed., 1886–95; E. Havet, 2 vols., ib. 1889; Molinier, ib. 1891; and the latest, by L. Brunschvicg and P. Boutroux, ib. 1908. The works were translated into Latin, Spanish, Italian, German, and English (London, 1657). His *Miscellaneous Writings*, translated from Faugère's ed., appeared London, 1849. For discussions of Pascal's life and work consult: E. Boutroux, *Pascal*, Paris, 1900, Eng. transl., Manchester, 1902 (the ripest fruit of the later investigations); C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vols. ii.–iii., Paris, 1860; idem, *Portraits contemporains*, ib. 1847; idem, *Monday Chats*, Chicago, 1877; idem, *Essays on Men and Women*, London, 1890; A. H. Reuchlin, *Pascal's Leben und der Geist seiner Schriften*, Stuttgart, 1840; V. Cousin, *Études sur Pascal*, Paris, 1857; H. Weingarten, *Pascal als Apologet*, Leipsic, 1863; E. Saisset, *Le Scepticisme*, pp. 241–342, Paris, 1865; T. W. Ecklin, *Blaise Pascal, ein Zeuge der Wahrheit*, Basel, 1870; J. G. Dreydorff, *Pascal, sein Leben und seine Kämpfe*, Leipsic, 1870; idem, *Pascal's Gedanken über die Religion*, ib. 1875; J. Tulloch, *Pascal*, Edinburgh, 1878; É. Droz, *Étude sur le scepticisme de Pascal*, Paris, 1886; E. Schérer, *Études* *littéraires*, Paris, 1887; F. Brunetière, *Études critiques sur . . . la littérature française*, vols. i., iii., iv., Paris, 1887–91; M. Nourisson, *Pascal, physicien et philosophe*, Paris, 1885; idem, *Défense de Pascal*, ib. 1888; J. Zettel, *Sur le pascalisme*, Paris, 1889; J. Bertrand, *Blaise Pascal*, Paris, 1890; D. Nasmith, *Makers of Modern Thought*, 2 vols., London, 1892; J. Owen, *The Skeptics of the French Renaissance*, pp. 731–808, London, 1893; V. Giraud, *Pascal*, Paris, 1900; A. Hatzfeld, *Pascal*, Paris, 1901; K. Warmuth, *Das religiös-ethische Ideal Pascals*, Leipsic, 1901; idem, *Wissen und Glauben bei Pascal*, Berlin, 1902 (of high value); W. R. Clarke, *Pascal and the Port Royalists*, Edinburgh and New York, 1902; A. Vinet, *Études sur Blaise Pascal*, Paris, 1904; E. Janssens, *La Philosophie et l'apologétique de Pascal*, Paris, 1906; W. J. Williams, *Newman, Pascal, Loisy and the Catholic Church*, London, 1906; K. Bornhausen, *Die Ethik Pascals*, Giessen, 1907; J. Gamble, *Study on Pascal*, London, 1907; A. Köster, *Die Ethik Pascals*, Tübingen, 1907; F. Strowski, *Pascal et son temps*, 2 parts, Paris, 1907; J. T. Burens, *De Casuïstik en Pascal*, Utrecht, 1909; Viscount St. Cyres, *Pascal. With Portrait, Index, Bibliography, and comparative Table*, New York, 1910; H. R. Jordan, *Blaise Pascal: a Study in Religious Psychology*, London, 1910; V. Girard, *Blaise Pascal. Études d'hist. morale*, Paris, 1910. The reader should consult also the literature under PORT-ROYAL; and works on modern philosophy and on the literary history of France.

PASCHAL: The name of two popes and one antipope.

Paschal I.: Pope 817–824. He was a Roman by birth, early entered the clerical state and was attached to the Lateran basilica, where he became deacon and priest, and under Leo III. was placed in charge of the monastery of St. Stephen Major and hospice for pilgrims near St. Peter's. On the death of Stephen IV., he was elected the same day and consecrated the next (Jan. 25, 26, 817), apparently to avoid the interference of the Frankish court. The Emperor Louis, however, made no objection, and renewed the agreement which had been in force under his predecessors. The document purporting to contain this agreement, the so-called *Pactum Ludovicianum*, for which the oldest witnesses are Anselm of Lucca and Deusdedit (qq.v.), has called forth much controversy. It is now usually considered to be not forged but merely interpolated, although scholars disagree as to the extent of the interpolations. In any case the relations between Paschal and the emperor were at first friendly. In the spring of 823 the young Lothair went to Rome, where Paschal crowned him (Apr. 5). In missionary work pope and emperor acted in unison; the former named the latter's foster-brother Ebo of Reims his vicar for the still heathen lands of the north. The recrudescence of the iconoclastic controversy afforded Paschal an opportunity for fresh intervention in eastern affairs as the upholder of orthodoxy. Leo the Armenian paid no heed to the representations of the Roman legates; but Paschal had the satisfaction of being recognized by the defenders of images as the head of the Church. The *Liber pontificalis* calls him a mild and benevolent ruler; the Frankish historians depict him rather as haughty and domineering. He was a devoted supporter of monasticism, and a zealous promoter of the cultus of the saints and their relics (see CECILIA, SAINT), to which qualities he probably owes his own canonization. His festival is May 14. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ et diplomata* are in *MPL*, cxxix.; and the *Pactum Ludovicianum* in T. Sickel, *Das Privilegium Ottos I.*, pp. 173 sqq., Innsbruck, 1883. Sources are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, ii. 52–68, Paris, 1892; Einhard, *Annales*, in *MGH, Script.*, i (1826), 135–218; Theganus, *Vita Hludowici*, in *MGH, Script.*, ii (1829), 604–648; Jaffe, *Regesta*, i. 318–320. Consult: Mann, *Popes*, ii. 122-155; B. Niehues, *Verhältnis von Kaisertum und Papsttum*, ii. 69 sqq., Münster, 1863; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 329 sqq., Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 800 sqq., Bonn, 1885; M. Heimbucher, *Die Papstwahlen unter den Karolingern*, pp. 116 sqq., Augsburg, 1889; F. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome*, iii. 35–55, London, 1895; T. Lindner, *Die sogenannten Schenkungen Pippins, . . . an die römische Kirche*, pp. 60 sqq., Stuttgart, 1896; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 481 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 519–529; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 193–201; Platina, *Popes*, i. 210–212.

Opening Promise of His Pontificate.

Paschal II. (Rainerius): Pope 1099–1118. He came from Galliata, near Ravenna, and entered the cloister in his boyhood; when at the age of twenty years he went to Rome on business for his cloister, he was detained there by Gregory VII., and stationed as presbyter at St. Clement's. He was elected successor of Urban II. on Aug. 13, 1099, and the next day was consecrated. Many burdensome tasks awaited solution at the hand of the new pope. Accordingly, it was fortunate that Guibert of Ravenna (q.v.), whom Henry IV. had put forward as antipope, was now expelled from Rome. [But Paschal's troubles were not ended with the expulsion of Guibert, nor even with his death. On the latter event the friends of Guibert elected Albert pope, but he was taken prisoner the same day and confined in the monastery of St. Laurence. The opposing party was undeterred, however, and chose Theodoric, who was captured after 105 days and shut up in the monastery of Cava, near Palestrina. The final effort of the Guibertians was the election of Magninulph, who took the title of Silvester IV., but was forced to flee from Rome, and died soon after.] The German situation at Paschal's pontifical accession stood favorable in that a weariness of conflict had set in, affecting even Henry IV. Hardly had the emperor learned of the death of Clement III. before he summoned the princes, at Christmas of 1100, to a conference at Mainz for the restoration of ecclesiastical peace. They advised the despatch of envoys to Rome, and Henry was ready to attend a council to be convoked at Rome in Feb., 1102. Paschal, however, from the outset was determined to continue the contest. He appealed to Count Robert of Flanders to engage in holy war against Henry, attempted to revive martial ardor in Swabia and Bavaria, and at the synod of Mar., 1102, proclaimed the *anathema perpetuum* against Henry. But the need of peace was universal, and the appeal to Robert of Flanders procured for the pope a sharp rebuff. At the outset, the bearing of Henry V. satisfied all expectations and hopes on the pope's part: Henry was humble in bearing, and by removing the schismatic bishops, and thus restoring to Germany her long-crippled freedom, he appeared to furnish proof of his sincerity. The emperor, who had ceased to stem the tumultuous vicissitudes of the last years of his life, died on Aug. 7, 1106; and with him, as it seemed from the papal standpoint, the chief enemy to the peace of the Church disappeared, while the situation of the Church in relation to statecraft grew less complex.

Investiture Strife.

Pope Paschal concentrated his interests upon Investiture (q.v.); and almost the sole aim of his policy was to secure that prerogative against the influence of the State. He purposed to conduct the negotiations personally with Henry V. in Germany, but his journey stayed short of achievement, and the synod in contemplation was held not in Germany, but at Guastalla, between Parma and Mantua, Oct. 27, 1106, when the pope renewed the interdiction on the subject of investiture. The fact that Henry then continued to exercise the right of investiture disconcerted the pope and aroused his mistrust. When the king's envoys paid their respects to him at Châlons, in May, 1107, and Archbishop Bruno of Treves at the same place defended the king's right of investiture, the pope sharply rejected the demand. Paschal nevertheless conceded, at the synod convening shortly afterward in Troyes, that thenceforth every incumbent who had been invested by a layman was to be duly deposed, together with his ordinator. Henry was granted a year's grace to visit Rome and advocate his claims there before a general council; but the plan failed and the relations between pope and king grew more acute. Henry started on his journey in Aug., 1110, notifying the pope and the Romans from Arezzo of his approach, and sending envoys to the former. In negotiations held at Turri Feb. 4, 1111, between the papal envoys and Henry, the following agreement was made. Henry was to yield on the subject of investiture on his coronation day after the pope had redeemed his promise in the matter of the regalia (see below), promising never again to interfere in the matter of investiture and to release his subjects from their oath to the bishops; he was also to establish the pope in possession of the patrimony of Peter (see PAPAL STATES) and to secure the pope's personal safety by a proper disposition of spiritual hostages. Peter Leonis, the leader of the papal envoys, promised for the pope that, when the king had performed his promises, the pope would direct the German bishops in attendance to restore to the king and the realm the regalia which had belonged to the empire in the time of Charlemagne and his successors; the pope was to forbid the bishops to put forth new claims to these regalia in future, or to exercise implied rights thereof, while his successors were to recognize this agreement; finally, the pope was to crown the king as emperor and to support him in the maintenance of his dominion; the pope was also to furnish hostages. This agreement was ratified by Henry V. at Sutri, Feb. 9, with a not unimportant reservation: the oath which he rendered covered merely the pope's personal safety, and conditioned even this upon Paschal's redeeming his pledges on the following Sunday. According to Ekkehard, the king still hinged his consent on the further condition that both spiritual and temporal princes should assent to the surrender of the regalia.

The New Agreement.

The execution of this treaty meant the solution of legal questions rooted in a past which comprehended several centuries; it reduced the bishops from princes to beggars, threw the German Church out of its routine, and was a revolution from above downward such as would affect the entire life of the Church; while the persons immediately concerned, the German bishops, had not the opportunity of submitting their opinion thereon. At that time the project was impracticable, since Paschal commanded no other instrument of coercion against the inevitable opposition than the sentence of excommunication, a penalty the impressiveness of which had lost much in the preceding half-century. Henry V. made his entrance into Rome on Feb. 12, and was ceremoniously received by Paschal. But when the original terms of agreement were read aloud in St. Peter's Church, there arose, amidst the temporal and spiritual princes alike, such a storm of indignation that the fulfilment of the compact proved quite impossible. These fruitless proceedings culminated at evening in Henry's arrest of the pope and cardinals, and a confinement of two months broke the pope's opposition to the king's wishes. On Apr. 11, the following compact was concluded by the two contracting parties. Paschal conceded that when a bishop or abbot has been freely elected, without simony and subject to the king's assent, he shall be invested by the king with ring and staff, and thereafter consecrated by the competent authority after the formal investiture. The pope furthermore promised not to molest the king and his realm, and never to visit the anathema upon Henry. He pledged himself to crown the king, and to support both realm and empire to the best of his power. Henry V. swore to liberate the pope, bishops, cardinals, and all other captives, on Apr. 12 or 13, and not to molest them again; to bestow peace on the Roman people; to acknowledge Paschal as pope; to maintain, or, if need be, reinstate, the Roman Church in its patrimony and goods; and to render the obedience due Paschal as pope, the honor of kingdom and empire being safe. Henry's coronation took place on Apr. 13, the pope obtained his freedom, the emperor retained the privilege of investiture, while every ecclesiastic or layman who should assail it was subject to anathema and deposition.

Disapproval and Annulment of the Agreement.

That Paschal under the stress of intense abasement had suffered himself to be constrained to these concessions subjected him to heavy penance. He lost the confidence of the Curia and embittered the remainder of his pontificate. This compact of Paschal's meant the relinquishment of demands which had been upheld through many years and defended with no mean sacrifices on the side of the Church; it canceled all efforts aimed at a reaction of public opinion in relation to the investiture; and it blocked the way to a resumption of such efforts in the future. A tempest of indignation rose against Paschal. In Rome a group of ecclesiastics turned their backs on him; in the rest of Italy there occurred intense and earnest protests; among the French and Burgundian clergy there almost ensued a schism; while even Germany was not entirely free from this refractory temper. The opposition of Paschal's fellow churchmen robbed him of self-confidence. He grew confused as to the lawfulness of his acts, and yet stood chained to them by virtue of his oath. Hence the equivocal turns of his procedure in the following years. This state of affairs became patent to greater circles at the Lateran Synod of Mar. 16–23, 1112. Here, in order to dispel doubts on the score of his orthodoxy, Paschal not only submitted a confession of his faith, wherein he notably recognized the decrees of Gregory VII. and Urban II., but he also assented to the resolution that the privilege wrested from the pope by coercion was to be condemned by the verdict of the Holy Ghost, declared invalid, and rendered null and void. After Paschal had thus broken the first part of the oath of Apr., 1111, he was powerless to escape the Gregorian party's importunity with reference to a censure of Henry V. For when the Synod of Vienne, Sept. 16, 1112, condemned lay investiture as heresy, pronounced excommunication against Henry V., and transmitted these resolves to the pope for confirmation, subjoining a threat of defection in case of his refusal, he did not hesitate to pass the sentence. When the ban against Henry had been reiterated, in the succeeding years, by the legates Kuno and Dietrich (at Beauvais, Reims, Cologne, Goslar), the matter underwent a searching discussion in the year 1116, at the Lateran synod convening on Mar. 6. First of all, the privilege of investiture met its doom. Paschal was compelled to pronounce his approval of the king's excommunication, in open audience; and thus did he surrender the second portion of his oath. But in spite of these resolutions of the Lateran synod, there ensued no absolute rupture of relations between pope and emperor. When Henry V. advanced upon Rome in the spring of 1117, the pope fled southward. [But the same year a synod was held at Benevento which fully supported the pope, and excommunicated Mauritius Burdinus, who had taken the part of Henry, and was the next year elected antipope with the title of Gregory VIII. (q.v.).]

Affairs in England, France, and the East.

In relation to other states, the administration of Paschal II. proved far less momentous. While in England a vehement conflict came about between the kingdom and the church, it found prompt solution through the Concordat of 1107. This was prior to the collision between the pope and the German king, and, owing to its localization, it exerted no general effect comparable in importance with the German investiture strife. Yet Paschal did not entirely lose sight of England in the years that followed. He sought to enforce, in opposition to King Henry I., the pseudo-Isidorian principles respecting appeals to the apostolic see (see PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS); demanded the lapse of the royal Placet (q.v.) in connection with his legates and edicts; and urged greater zeal in the payment of Peter's pence. In France, the pope found occasion to interfere in the marriage relations of King Philip I., who had separated from his consort and wedded Bertrade de Montfort, who had deserted her husband, Count Foulques of Anjou. At the Synod of Poitiers, 1100, and in presence of the papal delegates, the relapsing king was again sentenced with the ban; and not until Dec. 2, 1104, at the Synod of Paris, did he receive absolution upon promising to discontinue all commerce with Bertrade. The first great achievement of the crusade movement inaugurated by Urban II., the conquest of Jerusalem, did not come to the knowledge of that pope, since the news of it reached Rome not until the beginning of the pontificate of Paschal II. His attention, accordingly, was much engaged by the growing church problems in connection with the founding of the kingdom of Jerusalem. This burden was especially pressing by reason of the disputes over the occupancy of the patriarchate of Jerusalem; and the rivalry between the patriarchal sees of Antioch and Jerusalem.

Paschal II. died at Rome Jan. 21, 1118.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources: The *Epistolæ et privilegia* are in *MPL*, clxiii. 31–476. *Epistolæ* are also found in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules*, xv. 17–63, Paris, 1808; *MGH*, *Epist.*, iii (1891), 106–107; in *NA*, vols. iii., vi., vii., xiii., xvii., xx.–xxiii., xxv.; and S. Löwenfeld, *Epist. pontificum Romanorum*, pp. 67 sqq., Leipsic, 1885; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, ii. 296–306, Paris, 1892; Jaffe, *BRG*, vol. v.; idem, *Regesta*, i. 702–772; J. B. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum vitæ*, ii. 1–17, Leipsic, 1862; J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Iter Italicum*, Stuttgart, 1833; idem, *Acta pontificorum Romanorum inedita*, Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1881–86; M. Sdralek, *Wolfenbüttler Fragmente*, pp. 111–117, Münster, 1891; P. Kehr, in *Nachrichten der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philolog historische Klasse*, 1898–1903; H. Hagenmeyer, *Epistulæ et chartæ ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes*, pp. 178 sqq., Innsbruck,1901; Mansi, *Concilia*, vols. xx.–xxi. Consult: J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iv. 214–270, Bonn, 1885; U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, pp. 1721, 2761, Paris, 1877 sqq.; W. Schum, *Die Politik . . . Paschals II.*, Erfurt, 1877; G. Peiser, *Der deutsche Investiturstreit unter . . . Heinrich V.*, Berlin, 1883; M. Maurer, *Papst Calixt II.*, vols. i.–ii., Munich, 1886–89; G. Buchholz, *Ekkehard von Aura*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1888; W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, iii. 697 sqq., Leipsic, 1890; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, ib. 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 317–377, London, 1896; H. Gerdes, *Geschichte der deutschen Volks*, ii. 319 sqq., Leipsic, 1898; G. Richter, *Annalen der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, III., ii., Halle, 1898; T. F. Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy, 918–1273*, London, 1901; W. Barry, *Papal Monarchy . . . 590–1303*, New York, 1902; W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 67 sqq., Berlin, 1903; B. Monod, *Essai sur les rapports de Pascal II. avec Philippe I. (1099-1108)*, Paris, 1907; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. v.; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 874 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 75 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 427–452; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 18–29; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 44, 73, 75, 76, 91; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 129 sqq.; the literature under CALIXTUS II., and INVESTITURE.

Paschal III. (Guido of Crema): Antipope 1164–68. Guido of Crema was the most influential among the four or five cardinals who in 1159 elected Octavian (Victor IV., q.v.) as claimant of the papal see in opposition to Alexander III. He was of noble birth, in close relations with both the French and the English courts, and of long experience in the Curia. He was thus a natural candidate to succeed Victor IV., two days after whose death he was elected at Lucca by the recalcitrant party (Apr. 22, 1164). He was consecrated on Apr. 26 by Bishop Henry of Liége, and at once recognized by Barbarossa. His lack of support in Italy, Burgundy, and parts of

Germany, however, urged Barbarossa to an extraordinary measure. On May 22, 1165, he required of all the princes present at a diet in Würzburg an oath that they would never acknowledge Alexander III.; and he pushed the cause of Paschal actively in Italy and Burgundy. In July, 1167, the victory of Tusculum allowed Frederick and his pope to enter Rome, where the latter was enthroned in St. Peter's on July 22. The catastrophe which almost annihilated the imperial army in August forced him to quit Rome. In the following January Archbishop Christian of Mainz restored him, although to jurisdiction only over the right bank of the Tiber, and even this by an uncertain tenure. Before his power could be further confirmed, he died (Sept. 20, 1168). (H. Böhmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, ii. 410–420, Paris, 1892; Jaffe, *Regesta*, ii. 426–429; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, vol. iv. passim, London, 1896; Hauck, *KD*, iv. 258 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 296; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 511–514; literature under Alexander III., especially the work of Reuter, vol. ii.

PASCHAL CONTROVERSIES. See Easter, II.

PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS. See Radbertus, Paschasius.

PASSAU, BISHOPRIC OF: An ancient bishopric in Bavaria, organized by Boniface in 739 together with the other Bavarian dioceses. Its jurisdiction embraced both banks of the Danube from the confluence of the Isar, as far east as the Enns, north to the Böhmerwald, and south to near the present boundary between Upper Austria and Salzburg and Styria. Christianity had spread there in the Roman period. Lauriacum, the principal Roman fortress on the line of the Danube, was the seat of a bishop, and there were churches at Batava (Passau), Boiodurum, Quintana, and other places. But this Roman Christianity was destroyed by the Teutonic migrations, and its place had to be supplied in the Bavarian epoch by the work of itinerant bishops. One of these, Vivilo, consecrated by Gregory III., was placed in charge of the see of Passau at its foundation. After the downfall of the Avari in 796, the lands between the Enns and the Raab were added to its jurisdiction. In the beginning of the tenth century the East Mark was lost to Germany, but when it began to be reoccupied in the middle of the same century, the see of Passau took up its work again which was extended even to the east, into Hungary. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The list of bishops is in *MGH*, *Script.*, xiii (1881), 361–364, xv (1888), 1310–11. Sources are in *Monumenta Boica*, vol. xxviii., part 2, xxix., part 2, Munich, 1864 sqq. Consult further: Rettberg, *KD*, i. 226 sqq., ii. 245 sqq.; Friedrich, *KD*, i. 199 sqq., 343 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, i. 379, 505, ii. 460 sqq., iii. 150 sqq.; K. Schrödl, *Passavia sacra*, Passau, 1879; R. Reichenberger, *Wolfgang von Salm, Bischof von Passau, 1540–55*, Freiburg, 1902; U. Schmid, *Otto von Lonsdorf, Bischof zu Passau, 1254–65*, Würzburg, 1903.

PASSAU, TREATY OF. See Augsburg, Religious Peace of.

PASSAVANT, WILLIAM ALFRED: American Lutheran; b. at Zelienople, Pa., Oct. 9, 1821; d. at Pittsburg June 3, 1894. Ordained in 1842, the year of his graduation from the Lutheran theological seminary at Gettysburg, he held pastorates in Baltimore (1842–44) and Pittsburg (1844–55), where he founded *The Missionary* (1848–61), and was editor till it was merged in *The Lutheran and Missionary*, Philadelphia, remaining as one of the editors of the new periodical. In 1880 he founded *The Workman*, in Pittsburg, which he edited till 1887. He introduced the Kaiserswerth system of deaconesses in America (see Deaconess, III., 2, d, § 1). To his efforts were due the establishment of hospitals at Pittsburg, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Jacksonville, Ill.; orphanages at Rochester, Zelienople, Pa., and Mt. Vernon, N. Y.; and Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.

Bibliography: G. H. Gerberding, *Life and Letters of Rev. W. A. Passavant*, Greenville, Pa., 1906.

PASSION PLAYS. See Religious Drama; and Oberammergau.

PASSION WEEK. See Holy Week.

PASSIONISTS: The common name of the congregation of Barefoot Clericals of the Holy Cross and Passion of Christ, famous for their devotions and missionary zeal, and rising during the period of resistance to the Enlightenment (q.v.) of the eighteenth century. It was founded by Francesco Danei, known as Paul of the Cross (b. at Ovada [30 m. n.w. of Genoa] Jan. 3, 1694; d. at Rome Oct. 18, 1775). Although brought up to practises of piety, he was for a time inclined to military life; but in 1720 planned the foundation of an order and assumed the name with the approval of the bishop of Alessandria. He then came forth as an itinerant preacher of penance, obtained papal sanction for his order and received novices in 1720, and was ordained priest in 1727. The first house of the order was established on the promontory of Argentaro in 1737. The order was confirmed by Benedict XIV. in 1741, and again by Clement XIV. in 1769, and the latter assigned him the monastery of St. John and St. Paul at Monte Celio as the seat of his order. Paul was canonized in 1867 by Pius IX.

The members of the order take a fourth vow to promote a faithful observance of the salutary passion and death of Christ. Their emblem is the cross and a crown of thorns, and on the breast they wear the name of Christ. Pius VI., who in 1785 once more confirmed the rule with some mitigations, conferred upon them the mission of propagating Roman Catholicism, sending them first (1782) to Bulgaria and Wallachia. They are now scattered over eleven provinces in North and South America, Great Britain and Ireland, France and Belgium, Spain, and Australia; and number 100 houses and 2,000 members. Paul established the congregation of the female Passionists, which was reorganized by Magdalena Caponi in 1819. There are three houses and seventy members. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 309–313; (Oischinger), *Leben des . . . Paul vom Kreuze*, Regensburg, 1846; J. C. Mitterrutzner, *Der heilige Paul vom Kreuz*, Innsbruck, 1860; *Life of St. Paul of the Cross*, Dublin, 1868; Luca di San Giuseppe, *Vita della serva di Dio M. Maria crocifissa di Gesù*, Civita-Vechia, 1878; *KL*, ix. 1719–20; the literature under Clement XIV.

In the Hexateuch.

PASSOVER: One of the three principal festivals of ancient Israel. The name (Hebr. *pesaḥ;* Aram. *pisḥa';* Gk. *pascha*) is given to the lamb which was offered as an immunity-sacrifice at the opening of the feast; for the verb *pasah* signifies a passing over (as in Isa. xxxi. 5). Everywhere in the Bible this festival is referred to the Exodus. At that time, by divine command, the lamb was slaughtered in a certain manner and then eaten; and by this means the people were spared from the destroying angel who slew the first-born of the Egyptians (Ex. xii.). The annual repetition of the festival was enjoined. The eating of unleavened bread (*maẓẓoth*) for seven days was an integral part of this memorial feast, which was therefore frequently called the feast of unleavened bread. Definite rules for the festival appear in all the collections of laws in the Pentateuch. In the ancient Covenant Code it appears as one of the three great festivals of the pilgrimage (Ex. xxiii. 15), and likewise in Ex. xxxiv. 18, 25. The form and significance of the celebration appear more clearly in the narrative of JE (Ex. xii. 21–27, xiii. 3–16) and the necessary rules for the Passover and Maẓẓoth festivals are given in Deuteronomy also (xvi. 1–8, 16, 17); to the Holiness Code belong brief prescriptions (Lev. xxiii. 5–8 and probably 9–14), but the most explicit regulations are those of the Priest Code in Ex. xii. 1–20, 43–50. To these may be added the later rules in Num. ix. 10–14, xxviii. 16–25). In P it is stated that in the month of the Exodus which, because of this event, shall be counted the first month of the year (Ex. xii. 2), every father of a family must, on the tenth day, choose from among his sheep or goats, a male lamb one year old and without blemish. This he shall kill on the fourteenth day, " between two evenings," an ancient and obscure term. Samaritans and Keraites understood the twilight; the Pharisees, however, according to later usage, the time between three in the afternoon and sunset. In Egypt, the blood of the lamb was smeared on the posts and lintel of the door of the house as a sign for the destroying angel to pass by. The lamb itself was roasted, not boiled; and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. No bone was to be broken and no part could be carried from the house or kept for the next day, wherefore several small families united for the repast. This was required to be eaten quickly, with girded loins, staff in hand, and shoes on the feet (xii. 11). Later, this regulation was considered to refer only to the first Passover; but the Samaritans observe the usage at the present day. Only those who were circumcised could partake of the repast (xii. 43 sqq.). Whoever was prevented from so doing, either by a journey or by uncleanness (cf. Num. ix. 9–11), must observe the sacrifice on the fourteenth day of the second month. This sacrificial meal was the beginning of the seven-day festival of unleavened bread. From the fifteenth to the twenty-first day, to eat anything leavened was forbidden under penalty of being cut off from the community. The first and seventh days were special holidays on which a solemn assembly took place and no work was done (Ex. xii. 14 sqq.; Lev. xxiii. 1 sqq.). It is doubtful whether the offering of the first sheaves of the harvest formed part of the paschal rite.

The Legal and the Historical Sources.

A comparison of the references in the various legal and historical sources shows their agreement with the fact that the Passover and Maẓẓoth festivals were of Mosaic origin and were intended to remind the people of the Exodus. The significance of the unleavened bread is shown more clearly in JE than in P, since in the former the lack of leaven is attributed to the hasty departure from Egypt (Ex. xii. 34, 39), while in P it seems to be a ritual requirement (Ex. xii. 8, 15–20). There is also general agreement that the celebration was to be held in the central sanctuary of Yahweh. Ex. xviii. 15 and xxxiv. 20 name this festival as one of the three pilgrimage festivals, whereat all the male members of the family were to appear, but not with empty hands. This refers to voluntary private offerings (Deut. xvi. 17; cf. 10). On the other hand, Lev. xxiii. 8 (H) and Num. xxviii. 19 sqq. (P) speak of sacrifices of the community offered by the priests; and, according to R. Schaefer (*Das Passah-Mazzoth-Fest,* p. 267, Düsseldorf, 1900), the oldest literary prophets testify to the existence of an elaborate sacrificial service. Only P calls the month of the Passover the first of the year, which, however, does not warrant the conclusion that the Hebrews first began their year in the spring at the time of exile (Wellhausen). In the historical books, only a few Passovers are expressly mentioned. The first important celebration took place in Canaan, according to Josh. v. 10, immediately after the entry into the land and after everyone had been circumcised in the fields of the Jordan, near Jericho. Two other Passovers are especially mentioned. Of one during the reign of Hezekiah (II Chron. xxx. 26), it is narrated that since the days of Solomon no such festival had been celebrated in Jerusalem. II Chron. xxx. 5 asserts that the requirements of the law were not strictly observed, even on this occasion, as the second month was chosen instead of the first, because of delay in the preparations. The supplementary festival of seven days was another irregularity. This accounts for the statement of the Chronicler, touching the Passover of the eighteenth year of Josiah, that such a festival had not been held since the time of Samuel. According to the parallel passage in II Kings xxiii. 21 sqq., it should be understood that no one had conformed so perfectly to the law. In the Passover of Hezekiah, the Levites did the slaying, and at the first Passover after the exile they sacrificed for the whole community (Ezra vi. 19 sqq.).

Origin and Significance.

As to the origin of the Passover, Wellhausen sees in it nothing more than a thanksgiving festival of the shepherds, whereat they sacrificed first-born lambs. He believes that the tradition of the killing of the first-born of the Egyptians grew out of this usage, also that the feast of unleavened bread is independent of the Passover, and was adopted in Canaan as a harvest festival only because, during the harvest, the people were too busy to leaven their bread. The historical relation to the events of the

Exodus, he considers, was a later assumption. This explanation has found many adherents; but it ignores the real standpoint of the sources. Nowhere is the Passover mentioned as a festival whereat the first-born were sacrificed; moreover, the historical explanation is strongly supported by JE, and this testimony can not be rejected on the plea of re-editing (cf. Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, i. 104–105, Gotha, 1888–92; Schäfer, ut sup., pp. 136 sqq.). This does not, indeed, exclude the possibility that the Mosaic Passover festival may have absorbed a thanksgiving spring festival, when first-born of the flocks and first-fruits of the fields were offered. Although the older Protestants opposed the idea that the Passover was a sacrificial festival, the expression "the sacrifice of the Lord's passover" (Ex. xii. 27), as well as many other passages, place it in the category of sacrificial repasts. Indeed, in Num. ix. 7, it is expressly termed an offering to God. The sacrificial element is negligible in Egypt, probably because of the absence of priests and altars. Later the blood was poured upon the altar and the fat was burned (Ex. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25). Essentially the Passover does not belong to the expiatory sacrifices but rather to that unique kind centering in the meal-time and representing communion of God and man. In form it is a household and family offering.

In the New Testament, the paschal lamb has become the prefiguration of Jesus Christ (I Cor. v. 7), whose death is the sacrifice which averts the wrath of God from his community. By partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ (cf. John vi.) the community is united with God. This inner relationship was outwardly brought into proximity with the date of Christ's death and of his last supper, which took place at the Passover festival. This supper with his disciples on the eve of the passion of Christ was an anticipated Passover repast, as the fourteenth of Nisan fell only on Friday (John xix. 14) and intentionally represents Jesus as the true paschal lamb.

Method in New-Testament Times.

According to the Talmudic and Rabbinical sources of the New-Testament period, the paschal sacrifice could be offered only in the court of the Temple, like all other sacrifices. A great multitude of people was always attracted by this festival, and the Romans were frequently apprehensive of a revolt on these occasions (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII., ix. 3, XX., v. 3; cf. *War*, I., iv. 3). On such days many executions took place to terrorize the people; on the other hand, a prisoner was sometimes liberated to gain their good graces. The arrival of great crowds of people before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus proved very disastrous, since they were shut up in the city and perished with its destruction. Josephus relates (*War*, VI., ix. 3) that at the request of Cestius, who wished to give Nero some idea of the size of the Jewish population, the high-priests counted the paschal lambs, which numbered 256,500. Since at least ten men were reckoned to each lamb, the result would be 2,700,000 men, excluding those who were unclean. The date of the celebration was fixed by the harvest. If in the middle of the twelfth month this was not far enough advanced to hold the festival four weeks later, that month was treated as an intercalary one and a thirteenth month was added. Whoever ate leavened bread during the festival was punished by scourging. The lambs were slaughtered in the outer court of the Temple at half past eight (2.30 P.M. of our reckoning). If the day was the preparation for the Sabbath, this occurred two hours earlier. The priests stood in rows, holding golden or silver vessels, in which they received the blood, passing the full vessels from hand to hand, until they reached the priest nearest the altar, who poured the blood over it. The parts of the lamb dedicated to the sacrifice were also brought to the altar by a priest. Meanwhile, the Levites chanted the Hallel. The priests determined how many should partake of the lamb: not less than ten and seldom more than twenty. Josephus and the Mishna assume that women participated in the repast; but according to the Gemara they were not bound to do so (cf. Deut. xvi. 16). After the first cup, the first-born son asked his father the meaning of the feast, whereupon the latter (later, a reader) related the story of the Exodus. Then the company chanted the first part of the Hallel (particularly Ps. cxiii., cxiv.) upon which followed the second cup and finally the repast proper. Then a third cup was drunk, which is that mentioned in Luke xxii. 20 as the one used by our Lord for the institution of the Eucharist. Still a fourth cup was taken and, after it was filled, the second part of the Hallel was sung (Ps. cxv.–cxviii.). The passages, Matt. xxvi. 30 and Mark xiv. 26, "when they had sung a hymn," seem to refer to this. See also FEASTS AND FESTIVALS, I., §§ 1–5.

(C. VON ORELLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Much of the literature is given under FEASTS AND FESTIVALS, and under HEXATEUCH (qq.v.). Consult further: F. Delitzsch, in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1855, pp. 257 sqq.; G. M. Redslob, *Die biblischen Angaben über die Stiftung*, Hamburg, 1856; J. H. Kurtz, *Der alttestamentliche Opfercultus*, pp. 307 sqq., Berlin, 1862, Eng. transl., *Sacrificial Worship of the O. T.*, Edinburgh, 1863; J. Müller, *Kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung des Pesach-Mazzothfestes*, Bonn, 1883; D. Mackenzie, *Exposition of the O. T. Sacrifices*, Toronto, 1900: W. Riedel, in *ZATW*, xx (1900), 319 sqq.; idem, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, i. 52 sqq., Leipsic, 1902; R. Schäfer, *Das Passah-Mazzoth-Fest*, Gütersloh, 1900; E. M. Synge, *The Five Great Offerings and their Law*, London, 1901; R. B. Girdlestone, *The Passover, the Communion, and the Mass*, ib. 1902; S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*, New York, 1903; S. A. Fries, *Die Gesetzeschrift des Königs Josia*, Leipsic, 1903; W. Rosenau, *Jewish Ceremonial Institutions*, Baltimore, 1903; C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, iv. 265–268, New York, 1907; a considerable literature in journals is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 827. Consult also the works on O. T. theology, especially that of H. Schultz, London, 1892.

PASTOR ÆTERNUS: The title of the papal bull issued July 18, 1870, promulgating the doctrine of papal infallibility. See INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE. The text may be found in Reich, *Documents*; and in E. Friedberg, *Sammlung der Aktenstücke zum ersten vatikanischen Konzil* (Tübingen, 1872).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE; and VATICAN COUNCIL; especially H. E. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, London, 1877; and J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des vatikanischen Konzils*, 3 vols., Bonn, 1877–87.

PASTOR, ADAM (RUDOLF MARTENS, MARTINI): Anabaptist of the lower Rhine; b. at Emden or Münster about 1560 or 1570. Cleves was the principal scene of his activity. In 1547 he is mentioned as one of the most prominent participants in two synods held at Emden and Goch under Menno Simon's presidency; at the latter he was set apart as an apostle, but was soon after proscribed on account of disagreements, particularly on the doctrine of the Trinity. About 1550 he held a disputation on this doctrine with Menno at Lübeck. Besides a report of this, his only extant work is *Underscheit tusschen rechte leer unde valsche leer der twistigen articulen* (Amsterdam). In it he asserts that Christ was God's son and truly God, but later than and inferior in power to the Father; while the Holy Ghost was not an independent personal being. In his teaching on the Lord's Supper he is entirely dependent on Johannes Campanus (q.v.) who influenced all his views; in that of baptism, he names Erasmus as his spiritual father.

(FERDINAND COHRS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Sandius, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, p. 387, Freistadt, 1684; F. S. Bock, *Historia antitrinitariorum*, ii. 277, Leipsic, 1784; F. Trechsel, *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin*, i. 36–37, Heidelberg, 1839; J. H. Allen, in *American Church History Series*, x. 76–77, New York, 1894; K. Rembert, *Die "Wiedertäufer" im Herzogtum Jülich*, pp. 185 sqq., Berlin, 1899.

PASTOR, LUDWIG: Austrian Roman Catholic; b. at Aachen, Prussia, Jan. 31, 1854. He was educated at the universities of Louvain, Bonn, Berlin, Vienna, and Prague, and in 1880 became privatdocent at the University of Innsbruck, associate professor of history in 1886, and full professor of the same subject in the following year. Since 1901 he has also been director of the Instituto Austriaco di Studi Storici at Rome. He has written *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Carls V.* (Freiburg, 1879); *Die Correspondenz des Cardinals Contarini während der deutschen Legation 1541* (Münster, 1880); *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (4 vols., Freiburg, 1886–1905; Eng. transl. by F. I. Antrobus, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols., London, 1891–1908); *J. Janssen* (1893); *Zur Beurteilung Savonarola's* (1898); *August Reichensperger* (2 vols., 1899); *Acta Pontificum Romanorum inedita* (1904); and *Die Reise des Cardinals Luigi d'Aragona durch Deutschland, die Niederlände, Frankreich und Oberitalien 1517–1518* (1905), besides editing the seventh and eighth volumes of J. Janssen's *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg, 1903) and *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* since 1898.

PASTORAL LETTERS: Letters intended for public circulation, addressed by a bishop to either the clergy or the laity of his diocese or to both. Some of these are sent out regularly on specified occasions, as at the beginning of Lent each year to give the current rules for fasting. Others are issued at the discretion of the bishop, in order to warn the laity against particular dangers or to instruct them in particular truths, or to admonish the clergy as to some point or points of their priestly duty or the conduct of divine worship. The term also applies to letters issued by ecclesiastical bodies to the pastors under their jurisdiction, e.g., by a Presbyterian synod, and even to letters by the pastor of a church to the members.

PASTORAL LIFE, HEBREW.

I. General Description.
II. The Products.
III. The Shepherds.

I. General Description: In Syria and the region eastward of that country it is chiefly the nomadic Bedouins whose calling is that of cattle-raising. In the desert, where the areas of pasturage and the watering-places vary with the time of year, stock-farming can be carried on only in a nomadic way. But in the permanently populated districts cattle have always been raised extensively. Many parts of Palestine are better adapted to cattle-raising than to agriculture; for instance, the arid steppes of South Judea, the region about the Dead Sea, and many hillsides which can not be terraced, where the sparse growth of grass in the spring will maintain at least sheep and goats. The plains of Sharon and Jezreel, which are in part too marshy for cultivation, also afford rich pasturage. The country east of the Jordan, in particular, has always been a land for grazing; to the south Mesha raised his enormous herds of sheep (II Kings iii. 4), and in the north were Bashan's famous kine (Amos iv. 1).

The people who followed this pursuit (cf. the Tell Amarna Letters for the pre-Israelite period; see AMARNA TABLETS) when the country was in a high state of civilization were not nomadic Bedouins, but large owners both of herds and lands. They were kings and princes and the great in the land: David (I Chron. xxvii. 29–30), Absalom (II Sam. xiii. 23), Uzziah (II Chron. xxvi. 10); or they were rich citizens and farmers like Nabal (I Sam. xxv. 2 sqq.). The small farmers also had cattle, but the relation of cattle-raising to agriculture was not so intimate as it is, for instance, in Europe to-day. Besides, asses and camels were available for agricultural purposes. Still, the industry was of the highest significance to the people as a whole, and in the promises to the people prosperity in this direction was pledged (Deut. viii. 13, xxviii. 4; Jer. xxxi. 27, etc.). Legislation took particular account of cattle-raising; and the poetic language of the Bible is full of figures taken from the life of the shepherd. The princes were the shepherds of the people (II Sam. v. 2; Jer. xxiii. 2 sqq.); Israel was the flock of the Lord of hosts (Zech. x. 3), and Yahweh was the good shepherd (Ps. xxiii.). In the regions where herding was followed in place of agriculture, nomadic life and customs continued longer than elsewhere. The Calebite branch of the Rechabites particularly (I Chron. ii. 55) adhered to a nomadic life till the time of Jehu; and Jonadab, the founder of the Rechabites springing from Caleb, commanded his followers never to build houses but to dwell in tents, and never to adopt the agricultural life, but to live a pastoral life (Jer. xxxv.), thereby making a sharp protest against all civilization (see RECHABITES).

II. The Products: In Palestine, both anciently and in modern times, "live stock," or pastoral property (*miḳneh*, "possession") was composed principally of small cattle (*ẓon*). How important an item this is, even at present, may be perceived from statistics for the administrative district about Jerusalem, where, even following some years of murrain, the report for 1905 shows 90,000 head, or forty-five to the square kilometer. These figures are below the actual count, since the local husbandmen manage to prevent exact returns in order to lessen their taxes. Moreover, the district in question is perhaps the poorest in cattle, the country east of the Jordan being much richer in this respect. Anciently the tale of flocks and herds was considerably more appreciable. The data that Job possessed 7,000 sheep and 1,000 oxen (Job i. 3), Nabal, 3,000 sheep and 1,000 goats (I Sam. xxv. 2), and that King Mesha paid an annual tribute of 100,000 lambs and the wool of 100,000 sheep (II Kings iii. 4) are quite within the bounds of probability.

The Palestinian sheep (*seh* = "sheep"; *'ayil* = "ram"; *raḥel*, "ewe"; *kar*, "fat lamb"; *ṭaleh*, "unweaned lamb"; *kebhes* or *kesebh*, "yearling lamb") belongs mainly to the fat-tailed, broad-rumped species known as *ovis laticaudata*, or *platyura* (cf. H. B. Tristram, *Natural Hist. of the Bible*, p. 143, London, 1867). It is of medium size, with stout body, thin legs, fine crisp fleece, and a high-set nose. The color is usually white (Isa. i. 18; Dan. vii. 9; Ps. cxlvii. 16). The characteristic broad-tail weighs from eleven to thirty pounds. Another variety, similar to the Merino sheep, is found in North Palestine. Only the broad-tailed sheep is expressly mentioned in early times, since in every account of sacrifice of a sheep that variety (*'ayil*) is designated for the purpose as being especially valuable and belonging to God (Ex. xxix. 32; Lev. iii. 9, vii. 3, etc.). At all periods, sheep were the most usual animals for slaughter (I Sam. xxv. 18; II Sam. xii. 4, etc.), although flesh food was not a frequent article of diet in ancient times. Sheep were also the most usual animals for sacrifice (I Sam. vii. 9; Isa. i. 11; etc.). The ewes are especially prescribed for sin-offering and guilt-offering (Lev. iv. 32 sqq., v. 6), and in connection with the purification of lepers (Lev. xiv. 10). The ram was accounted a peculiarly worthy victim (Ex. xxix. 18), and is prescribed notably on occasion of great festival offerings, also as a guilt-offering (Lev. v. 15), and as the Nazirite's purifying oblation (Num. vi. 14). Together with the flesh, the fat milk is prized as food. Sheep-skins, slightly tanned, were used as mantles and wraps (see DRESS, AND ORNAMENT, HEBREW). The most valuable product was the wool, from which the commonest and the most important articles of dress were made (Lev. xiii. 47 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 3, etc.). For this reason sheep-shearing was conspicuously a time of rejoicing (I Sam. xxv. 4 sqq.; II Sam. xiii. 23 sqq.). This took place toward the end of April or the first of May. In the Bible this animal is mentioned in numerous figures of speech; and its patience (Jer. xi. 19; Isa. liii. 7) and stupidity were proverbial (Num. xxvii. 17; I Kings xxii. 17; Isa. liii. 6).

Along with sheep, the goat is also raised in many districts, being more numerous than sheep, especially in mountainous and arid regions, since it thrives where sheep can hardly be sustained, climbing along the steepest precipices where no sheep can range. In the Old Testament, the goat is frequently embraced along with the sheep under the common designation *ẓon* (ut sup.); on the other hand, the goat's distinct importance is attested by a number of terms applying only to itself (*'ez*, "goat"; *'ittud'* *sa'ir*, etc., "he-goat"; *gedhi*, "kid"). In Palestine, two species are bred; the prevailing kind being the *capra mambrica*, with loosely drooping ears about eight inches long, smooth, sickle-shaped, recessive horns, and glossy black hair, both long and thick. In the north, on Mount Lebanon, two other varieties are found. Spotted goats are exceptional (Gen. xxx. 32 sqq.). More than half drop their young in December and January, which is the most favorable season for the kids, because, after sucking for two months, they still have abundant spring pasture. About one-fifth bring forth in the spring (March to middle of April); the kids of this season still have plenty of milk from the dam, but no longer the subsequent abundance of grass. One-tenth bear in June and July, and the kids remain weak and small, having but little milk from the dam, and finding too little grass. The young brought forth in autumn either die as soon as born, or perish in miscarriage. Goats and sheep graze together, but the two flocks will then keep somewhat apart (cf. Matt. xxv. 32), as they do also at night. The goats are fond of climbing along the steeps and browsing the brushwood. Goat's flesh was more esteemed in olden times than it is at present. In particular the kid was relished (Gen. xxvii. 9; Judges vi. 19, xiii. 15, xv. 1). The Israelites were forbidden to boil it in its mother's milk, the favorite way of preparing it in modern times (Ex. xxiii. 19). Goat milk was in general use (Prov. xxvii. 27), the skins were used for making vessels for water, wine, etc., while the hair was woven into a coarse cloth suitable particularly for tents (Ex. xxxvi.; Num. xxxi. 20; see TENT). The goat had value also for sacrifice. A he-goat might be used for either the burnt or the peace offering (Lev. i. 10, iii. 12, etc.), and was the animal usually required for the sin offering (Lev. iv. 23 sqq., v. 6, xvi. 5; Num. xv. 24, etc.). As a sacrificial offering the he-goat was always called *sa'ir*, "the hairy one," owing to the mythological belief that the hairy creature belonged to the deities of the under world (see DEMON, DEMONISM, § 3). For this reason, it was a goat that was sent into the wilderness to Azazel on the Day of Atonement; and the wicked who are condemned to everlasting fire are the goats (Matt. xxv. 32 sqq.). The goat suggested to the poets many of their figures. The princes, as leaders of the people, are likened to the he-goats that go before the flock (Isa. xiv. 9, margin; Zech. x. 3, cf. Prov. xxx. 31; Jer. l. 8), and unscrupulous rulers among the people are compared to violent he-goats that impose on the rest of the herd (Ezek. xxxiv. 19).

Neat-cattle were collectively called *baḳar* (*shor* is a single animal, *'eleph* is "one broken to the yoke"; *par* is a young but well-grown bullock suitable for sacrifice; *parah* "cow," *'egel* "heifer," and *'eglah* "calf," are other terms used). They require good pasturage with abundant water, such as is afforded by the plains. As work-animals they were universally used by farmers. The breed found in the south to-day is rough and unattractive, and usually black or brown. In Galilee neat-cattle are light in color and of better stock. The first-mentioned breed is the most ancient in Palestine. The East Indian cattle (*bos bubalis*) were not introduced till post-Biblical times. For the farmer neat-cattle were indispensable for plowing, harrowing, and threshing; were used also as beasts of burden; and were valued for purposes of slaughter. In early times beef was a more common element of diet than to-day, not for the small farmers, indeed, but for the rich in the cities (Gen. xviii. 7; I Sam. xxviii. 24; Amos vi. 4; Luke xv. 30). Among animals used for sacrifice (q.v.) the ox or bullock was considered the choicest, especially for festal occasions (Num. xxiii. 1 sqq.) and sin offerings (Ex. xxix. 1; Lev. iv. 3, 14; xvi. 3, 6, 11).

III. Shepherds: The people whom the Old Testament describes as shepherds are not those husbandmen who keep a few head of large and small cattle for themselves; but rather such persons as follow herding for their principal vocation, i.e., the great proprietors such as Nabal, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the keepers of the flocks. The great owners did not personally attend to the care of the herd but employed their appointed keepers, or shepherds, who were usually free hired servants—less frequently, slaves. Their status in relation to the proprietor is minutely regulated in the law (cf. Ex. xxii. 4, 9–12; cf. Amos iii. 12; Gen. xxxi. 38; etc.); and in a manner substantially accordant with the primitive legal customs embodied in the code of Hammurabi (q.v.). The shepherd's calling was decidedly fatiguing (cf. Gen. xxxi. 40). He had to keep his charges together, to find the lost and strayed ones, to nurse the sick, bind up the wounded, carry the wearied lamb, draw water for his flock, protect them against wild beasts, etc. (Gen. xxxi. 38 sqq.; I Sam. xvii. 34 sqq.; Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 3–16). At evening the flocks were driven into folds and pens, constructed along rough stone walls, and affording protection against wild beasts (Gen. xlix. 14; Num. xxxii. 16, 24, 36; Judges v. 16; Ps. l. 9; Mic. ii. 12; Hab. iii. 17). Wealthier proprietors erected watch-towers in the sheepfold (Gen. xxxv. 21; etc.). The shepherd's outfit was simple; a common shepherd's pouch for his victuals (I Sam. xvii. 40), a shepherd's rod (Mic. vii. 14), which was also his chief weapon, a sling (I Sam. xvii. 40), and the indispensable shepherd's pipe or flute (Judges v. 16). He was aided in his watch by sheep dogs (Job xxx. 1). I. BENZINGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, London, 1884; idem, *Natural History of the Bible*, ut sup.; R. F. Burton and C. F. T. Drake, *Unexplored Syria*, i. 341–342, London, 1872; J. G. Wood, *Bible Animals*, ib. 1883; L. Anderlind, in *ZDPV*, ix (1886), i. 73; E. Day, *Social Life of the Hebrews*, New York, 1901; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere*, Berlin, 1902; C. Hart, *Fauna and Flora of Sinai*, London, PEF; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 138–139; *DB*, i. 362, ii. 195–196, iv. 486–487; *EB*, i. 710–715, ii. 1742–45, iv. 4440–42; *JE*, iii. 626–627, v. 686, xi. 250–251, 284.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

I. The Cure of Souls.
- Roman Catholic Interpretation (§ 1).
- Principle and Practise of the Reformers (§ 2).
- Influence of Pietism and Modern Thought and Events (§ 3).
- Cure of Souls the Duty of All Christians (§ 4).
- Cooperation of Pastor and Congregation (§ 5).
- Cure of Souls Analogous, not to Pedagogy, but to Medicine (§ 6).
- Means to be Adapted to Individual Needs (§ 7).
- Paracletic or Consolatory Cure of Souls (§ 8).
- Paideutic or Corrective Cure of Souls (§ 9).
- Didactic or Instructive Cure of Souls (§10).

II. The Parish and Minister.
- The Candidate (§ 1).
- Relations of Pastoral Work to Preaching (§ 2).
- Pastoral Visits (§ 3).
- Relations to Church Officers and Organizations (§ 4).
- The Pastor's Study (§ 5).
- The Sacraments and Devotional Meetings (§ 6).

Practical theology (q.v.), itself one of four divisions of the science of theology (exegetical, historical, doctrinal or systematic, and practical), is divided into four parts, Homiletics (q.v.) catechetics (see CATECHESIS, CATECHETICS), Liturgics (q.v.), and poimenics or pastoral theology, with which last this article is concerned.

I. The Cure of Souls: [The expression "cure (i.e., care) of souls" (Lat. *cura animarum*), originally a technical term of canon law, is defined as "the activity for the salvation of immortal souls in a definite, prescribed locality, exercised in conformity with the laws given by God and the Church and resting on legitimate commission" (*KL*, xi. 62). The phrase is now used in English chiefly by the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches, connoting the charge on a priest or clergyman to supply the spiritual needs of his parishioners, and implying especially the right of administering the sacraments. On this ground benefices are distinguished as those with and those without the cure of souls (*curata* and *non curata;* see BENEFICE.)]

The cure of souls in the wider sense is the foundation and aim of all vital activities of the Church both toward those within and those without the fold. A distinction is made between the cure of souls in a comprehensive and a narrower sense, the former exerted over the congregation or church as a whole, the latter having as its object the individual members of the congregation. Of the several terms which have been used to designate the special cure of souls as a distinct theological discipline, poimenics (from the Gk. *poimēn*, "a shepherd, pastor") seems especially commendable.

The discharge of the pastoral cure is interpreted according to the conception of the spiritual office and its relation to the congregation; herein consists the fundamental difference as to the cure of souls in the Roman Catholic and in the Evangelical Churches. The Roman priest is the organ of the

1. Roman Catholic Interpretation.

hierarchy which is over the people, i.e., the "Church" in the narrow sense of the word. He is vicar of his bishop, as the bishop is vicar of the pope, and the pope is vicar of Christ. He has to exercise the functions of God, of the pope, of the bishop, with reference to the aggregate of the Roman Catholics who constitute his parish. The parish, however, is an accidental and contingent fraction of the Church as a whole; the conception of the organized and independent single congregation is foreign to the Roman canon law. The priest is sharply distinguished from his parish and stands high above all the laity, being consecrated beyond repeal, and empowered with the keys of heaven and hell. The discharge of his spiritual cure is not dependent on his personality or on his religious and moral characteristics, but on the canonical execution of the law and institutions of the constituted Church. He rules the souls, is lord over consciences, is judge of the soul; and the cure of souls and church discipline become one and the same thing because each is exercised through the confessional. The eternal blessedness of the Roman Catholic is dependent upon the voluntary confession of known open or secret mortal sins, together with the confession of all other sins, if asked by the priest. After confession the priest absolves from all manner of guilt; herein he has unlimited control over souls. See Parish and Pastor.

2. Principle and Practise of the Reformers.

Through the Reformation, new principles, in accordance with the Gospel, were revealed for the cure of souls. The Church is recognized as the "congregation of saints," the clerical priesthood and with it all hierarchy disappears, a twofold morality is no longer offered. The condition of salvation for all alike is faith alone, which is aroused and nourished by the preaching of the word; the sacraments are effective not *ex opere operato*, but ethically in union with the word; Holy Scripture is accessible to all; and the moral forces of the home, of marriage, of the State, science and art, and the like, are freed from the rule of the Church and recognized as allies of the Church. But the new principle was not carried through. It is true that the Reformers individually, in their correspondence and expressed opinions, manifested a conception of the cure of souls which was exceedingly fruitful and evangelically free and profound; but in the Lutheran Church officially the field of the cure of souls remained private confession, transferred from Rome, in closer connection with the Lord's Supper. Luther himself sets forth the principle that private confession is voluntary and free; but it was introduced in 1528, and was then made a part of church discipline, and was even enforced by the secular authorities. Again, in the Reformed Church of Calvin and Johannes a Lasco, after Butzer's tract *Von der waren Seelsorge und dem rechten Hirtendienst* (1538), the cure of souls and ecclesiastical discipline were one. Only they were not, as in the Lutheran Church, accepted reluctantly, as evidence of the rule of the clergy over the congregation, but rather they were desired by the congregation as an indispensable and salutary matter, and were exercised by all members of the congregation reciprocally. At Geneva in 1550, Calvin introduced the "regular and stated visitation at the home," and it is still retained in strict Reformed congregations, where the official "visitation" by the pastor and an elder is distinguished from the pastor's friendly social calls. Private confession, however, in the Reformed Church was left free to the individual, and so continues to-day.

3. Influence of Pietism and Modern Thought and Events.

In the Lutheran Church, it was only under the influence of pietism that the cure of souls and church discipline became separated. Spener called for an increase in the number of pastors, the institution of districts for the pastoral charge, and the assignment of elders to assist in the pastoral cure (*Theologische Bedenken*, i. 2, 3, 10; *Pia desideria*, chap. ii.; *Consilia et judicia theologica*, i. 3, 4). His worthy opponent Valentin Löscher, in Dresden, agreed with him in demanding a pastor for every thousand church members, in requesting the keeping of an exact register of all parishioners, the appointment of deacons for the care of the poor, and the institution of regular household pastoral visits (*Unschuldige Nachrichten*, 1703). These were recommended also by A. H. Francke (*Collegium pastorale*, 1713, 1714, 1743). Unfortunately pietism (even Valentin Grossgebauer, so early as 1661) associated the necessity for the special cure of souls with the deplorable condition of Christianity, and thereby aroused new distrust in the congregations; from which not even a Schleiermacher could free himself in his day. The conception of the special cure of souls in the Church was first clarified, and its exercise filled with Evangelical spirit, through the efforts of the Innere Mission (q.v.), through the religious and moral evils that were revealed during the revolutionary years of the middle of the nineteenth century, and through the industrial development, which has brought such grave social embarrassments in its train.

4. Cure of Souls the Duty of All Christians.

The reconstructive thoughts in respect to the origin of the spiritual office and its relation to the congregation which Luther expressed in 1520 in his tract *An den christlichen Adel* have become in some degree the common property of Evangelical theology. The spiritual office is a logically and morally necessary product of the universal priesthood within the religious community, wherein the salutary fellowship of the "Church" manifests itself. The proclaiming of the divine word and administration of the sacraments necessary to the attainment, preservation, and consummation of the possession of salvation, which the spiritual office has to execute publicly in the Church and in the name of the Church by divine right, is likewise by divine right the duty and privilege of every Evangelical Christian within his proper sphere and the limits to be observed for the sake of ecclesiastical order. It is also the duty and right of all Christians, according to their station, to exercise a special cure of souls among one another. This is grounded upon the naturally necessary influence which in every community one member exerts upon the other, the individual upon the community, and the community upon the individual; whence arises the Christian's duty to exert his influence in keeping with the Gospel, and to discover corruptive influences, from the two motives of asserting his ethical personality and that of brotherly love. Both these motives are the more imperative as the needs of others are greater or our position or calling is the more responsible (cf. Hardeland, in bibliography, chap. x., pp. 208 sqq., also pp. 299 sqq., 326 sqq.).

5. Cooperation of Pastor and Congregation.

The pastor, in performing his duty in the special cure of souls, must use all cooperative agencies and make them work harmoniously. Since there is no legal obligation on the layman to seek and accept the cure of souls, the pastor can accomplish his purpose only as he holds the confidence of the members of the congregation; in proportion as they willingly recognize the exemplary quality of his religious and moral character, and have no doubt of his wisdom in the cure of souls. This means that the pastor must be an example for the congregation (I Pet. v. 3), and must obtain the requisite wisdom by an exact acquaintance with the congregation and a psychological understanding of individualities. He must regard as under the " seal of the confessional " communications imparted to him in order to procure his counsel, comfort, or instruction, his duty in this respect being qualified only by the fact that he recognizes the culpability of silence in case of high treason; in case of contemplated crime; and in case of averting the consequences of perpetrated crime. The personal responsibility and self-training of every Christian are taken for granted; hence if some laymen feel that their participation in the special cure of souls might be an infringement of liberty and attempt at guardianship, it does not necessarily signify disparagement of the Christian life or a defective conception of the Church. The question whether action should wait for request or proceed spontaneously (at the pastor's initiative) is a practical one; it is the duty of him who would care for souls to know all members of the congregation, and many spiritual conditions arise which exclude the possibility of a request for help.

6. Cure of Souls Analogous not to Pedagogy, but to Medicine.

The special cure of souls in the Church does not stand on an analogous footing with pedagogy; for the latter is grounded upon the difference between the mature and knowing and the immature and unknowing, and becomes redundant in proportion as the self-training of the pupil grows effective. Although in every congregation there will be a larger or smaller number of members whose relation to the pastor is really that of pupils to teacher, the pastor is not the authoritative master, since the entire spiritual charge rests upon confidence in the pastor, and self-training no less than personal responsibility remains the postulated basis of the cure of souls everywhere. Indeed the aim of the spiritual charge is not ecclesiastical punctilio or moral independence, but the ideal elevation of the religious and moral life according to Matt. v. 48; Phil. ii. 5; Col. i. 28; Eph. iv. 13; Rom. viii. 29. The proper analogy for the cure of souls is the practise of medicine. However, the attitude of the spiritual adviser toward the members of the congregation is not that of the whole to the sick, but of the one who knows the means of salvation to the one in need of them, and the pastor himself is one of the needy. The charismal gifts of the spiritual adviser, like the functions of the physician, are diagnostic and therapeutic. In diagnosis, the three fundamental psychological faculties come into play; the knowing property of the intellect in its teachableness; the esthetic or perceptive property of feeling in the active religious life on its emotional side; the moral force of the will, in its unalterable state of readiness to render every possible service in the spiritual cure. The question as to the categories of treatment (therapeutics) in the spiritual cure, is also to be answered by going back to the three fundamental psychological faculties. The emotional life needs the spiritual cure in suffering; the will, on occasion of sinning; the intellect, in the erring man; and accordingly the categories of the spiritual cure become the paracletic or consolatory, the paideutic or corrective, and the didactic or instructive. But since there is no isolated fundamental faculty, but all three fundamental faculties always interact, so likewise the suffering of men is always more or less complicated with sin and error; the sin of man, with suffering and error; the error of man, with suffering and sin. From the complication of suffering with sin arises the inclination toward languishing in resignation or carelessness, and toward extravagant complaint and accusation: through complication with error, the inclination to nurse delusions. From the complication of sin with suffering arises the redemptive need; with error, the redemptive capacity (Luke xxiii. 34; Acts iii. 17; I Cor. ii. 8). The complication of error with suffering begets willingness to receive instruction; with sin, the guilt of error (Luke xii. 47, 48) by enhancing the fault of intellect into error of conscience, or a morally wrong attitude in respect to recognition of the truth.

7. Means to be Adapted to Individual Needs.

Suffering, sinning, erring men are not to be regarded as exceptional in the congregation. There is no human being who does not suffer; the spiritual adviser can take to himself II Cor. i. 3–4 (see SUFFERING). There is no human being who does not sin (I John i. 6–10); the spiritual adviser is at best a pardoned sinner. There is no human being who does not err so long as he strives; the spiritual adviser is not infallible, and must wait for perfected knowledge (I Cor. xiii. 8–12). However, the universality of suffering, sinning, erring, does not abrogate the individuality of every particular instance of suffering, sinning, erring. Hence all mechanical procedure on the spiritual adviser's part is of evil counsel; only specific procedure is admissible. For this proper application of the means of the spiritual cure to the individual contingency, Nicholas Hemming, in 1566, in his work *Pastor sive pastoris optimus vivendi agendique modus*, coined the masterly expression *Orthotomia*. The expression connects itself with II Tim. ii. 15: " rightly dividing (R. V. handling aright or [marg.] holding a straight course in) the word of truth."

8. Paracletic or Consolatory Cure of Souls.

The branch of the cure of souls dealing with the suffering man is the paracletic or consolatory. Real comfort or joyful confidence is procured by the conviction that suffering experienced in the way of restrictions of life, pain, loss, is intended, by the will of God, to become gain, joy, advancement. This it becomes through faith, in the Gospel sense of the term, which is proved in patience, confirmed in prayer (Rom. viii. 28; II Cor. iv. 16–18; Heb. xii.). In each instance, according to the sufferer's individuality and history, the suffering leads to sobering reflection or to defiance and despair, to friendly mildness or to stubborn egoism. Accordingly the applied consolation must manifest itself either as an alleviating and assuaging force, or as an admonitory and corrective power. The question as to the pastor's duty in preparing the sick for death is to be answered on like principles. The medieval visitation of the sick went to extremes in this matter; the elaborate confession and the terrors of death and judgment were made its chief feature. According to the Evangelical conception, preparation for death consists in aiding the sick to a state of composure, because death means no loss, but gain for the Christian; and the like spirit should pervade the entire sphere of the visitation of the sick, whether there be express reference to approaching death or not.

Special mention is necessary of the means of treatment of the spiritually sick (cf. Köstlin, pp. 314–315 and the bibliography cited p. 334; H. Römer, *Psychiatrie und Seelsorge*, Berlin, 1899). The number of these patients increases in serious proportions, and certain milder forms, which when unassisted are somewhat portentous, confront the pastor frequently. Not in every instance, indeed, has he to deal with spiritual diseases, but rather with nervous impairment. The spiritual adviser must confine himself to his proper province, and banish the thought of competing with the physician. In conversation with the spiritually sick he should direct the patient's interest toward new topics, and seek to occupy his thoughts with friendly contemplations. The pastor's religious task recedes while the malady increases and stays at its height, but comes to the front so soon as convalescence has begun. More difficult is the pastor's task during incipient illness, in that the afflicted are wont to oppose every phase of pathological treatment. Moral laxity, that can be corrected only by ethical treatment, sometimes—especially during the period of development—makes itself known by physical disorders, which seem to be the physician's concern; but many nervous conditions are to be repressed by earnest will-power or moral decision.

9. Paideutic or Corrective Cure of Souls.

The paideutic, or corrective cure of souls has to do with sinning man, and is to be classified as prophylactic, or preventive, and epistreptic, or converting. (1) Since nearly all transgressions and crimes go back to defective home training, and since the most effectual forces of integrity are the imponderable impressions wrought by the mental, religious, and moral atmosphere of the parents' house, the prophylactic cure of souls will direct itself in first instance to the parental home, partly through the channel of public worship, partly by household visits, partly in connection with the school, by dissemination of wholesome educational principles among the parents. Direct prophylactic cure of souls begins in the religious or, in this connection, ecclesiastical instruction of youth. Here, too, confidence is the condition of fruitful activity,—confidence of the young in their pastor, which is procured by the pastor's confidence in them, manifesting itself in fatherly thoughtfulness, in comprehension of youth, in earnestness and firmness combined with forbearance and patience, as well as in his guidance to religious and moral independence of decision. The prophylactic spiritual charge has its most difficult task in the guidance, safeguarding, and strengthening of youth from the age of fifteen to twenty-five. Young people should be gathered informally and freely; entertainment and instruction are to be offered in the best forms at command; and the aid of the experienced and proficient is to be invited with grateful pleasure. (2) The epistreptic or converting cure of souls has to do with acute cases of sin and with chronic states of sin, whether these have become openly offensive or not. It is the specific field of the Roman sacrament of penance, and of the judicial office of the priest. The Evangelical spiritual adviser must renounce all judgment in respect to moral worthiness or unworthiness in estimating the personal guilt and character of the sinner, because he is no fathomer of the heart.

It is not the pastor's office to judge the sinner, but to assist him toward conversion and newness of life; and he will the better succeed, the more he realizes that only God's merciful guidance has preserved him from similar falling. According to the Augsburg Confession (Art. xii.) the pastor's aim in correction may be reached in three ways: (1) By securing acknowledgment of the sin. Various means are necessary to lead the sinner to this condition; in every instance the dominating religious and moral susceptibilities already latent in him must be appealed to. (2) By inducing repentance in the form of contrition, and "saving faith." False contrition broods over the external consequence of sin; true contrition, over the guilt and misery of sin itself. Contrition alone begets despair and desperation, and not until combined with the "saving faith" does it lead to "godly sorrow" (II Cor. vii. 10), when it thereby honors God by accounting his grace to have been shown in the forgiveness of sin, as it also accounts all the guilt and misery the sinner's own. (3) "Then should follow good works which are fruits of repentance." "Good works" are the new life of the one converted. The pastor has to offer protection and encouragement; protection against temptation from former companions in sin, against seductive false religion; encouragement to sturdy decision, to bear the consequences of faults; he should also help to make these consequences endurable, warn against undue security, aid the convert to stand firmly against relapses, and, it may be, remove him to a good environment.

The didactic cure of souls endeavors, by means of instruction, to correct ignorance, half-knowledge and conceit, intellectual error and error of conscience, superstition and unbelief; it ministers to the need of a deeper grasp of Evangelical truth, and tries to counteract doubt in its multiplied forms.

10. Didactic or Instructive Cure of Souls. Here transition is made from the special cure of souls to the general (preaching), and the latter is concerned mainly with opposing unbelief and doubt (see Homiletics). For the difficulties which disturb the one who does not yet believe and the one who no longer believes, as likewise the refractory believer, the wrestling one, the one doubting because of his very need of faith, as well as the irreligious one coquetting with his doubts, will only seldom confront the special spiritual adviser, deriving, as they do, from spiritual perturbations universal in their nature and rooted in very ancient problems, though modern in form. As they actually arise, however, they are for the most part so distinctive and have originated so largely out of the most minutely specialized sciences or the great aggregate of polite literature, that the didactic spiritual adviser can operate on solid ground only within very restricted limits. But that manner of preaching the Gospel which takes into account the grade of culture and the known needs of the congregation; the upbuilding of Christian personalities in the congregation who shall reveal the power of the Gospel in speech and conduct, in character and action; these are forces which have waxed wholesome for all unbelief and doubt.

E. C. Achelis.

II. The Parish and the Minister: For the history of the parish see Parish and Pastor.

1. The Candidate. An ecclesiastical body or authority, in permitting a candidate for the ministry to pass as approved by it, gives its verdict upon his fitness for the service. That verdict is endorsed by the call of a church and congregation to the candidate to become their pastor, or, in case of the episcopal churches, by appointment to a charge. The call of a church and congregation, when accepted, involves reciprocal obligations. These obligations are represented, but can not 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. The call made and accepted is a contract, but it is more than that. Not only must it be fulfilled on both sides with businesslike fidelity, but it must be fulfilled in the largeness of the spirit of mutual Christian love.

The true minister will never be a place-seeker. 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 will 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.

2. Relations of Pastoral Work to Preaching. 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 that is 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. 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. Meanwhile the course of preaching should correspond with the course of pastoral labor, beginning at the center of the church, and working outward 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 egoism 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 little spiritual health and vigor without such work. Hence that pastor will be the most successful, who, instead of trying to do all the work of the parish himself, strives to enlist and stimulate the members of the church to work with him as their appointed leader.

There is an old saying, as trite as true, "A house-going minister makes a church-going people."

3. Pastoral Visits. The work of pastoral visitation should 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 entered, 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 aim to enter into the sympathies of the people, to know their home life, and to win their confidence and affection. Besides this general visitation there should be special calls made upon the sick and the afflicted. The tenderness and the sympathy of Christ as toward the suffering, and the words of promise, of counsel, and of comfort with which the Bible abounds, will suggest to the true pastor how he should minister among the sick and the sorrowing. Such calls should be short and frequent, and the words spoken should be few and careful. Other special calls must be made to reach particular cases of spiritual need. As soon as may be, the pastor should inform himself concerning the spiritual condition of every member of his congregation. His work should begin with the officers of the church, to enlist them in active cooperation; 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 center outward, by the time he comes to seek those who are without Christ (beginning with the thoughtful, then approaching the careless, and then the skeptical), the pastor will find that the way has been prepared for him. 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 to judge men in themselves, making large and generous allowances for differences that come of nature or of education, of antecedents or of present circumstances. In order to do 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.

4. Relations to Church Officers and Organizations.

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 Sunday-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. But it would be inexcusable egoism in the pastor to demand that the devotional music in the Sunday worship should be adapted only to his individual taste and culture, and not rather to the average taste and culture of the whole congregation. The pastor should visit both the choir and the Sunday-school in the spirit of courteous Christian sympathy with the departments of church life there represented. There may be within the church organizations for varied Christian work; such as young people's associations, young men's Christian associations, Dorcas or sewing societies, missionary societies, foreign and home; and to the leaders in these organizations the relations of the pastor are always delicate, and sometimes difficult. It is a question how far it is wise to multiply organizations within the church; since the church is itself the divinely appointed organization as against all evil, and for all good. The benevolences of the church constitute an important part of public worship. The pastor should keep himself informed concerning all the aggressive work of the church, so that he can inform his people, and should study methods of reaching their hearts, so as to make them feel the claims of Christ in all departments of his work. They should be taught, not only that giving is worship, but that, under existing conditions, it is doubtful whether there can be true and acceptable worship unless the offerings of the heart and the lips are accompanied, sometimes at least, if not always, by the generous offerings of the hand.

5. The Pastor's Study.

There is a danger in almost every parish, that the people will demand more frequent calls or visits than 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 Sunday, some portion of time should be given to systematic courses of study. The time thus devoted should be protected in all possible ways from unnecessary interruptions. To be a good pastor, a minister must be a good preacher; and the converse is equally true,—to be a good preacher, a minister must be a good pastor. Nothing in the way of activity and zeal can take the place of systematic, close, sustained study; and no amount of study can take the place of systematic house-to-house visitation. The two departments of work, pulpit and parochial, must not conflict, but be proportionate, harmonious, and mutually subsidiary. There should be preparation in the study, not only for preaching, but also for the other parts of public worship. The Scripture reading should be, in spirit and manner, instructive and interesting. 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.

6. The Sacraments and Devotional Meetings.

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 ordinance those who are not truly regenerated; or, on the other hand, he may repel or restrain those timid and doubting Christians who need that spiritual refreshment which Christ gives only at his table. The celebration of the sacramental feast should be made bright and hopeful, self and sin disappearing, for the time, 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 that will be considered. Questions may be sent in to the pastor to be answered in the prayer-meeting. A course of familiar exposition, if not too long or labored, may be tried with profit. The pastor should be bound by no method, but should impress his people with the deep significance, sacredness, and power of united prayer.

Unselfish consecration, the love of men for Christ's sake, power in the pulpit, tact, tenderness, a profound knowledge of human nature, and a Christlike manliness, are the fundamental necessities to success in pastoral work. THOMAS S. HASTINGS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the cure of souls consult: H. A. Köstlin, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, Berlin, 1906; R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V., lxxx. 2, in *Works*, ed. Keble, London, 1845; R. Field, *Of the Church*, book v., chap. 28, Cambridge, 1852; C. Wyss, *Etwas vom Kern und Stern der Seelsorge*, Basel, 1858; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, pp. 179–180, London, 1870; A. Schweizer, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, Leipsic, 1875; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Die spezielle Seelsorge in ihrem Verhältniss zur generallen*, Berlin, 1878; F. Probst, *Theorie der Seelsorge*, Breslau, 1883; W. Cramer, *Die apostolische Seelsorge*, Dülmen, 1889; J. M. Watson, *Cure of Souls*, New York, 1896; A. Hardeland, *Geschichte der speciellen Seelsorge*, Berlin, 1897–98; H. Bechtolsheimer, *Die Seelsorge in der Industriegemeinde*, Göttingen, 1907; W. Cunningham, *The Cure of Souls*, New York, 1908; K. Hesselbacher, *Die Seelsorge auf dem Dorfe*, Göttingen, 1908; P. Du Bois, *Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders*, 6th ed., New York, 1909; H. Bechtolsheimer, *Die Seelsorge in der Industriegemeinde*, Göttingen, 1909; W. W. Webb, *The Cure of Souls; a Manual for the Clergy*, 2d ed., Milwaukee, 1910. Consult also the monthly, *Die Seelsorge in Theorie und Praxis*, Leipsic, 1896 sqq.

On the general subject of pastoral theology the literature is immense, much being indicated under PRACTICAL THEOLOGY (q.v.). The following list is but a selection: A classic is G. Herbert's *A Priest to the Temple*, new ed., by H. C. Beeching, Oxford, 1898; A. Vinet, *Theologie pastorale*, Paris, 1889, Eng. transl., of earlier ed., Edinburgh, 1855, new issue, Nashville, 1875; J. H. Blunt, *Directorium Pastorale; Principles and Practice of Pastoral Work in the Church of England*, London, 1864; J. W. Burgon, *A Treatise on the Pastoral Office*, London, 1864; A. Oxenden, *The Pastoral Office; its Duties, Difficulties, and Prospects*, London, 1864; A. F. Douglass, *The Pastor and his People; Discussions on Ministerial Life and Character*, London, 1868; D. P. Kidder, *The Christian Pastorate; its Character, Responsibilities, and Duties*, New York, 1871; A. F. C. Vilmar, *Lehrbuch der Pastoraltheologie*, Gütersloh, 1872; P. Fairbairn, *Pastoral Theology*, Edinburgh, 1875; W. Löhe, *Der evangelische Geistliche*, 2 vols., Gütersloh, 1876; W. G. T. Shedd, *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology*, New York, 1876; T. Murphy, *Pastoral Theology: the Pastor in the various Duties of his Office*, Philadelphia, 1877; G. T. Bedell, *The Pastor*, Philadelphia, 1880; J. Amberger, *Pastoraltheologie*, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1883–86; J. M. Hoppin, *Pastoral Theology*, New York, 1884 (excellent); W. W. How, *Lectures on Pastoral Work*, New York, 1884; J. T. Beck, *Pastoral Theology of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1885; W. G. Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, London, 1885; C. Harms, *Pastoraltheologie*, 2 vols., Gotha, 1888 (of high value); C. Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, London, 1889; H. James, *The Country Clergyman and his Work*, New York, 1890; E. Blech, *Pfarramtsideal*, Leipsic, 1891; W. Lefroy, *The Christian Ministry*, New York, 1891; J. P. Lilley, *The Lord's Day and the Lord's Servants: a Contribution to Pastoral Theology*, Edinburgh, 1891; F. R. Wynne, *Our Sacred Commission*, New York, 1891; J. D. Wells, *The Pastor in the Sick Room*, Philadelphia, 1892; W. Stang, *Pastoral Theology*, New York, 1897 (Roman Catholic); W. Gladden, *Christian Pastor and the Working Church*, New York, 1898; B. Riggenbach, *Die Christliche Gemeindepastoration nach Schrift und Erfahrung*, Basel, 1898; J. St. Wilson, *Ministerial Life and Work*, 2 vols., London, 1900–01; A. W. Williamson, *Ideals of Ministry*, Edinburgh, 1901; E. A. Knox, *Pastors and Teachers*, London, 1902; G. H. Gerberding, *The Lutheran Pastor*, Chicago, 1903; J. F. Lepine, *The Ministers of Jesus Christ*, 2 vols., London, 1903; H. E. Savage, *Pastoral Visitation*, London, 1903; H. Cremer, *Pastoraltheologie*, ed. E. Cremer, Stuttgart, 1904; A. Krauss, *Pastoraltheologie*, ed. F. Niebergall, Tübingen, 1904; C. F. Rogers, *Principles of Parish Work, Essays in Pastoral Theology*, London, 1905; E. C. Achelis, *Eine Pastoraltheologie in Versen. Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654): Das gute Leben eines rechtschaffenen Dieners Gottes, aufs neue dargeboten*, Marburg, 1906; V. S. S. Coles, *Pastoral Work in Country Districts*, New York, 1906; F. Schulze, *Manual of Pastoral Theology*, Milwaukee, 1906; C. L. Goodell, *Pastoral and Personal Evangelism*, New York, 1907; A. Hardeland, *Pastoraltheologie*, Leipsic, 1907; S. Horne, *The Ministry of the Modern Church*, London, 1907; W. H. Crawford, *The Church and the Slum: a Study of English Wesleyan Mission Halls*, New York, 1908; J. O. Dykes, *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, London, 1908; H. Johnson, *The Ideal Ministry*, London, 1908; A. S. Hoyt, *The Preacher. His Person, Message, and Method*, London, 1909; R. C. Joynt, *Pastoral Work*, New York, 1909; W. Moore Ede, *The Clergy and Social Service*, New York, 1909; H. H. Henson, *The Liberty of Prophesying; with its just Limits and Temper considered with Reference to the Circumstances of the modern Church*, New Haven, 1910; J. S. Lidgett, *Apostolic Ministry*, London, 1910; A. J. Lyman, *The Christian Pastor in the New Age; Comrade, Sponsor, social Mediator*, New York, 1910; W. A. Quayle, *The Pastor-*

Preacher, Cincinnati, 1910; F. Dorfmann, *Ausgestaltung der Pastoraltheologie zur Universitätsdisziplin und ihre Weiterbildung*, Vienna, 1910.

PASTORELS (PASTOUREAUX, PASTORELLS): The name given to two singular movements in France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Into northern France in the year 1251 came a man called Master Jacob of Hungary, who was skilled in Latin, German, and French, with the gifts of a demagogue but without the talent of a real leader. He affirmed that he was sent of God to lead a new crusade to the Holy Land, the forces to be composed not of knights but of the more lowly. To him the people flocked, especially shepherds (whence the name of the movement; Lat. *pastor*), to the number of 100,000, divided into fifty companies. He professed to receive visions and visits from angels. At first countenance was given by the noble of the land; even the queen mother, then regent, hoped that Louis IX., who was in captivity in the East, would be released by these people. But the movement soon assumed a revolutionary or riotous character, attacked Jews, and at length the clergy, by whom the ban was pronounced, and at last came to open blows, and in one of these assaults Jacob lost his life. At first the intention was doubtless genuine to make a crusade; but as the attached masses grew, the social ferment led to the anticlerical issue.

A similar and like-named movement took place two generations later, also connected with the thought of the crusades. In 1319 Philip V. proposed to the pope a crusade, which the pope rejected as inopportune. But the people took up the idea, and women and children participated in the gatherings. Some of the participants were imprisoned but forcibly released. Revolutionary movements followed, Jews and even Christians and churches were attacked. From Paris to Toulouse and Carcassonne the country was affected, and in 1320 Avignon was threatened. Then the seneschal of Carcassonne assembled troops, and the movement ended with a considerable number of executions. (S. M. Deutsch†.)

Bibliography: Sources are the writings of Matthew of Paris and the *Continuator Nangii* of William of Nangis. Consult: Bouquet, *Recueil*, vols. xx.–xxiii.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 57–68, vii. 64–65; J. C. L. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, vols. vii., ix., 31 vols., Paris, 1821–44; and Röricht, in *ZKG*, vi. 290–296.

PATARENES (PATARINI, PATERINI): A reform party at Milan in the eleventh century. Stormy times prevailed at Milan under Archbishop Aribert (1018–45), resulting in a limitation of the archbishop's power. Upon the death of Henry III. in 1056, disturbances broke out afresh, and at times centered upon ecclesiastical and religious affairs. Arialdo, a Milanese deacon of the Valvassors, took notice of the contradiction between the divine law and the contemporary worldly behavior of the clergy. He was seconded by Landolfo, of the captains' gild, a man of eminent oratorical powers; by the presbyter Anselm, who ascended the episcopal throne of Lucca in 1057; and by the wealthy mintmaster Nazarius. That the clergy of Milan, in the matters of unchastity and simony, were worse than those of other Italian cities can not be charged; but the degree of exasperation here was unparalleled in bitterness, and led to an open advocacy of revolution. The property of the refractory clergy was abandoned to the plunder of the mob; and presently the combined populace, composed mostly of the lowest orders, of paupers, debtors, and artisans, but including some of the middle class as well, rose against the clergy. Landolfo hazarded a riotous disturbance of a divine service conducted by the archbishop himself; the clergy were compelled to bind themselves in writing to live a chaste life; those married were withdrawn from the altars, and their dwellings were stormed. By order of Victor II. a synod was convened at Fontanetum near Novara; but Arialdo and Landolfo were not to be intimidated by the ban imposed upon them. On the contrary, they proceeded to organize their followers. From their opponents they received the designation *Pataria:* a term probably derived from a quarter in the heart of Milan, where yet in the eighteenth century there was a street occupied by handlers of old clothes (called *patarià*). Under Stephen IX. this Patarenian movement received a renewed impetus; the decree of Fontanetum was ignored, and by sending Hildebrand (see Gregory VII.), the apostolic see openly made known its sympathies. Nicholas II. (q.v.) entrusted a deputation to Milan, in 1059, to Peter Damian and Anselm of Lucca (qq.v.), who humiliated the Milanese church by an unreserved partizanship with the Patarenes. On the death of Landolfo Erlembaldo took his place. Under his leadership the Patarenian forces obtained accessions from the upper classes; and they renewed their attack upon the married and simoniacal clergy and their worship. They were supported by the authority of Rome, and well might Erlembaldo regard himself as the agent of Rome, since Alexander II. had commissioned him with the power of excommunication as the champion of the Church. The open conflict between the Patarenes and their opponents broke out in 1066. The Patarenian rabble ill-treated Archbishop Guido in the cathedral, and then stormed the archiepiscopal palace. These violent excesses led to a powerful reaction on the part of the other citizens. Archbishop Guido was enabled to proclaim an interdict upon the city and forced Arialdo to retreat. Soon afterward, the latter was assassinated, but in the following year (1067) Erlembaldo had rallied his faction by means of new sworn pledges, so that he could resume the riotous activities. When Archbishop Guido abdicated, the Patarenes, pursuant to Hildebrand's counsel, extended their reform to abolishing the royal investiture. When Godfrey, the successor of Guido, had returned from Germany with an investiture from Henry IV., he found it impossible to enter upon his office. Erlembaldo was emboldened, in the presence of a Roman legate, to direct the election, in 1072, of a young cleric of Milan, Atto by name, as archbishop. But Henry IV., refusing assent, procured the consecration of Godfrey at Novara. Gregory VII., friend and adviser of the Patarenes, at the beginning of his pontificate gave promise of a pacific understanding with the king with reference to the diocesan strife at Milan; this did not, however, jeopardize Gregory's relations with Erlembaldo.

The latter's despotism eventually became insufferable; insomuch that an opposition league was formed, whose members pledged themselves to recognize as archbishop the king's nominee. Erlembaldo lost his life in the first clash with these Anti-Patarenes, shortly after Easter, 1075. This was the end of the Patarenes as a party, though Gregory, in 1076, made some attempts to revive it.

The history of the Patarenes, covering a period of only twenty years, had a significance which was political as well as ecclesiastical. On the whole, it represented the great reform movement in the Church which arose about the middle of the eleventh century, the triumph of which in Italy became its reward. It furthermore subjected the archbishopric of St. Ambrose to the authority of the pope and thereby gained Lombardy for his jurisdiction. Finally, it played an important preparatory part in the mighty conflict between the papacy and the German empire, by terminating the archiepiscopal régime in Milan; and by bringing about the mutual recognition of the antagonistic classes engaged in the church struggles at Milan, it promoted the unity and autonomy of the Church democratic. At a later time the term Patarenes occurred among the many designations for the Catharist heretics (see New Manichæans, II.); but this does not establish an inherent affinity with the old Patarenes, as the original name had rapidly faded into a common sneering epithet. Carl Mirbt.

Bibliography: Sources are: Arnulf's *Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium*, in *MGH, Script.*, viii (1848), 1 sqq.; Landulf's *Hist. Mediolanensis*, in the same, pp. 32 sqq.; Andreas, *Vita Arialdi*, in *MPL*, cxliii. 1437 sqq.; Boniso, *Liber ad amicum*, in *MGH, Lib. de lite*, i (1891), 568 sqq. Consult: C. Hegel, *Geschichte der Städtverfassung von Italien*, ii. 140 sqq., Leipsic, 1847; Paech, *Die Pataria in Mailand, 1056–77*, Sondershausen, 1872; A. Krüger, *Die Pataria in Mailand*, Breslau. 1873–74; W. Wicherkiewics, *Die kirchliche Stellung der Erzbischöfe von Mailand zur Zeit der Pataria*, Breslau, 1875; G. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich IV.*, i. 669 sqq., Leipsic, 1890; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, pp. 244 sqq., 264–265, 447 sqq., ib. 1894; W. Martens, *Gregor VII.*, ib. 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 128, London, 1896; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vols., iv.–v.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 20–21; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 393, iv. 99, 225, 226, 565, 592; and the literature on the popes contemporary with the movement.

PATEN. See Vessels, Sacred, § 2.

PATER-NOSTER. See Lord's Prayer.

PATERSON, JAMES ALEXANDER: United Free Church of Scotland; b. at Dalry (22 m. w. of Dumfries), Kirkcudbrightshire, June 20, 1851. He was educated at the University of Aberdeen and Pembroke College, Oxford (B.A., 1876; M.A., 1879); was professor of Hebrew and Old-Testament literature in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh (1876–1900); and since 1900 has been professor of the same subject in the United Free Church College, Edinburgh. In theology he is an Evangelical Presbyterian. He has written *Period of the Judges* (Edinburgh, 1887); edited Leviticus for *The Temple Bible* and Numbers for *The Polychrome Bible;* A. B. Davidson's *Biblical and Literary Essays* (London, 1902); *The Called of God* (Edinburgh, 1902); and *Waiting upon God* (1903); and *Old Testament Prophecy* (1903), and translated H. Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie* (2 vols., Frankfort, 1869) under the title of *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1892).

PATERSON, WILLIAM PATERSON: Church of Scotland; b. at Skirling (11½ m. w. of Peebles), Peeblesshire, Oct. 25, 1860. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh (B.D., 1883) and the universities of Leipsic, Erlangen, and Berlin (1883–1885); was minister at Crieff, Perthshire (1887–94), and was appointed professor of systematic theology in the University of Aberdeen (1894). Since 1903 he has been professor of divinity in the University of Edinburgh, and was Baird lecturer in 1904–05. He has written *The Position and Prospects of Theology* (Edinburgh, 1903) and *The Pauline Theology* (1903).

PATHRUSIM. See Table of the Nations, § 2.

PATIENCE: Firm and conscientious resistance to forces which operate in opposition to personal conviction. It must be an act, not merely a state, and it must also be conscious of actual endurance, not merely self-assertion. To the Christian, patience is the nadir of his spiritual life, in which he indeed clings to God, yet does not feel the assurance that God is near him. When Paul declares (Rom. v. 4) that hope first springs from tested patience, he means that the solace of hope fails the Christian in the moment of patience, and experiences can come to the Christian in which his only feeling is pain. Yet even though no such vicissitudes ever befell him, nevertheless his spiritual development would often bring him into circumstances in which he would feel that he was the conquered instead of the conqueror, for in all cases duty transcends human power. Here no vague abstract concept of the good can be his guide, nor can mere duty be other than external and foreign to his life. Nothing but a personal authority can save him in his moments of disavowal of self and he is able to comprehend this authority and accept the aid and encouragement which it brings only when he himself recognizes what is good. Voluntary endurance under such circumstances is patience.

It is easy to fail to recognize, however, that this patience of self-denial consists solely in the will to follow another, or in obedience; for good deeds are performed only as a result of personal conviction. Moral acts are, therefore, frequently explained as proceeding from individual thought, thus leading to the abandonment of the concept of self-denial. The truths involved in this view may indeed be retained in Christian ethics, yet they must be combined with recognition of the fact that the moral relation is a spiritual growth, and therefore implies self-denial and patience. This implies also obedience, which does not exclude freedom if the example followed be worthy of being obeyed, since the obedience involves the conviction that the Christian life is rendered stronger and richer by experience of pain. The basal principle that moral good implies independence can not exclude recognition of the fact that moral growth is possible only when the individual is made patient through obedience, and that what he could not and would not take upon himself is endured in patience.

So long as the Christian in his faith in God is able to look through his sufferings to the love of God, he has no room for patience. One is patient when in the darker events of life he does not lose self-mastery but remains firm and ready in the purpose that he must obey God. Such obedience is the last remnant of trust in God. While this patience is not the joy which puts an end to suffering, it is the path which leads to it, and the future offers a hope which finds its justification in the fact that Christ in his death is evident to the Christian as a visible manifestation of the love of God (cf. Rom. v. 5–8). Christian patience thus becomes the strength of faith, although the Christian himself feels it to be the weakness of faith. Christian patience is, however, not a mere test of faith, but is the inner process whereby personality is developed beyond what it was, and the believer experiences its full meaning only when he subjects himself in silent patient obedience to a higher power, which must be personal, and not an institution of any kind. (W. HERRMANN.)

PATON, JOHN BROWN: English Congregationalist; b. at Loudon, Ayrshire, Scotland, Dec. 17, 1830. He was educated at Spring Hill College, Birmingham (B.A., London University, 1849; M.A., 1854); was minister of Wicker Church, Sheffield (1854–63), and from 1863 until his retirement in 1897 as principal emeritus was principal of the Congregational Institute for Theological and Missionary Studies, Nottingham. He was one of the founders of the University Extension system, and established the Bible Reading and Prayer Union in 1892, the Boys' and Girls' Life Brigades in 1900, and the Young Men's and Young Women's Brigade of Service in 1904. He has been vice-president of the British Institute of Social Service since 1904, and has taken a prominent part in educational, charitable, and non-conformist religious work. Besides his work as joint editor of *The Eclectic Review* (1858–61) and associate editor of *The Contemporary Review* (1882–88), his writings include *Evangelization of Town and Country* (London, 1861); *The Origin of the Priesthood in the Church* (1875); *Supernatural Religion: A Criticism* (1878); *The Inner Mission of Germany, and its Lessons to Us* (1885); *The Twofold Alternative—Materialism or Religion: the Church, a Priesthood or a Brotherhood* (1885); *Contemporary Controversies on the Doctrine of the Church and the Relations of Church and State* (1886); *The Inner Mission* (four addresses; 1888); *The Inner Mission of Great Britain* (1896); and *Collected Essays* (2 vols., 1907.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Marchant, *J. B. Paton, Educational and Social Pioneer*, London, 1909.

PATON, JOHN GIBSON: Presbyterian missionary; b. at Kirkmahoe (9 m. n. of Dumfries), Scotland, May 24 1824; d. at Canterbury, Victoria, Australia, Jan. 28, 1907. He was educated at the University of Glasgow, the divinity hall of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the Andersonian medical university, all in Glasgow, where he was a city missionary from 1847 till 1857. He was licensed Dec. 1, 1857, and ordained a missionary to the New Hebrides Mar. 23, 1858, and left Glasgow with his wife Mary Ann Robson on April 16. At Melbourne they transhipped to Aneityum where they landed Aug. 30. He began his labors on the island of Tanna Nov. 5, 1858. There, on Feb. 12, 1859, his wife died in child-bed, and her infant son, March 20. The natives proved to be intractable and he was finally driven away by their savage attacks on Feb. 4, 1862. He then began those tours in behalf of New Hebrides mission work which were ultimately to make him known throughout all the English-speaking world. He went first to the Presbyterian churches of Australia and New Zealand. In 1864 he visited Scotland, was elected moderator of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, secured seven missionaries for the New Hebrides, and returned with his second wife, Margaret Whitecross. He landed in Sydney Jan. 17, 1865, made another tour of the churches, and visited the New Hebrides. In Nov., 1866, he became a missionary on one of the islands, Aniwa. He held his first communion there Oct. 24, 1869, and ultimately saw all the natives nominal Christians. In March, 1873, he visited the Australasian colonies to raise money; returned to Aniwa the next year, but in 1883 laid before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria the necessities of the New Hebrides mission and was sent by it in 1884 to Great Britain to raise the money. He returned with the funds desired early the next year, visited Aniwa, but then took up his missionary tours again through Australasia between 1886 (when he was elected moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria) and 1892, then through the United States and Canada, and so around the world, returning to Victoria in 1894. In 1897 he was in Melbourne carrying through the press the New Testament in the Aniwan language. In 1899 he was in Aniwa. In 1900 he attended the Ecumenical Missionary Conference in New York City, and was hailed as a great missionary hero. In 1901 he was back in Australia. His health had begun to fail, his wife was also ailing, and on May 16, 1905, she died. In 1904 he issued his translation into Aniwan of the Acts of the Apostles, and began proof-reading on that of Genesis. He was a man of picturesque appearance and bore his testimony with great power.

He described himself as theologically "a Presbyterian Evangelical Calvinist of the old Covenanter Reformed Church of Scotland." He wrote many pamphlets on missionary topics, and also to expose the evils of the Kanaka labor traffic, as well as opposing the French annexation of the New Hebrides in favor of British occupation. But the book which made him famous was his autobiography, whose sale was enormous on the strength of his perils on Tanna and Aniwa. The book owed much to the literary skill of his brother, Rev. James Paton, D.D. (who died in Glasgow Dec. 21, 1906), and appeared in three parts, *John G. Paton, missionary to the New Hebrides. An Autobiography. Edited by his Brother* (New York, 1st part, 1889, second part 1890; parts three and four, carrying the story from 1885 till his death, appeared bound up with the other parts, 1907).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Autobiography*, consult Harriet B. Genung, *J. G. Paton, Missionary to the Martyr Islands*, Boston, 1907.

PATON, LEWIS BAYLES: Congregationalist Biblical scholar; b. at New York City June 27, 1864. He was educated at Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia., New York University (A.B., 1884), Princeton Theological Seminary (1890), and the universities of Berlin (1890–92) and Marburg (Ph.D., 1897). Since 1892 he has been connected with Hartford Theological Seminary, where he has been instructor in Old-Testament exegesis (1892–93), associate professor (1893–97), and Nettleton professor of Old-Testament exegesis and criticism (since 1897). He was also director of the American School of Archeology at Jerusalem in 1902–04. In theology he belongs to the critical evangelical school. He has written *The Early History of Syria and Palestine* (New York, 1902); *Jerusalem in Bible Times* (Chicago, 1908); and *Esther*, the latter for the *International Critical Commentary* (New York, 1908); and has edited *Recent Christian Progress; Studies in Christian Thought and Work during the last Seventy-five Years* (1909).

PATRIARCH: A title applied in the early Church to the chief bishops, having jurisdiction over metropolitans. The name occurs in the fourth century as applied to ordinary bishops; but by degrees, as the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem gained more importance and stood at the head of large ecclesiastical provinces, it was used specifically of them. The development of the constitution of the Church involved in the creation of the patriarchates followed the analogy of the political subdivisions of the Empire. From the time of Diocletian (284–305) and Constantine (306–337) this was divided into four prefectures, and these again into a number of dioceses, which in their turn were composed of provinces or eparchies. Thus the prefecture of the East comprised the dioceses of "the East" (*Oriens*), Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, whose capitals were Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea, Cappadocia, and Heraclea. The districts of the metropolitans corresponded to the provinces, as those of bishops to the less important city districts; but ecclesiastical divisions corresponding to civil dioceses did not then exist. Early in the process of development there is evidence of efforts on the part of the metropolitans of prominent cities to extend their jurisdiction more widely and to obtain an influence over several metropolitan districts. This goal was attained by Alexandria at the beginning of the fourth century, as is recognized by the famous sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa. The wording of the canon is not altogether clear; but it is evident from the history of the Meletian Schism (see MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE MELETIAN SCHISM) that the following rights were claimed by the bishop of Alexandria: to issue binding regulations in questions of discipline; to hold synods representing the metropolitan districts united with him; in conjunction with such synods, to judge the bishops of the district; and in the case of a vacancy to administer the vacant diocese. Similar conditions arose by degrees at Rome and probably at Antioch. To argue back from the later system, it would seem probable that the power of the patriarch of Antioch was less than that of the patriarch of Alexandria to the extent that he ordained the metropolitans only, and not also the bishops. The extension of the influence of the metropolitans of great cities over neighboring metropolitans, corresponding to the civil diocesan division, is the beginning of the patriarchal organization, the impetus to which may have been the example of the secular government, but doubtless the ambition of the bishops of the metropolises had its effects. The West was not affected by the process, owing to the predominant position of Rome and its claims to the primacy; but in the East the process was completed by the time of the Council of Constantinople in 381. Its second canon contemplates the recognition of five great divisions in the East: Egypt, "the East" (*Oriens*), Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. The provision against the overstepping of these boundaries can have been directed only against encroachments on the part of Alexandria and Antioch, which were thus strictly limited to Egypt and to "the East." That this took place in the interest of Constantinople is shown by the third canon. Constantinople had supplanted Heraclea as the head of the Thracian dioceses, nor was it long in absorbing the powers of Ephesus and Cæsarea in Cappadocia, which were unable to maintain themselves on an equal footing with the others. The result of this process received canonical sanction at the Council of Chalcedon (451). This reduced the five eastern patriarchates to three; but another was added in Jerusalem, which had a certain honorary precedence as early as the Council of Nicæa (325), though with express reservation of the rights of the metropolitans of Cæsarea in Palestine. At the Council of Ephesus (431) an attempt was made to render Jerusalem independent of the diocese of "the East"; this was unsuccessful, until, with the aid of the Emperor Theodosius II., Palestine, Phenicia, and Arabia were severed from the rest of this division and made subject to the see of Jerusalem. Antioch protesting, Phenicia and Arabia were to remain with Antioch and the three eparchies of Palestine fell to Jerusalem; and this was confirmed at Chalcedon. The same council also gave Constantinople a concurrent jurisdiction on appeal, at the choice of the appellant, with the patriarchal see to which he might be immediately subject, thus rendering it virtually an archpatriarchate.

In the time of the Council of Chalcedon, patriarchs were known yet as eparchs, which term was also used as yet by the metropolitan of Sardica. When afterward the term patriarch became affixed to the titles of the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, eparch remained for the bishops of Ephesus and Cæsarea; but their power was not essentially different from that of metropolitans. In the West the title patriarch was borne by the bishops of Aquileia and Grado until 1451, when the patriarchate of Grado was transferred to Venice, and that of Aquileia was abolished. Later the title was given to the bishops of Lisbon and Goa, but was merely honorary. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, II., ii. § 9, xvii (practically complete); J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, xi. 148 sqq., Leipsic, 1830; K. Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients*, Münster, 1901; and the works on ecclesiastical law (*Kirchenrecht*) by P. Hinschius, i. 538 sqq., Berlin, 1869; E. Löning, i. 424 sqq.,

Strasburg, 1878; R. Sohm, i. 400 sqq., Leipsic, 1892; and E. Friedberg, p. 30, ib. 1903; and the literature under Eastern Church.

PATRIARCHS, TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE. See Pseudepigrapha.

PATRICIANI. See Symmachians.

PATRICK, SAINT: The traditional apostle of Ireland. So great is the mass of legend connected with his name that some have been led to question his existence. In earlier times two Patricks were assumed, "the older" (Sen Patrick) and "the apostle." Most investigators now try to distinguish between a historical and a legendary Patrick. For such an attempt by Heinrich Zimmer see Celtic Church, I., 2. What is attempted here is merely to supplement what is there said by indicating the difficulty of the problem, and noting some views which are at variance with those of Professor Zimmer.

The contemporary sources for Patrick are: (1) his own writings, of which the *Confessio* and the *Epistola ad Coroticum* (more properly "Letter concerning Coroticus or to his Christian subject") are conceded to be genuine; unfortunately existing copies of both are not free from suspicion of having been tampered with. The hymn (in Irish), called the *Faed Fiada* ("Deer's Cry") and the *Lorica* ("Breastplate"), is more doubtful; it gives no facts, but has value for its indications of doctrine. (2) The *Hymn of Secundinus* (Sechnall) is valuable only for its description of Patrick as a religious teacher by one who had personal knowledge. The later sources include (1) the so-called *Lives*, all containing more or less of the legendary, marvelous, and fictitious. They begin with the memoir by Muirchu Maccu-Machtheni and the collections of Tirechan in the seventh century and culminate in the life by Jocelin in the twelfth. The so-called *Tripartite Life* (eleventh century) is the most complete and perhaps the most trustworthy. (2) Chronicles, hymns, scholia, prefaces, and the like, all late and untrustworthy.

It is impossible to fix dates for Patrick. Most writers, accepting Prosper's statement about Palladius (*Chronicon*, an. 431) and assuming that Patrick followed Palladius and was ordained by Pope Celestine I. (d. 432), put his mission in 432. Whitley Stokes advocates c. 397; Olden thinks that Patrick preceded Palladius and is inclined, with Killen, to accept 405, the date given by Nennius. Todd gives 440. Nicholson tried to show that Patrick belonged to the third century. His birth is variously placed in 372 (Ussher, Tillemont, Petrie); c. 373 (Stokes, Olden); 378 (the Bollandists); 387 (Lanigan). The year of his death is given as 455 (Tillemont); 460 (the Bollandists); c. 463 (Stokes, Olden); 464 (Nennius); 465 (Lanigan, Killen); 492 or 493 (Ussher, Petrie, Todd, following the most common tradition). The opening sentence of the *Confessio* appears to state that when he was sixteen his father owned an estate at "Bannavem Taberniæ." But the passage is not clear, may be corrupt, and does not in any case give the birthplace. "Bannavem Taberniæ" should probably be emended to read *Bannaventa Britanniœ* (cf. *The Academy*, May 11, 1895, pp. 402–403). Bannaventa was in Northamptonshire near Daventry. Attempts to locate "Bannavem Taberniæ" placed it in Gaul (Boulogne?) and at Ailclyde (Dumbarton), Scotland.

Patrick's own writings are silent concerning the period in his life between his escape from captivity in Ireland and his reappearance there as missionary. Olden thinks that the pirates who helped him to escape took him to Gaul and that his wanderings or residence in that country begin at this time. He is said to have studied with Germanus at Auxerre and with Martin at Tours. But he can not have studied with both, and his bad Latin, his ignorance of the doctrine and practise of the Roman Church, and his lack of knowledge of the Vulgate make it hard to believe that he studied with either. Some deny that he went to Rome. His own writings do not intimate that he was ever there, it is thought improbable that a Briton of his time would be drawn thither, while a visit and ordination at Rome, if lacking, would be an inevitable invention of later times. Perhaps he was ordained in Gaul (by Amator of Auxerre? d. 418) and assumed the title Patricius then. Canon Bright conjectures that he was consecrated in his native country. Whitley Stokes thinks that he began his work in Ireland, labored for thirty years with but little success, and then, attributing his failure to the lack of Roman authority, started for the capital; on the way he spent some time at Auxerre and was there when the death of Palladius became known; whereupon Germanus at once sent him back to Ireland well provided with assistants and funds.

Concerning his work in Ireland there are only late accounts, exaggerated and full of the marvelous. He is said to have settled first in the present County Down, to have converted all Ulster, and then to have proceeded westward to Mayo. Daire, a local chieftain, allowed him to build a church on the hill of Macha (Ardmacha, Armagh) and there the seat of the primacy was established. It seems quite certain that he did not visit a large part of the south. A visit to Tara at the Easter following his arrival is recorded and the conversion of the king, Laeghaire, is described with embellishments. His burial place is given as Saul, Armagh, Downpatrick, and Glastonbury. It was probably Armagh, where his bell, his crosier, and his New Testament were long preserved. The crosier was burnt at the time of the Reformation. The bell and the New Testament (or a copy of it) are now in Dublin. He was never canonized at Rome and passes as a saint merely by popular usage.

Bibliography: Patrick's writings, genuine and spurious, with the hymn of Secundinus, are in *MPL*, liii. 789–840; the genuine works, with the more important sources and a valuable introduction and notes, may be found in *The Tripartite Life of Patrick, with Other Documents Relating to that Saint*, ed. with translations of the Irish, by Whitley Stokes, in *Rolls Series*, no. 89, 2 vols., London, 1887 (cf. pp. exxix.–cxliii. for Stokes' attempt to construct the "Personal History of Patrick"); the genuine writings, the hymn of Secundinus, and canons attributed to Patrick are also in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. 2, pp. 296–338; Eng. transls. are by C. H. H. Wright in *Christian Classics Series*, vol. vi., London, 1895, new ed., 1909, and T. Olden, Dublin, 1895; seven of the *Lives* were collected by J. Colgan in his *Trias thaumaturga*, Louvain, 1647; the *Confessio*, the *Epistola*, and the life by Jocelin, with a commentary and appendix, are in *ASB*, Mar., ii. 517–592; Jocelin's life was translated by E. L. Swift, Dublin, 1809; reprinted with translations of the Confession and Letter, Fiach's hymn, and the Tripartite Life by W. M. Hennessy in *The Most Ancient Lives of St. Patrick* by J. O'Leary, New York, 1874; the life by Muirchu Maccu-Machtheni and the collections of Tirechan have been edited from a Brussels manuscript by E. Hogan, S. J., in *Documenta de S. Patricio*, 2 parts, Brussels, 1884–89, reprinted from *Analecta Bollandiana*, i. 531–585, ii. 35–68; Muirchu's life has been translated and edited by A. Barry, Dublin, 1895; of modern lives the one most often quoted is by J. H. Todd, Dublin, 1864; others are by R. S. Nicholson, ib. 1868; Miss M. F. Cusack, London, 1871; R. Gradwell, *Life and Times*, Preston, 1886; idem, *Succat*, London, 1891; W. B. Morris, London, 1890; E. J. Newell, ib. 1890; J. B. Bury, Dublin, 1905; J. Healy, Dublin, 1905; and sketches in W. Walker, *Greatest Men of the Christian Church*, Chicago, 1908; and by G. F. Maclear, in *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, pp. 29–40, London, 1888.

For criticism and various views consult G. Petrie, *On the History and Antiquities of Tara Hill*, in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xviii (1839), Antiquities, pp. 25–232; Sir S. Ferguson, *On the Patrician Documents*, ib., xxvii (Dec., 1885), Antiquities, pp. 67–134; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, chaps. ii.–vii.; C. J. Greith, *Geschichte der altirischen Kirche*, pp. 95 sqq., Freiburg, 1867; A. P. Forbes, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, pp. 431–434, Edinburgh, 1872; W. D. Killen, *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. i., chap. i., London, 1875; W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, vol. ii., chap. i., Edinburgh, 1877; J. F. Shearman, *Loca Patriciana, an Identification of Localities chiefly in Leinster visited by St. Patrick*, Dublin, 1882; B. Robert, *Étude critique sur la vie et l'œuvre de Saint Patrice*, Paris, 1883; A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Irland*, pp. 1–68, Mainz, 1890; T. Olden, *The Church of Ireland*, chap. ii. and app. A., London, 1892; W. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 367–385, London, 1896. Consult also the literature under CELTIC CHURCH IN BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

PATRICK, JOHN: Church of Scotland; b. at Lochwinnoch (15 m. s.w. of Glasgow), Renfrewshire, Sept. 15, 1850. He was educated at the universities of Glasgow (M.A., 1875), Edinburgh (B.D., 1877), and Heidelberg, after which he was minister of High Church, Kilmarnock (1877–80), Monkton and Prestwick Parish (1880–87), and Greenside Parish, Edinburgh (1887–98). Since 1898 he has been regius professor of Biblical criticism and Biblical antiquities in the University of Edinburgh, dean of the faculty of divinity since 1899, and Croall lecturer in 1899–1900. He served also as examiner for the degree of B.D. in Edinburgh University (1880–83); convener of the Education Committee of the Church of Scotland (1894–1905); and convener of the education committee of the Heriot trust (1898–1905). In theology he is a liberal conservative. He has translated Origen's apology in reply to Celsus (Edinburgh, 1892) and part of the same writer's commentary on Matthew (1897), and has written *The Conservative Reaction in New Testament Criticism* (1898).

PATRICK, SIMON: English bishop and commentator, usually classed among the Cambridge Platonists (q.v.); b. at Gainsborough (16 m. n.w. of Lincoln) Sept. 8, 1626; d. at Ely May 31, 1707. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, where he came under the influence of John Smith, the Platonist leader. Though not closely connected with the work of this school, he was much interested in their views, and defended them in his *Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitudinarians* (London, 1662). He was for a time a Presbyterian minister, but took orders in the Church of England in 1654. He was made prebendary of Westminster in 1672, dean of Peterborough in 1679, Bishop of Chichester in 1689. He was a voluminous author, producing fifty-one works, and is best known as a commentator. His commentary on the Old Testament down to the Song of Solomon (10 vols., London, 1695–1710) was very popular for a hundred and fifty years, and was combined with the contemporary work of William Lowth on the Prophets, Richard Arnold on the Apocrypha, Daniel Whitby on all the New Testament except the Apocalypse, and Moses Lowman on that book to make a complete commentary (London, 1809; many subsequent editions). He was one of the five original founders of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. His *Autobiography* was published at Oxford in 1839, and complete works were edited by Alexander Taylor (9 vols., Oxford, 1858).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Autobiography*, ut sup., and the literature under CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS, consult: The *Memoir of Bishop Patrick* by T. Chamberlayne, in the latter's ed. of Patrick's noteworthy *Parable of the Pilgrim*, London, 1839; J. Hunt, *Hist. of Religious Thought in England*, 3 vols., ib. 1871–73; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, vol. ii., passim, ib. 1897; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church 1625–1714*, ib. 1903; *DNB*, xliv. 45–47.

PATRIPASSIANS. See CHRISTOLOGY, II., §§ 1, 2; MONARCHIANISM.

PATRISTICS, PATROLOGY.

Early Attempts at Treatment (§ 1).
Medieval and Lutheran Work (§ 2).
Roman Catholic Labors (§ 3).
Nineteenth-Century Work (§ 4).
Conceptions of Patristics and Patrology (§ 5)
Scope of the Department (§ 6).
Methodology (§ 7).

[Patristics and Patrology are the names of that department of theology which gives instruction concerning the lives, writings, and theological doctrines of the Church Fathers, and all else which has a direct bearing upon the study of the Church Fathers. If a distinction is to be made between the two names, then patrology concerns the external history, lives, etc., of the Fathers; patristics, their doctrinal teachings.]

1. Early Attempts at Treatment.

Among the subjects treated in his "Ecclesiastical History" Eusebius included a report of writers who bore testimony to the Scriptures, and he thus laid the foundation upon which later authors built. But the first to conceive and carry through a history of Christian literature was Jerome with his *De viris illustribus* (best editions by C. A. Bernoulli, Freiburg, 1895, and E. C. Richardson, Leipsic, 1896; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 359–384), at the suggestion of the prefect Prætorius Dexter, 392, revised the same year. Jerome had in mind to do for Christian teachers and authors what Suetonius had done for other notables of antiquity, and at the same time to show, against Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, that among the Christians also there were noted scholars. He included in his list 135 writers, including three Jews (Philo, Josephus, and Justus of Tiberias), and heretics and schismatics; but he was very closely dependent upon the work of Eusebius mentioned above and his *Chronicon*. Even though the scientific value of Jerome's work is not high, he was the first to blaze the path in this direction. But he found numerous continuators, such as Gennadius of Marseilles, Isidor of Seville, and Ildephonsus of Toledo (qq.v.). In the Middle Ages there were lacking for independent study of this character both sources and helps and the historical interest. While patristic works were then copied, excerpted, worked into exegetical Catenæ (q.v.), or collected into dogmatic "Sentences," knowledge of the Greek Fathers, particularly, remained limited, and the methods employed were uncritical. As a learned collection of notices, however, the *Bibliotheca* of Photius (q.v.) is inestimable, gathering as it does from 280 heathen and Christian authors. Outside of this, histories of literatures in the East were wanting; but in the West Jerome found imitators and continuators throughout the Middle Ages: Honorius of Autun (q.v.) wrote *De luminaribus ecclesiæ*, the limits being the apostles and Anselm of Canterbury; Sigebert of Gembloux (q.v.), who in his *Scriptores ecclesiastici* covered the period from the apostles to his own time; the so-called Anonymus Mellicensis, who wrote about 1135 a *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis;* the anonymous author of *De viris illustribus;* and Johannes Heidenberg (d. 1516), who wrote a *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (ed. princeps, Cologne, 1494), which showed diligent if uncritical use of sources, beginning with Clement of Rome and ending with the year 1492.

2. Medieval and Lutheran Work.

The last century of the Middle Ages saw the necessity of going behind ecclesiastical and scholastic tradition to the purer sources of Christian knowledge in Scripture and the Fathers. Gerson was a leader in this direction. But especially influential was the Humanistic movement of the fifteenth century, which awakened historical and critical interest, while the art of printing contributed no little. Patristic writings were discovered and edited, at first the Latin Fathers, then the Greek. Learned Humanists and theologians (Erasmus, Œcolampadius, Beatus Rhenanus) and printers (the Stephens) applied themselves to the work. The Reformation also helped through its opposition to scholasticism and traditionalism, but used its powers in an apologetic or polemic fashion (Œcolampadius and Melanchthon). Evangelical theologians of the second half of the sixteenth century were known for patristic learning (Matthias Flaccius, q.v.; Michael Neander, d. 1595; Martin Chemnitz, q.v.; Johannes Schopf, d. 1621; and Abraham Scultetus, d. 1624), and left works upon the subject. Lutheran workers in this field in the seventeenth century, who followed the old "Nomenclators," were Johann Gerhard (q.v.), who began with Hermas and closed with Bellarmin; Johann Hülsemann, with *Patrologia* (ed. J. A. Scherzer, Leipsic, 1670); Johann Christoph Meelführer, with a *Corona patrum;* Johann Gottfried Olearius, with *Abacus patrologicus* (Jena, 1673).

3. Roman Catholic Labors.

Meanwhile the Roman Catholic Church, particularly in its monastic orders, was stimulated to work in this field, especially the Benedictine congregation of St. Maur (see Saint Maur, Congregation of), which has gained deservedly high reputation for its work, as for example in the as yet unsurpassed edition of Augustine. Individual laborers from this order were Jean Luc d'Achery (q.v.), Jacques du Frische (d. 1693), Jean Mabillon Thierry Ruinart, René Massuet (qq.v.), A. A. Touttée (d. 1719), Jean Martianay (q.v.), Pierre Coustant (d. 1721), Denis N. Le Nourry (d. 1724), Denis de Sainte-Merthe (d. 1725), Julien Garnier (q.v.), Charles de la Rue (d. 1739), Bernard de Montfaucon and Prudence Maran (qq.v.), and Charles Clemencet (d. 1778). From the Jesuits were Fronton du Duc (q.v.), Jakob Gretser (d. 1625), Jan Bolland (see Bolland, Jan, and the Bollandists). Still others were Jean Garnier (d. 1681), François Combefis, Johannes Baptista Cotelerius, and Étienne Baluze (qq.v.). Especially characteristic of this period were the collections, such as that of Marguerin de la Bigne (q.v.) and the great *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum* (27 vols., Lyons, 1575–79), and notably that of Andrea Gallandi (*Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum* (14 vols., Venice, 1765–81). There is also the gigantic work, the *Acta sanctorum* (see Acta Martyrum, Acta Sanctorum); and not to be forgotten are the labors of the Assemani (q.v.) in the *Bibliotheca orientalis*, dealing with eastern literature. There were also original investigations and treatises such as those by Bellarmine (q.v.), Louis Ellies Du Pin (qq.v.) in *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* (58 vols., Paris, 1686–1704), a work in which critical processes are applied to the material as a whole and in its particulars with a certainty which deserves recognition. The work displays both great diligence and a regard for subjects which one would not expect a history of literature to cover, such as the history of councils. On the ecclesiastical side the free position of Du Pin, especially in matters of dogma, proved a shock; Bossuet tried in vain to have the Sorbonne censure his work, but the archbishop of Paris was convinced of the personal orthodoxy of the author. The first five volumes were placed on the Index July 1, 1693, and the decree was extended to the entire work by the decree of May 10, 1757. The work was attacked by the Benedictines, in whose interest Matthieu Petit-Didier issued his *Remarques sur la Bibliothèque . . . des Monsieur Du Pin* (3 vols., Paris, 1691–96), while, from the remains of Richard Simon, Souciet published a sharp *Critique de la Bibliothèque . . .* (4 vols., 1730). Meanwhile Remy Ceillier had published the eleventh volume of his *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés* (23 vols., Paris, 1729–63, new ed., 16 vols., 1858–69), the subtitle of which imitates the title of Du Pin's work, while the work in its entire tendency is opposed to the undertaking of Du Pin, though not without recognition of the conceded value of the same. The Benedictine Denis Nicolas Le Nourry (q.v.) produced his *Apparatus ad bibliothecam maximam patrum veterum* (2 vols., 1604–97). The Jansenist Le Nain de Tillemont issued his *Mémoires de l'histoire ecclésiastique* (16 vols., Paris, 1693–1712), a work the rich excursuses of which make it still a mine of wealth. The Benedictine Daniel Schram (d. 1797) carried as far as Ambrose and Epiphanius his *Analysis operum sanctorum patrum* (18 vols., Würzburg, 1780–96), while Gottfried Lumper issued *Historia theologico-critica de vita . . . sanctorum patrum . . . trium priorum seculorum* (13 vols., Würzburg, 1783–99).

Among the Reformed theologians of England, Holland, and France are to be named William Cave (q.v.) with his *Historia litteraria scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (2 vols., London, 1688–98); James Ussher (q.v.), who labored upon the Apostolic Fathers, the Apostolic Constitutions, and the apostolic symbol; Johannes Ernst Grabe (q.v.), who produced a *Specilegium sanctorum patrum* (2 vols., Oxford, 1698); John Pearson (q.v.), who illuminated the subject of Ignatius; Henry Dodwell (q.v.); Jean Le Clerc (see CLERICUS, JOHANNES) dealt also with the Church Fathers; Jean Daille (q.v.) wrote upon Dionysius the Areopagite and Ignatius, among other subjects; Casimir Remi Oudin (q.v.) left a *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiæ* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1722). The Lutheran Church was in this direction unproductive during the eighteenth century, its activity touching in this field only upon antiquities in the writings of J. A. Fabricius (q.v.), and C. T. G. Schönemann (d. 1802).

4. Nineteenth-Century Work.

The nineteenth century was in this field comparatively unproductive. The *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* of Angelo Mai (q.v.) may be mentioned (10 vols., Rome, 1825–38), and the *Nova patrum bibliotheca* (9 vols., 1852–88). Jean Baptiste Pitra (q.v.) also requires notice, with his *Specilegium Solesmense* (4 vols., Paris, 1842–58) and his *Analecta sacra* (4 vols., 1876–84). The series of Jacques Paul Migne (q.v.), in themselves serviceable, are yet in some sense a hindrance because of faulty printing and editing. Roman Catholics and Protestants have produced many worthy books on the subject. Such works are by Johann Adam Möhler (q.v.), *Patrologie* (Regensburg, 1840); Joseph Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiæ* (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1850–59); H. J. Pestalozzi, *Grundlinien der Geschichte der kirchlichen Litteratur der ersten sechs Jahrhunderte* (Göttingen, 1811). But the later decades of the century brought about a great revival of interest and work in this department which recalled the classical times of the seventeenth century. Of importance here were the great discoveries which have enlarged knowledge of the ancient sources. Among these may be named the fragments of the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter, the Didache, the complete text of the letters of Clement, the Apology of Aristides, the Acts of Paul and Apollonius, the Diatessaron of Tatian, the *Philosophumena* and commentary on Daniel by Hippolytus, the *Carmen* of Commodian, the *Tractatus Origenis*, the homilies on the Psalms by Jerome, papyri and ostraca from Egypt, etc. New editions have been issued or begun, like the *CSEL* (Vienna, 1866 sqq.), the set of Greek writers of the first three centuries under the auspices of the Prussian Academy (1897 sqq.), the *Patrologia orientalis* under the care of R. Graffin and F. Nau (Paris, 1903 sqq.), the *Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium* (Paris and Leipsic, 1903 sqq.), [G. Krüger's *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften* (Tübingen, 1901 sqq.), and *Florilegium patristicum*, ed. G. Rauschen (Bonn, 1904 sqq.)]. There are also series devoted to the issue of individual writers and monographs on them, like Harnack and Gebhart's *TU* (Leipsic, 1882 sqq.), and the *Cambridge Texts and Studies* (1891 sqq.). There should be taken into account the numerous periodicals given to this department, as well as the monographs and collections for purposes of instruction like the *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter* (79 vols., Kempten, 1869–88), *ANF* and *NPNF* (see vol. i., p. xviii. of this work), and E. Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen and Leipsic, 1904). Especial attention has been paid to the first three centuries, and the work has been characterized by a notable impartiality in investigation. The Tübingen school were pioneers in this direction. But the man whose work has been most fruitful and illuminating is Adolf Harnack (q.v.), bringing to the task an unexampled richness of knowledge, keen powers of combination, patience in investigation, and brilliant abilities in the way of exposition. With him were such coworkers as Theodore Zahn, Adolf Hilgenfeld, and Franz Xaver Funk (qq.v.) in Germany, Joseph Barber Lightfoot (q.v.) in England, while in France, Italy, and the United States a renewed activity and industry are being applied to patristic study. It is conceivable that in so restlessly busy and progressive an age leisure would not be found for summarizing, and until recently this was the great need. Not up to the standard were J. Alzog's *Grundriss der Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1866), O. Zöckler's *Geschichte der theologischen Litteratur* (Nördlingen, 1889), and J. Nirschl's *Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik* (3 vols., Mainz, 1881–85). J. Donaldson, however, did excellent work in his *Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine* (3 vols., London, 1864–66). The dearth in this respect led to Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipsic, 1893–1904). G. Krüger sought lines of development in his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Freiburg, 1895; Eng. transl., *Hist. of Early Christian Literature*, New York, 1897). O. Bardenhewer in his *Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1901; Eng. transl., *Patrology*, St. Louis, 1908), held to beaten paths; in his *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur* (2 vols., 1902–04), he showed independence. The Frenchman P. Batiffol in his *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes* (Paris, 1897) is not independent of German predecessors; while in England C. T. Cruttwell produced his *Literary Hist. of Early Christianity* (2 vols., London, 1893). In Greece interest is manifest in the *Christianikē grammatologia* of G. J. Derbos (vol. i., Athens, 1903). The department is developing strength along the lines of special grammatical, stylistic, and literary studies of the material available, as is proved by W. Christ's *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf die Zeit Justinians* (3d ed., Munich, 1898), W. S. Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (5th ed., ed. L. Schwabe, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1890; which yet leaves much to wish for), the work of J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, vol. i., part 1 (2d ed., Leipsic, 1889), A. Ebert's *Allgemeine Geschichte* (vol. i., 2d ed., Leipsic, 1889), M. Manitius' *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie* (Stuttgart, 1891), and M. Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (7 vols., Munich, 1894–1908).

It is not superfluous to discuss the methodology of what is denominated "Patristics" and "Patrology." These terms took their rise in the con-

5. Conceptions of Patristics and Patrology.

ception of the subject in the minds of seventeenth-century Lutheran theologians, who regarded the discipline as embracing the collection of patristic testimony for individual doctrines. The Roman Catholics regarded it as "the discipline which searches out from the writings of the Fathers what pertains to faith, morals, and discipline, and reduces it to order." Nirschl defined it as "the systematic exposition of the teaching on faith and morals of the Church Fathers and ecclesiastical writers." It has been shown also that the interest in the subject was not purely historical; there was a polemic element in it. "Patrology" came to be applied to the historical side of the discipline, "Patristics" to the systematic treatment, though this distinction is not always maintained. Yet in using these names Lutheran orthodoxy borrowed from Roman Catholicism, employing the word which the Roman Catholics applied in honor of the ecclesiastical teachers of early times (*pater*, "father"). Indeed from the fourth century the term "the Fathers" has represented a certain body of men, especially of bishops, who had borne testimony in the Church. Not all "ecclesiastical writers" were counted in with the "Fathers" as used in its dogmatic sense, since not all of them were regarded as orthodox. There arose then a distinction between "Fathers" and "writers." To the term "Church Fathers" four marks were attached; a sufficient antiquity, orthodoxy in doctrine, sanctity of life, and the approbation of the Church. Later in the history of the Church there were singled out the "doctors of the Church," who were distinguished, in addition to the four marks just named, by a singular erudition; this title was given in eminence to Gregory the Great, Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, and later symbolism saw in these four names four ecclesiastical grades—bishop, archbishop, cardinal, and pope. The title of "doctor" was later applied also to Hilary of Poitiers, Peter Chrysologus, Leo the Great, and Isidor of Seville in the West; to Athanasius, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and John of Damascus in the East. But in the liturgical books of the East itself only three names stand out with distinction—Basil, Gregory, and Chrysostom. The West awards the title doctor also to Bede, Peter Damian, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, St. Francis of Sales, and Liguori.

6. Scope of the Department.

Such a conception as the foregoing involves implies a narrowing of the field of this discipline as merely dogmatic from which historical science strives to free itself. So Friedrich Nitzsch declared that from the historical-literary standpoint the meaning of a writer does not depend upon its origin from a Church Father, and that consequently patristics must be freed from a mechanical method which took account first of all of narrow chronological and biographical matters. Such a point of view had already been hinted at by Pestalozzi. The first idea of Nitzsch implied a return to the principle announced in his preface to the edition of Jerome's *De viris illustribus* (Leipsic, 1860). This writer put the Apostolic Fathers on the same footing as New-Testament writers, Philo figured with Hermas, Bardesanes with Musanus the opponent of heretics. The influence of something like this was felt by Bardenhewer, who called his work *Geschichte der altkirchlichen* (not *altchristlichen*) *Litteratur*, which expressed his idea of what patrology ought to be. From the historical-literary point of view, a Gnostic who commented on the Fourth Gospel has a claim to be represented as good as that of a teacher of the Church, the claim of an Arius equals in force that of an Athanasius. History of literature is not dogmatics and does not contain the prolegomena to it; it has its own principles. On such a basis the entrance of the New-Testament writers into the scheme follows at once, and is not the result of rationalistic handling of Scripture. Jerome did not hesitate to include them; and it is arbitrary to exclude any group of writings upon ecclesiastical grounds. If all New-Testament writings are "apostolic," there is all the more reason to head a history of early Christian literature with a section on apostolic writings. From a methodological standpoint the relations of the discipline of New-Testament introduction to the history of early Christian literature are matters of no consequence.

7. Methodology.

This is not a mere strife about words, for the discipline is something more than the arrangement of names and writings according to chronological and biographical details. True, the followers of Jerome in the Middle Ages became known as *Nomendators;* and the method here indicated has stuck in the later treatment. Franz Overbeck has expressed the opinion (*Historische Zeitschrift*, xlviii., 417–472) that the history of early Christian literature will not have reached its rights until it brings into view the historical connections. This writer distinguishes between a primitive Christian literature arising before contact of Christianity with the world about it and the literature which sprang into existence after such contact and in view of it. The disposition to exclude, along with the New-Testament writings, those of the Apostolic Fathers as pupils of the apostles is dogmatic, not literary-historical. It is now recognized that the related has been separated, the unrelated has been brought together. But the varieties of primitive literature—Gospels, Acts of the apostles, epistles, doctrinal writings, apocalypses, and the like, began with new accessions of material to form into groups, and the New Testament, the apocryphal writings, the productions of the Apostolic Fathers, found appropriate distribution. Gnostic writings separated themselves from these, but influenced the growing patristic literature. The apologetic writings of the second century formed the groundwork of those of succeeding centuries. The individualities of eastern and western compositions came to recognition. The first result of this was the exposition of Harnack in his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* (ut sup.), and he has been followed by Haussleiter and Ehrhard. That so far the efforts have been applied mainly to the first three centuries is due to the preeminent interest that period possesses. But M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur des 4.*

Jahrhunderts (Munich, 1904), has begun to treat Christian Latin literature from the same point of view, a fact which gives good promise for the future that the principle advanced by the writer in his work will govern, viz., that literary-historical and not ecclesiastical or theological methods will come to prevail in this region. (G. Krüger.)

Bibliography: For bibliography the two important works are Potthast, *Wegweiser;* and U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques*, Paris, 1877 sqq.; cf. vol. i., pp. xvii.–xviii. of this work. On the history and theory of patristics consult: A. Ehrhard, *Die altchristliche Litteratur und ihre Erforschung*, 2 vols., Strasburg, 1894; J. Daille, *Treatise on the Right Use of the Fathers in the Decision of Controversies*, London, 1842; J. J. Blunt, *The Right Use of the Early Fathers*, London, 1869; G. B. Crooks and J. F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopædia*, pp. 396–401, New York, 1894; H. B. Swete, *Patristic Study*, New York, 1902; L. Emery, *Introduction à l'étude de la théologie protestante*, Paris, 1904; W. Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, London, 1903; P. Schaff, *Theological Propædeutic*, pp. 273–276, New York, 1904; A. Fortescue, *The Greek Fathers*, London, 1908. To the works named in the text add: C. F. Rösler, *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter in Uebersetzungen und Auszügen*, 10 vols., Leipsic, 1776–86; E. B. Pusey, J. Keble and J. H. Newman, *Library of the Fathers*, Oxford, 1839 sqq.; A. B. Caillan and M. N. S. Guillon, *Collectio selecta sanctorum ecclesiæ patrum*, 148 vols., Paris, 1829–43.

PATRONAGE.

Early History (§ 1).
Germanic Formulation (§ 2).
Reform and Secular Encroachment (§ 3).
The Reformation (§ 4).
Status: Roman Catholic (§ 5).
Status: Evangelical (§ 6).

1. Early History.

In the ecclesiastical sense, patronage is a term applied to the right of a patron to nominate for appointment to, and cooperative administration of, a benefice. From early times a certain prerogative in nomination for appointment and administration has been relinquished to those who erected ecclesiastical buildings, institutions, or offices; in short, to the sovereign landlords. In the orient, the Christian emperors from the second half of the fifth century imposed upon those who had begun a foundation the obligation of completing it; and if the foundation was testamentary, the obligation fell upon the heirs. In order to encourage the donators in this often neglected duty the imperial legislation extended to them, subject to the final decision of the bishops, a proportionate share in the administration by virtue of appointments. Justinian in 546 (*Novellæ*, cxxiii. 18) conferred upon them the right of presentation to the spiritual dignitary who had the function of appointment and was also frequently the same person as the administrator. Thus arose the possessor's or founder's right (*Ktetorikon dikaion*). This has never attained great significance from the point of view of constitutional history, and where it still exists it is strictly differentiated from the right of patronage imported into the orient in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

2. Germanic Formulation.

In the West the Germans furnished the legal form for this institution for a long time to come. Canon 10 of the Synod of Orange (441), reference to which is often made, had conceded to the *episcopus ædeficator* only the right of proposing candidates for a church built outside of his diocese but on property belonging to the bishopric. When in Gallic-Roman times a private right in church property is spoken of, a merely "bare right" is implied. A radical change, however, followed the entrance of the Germanic peoples into the Church. The conception prevailed with increasing weight that whoever erected a church on his land retained a right to the inheritable and alienable property, and full power of administering it. By the beginning of the eighth century the victory of proprietary church right was decisive, at least with reference to non-parish churches. Numerous documents show that churches were treated and alienated like other properties. Especially in the kingdom of the Franks, as a part of the general sequestration policy of Charles Martel and Pippin, the free churches descending from the Roman régime and wholly subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops were appropriated for the laity, so that the proprietary churches of kings and landed nobles were the majority. And in the ninth century the proprietary right became supreme by the surrender of the remaining churches on the part of the bishops. The proprietary right was sanctioned for the Frankish Church by Charlemagne (canon 54, Synod of Frankfort, 794), and for the Italian Church by Eugene II. (canons 21, 24, Synod of Rome, 826). It gained supremacy also in the districts that had remained Roman (e.g., Italy) and now became universal in Western Europe. The Carolingian legislation concerned itself with the subject in much detail; and as the synods and ecclesiastical administrative bodies became weaker and feudal conceptions stronger, the theory of private church right became continually more sharply defined. Under the régime of private church right the entire clergy of the lower churches was conceived as private. Every church with its possessions and incomes was considered the special property of its lord; that is, of the king, of a temporal magnate, of a bishopric, or of a cloister. It was no longer a legal subject or a public office. The lord was regularly and officially called *senior;* only rarely, and in private documents, was he called *patronus*. He had the power to determine the personnel which was to officiate in his church and to dispense or recall such ministration. The correct ecclesiastical terminology was retained to represent his right as that of presentation, the final decision being supposed to rest with the bishop. In practise, however, the lord had unlimited power of appointment and dismission. The enfeoffment conformed with the investiture of the private right or *peculium* of the German feudal land tenure. In most cases it was the non-servile, lifelong benefice, the free fief of the Frankish law, that the priest received. A church-book was handed to him as a symbol of the use of his fief. As some of the land came to be withdrawn by the lord for raising revenue to defray material expenses devolving on him, or was sequestrated for private use, the clergy were more and more limited to the benefice in the narrower sense. The result was the decline and depreciation of the church-lands, and the differentiation of the previous simple private church right into various species, one of which was the right of presentation, called also *jus patronatus;* or where the benefice and the *exenium* (" gift ") to the lord were in view, ecclesiastical investiture. The former comprehensive proprietorship became extinct.

3. Reform and Secular Encroachment.

But the Church profited for its own liberation with this differentiation process, by applying it to a distinction of " church " and " altar." The lord hereby invested the ecclesiastic with the church-building and the appurtenances, while the bishop invested him with his spiritual office and authority. Gregory VII. (1078) declared not only lay investiture, but also the traditional lay property right and lordship, sinful usurpation. Alexander III. interpreted hitherto legal jurisdiction as spiritual and rejected unconditionally private church right and restricted the lord's appointing power to mere nomination, which he and canon law after him based upon the gratitude of the Church for the endowment. To this he appropriated the term *jus patronatus*, that was coming ever more definitely to the front on both sides of the Alps. In principle and law at least private ownership in the Church was extinct. Practically, matters were far otherwise. The church lords, it is true, had everywhere to consent to be called patrons, but it was not possible for the Church even to maintain its jurisdiction in disputes as to patronage. Such disputes were soon increasingly referred to the temporal courts. The patrons used their right of nomination with the bishop so as frequently to procure benefices for as many as half a dozen members of their families, or to have as many conferred on the same person. In northern Germany the field of patronage was widened by extending itself over the archdeaconal districts with their individual parishes. Canon law was not only stretched and modified but in many respects ignored. The right of patronage, in fact, remained, especially in Germany, a practical right all through the Middle Ages. The patrons did not relinquish the right of free alienation; in effect they long maintained the old right of appointment and paid little attention to the bishop. In later times the patronage was divided, as it had been in France in the twelfth century, between church and altar. In Germany from the thirteenth and elsewhere from the fourteenth century this church principle fixed itself more and more upon the landed nobility. The developing principle of " land dominion " appropriated to itself also the right of appointment and administration, and church proprietorship was transplanted from the soil of private to that of public right. The patronage of a church built on a lord's territory belonged to him as a matter of course, unless he had expressly granted the right to the individual or congregation that built it.

4. The Reformation.

The Reformation took over patronage along with the parish. Calvinism rejected it with lay control over the Church as a whole. The Evangelical church ordinances in so far as they dealt with patronage fell in more or less with the canon law. Conservatism with reference to patronage made itself evident in that, after the Peace of Westphalia, Roman Catholics were permitted to exercise the right of patronage over Protestant churches, and vice versa. The absorption of cloistral estates led frequently to an increase of patronage; the princes not only securing the patronage of monasteries, but all inherent rights over churches incorporated with them. The decline of episcopal jurisdiction not being always immediately succeeded by a strict consistorial government also favored an increase of patronage. The right of the patron was now regarded as covering that of appointment, involving right of dismissal as well. Similar tendencies arose in the Roman Catholic Church. After the sixteenth century the patron came to be called collator, and privileges of appointment accumulated especially where numerous rights of presentation to minor benefices as well as nominations to bishoprics were conferred as a reward for services in the Counter-Reformation. Patronage disputes came to be settled in the seventeenth century before temporal authorities, and Leopold I. of Austria in 1679 issued for the first time a decree for a comprehensive temporal regulation, which followed canonical precedent and remains, in its main points, in force to-day. On the other hand, a long series of edicts by Maria Theresa and Joseph II. increased the building-burdens of the patron and curtailed his right of nomination. The first comprehensive regulation on the part of the State for both confessions resulted in Prussia, where the general land law has since 1794 regulated patronage by a supplementing, defining, and amending of the common law, and has subjected patronage to the jurisdiction of the temporal courts. Successive efforts during the nineteenth century for the abolition of patronage, especially those springing from the revolution of 1848, have not resulted in legislation to that effect. In Austria the abolition of monasteries increased the mass of patronage and the attempt has been made to divide the right with reference to all state churches from the sovereignty. In Bavaria, by the Concordat of 1817, it was asserted by the crown, and Prussia has effected a compromise with the bishops. In the Evangelical churches the contradiction between church self-government and patronage was felt most sharply. The Eisenach Conference (q.v.), in 1859 and 1861, and a number of synods committed themselves to the abrogation of the right. This has, however, failed in that no one will assume the patron's burdens, especially that of the building-obligation; and even where these obligations do not exist, people are indisposed to assail rights properly obtained.

5. Status: Roman Catholic.

In the Roman Catholic Church " patronage denotes the powers and duties that accrue to a person with respect to a church or a churchly office, on the ground of some special right independent of the position of the church or office in the hierarchy." In Prussia patronage is subject to the common land law; in Baden and Austria to state enactment. Primarily patronage is subject to canon law and is regulated thereby in many German states. At the same time it is recognized as state law, belonging in the highest measure to the public code, inasmuch as patronage includes certain duties, such as that of building, and of administering church properties, which, as a rule, can be enforced only by external compulsion. The right of patronage is either real or personal. The former inheres in real estate, and its rights and duties are determined by ownership. The latter inheres in a physical or legal person. The patronage may be spiritual, lay, or mixed, according always to the respective status of the patron. A common right of patronage may be held by several persons. The right of patronage is secured, first, by the title of acquisition. The ordinary title is provided by the establishment of an ecclesiastical foundation, or of a mere churchly benifice, and the assumption of the legal obligations imposed thereby. The foundation must cover the three items of ground, erection, and maintenance. The consent of the ecclesiastical superiors is also necessary, but this may be given tacitly. Except by way of foundation a right of patronage can not now be established without a papal privilege. The second essential to the creation of a right of patronage is personal qualification. The person (physical) must be an active member of the Roman Catholic Church in good standing. All the unbaptized are excluded (pagans and Jews), and also heretics, schismatics, apostates, and those under the ban of the Church. In practise non-Catholics still exercise the right, Jews excepted. Juridical persons (e.g., stock companies) may exercise the right although their agents be unqualified, provided the object of such juridical person subserve a particular confession. Thirdly, the right of patronage can be obtained only over the proper objects, such as parish churches, chapels, oratories and their accompanying benefices, and canonries; but not over bishoprics or episcopal positions. Patronage includes a number of rights and duties. The latter are of little importance in common law. The former are either honorary, beneficial, or intended to secure the interest of the patron in the foundation. Among the rights one is that of presentation, by virtue of which the patron may present a properly qualified person to the ecclesiastical superior, usually the bishop, under whom a vacancy has occurred. He is, however, limited to the candidate proving the highest apparent fitness. A spiritual patron has six months, a lay patron four months, in which to nominate his candidate; but this rule varies under different codes. The lay patron may also nominate several candidates from whom the bishop may make his choice (see NOMINATION, ALTERNATIVE RIGHT OF). If an improper candidate is presented by a spiritual patron the right for that occasion is lost, but a lay patron may nominate again if his nominating period has not passed. The right of nomination does not belong to the patron absolutely; the first positions in the cathedral and collegiate chapters may be sought only through papal privilege. Of honorary rights in the real sense, that of precedence over other laymen in processions inside or outside of the church is the only one secured by common law; by particular rights and the law of custom come the privileges to a prominent seat in the church, to the church-prayer, and to burial within the church or church-yard in a prominent place and free of cost. Of rights of benefit the common law, in case the patron has become destitute through no fault of his own and can not support himself, secures him maintenance by the church, provided he is a descendant of the original founder and sufficient funds are left over after providing for the proper religious services. The interest of the patron in the maintenance of the foundation is secured by the right to take cognizance of the administration of the property, to propose the removal of obvious abuses and unfaithful administrators, and in urgent cases to propose extraordinary reforms. He has the right to be heard when church property is to be sold, and when the selling of the original endowment is in question his consent is necessary. Finally, his agreement is required to proposed alterations of the institution or benefice. The duties of the patron by common law are, in case he draws an income from the church's estate, to pay for the repair and restoration of the parish church and parish house. In case he draws no income, his failure to repair and rebuild results in the lapse of his right of patronage. By statute laws, the duties of the patron with respect to repair and rebuilding are much more comprehensive. The right of patronage may be transferred, by sale, exchange, or testament, with the property in which it inheres. The personal patronage passes to the civil-law heirs of the patron, unless special disposition of it has been made by the patron. When it is restricted to a particular family, it disappears if the family becomes extinct. Personal patronage may be donated only with the consent of the ecclesiastical superiors, except when a lay patronage is turned into a spiritual one, or a common right is transferred to a fellow patron. If sold for money it becomes void, because a simony is involved in the transaction. A patronage right becomes extinct when the patron waives his right, when no qualified patron exists, as at the extinction of the family, when the object disappears, as in case of the suppression of the institution or benefice, by right of " unhindered occupation " on the part of the church superiors, by committing an offense punishable according to church law, such as simony, killing or maiming a clergyman belonging to the church in question, attacking the property of the church, and by the heresy, apostasy, or schismatism of the patron; and by papal annulment.

6. Status: Evangelical.

Patronage has been non-existent on the left bank of the Rhine, in Oldenburg, Hesse, Hamburg, and Lübeck, since 1801. The same civil law applies to the Evangelical bodies as to the Roman Catholic Church. The application of the " body of canon law " is valid, being inherent in the patronage received by the Evangelical churches and prevailing in various states; while the legal status is similar to that of Roman Catholic patronage. There is no mixed patronage. The nomination is presented to the church government or consistory, which has the power to confirm, and is limited by the recommendation of the consistory as to fitness. According to Prussian law the patron must subject his candidate to a trial sermon and examination, and must give the congregation an opportunity to state objections to his doctrine or character. The Evangelical patron, whose guardianship over ecclesiastical property is enlarged, has a right, under the stress of patronage burdens, to appropriate from the church accounts; he can in some places cooperate in important acts of church administration, and in some states may attend without votes the sessions of the church governing body or send a properly qualified substitute. See PARISH AND PASTOR, § 3.

(U. STUTZ.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, IV., ii., § 19, V., vi., § 5, IX., viii., § 6; I. Kaim, *Das Kirchenpatronatrecht*, Leipsic, 1845; B. Schilling, *Der kirchliche Patronat*, Leipsic, 1854; P. Hinschius, *Das landesherrliche Patronatrecht*, Berlin, 1856; idem, *Das preussische Kirchenrecht*, pp. 319, 371 sqq., ib. 1884; B. W. Leist, *Das römische Patronatrecht*, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1879; A. Frantz, *Die Patronats-Befugnisse*, Marburg, 1883; J. von Zhishman, *Das Stifterrecht in der morgenländischen Kirche*, Vienna, 1888; L. Wahrmund, *Das Kirchenpatronatrecht . . . in Oesterreich*, 2 parts, Vienna, 1894–96; U. Stutz, *Geschichte des kirchlichen Benefizialwesens*, Berlin, 1895; M. Hansult, *Das Patronat in der evangelischen Landeskirche . . . Hesse*, Giessen, 1898; W. von Brünneck, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, Berlin, 1902–04; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 673–695, London, 1903; Galante, *La Condizione giuridica delle cose sacre*, part i., Turin, 1903; the treatises on ecclesiastical law (*Kirchenrecht*) by Hinschius, ii. 128, Berlin, 1878; and Friedberg, §§ 118–122, 128, Leipsic, 1903; *KL*, ix. 1620–29; Hauck, *KD*, iv. 29 sqq. A large literature is indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 13–14.

PATTERSON, ROBERT MAYNE: Presbyterian; b. at Philadelphia, Pa., July 17, 1832. He was graduated from the high school of his native city in 1849; was official reporter of the United States Senate (1850–55); was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary (1859); was pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Great Valley, Pa. (1859–67); of the South Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. (1867–80); and again at Great Valley (1880–1906). In 1880 he was the author of measures enlarging the powers of synods and formulated the " Inerrancy deliverance " in the General Assembly of 1892. Besides his work as associate editor of *The Presbyterian* (1870–80) and of *The Presbyterian Journal* (1880–1893), he has written *Revival Counsels* (Philadelphia, 1871); *Total Abstinence* (1872); *Presbyterianism in Philadelphia* (1873); *Which is the Apostolic Church?* (1874); *Paradise, the Place and State of Saved Souls* (1874); *Visions of Heaven for the Life on Earth* (1877); *Elijah, the Favored Man* (1880); *The Skeptic Reclaimed* (1888); *Isaiah and the Higher Critics* (1889); *American Presbyterianism* (1896); and *The Angels and their Ministrations* (1900).

PATTESON, JOHN COLERIDGE: Church of England bishop of Melanesia; b. at London Apr. 1, 1827; murdered on the island of Nukapu, Melanesian group, Sept. 20, 1871. He studied at Eton and afterward at Oxford, where he was elected fellow of Merton College, 1852; was curate at Alfington, Devonshire; went 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; and translated into the Mota tongue the Gospels of Luke and John and other part
Scripture. He was indefatigable and self-deny
organizing, teaching, and conducting di
ship, with special effort for the econo

of the natives and the reduction of the numerous dialects (he spoke twenty-three) to written languages. An evidence of his success and that of his coworkers is the fact that after twenty years only forty of the 800 natives on the chief island, Mota, remained unbaptized. The kidnaping of the islanders by unscrupulous traders to be sent to the plantations of Queensland and Fiji was apparently the cause of his death. Not aware of the ill-feeling aroused over the alleged slaying of five of their number, he landed at Nukapu and was immediately killed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographies have been written by C. M. Yonge, 2 vols., London, 1873–78; E. Palmer, ib. 1872; Frances Awdry, *Story of a Fellow Soldier*, ib. 1875; W. Baur, *Lebensbilder aus der Heidenmission*, vol. iv., Gütersloh, 1878; Jesse Page, London, 1891; and in *DNB*, xliv. 53–56.

PATTISON, DOROTHY WYNDLOW (SISTER DORA): Philanthropist, sister of Mark Pattison (q.v.); b. at Haukswell, near Richmond (40 m. n.w. of York), Jan. 16, 1832; d. at Walsall (9 m. n. of Birmingham), Staffordshire, Dec. 24, 1878. She was the youngest daughter of Mark James Pattison, rector of Haukswell and a man of means; in her twenty-ninth year, purely from philanthropic motives, she became village schoolmistress in the parish of Little Woolston, Buckinghamshire, serving there 1861–64; in 1864 she entered the sisterhood of the Good Samaritan at Coatham, Yorkshire, and the next year was sent to Walsall to assist in the hospital there conducted by the sisterhood; she devoted herself to the study of nursing, became exceptionally skilful, and was able even to perform minor operations with success. The casualties which called forth her ministrations were mostly among workmen engaged in coal-mining and in machine shops, and her faithful devotion, skill, unfailing cheerfulness, large ability for enduring continuous hours of duty, and great tenderness won for her the complete confidence and enduring love of the people to whom she ministered. In 1867 a new hospital was built, and she received charge of it. She pursued her studies at the Birmingham Ophthalmic Hospital, and also carried on the training of nurses at Walsall. In 1874 she left the sisterhood, and had charge in 1875 of the Walsall Municipal Epidemic Hospital, where the cases were principally those of smallpox. But she returned late in 1875 to the Cottage Hospital. In 1876 she developed cancer, from which she eventually died. Memorials of her life of sacrifice took the shape of her portrait in the hospital, a fund for the placing of convalescent patients, a memorial window in the parish church, and her statue at Walsall, unveiled Oct. 11, 1886.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Margaret Lonsdale, *Sister Dora*, London, 1879 (many editions); Ellen M. M. Ridsdale, *Sister Dora: personal Reminiscences of her later Years, with some of her Letters*, ib. 1880; *Sister Dora and her Statue*, Walsall, 1886; *DNB*, xliv. 57–58.

PATTISON, MARK: Church of England; b. at H w (30 m. n.w. of York), Yorkshire, Oct. 10,
k), York-
eceived
the

coln Colleges, Oxford (B.A., 1836; M.A., 1840; B.D., 1851). He became a fellow of Lincoln College in 1839, was ordained deacon in 1841, priest in 1843, and appointed college tutor in 1843. He was also appointed examiner in *literæ humaniores* in 1848, again in 1853, and for the third time in 1870. Under the influence of Newman he abandoned the rigid Evangelical views that he had acquired from his father, and for a time was a pronounced Puseyite (see Tractarianism), reciting the Roman breviary daily, and on one occasion even going to confession to Edward Pusey. From Tractarianism, however, he gradually recovered. He resigned his tutorship in 1855, and for the next few years spent much time in Germany. In 1859 he was appointed one of the assistant commissioners to report on continental education. In 1860 he contributed to the famous *Essays and Reviews* (q.v.) the essay, *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England 1688–1750*. In 1861 he was elected rector of Lincoln, after having been defeated for the place in 1851. Pattison was eminently successful as examiner, lecturer, and author, and, in point of real scholarship and academic distinction, he stood second to none at Oxford. His writings include numerous literary and theological articles published in the leading reviews; a translation of Thomas Aquinas' commentary on Matthew, in *Catena aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels* (ed. J. H. Newman, 4 vols., Oxford, 1841–45); and lives of Stephen Langton and St. Edmond, *Lives of the English Saints* (ed. by J. H. Newman and others, 14 vols., London, 1844–45). Other important works are: *Isaac Casaubon* (1875), his best book; *Milton* (1879), in the *English Men of Letters* series; *Memoirs* (1885); *Sermons* (1885); and *Essays* (ed. H. Nettleship, 2 vols., Oxford, 1889).

Bibliography: *Memoirs* (ed. Mrs. Pattison), London, 1885; L. A. Tollemache, *Recollections of Pattison*, ib. 1885; Althaus, in *Temple Bar*, Jan., 1885; *DNB*, xliv. 58–63; literature cited under Essays and Reviews.

PATTON, CORNELIUS HOWARD: Congregationalist; b. at Chicago Dec. 25, 1860. He received his education at Howard University, Emerson Institute, Washington, D. C., Amherst College (B.A., 1883), and Yale Divinity School (B.D., 1887); was ordained in 1887, and served the churches at Westfield, N. J., 1887–95, Duluth, Minn., 1895–98, and the First Congregational Church at St. Louis, 1898–1904; since 1904 he has been corresponding secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

PATTON, FRANCIS LANDEY: Presbyterian; b. at Warwick, Bermuda, Jan. 22, 1843. He was educated at Knox College, Toronto, the University of Toronto, and Princeton Theological Seminary (graduated, 1865). He was ordained in 1865 and held pastorates at the Eighty-fourth Street Presbyterian Church, New York City (1865–67), Nyack, N. Y. (1867–70), and South Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1871); he was Cyrus H. McCormick professor of theology in the Theological Seminary of the North-West (now McCormick Theological Seminary), Chicago (1871–72); pastor of the Jefferson Park Presbyterian Church in the same city (1874–81); Robert L. Stewart professor of the relations of philosophy and science to the Christian religion in Princeton Theological Seminary (1881–1888); also professor of ethics in Princeton College (1886–88). In 1888 he was elected president of Princeton College, and held this position until 1902, when he resigned and was elected to his present position of president of Princeton Theological Seminary. He still retains, however, the professorship of ethics in Princeton University, as well as a lectureship on theism in Princeton Theological Seminary. In theology he is extremely conservative. Besides editing *The Interior* (1873–76) and being for several years a member of the editorial board of *The Presbyterian Review*, he has written *Inspiration of the Scriptures* (Philadelphia, 1869); and *Summary of Christian Doctrine* (1874).

PAUL: The name of five popes.

Paul I.: Pope 757–767. He first appears as a Roman deacon and was frequently employed by his brother, Pope Stephen II., in negotiations with the Lombard kings. After Stephen's death (April 26, 757) Paul was chosen his successor by those who wished a continuation of the late pope's policy. The new pope's reign was dominated by his relations to the Frankish and Lombard kings and to the Eastern emperor. He adopted an independent tone in informing the exarch in Ravenna of his election, but wrote to Pepin that the Frankish alliance should be maintained unimpaired, being forced to this course by the attitude of the Lombard king, Desiderius. The latter held the cities of Imola, Osimo, Bologna, and Ancona, which were claimed by Rome, and in 758 seized upon the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento. The same year he visited Rome and compelled Paul to write to Pepin asking him to concede all the Lombard claims except that to Imola; another letter of exactly opposite tenor was sent by the same messenger. Pepin found it advisable to maintain good relations with Desiderius, and Paul accomplished nothing by his double-dealing. Later, however, Pepin gave the pope some support and acted as arbiter between the Roman and Lombard claims. In 765 the papal privileges were restored in Beneventine and Tuscan territory and partially in Spoleto. Meanwhile, the alienation from Byzantium grew greater. Several times, especially in 759, Paul feared that the Greek emperor would send an armament against Rome; and he lived in continual dread lest Byzantine machinations turn the Frankish influence in favor of the Lombards. This was actually attempted, but Pepin held to his original Italian policy. Paul died June 28, 767. See Papal States.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Mann, *Popes*, i. 2, pp. 331–360; F. Papencordt, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, pp. 89 sqq., Paderborn, 1857; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 251 sqq., Elberfeld, 1868; J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, ii. 329 sqq., Innsbruck, 1869; L. Oelsner, *Jahrbücher des frankischen Reichs unter . . . Pippin*, pp. 319 sqq., 343 sqq., 353 sqq., Leipsic, 1871; B. Niehues, *Geschichte des Verhältnisses zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum*, i. 497 sqq., Münster, 1877; idem, in *Historischer Jahrbücher*, ii. 221 sqq., ib. 1881; W. Martens, *Die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen*, pp. 86 sqq., 254–255, Stuttgart, 1881; E. D. Glasson, *Les Rapports du pouvoir spirituel et du pouvoir temporel au moyen âge*, Paris, 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City* *of Rome*, ii. 305 sqq., London, 1894; P. Kehr, *Chronologie der Briefe Pauls I. im Codex Carolinus*, in *Göttinger philologische Nachrichten*, 1896, pp. 103–157; W. Gundlach, *Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates*, Breslau, 1899; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 109–114; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 428; Platina, *Popes*, i. 172–174; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 420, 431 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 18, note 3 (for supplementary bibliography); literature under PAPAL STATES.

Paul II. (Pietro Barbo): Pope 1464–71. He was born at Venice 1418, and was a nephew of Pope Eugenius IV. His adoption of the spiritual career was prompted by his uncle's election as pope. His promotion was rapid; he became a cardinal in 1440, and was unanimously elected pope on Aug. 30, 1464, to succeed Pius II. His oath on taking office obligated him to abolish the prevalent nepotism in the Curia, to improve the morals there, to prosecute the war on the Turks, and to convene an ecumenical council within three years. But these terms of subscription were modified by Paul at his own discretion, and this action lost him the confidence of the sacred college. Consequently, when in 1466, designing to eliminate redundant offices, Paul proceeded to annul the college of abbreviators, whose function it was to formulate papal documents, a storm of indignation arose, inasmuch as rhetoricians and poets had long been accustomed to buy in the reversion of such positions. Platina (q.v.), who was one of these, wrote a threatening letter to the pope, and was imprisoned but discharged; in 1467 he was again imprisoned on the charge of having participated in a conspiracy against the pope, and was subjected to torture, being accused, along with other abbreviators, of pagan views. In retaliation, Platina, in his *Vitæ pontificum*, set forth an unfavorable delineation of the character of Paul II. It is certain that Paul was an opposer of the humanists, was second to none in making provision for popular amusements, and displayed an extravagant love of splendor. But justice requires notice of his strict sense of equity, his reforms in the municipal administration, and his fight against official bribery and traffic in posts of dignity.

In statecraft, Paul lacked eminence and achieved nothing of consequence for Italy. In his own domain, however, he terminated, in 1465, the predatory régime of the counts of Anguillara. In the matter of war on the Turks, the one sovereign who might have taken the lead, King George Podiebrad of Bohemia, was rejected by the pope, and prosecuted as heretic because he sustained the conventions of Basel (see HUSS, JOHN) in favor of the Utraquists. In August, 1465, he summoned Podiebrad before his Roman tribunal, and, when the king failed to come, leagued himself with the insurgents in Bohemia, and released the king's subjects from the oath of allegiance. In December, 1466, he pronounced the ban of excommunication and sentence of deposition against Podiebrad. When ultimately the king's good success was disposing the pope in favor of reconciliation, Paul II. died, on Mar. 22, 1471.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources: Of prime importance is the continuation of the *Commentarii Pius II.*, by J. Ammanati, and the latter's *Epistolæ* in the Frankfort, 1614, ed. of the *Commentarii*; Gaspar Veronensis, *De gestis Pauli II* [illegible] book i., in G. L. Marini, *Archiatri pontificii*, ii. 17[illegible] 1784, books ii.–iv. in Muratori, *Scrip*[illegible] sqq.; Muratori, ut sup., pp. 993 sqq., contains a *Vita* by M. Canensius; A. M. Quirini, *Pauli II. Vita*, Rome, 1740; A. Ciaconius, *Vitæ . . . pontificum Romanorum*, ii. 1069–1070, Rome, 1677. Consult: Pastor, *Popes*, iv. 1–196, documents are reproduced, pp. 475–505 (the footnotes afford a most complete bibliography); Creighton, *Papacy*, iv. 4–60; F. Papencordt, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, Paderborn, 1857; J. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, vols. iv.–v., Prague, 1860–65; M. Jordan, *Das Königtum Georgs von Podiebrad*, pp. 184 sqq., Leipsic, 1861; Petrucelli della Gattina, *Histoire diplomatique des conclaves*, i. 285 sqq., Paris, 1864; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii., i., pp. 152 sqq., Berlin, 1867; J. Burckhardt, *Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien*, Stuttgart, 1878; idem, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1877–78; Von Höfler, in *Archiv für österreichische Geschichtskunde*, xii. 328 sqq.; idem, in *Sitzungsberichte Wiener Akademie, historische Klasse*, xcvi., 1881; De l'Epinois, in *Revue des questions historiques*, 1886, pp. 278 sqq.; W. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy*, pp. 83–85, New York, 1902; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 275–296 (cf. remark in text); Bower, *Popes*, iii. 244–248.

Paul III. (Alessandro Farnese): Pope 1534–49. He was born at Carino, in Tuscany, and came through his mother from the Gaetani family, which had also produced Bonifacius VIII. He received his instruction at Rome and Florence from distinguished humanists, and became a prothonotary at the Curia under Innocent VIII. From Alexander VI. he received rapid promotion, becoming cardinal in 1493. He came near succeeding Leo X. and Adrian VI. Under Clement VII. he became cardinal bishop of Portus (Ostia) and dean of the sacred college, and on the death of Clement VII., in 1534, received election as pope.

His first appointment to the cardinalate on Dec. 18, 1534, made it clear that nepotism had come to the front once more; since the red hat fell to his nephews Alessandro Farnese and Ascanio Sforza, aged fourteen and sixteen years respectively; yet subsequent appointments included Gasparo Contarini, Sadoleto, Pole, and Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, subsequently Pope Paul IV. (q.v.). Paul III. was in earnest in the matter of improving the ecclesiastical situation, and on June 2, 1536, he issued a bull convoking a general council to sit at Mantua in 1537. But at the very start the German Protestant estates declined to send any delegates to a council in Italy, while the duke of Mantua himself put forth such large requirements that Paul first deferred for a year and then discarded the whole project. In 1536 Paul invited nine eminent prelates, distinguished by learning and piety alike, to act in committee and to report as to the reformation and rebuilding of the Church. In 1537 they turned in their celebrated *Concilium de emendenda ecclesia* (in J. le Plat, *Monumenta ad historiam Concilii Tridentini*, ii. 596–597, Louvain, 1782), exposing gross abuses in the Curia, in the church administration and public worship; and proffering many a bold and earnest word in behalf of abolishing such abuses. This report was printed not only at Rome, but at Strasburg and elsewhere. But to the Protestants it seemed far from thorough; Luther had his edition (1538) prefaced with a vignette showing the cardinals cleaning the Augean stable of the Roman Church with their fox-tails instead of with lusty brooms. Yet the pope was in earnest when he took up the problem of [illegible] clearly perceived that the emperor [illegible] oblem were grappled in earnest, and that the surest way to convoke a council without prejudice to the pope was by an unequivocal mode of procedure that should leave no room for doubt of his own readiness to make amendments. Yet it is clear that the *Concilium* bore no fruit in the actual situation, and that in Rome no results followed from the committee's recommendations.

On the other hand, serious political complications eventuated. In order to vest his grandson Ottavio Farnese with the dukedom of Camerino, Paul forcibly wrested the same from the duke of Urbino (1540). He also incurred virtual war with his own subjects and vassals by the imposition of burdensome taxes. Perugia, renouncing its obedience, was besieged by Pier Luigi, and forfeited its freedom entirely on its surrender. The burghers of Colonna were duly vanquished, and Ascanio was banished (1541). After this the time seemed ripe for annihilating heresy.

While it was not foreseen at Rome in 1540, when the Church officially recognized the young society forming about Ignatius of Loyola (see JESUITS), what large results this new organization was destined to achieve; yet a deliberate and gradual course of action against Protestantism dates from this period. The second visible stage in the process becomes marked by the institution, or reorganization, in 1542, of the Holy Office (see INQUISITION). On another side, the emperor was insisting that Rome should forward his designs toward a peaceable recovery of the German Protestants. Accordingly the pope despatched the nuncio Morone to Hagenau and Worms, in 1540; while, in 1541, Cardinal Contarini took part in the adjustment proceedings at Regensburg (see REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF). It was Contarini who led to the stating of a definition in connection with the article of justification in which occurs the famous formula "by faith alone are we justified," with which was combined, however, the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works. At Rome, this definition was rejected in the consistory of May 27, and Luther declared that he could accept it only provided the opposers would admit that hitherto they had taught differently from what was meant in the present instance. The general results of the conference and the attitude of the Curia, including its rejection of Contarini's propositions, shows a definite avoidance of an understanding with the Protestants. All that could henceforth be expected of the pope was that he would cooperate in the violent suppression of "heretics" in Germany, as he had done in Italy, by creating for their annihilation the arm of the revived Inquisition.

Yet, even now, and particularly after the Regensburg Conference had proved in vain, the emperor did not cease to insist on convening the council, the final result of his insistence being the Council of Trent (q.v.), which, after several postponements, was finally convoked by the bull *Lætare Hierusalem*, Mar. 15, 1545.

Meanwhile, after the peace of Crespy (Sep., 1544), the situation had so shaped itself that Charles V. began to put down Protestantism by force. Pending diet of 1545 in Worms, the emperor concluded a ment of joint action with the papal legate, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. The pope was to aid in the projected war against the German Evangelical princes and estates. The prompt acquiescence of Paul III. in the war project was probably grounded on personal motives. The moment now seemed opportune for him, since the emperor was sufficiently preoccupied in the German realm, to acquire for his son Pier Luigi the duchies of Parma and Piacenza. Although these belonged to the Papal States (q.v.), Paul thought to overcome the reluctance of the cardinals by exchanging the duchies for the less valuable domains of Camerino and Nepi. The emperor agreed, because of his prospective compensation to the extent of 12,000 infantry, 500 troopers, and considerable sums of money. In Germany the campaign began in the west, where Protestant movements had been at work in the archbishopric of Cologne since 1542. The Reformation was not a complete success there, because the city council and the majority of the chapter opposed it; whereas on Apr. 16, 1546, Herman of Wied (q.v.) was excommunicated, his rank forfeited, and he was, in Feb., 1547, compelled by the emperor to abdicate.

In the mean time open warfare had begun against the Evangelical princes, estates, and cities allied in the Schmalkald League (see PHILIP OF HESSE). By the close of 1546, Charles V. succeeded in subjugating South Germany, while the victorious battle at Mühlberg, on Apr. 24, 1547, established his imperial sovereignty everywhere in Germany and delivered into his hands the two leaders of the league. But while north of the Alps, in virtue of his preparations for the Interim (q.v.) and its enforcement, the emperor was widely instrumental in recovering Germany to Roman Catholicism, the pope now held aloof from him because the emperor himself had stood aloof in the matter of endowing Pier Luigi with Parma and Piacenza, and the situation came to a total rupture when the imperial vice-gerent, Ferrante Gonzaga, proceeded forcibly to expel Pier Luigi. The pope's son was assassinated at Piacenza, and Paul III. believed that this had not come to pass without the emperor's foreknowledge. In the same year, however, and after the death of the French King Francis I., with whom the pope had once again sought an alliance, the stress of circumstances compelled him to do the emperor's will and accept the ecclesiastical measures adopted during the Interim. With reference to the assassinated prince's inheritance, the restitution of which Paul III. demanded ostensibly in the name and for the sake of the Church, the pope's design was thwarted by the emperor, who refused to surrender Piacenza, and by Pier Luigi's heir in Parma, Ottavio Farnese. In consequence of a violent altercation on this account with Cardinal Farnese, the pope, at the age of eighty-one years, became so overwrought that an attack of sickness ensued from which he died, Nov. 10, 1549. He proved unable to suppress the Reformation, although it was during his pontificate that the foundation was laid for the Counter-Reformation.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult for sources: Paul's bulls, with those of Pius IV. and Gregory XIII. and related documents, Paris, 1624; they are also to be found in Coquelines, *Bullarum, privilegiorum . . . collectio*, iv. 1, pp. 112 sqq., Rome, 1745; O. Panvinius, *Pontificum Roma-*

norum vitæ, pp. 368 sqq., Cologne, 1626; E. Albèri, *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*, II., iii. 295 sqq., 15 vols., Florence, 1839–63; *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, xxx., pp. v. sqq., 11 sqq., Vienna, 1870; O. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, for 1534–49, Cologne, 1694 sqq.; [W. Clagett], *The State of the Church of Rome when the Reformation Began*, London, 1688; *Calendar of State Papers, Henry VIII.*, vols. vii. –viii., in *Rolls Series*. Further discussions are: Ranke, *Popes*, i. 180–206; idem, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*, vols. iv.–v., Leipsic, 1894; G. de Leva, *Storia documentata di Carlo V.*, vols. iii.–iv., Bologna, 1867–81; L. Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V.*, pp. 90 sqq., Freiburg, 1879; idem, *Geschichte der Päpste*, vol. v., ib., 1909; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, i. 163 sqq., Gotha, 1880; F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher*, passim, Bonn, 1883; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, Gotha, 1892–99; E. Gualano, *Paulus Papa III.*, Parma, 1899; De Navenne, in *Revue historique*, lxxvii (1901), 241–278; J. Gairdner, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, passim, London, 1903; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, vols. ii.–iv., passim, New York, 1907; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 311–317.

Paul IV. (Giovanni Pietro Caraffa): Pope 1555–59. He was a Neapolitan, born in 1476, and entered the clerical estate in 1494, after a course of studies embracing languages, philosophy, theology, and canon law. His uncle, Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa, opened the way for him to ecclesiastical advancement. He thus came to be chamberlain under Alexander VI., prothonotary under Julius II., and bishop of Chiete (Teate) in the Abruzzi. He was employed in diplomatic missions in the years 1506 and 1507, and was then busied for several years with reforms in his own diocese, till the fifth Lateran Council, in 1512, recalled him to Rome as president of one of the congregations. Still pending the council, he was despatched to England by Leo X., to collect Peter's Pence (q.v.), and before returning was sent to Spain to unite the Christian princes against the Turks. The sojourn thus afforded him for several years in Spain proved of decisive effect upon Caraffa's ulterior policy. On this occasion he learned the nature of an institution which nominally also existed elsewhere, while only in the form it had assumed in Spain did it serve as a powerful and undeviating instrument, viz., the Inquisition (q.v.).

To begin with, Caraffa tried his hand at reforms within the Church. Under Leo X. he served on a committee with Silvester Prierias (q.v.); afterward he was a member of the Oratory of Divine Love (q.v.). And when Adrian VI. undertook to promote reform, he promptly directed Caraffa and Tommaso Gazzella of Gaeta to prepare a draft of recommendations, though their labors appear to have been void of result. In like manner, when Clement VII. was reluctantly constrained by public opinion to put forth some efforts, he called for Caraffa's assistance, though here again the movements for improving the preparatory training of the clergy and for terminating simony were not much forwarded. By way of reaction from so much labor in vain, Caraffa withdrew himself altogether from public life about the Curia. With some friends of the Oratory he founded the Theatines (q.v.). It was natural in a man of Caraffa's character, that, after all attempts at reform from within the Church had miscarried and "heresy" but spread the wider, he should view the policy of resolute, uncompromising reaction as the indicated mode

cordingly, when the capture of Rome at the hands of the Spanish and the German troops of Charles V., in 1527, had driven the new order from Rome to Venice, Caraffa was again at work in the path of enlightened reaction. This is evidenced by two reports; one to the decemvirate, the other, in 1532, to Clement VII., and both urge extreme stringency against all manner of heresy.

Caraffa both sought and found new methods. Once more, indeed, when he had returned to Rome, he attempted reform, for he was appointed by Paul III. on the committee of nine prelates who drafted the *Concilium de emendenda ecclesia*, in 1536 (see PAUL III.); but this effort also proved without results at the time, although the Council of Trent, a quarter-century later, carried out the amendments that were here demanded. In the year 1537, however, he and his colleagues of the committee of nine incurred the scorn of the Protestants on account of the inoperative "reform." Still the Curia seemed willing once more to seek a pacific understanding with the Protestants, since Contarini (see REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF), in 1541, was despatched to Regensburg as the pope's delegate. Yet a strong party in the Curia, Caraffa among them, had opposed the plan from the start; and they so contrived that the most important proposition toward a settlement was rejected. On this account, every further attempt at peaceable conjuncture was set aside. In this connection, Caraffa and Contarini stand forth as the opposite poles of the Curia's policy; complete reaction won the day, and Contarini, under suspicion of treachery, withdrew from the Curia. It is now noteworthy that, in the very same year and by virtue of the bull *Licet ab initio* (July 21, 1542), there went into effect the reorganized institution of the Roman inquisition, which Caraffa had remodeled according to the Spanish pattern. This was his favorite creation; hence he provided, of his own means, whatever was requisite for setting to work at once, directed all advisory conferences, and drew the lines over all Italy. Fully convinced, as he was, that Roman Catholicism was in a position to recover its lapsed universal supremacy, provided only that every effort were exerted absolutely to that end, Caraffa stood forth as the embodiment of the Counter-Reformation.

Although at the election subsequent to the death of Paul III., in 1549, Caraffa had obtained many votes, it was not until after Julius III., in 1555, that he came into the papal succession as Paul IV.; being already nigh seventy-nine years old. The four years that were still his allotted term he used principally in furtherance of the task he had set for himself. He might have accomplished still more than he did, had he not been blinded by his passionate hatred for everything Spanish or imperial, and if nepotism had found no lodgment in his soul. But the latter fault, at least, he overcame in his very last year, expelling the young Caraffas. Paul IV. inflexibly plied and furthered two distinct activities: the inquisition and the prosperity of the Jesuits (q.v.). In the use of the inquisition he preferred to strike at those in high places, such as Morone and Bishop Soranzo; while he so favored the Jesuits that one of their

ny wrote: "Many people even hold him to

be the founder of our society." When he died, there passed away a powerful pope, one who had stamped his genius on the church organism of his time.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Sources: A. Caracciolo, *De vita Pauli IV.*, Cologne, 1612; G. B. Castalso, *Vita del Pontifice Paolo IV.*, Modona, 1618; P. S. Paolo, *The Papacy of Paul IV.*, London, 1673; A. Andrea, *Della Guerra di Compagna di Roma e del Regno di Napoli nel pontificato di Paolo IV.*, in *Raccolta . . . del Regno di Napoli*, vol. vii., 23 vols., Naples, 1769–1771; *Archivio storico Italiano*, vol. xii., Florence, 1847; a document of Caraffa's to the Venetian senate is in *Rivista Cristiana*, 1878. Consult further: Ranke, *Popes*, i. 213–241, iii. no. 29; J. Chantrel, *Paul IV. et la tyrannie papale*, Paris, 1870; K. Benrath, in *JPT*, 1878; idem, *Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig*, pp. 6–7, 114–115, Halle, 1887; O. Jensen, *Giovanni Pietri Caraffa*, Copenhagen, 1880; G. Duruy, *Le Cardinal Carlo Carafa, 1519–61. Étude sur le pontifical de Paul IV.*, Paris, 1882; F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, passim, Bonn, 1883; J. Gairdner, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, passim, London, 1903; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, vols. ii.–iv., passim, New York, 1907; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 318–319, and literature under Inquisition; and Paul III.

Paul V. (Camillo Borghese): Pope 1605–21. He was born at Rome on Sept. 17, 1552; was trained at Perugia and Padua in canon law; entered the service of the Curia, first as abbreviator, then as referendary of signatures; and in 1588 he was vice-legate at Bologna. He succeeded so well with a legation to Spain, under Clement VIII., that in 1596 he was duly rewarded with the purple. He became pope on May 16, 1605.

Quite at the outset he was called upon to pass decision in case of certain grave conflicts within the Church. The strife between Jesuits and Dominicans concerning the doctrine of grace (see Molina, Luis) was still active, and the new pope took sides with the Jesuits, and went at least so far toward a definition that he disallowed the teaching of Molina to be styled Pelagian. Furthermore, under date of Dec. 1, 1611, he forbade all published expression on the matter without papal approbation.

A still more deeply momentous conflict with the Venetian republic was brought to a head at the same season. The encroachment of the ecclesiastical tribunals had produced such soreness in that quarter that finally the decemvirate began to strike back. With reference to the legislation then in force, an edict of Mar. 26, 1605, had ruled that the building of churches, as well as the introduction of religious orders within the state, must be subject to express approval on the part of the republic. Two ecclesiastics, moreover, who had incurred some grave criminal charges were cited before the civil courts. The pope undertook to nullify this disposition of the case; and, under threat of the interdict, he demanded the prompt delivery of the accused to the spiritual court (Dec., 1605). The council standing firm, the interdict was declared (Apr. 17, 1606). On the Venetian side, the campaign was led by the Servite Paolo Sarpi (q.v.); and the council's firmness triumphed, since the interdict proved wholly a blank discharge. The Jesuits, Theatines, and Capuchins, who supported the pope's cause were expelled from the state's domain, while mbers of other orders and the secular clergy ed in office. Eventually, France offered to e, whereupon the chief point of dispute was waived by the transfer of the two accused ecclesiastics to the French ambassador, with the express proviso that the right of the republic to try all inhabitants be kept intact. The republic refused either to seek or to receive absolution. This was none the less bestowed, in the name of the pope, on the doge and the council, by Cardinal Joyeuse, on Apr. 21, 1607, in his declaration that the pope repealed all measures that had been instituted against Venice.

Simultaneously with the Venetian quarrel, Paul incurred strife with England. In that country, after the Gunpowder Plot (q.v.), which was charged on the Roman Catholic party, parliament had enjoined upon all Englishmen the oath that they would never assent to the doctrine whereby the pope could dispose kings or nullify subjects' oath of allegiance. Paul forbade this oath (1606 and 1607), whereupon there ensued a controversy involving, on the one side, King James himself, on the other, Bellarmine (q.v.). This dispute as to the scope of the papal authority was transplanted to France as well, when Henry IV. fell a victim to the assassin Ravaillac (1610). What was Paul's mind in this case appears from his remark to the envoy from Flanders: "This was the Lord's doing, because he was given to a reprobate understanding." Forasmuch as the Jesuit Mariana, in his tract *De rege et regis institutione* (Mainz, 1605), defended the murder of heretical kings, parliament ordered that work to be burned by the public executioner, and also prohibited Bellarmine's attack on James I. But this was not the end of the contest. In 1611, when Edmund Richer, in his treatise *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate*, gave expression to the Gallican ideas, the Jesuit Suarez retaliated with a fresh assault on James I., thereby winning the pope's highest praise; whereas it was only by special negotiations that Marie de Medicis, as guardian of Louis XIII., could be induced to withhold acceptance of the French parliament's decree, which practically countenanced the circulation of Richer's document by forbidding its annulment (cf. F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, ii. 355–356, Bonn, 1883).

Amid strifes in such number, Paul was twice afforded the opportunity of working in behalf of peace; in Spain, from 1606 downward, and in Germany, before the Thirty Years' War (q.v.). The situation in Spain turned on the forcible expulsion of the Moors. In 1608, the Dominican Bleda endeavored to justify, with his *Defensio fidei*, the somewhat maturely contemplated measure which Cardinal Richelieu described as "the most barbarous procedure in the annals of humanity" (*Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu*, i. 86, Paris, 1836), and the Roman commissioners endorsed the project, notwithstanding that Paul had earlier counseled a pacific agreement. It was, accordingly, in the spirit of this "hideous book" (H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, iii. 388, New York, 1907), that Philip III. set to work, confiscating vast properties of the Moors, and driving hundreds of thousands to misery. In Germany Paul urged the Roman Catholic powers into war with Frederick Palatine, promised them support, and survived the victory at Weissberg (Nov., 1620); but was stricken with paralysis while taking part, on Jan. 28, 1621, in a procession designed to solemnize the issue. Besides opulently endowing his brother's family, and thus enabling the Borghese to accumulate the greatest landed property ever in temporal hands within the Papal States, Paul bequeathed a valuable equipment to the city of Rome in his restoration of the great aqueduct which bears his name (Aqua Paola). K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: The bulls in Cherubini's *Bullarium magnum*, iii. 189 sqq.; A. Bzovio, *Vita di Paolo V.*, in Platina, pp. 509 sqq., ed. of Cologne, 1626; *A Declaration of the Variance between the Pope and the Segniory of Venice*, London, 1606 (from the Italian of F. Manfredi); James I. of England, *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus:* or an *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance against the two Breves of Paul V.*, London, 1607; P. Sarpi, *Hist. of the Quarrels of Pope Paul V. with . . . Venice* (from the Italian), London, 1626; idem, *Neue Briefe (1608-1616)*, ed. K. Benrath, Leipsic, 1909. Consult: Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 106 sqq., iii. nos. 79, 81; E. Cornet, *Paolo V. e la Republica Veneta*, Vienna, 1859; T. A. Trollope, *Paul the Pope and Paul the Friar*, London, 1860; S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of England 1603–16*, pp. 278 sqq., London, 1863; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, pp. 605 sqq., Berlin, 1870; Cappelletti, *I Gesuiti e la Repubblica de Venezia*, Venice, 1873; B. Cecchetti, *La repubblica di Venezia e la corte di Roma*, ii. 403 sqq., Venice, 1874; N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, *Relazione della corte di Roma*, vol. i., Venice, 1877; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, i. 851 sqq., Gotha, 1880; F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, passim, especially ii. 319 sqq., 327 sqq., 341 sqq., 355 sqq., Bonn, 1883; W. H. Frere, *The English Church, 1558–1625*, pp. 286, 336, 380, London, 1904; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, vol. iii. passim, New York, 1906; idem, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, vols. ii.–iv. passim, ib. 1907; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 327–328.

PAUL THE APOSTLE.

- I. Life.
- 1. Chronology.
  - Flight from Damascus (§ 1).
  - Journey of Acts xi. 30 (§ 2).
  - First Missionary Journey (§ 3).
  - First Visit to Corinth (§ 4).
  - Arrest in Jerusalem (§ 5).
  - Conversion (§ 6).
- 2. Period before Conversion.
- 3. Conversion and Preparation for Missionary Service.
- 4. Paul the Missionary.
- 5. Contest with Judaism.
- 6. Paul's Gospel and Theology.
- 7. Paul the Martyr.
  - Stated Facts (§ 1).
  - Probable Conjectures (§ 2).
- II. Epistles.
- 1. Preliminary Questions.
  - External Testimony (§ 1).
  - Internal Evidence (§ 2).
  - Character of Epistles as a Collection (§ 3).
  - Not an Argument in a Circle (§ 4).
  - Paul's Personality (§ 5).
- 2. First Group.
  - I Thessalonians (§ 1).
  - II Thessalonians (§ 2).
- 3. Second Group; the "Quadrilateral."
  - General Characteristics; Repulse of Judaistic Attack (§ 1).
  - I Corinthians (§ 2).
  - II Corinthians (§ 3).
  - Galatians (§ 4).
  - Romans (§ 5).
  - Unity of Romans (§ 6).
  - Criticism by Dutch School (§ 7).
- 4. Third Group; Prison Epistles.
  - Philippians (§ 1).
  - The Pauline Style (§ 2).
  - Colossians (§ 3).
  - Ephesians (§ 4).
- 5. Pastoral Epistles.
  - The Release from Prison (§ 1).
  - I Timothy (§ 2).
  - II Timothy, Titus (§ 3).

I. Life.—1. Chronology: The general course of events in Paul's life may be gathered from the Acts and from information which he himself gives in the epistles (Gal. i. 15–ii. 1; II Cor. xii. 2; Rom. xv. 23; Philemon 9). Actual dates depend upon data which do not afford a single indisputable conclusion, yet, taken together, set definite limits to the field of choice. The data and the events which they thus approximately determine are as follows: On Paul's own testimony he escaped from Damascus in the time of a certain "Aretas the king" (II Cor. xi. 32), who must be the Nabatæan Aretas IV. (see ARETAS).

1. Flight from Damascus.

From inscriptions and coins it is gathered that the forty-eighth year of the reign of this Aretas IV. was 39 or 40 A.D. (cf. Gutschmid in J. Euting, *Nabatäische Inschriften*, pp. 84–85, 87–88, Berlin, 1885). Manifestly no *terminus a quo* is furnished herein, and a *terminus ad quem* only in the doubtful case that the forty-eighth year of Aretas' reign was the last. Nevertheless it is a common assumption on this basis that the flight from Damascus took place before 40 and the conversion (which occurred three years before the flight; Gal. i. 17-18; Acts ix. 23–28) before 37 A.D. (see § 6, below).

The facts known which bear on the end of Aretas' reign are (1) that his successor, Abias, ruled under Claudius (41–54 A.D.); and (2) that Abias' successor, Malchus II. (called III. by Gutschmid) reigned c. 49–71 A.D. The "governor [Gk. *ethnarchēs*] under Aretas the king" of II Cor. xi. 32, is generally supposed to have been an official appointed by Aretas over Damascus and contiguous territory, and hence it is inferred that Damascus at the time of the flight belonged to the realm of Aretas. Both suppositions are conjectural. It is more probable that the ethnarch of Aretas was a Bedouin chieftain subject to the Nabatæan king, who with his tribe invaded Damascene territory and lay in wait for Paul before the city gate (cf. T. Zahn, in *NKZ*, 1904, pp. 34 sqq.). The expression "the city of the Damascenes" (II Cor. xi. 32) seems to show that Damascus at this time did not belong to Aretas. The theory that Damascus was given to the Nabatæans by Caligula (consequently after the death of Tiberius, Mar., 37 A.D.) and was taken away from them by Nero (consequently after Oct., 54 A.D.) has no other support than the inconclusive fact that no inscriptions or coins are known which show that Damascus belonged to the Roman empire in the years 35–62 A.D. That it did not belong to Aretas c. 35–37 A.D. seems a sound conclusion from the silence of Josephus concerning such a relation in *Ant.* XVIII., vi. 3, and v. 3. [But see NABATÆANS II., § 2.]

2. Journey of Acts xi. 30.

In Acts xi. 30, there is mention of a journey of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, carrying contributions for the relief of the brethren in Judea. The narrative is then interrupted by an account of events in Jerusalem and Palestine, including the death of Herod Agrippa I., and is resumed in Acts xii. 25, with the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch. From Josephus it is gathered that Agrippa died in 44 A.D. It was Passover time (Acts xii. 3); hence the journey occurred about the Passover of 44 A.D. It was probably after the Passover, but not very long. From this datum the beginning of the association of Paul and Barnabas may be determined. They labored together in Antioch "a whole year" (Acts xi. 26); if at the end of this year the journey took place which interrupted their work in Antioch, it was after the Passover of 43 A.D. that Barnabas brought Paul from Tarsus (Acts xi. 25–26); at any rate before the end of 43 A.D.

Josephus says that Agrippa died three years after he became king of all Judea (*War*, II., xi. 6; *Ant.*, XIX., viii. 2); consequently at the earliest in Feb., 44 A.D., since he received "his whole paternal kingdom" from Claudius immediately after the latter's accession (Jan. 24, 41 A.D.; *War*, II., xi. 5; *Ant.*, XIX., v. 1). Furthermore, he died at a time of special festivities because of the emperor's "safety" (*Ant.*, XIX., viii. 2), which must refer to Claudius' safe return from Britain at the beginning of 44 A.D. Two or three months were required for the news of the emperor's return to reach Palestine and for the preparations for the festivities. Hence the year 44 A.D. is well attested as that of the death of Agrippa, and the time of year indicated by Acts is quite consistent with Josephus. The events recorded in Acts xii. 1–19, can hardly have occurred while Paul and Barnabas were in Jerusalem, since the two apostles do not seem to have been involved in them; and if these events and the death of Agrippa (Acts xii. 20–24) occurred after the journey, the natural place to relate them would be after Acts xii. 25 (or before xv. 1). The date of the famine in Palestine was probably 46–48 A.D. But the determination of the Antiochians to send relief to Judea was formed because of a prophecy foretelling "great dearth throughout all the world" before the event (Acts xi. 27–29). In 41–43 A.D. there were harvest failures in different parts of the empire, which may well have been regarded as the beginning of the fulfilment of the prophecy (cf. T. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 417, 633 sqq., Leipsic, 1900).

3. First Missionary Journey.

Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus when Paul and Barnabas visited the island as recorded in Acts xiii. 4–13, is undoubtedly the proconsul Paulus of a Greek inscription of Soloi (D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, p. 114, Oxford, 1889; cf. *NKZ*, 1904, pp. 192 sqq.) and the Lucius Sergius Paulus of *CIL*, vi. 31, 545. He governed Cyprus before 53 A.D., the date of the inscription of Soloi, but was not the proconsul of 52 or 51. If he was the proconsul of 50, he would have been in office in the spring of 51 A.D., and this date is the *terminus ad quem* of the beginning of Paul's first missionary journey. The inscription *CIL*, vi. 31, 545, is probably earlier than the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus, since his name appears there in a subordinate position which would not be likely if he had filled so important an office before the inscription was written; but since the date of this second inscription is uncertain, no satisfactory *terminus a quo* is furnished herein.

In 52 A.D. Lucius Annius Bassus was proconsul of Cyprus (*CIG*, 2632). His predecessor was Quintus Julius Cordus (*CIG*, 2631). Gatti, the first editor of *CIL*, vi. 31, 545, with impropriety assumed that it was later than the censorship of Claudius (Apr., 47–Oct., 48 A.D.; cf. *Prosopographia*, iii. 221, Berlin, 1898; Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyklopädie*, iv. 1793).

4. First Visit to Corinth.

Paul's first visit to Corinth was made at a time when Aquila had lately come thither in consequence of an edict of Claudius expelling all Jews from Rome (Acts xviii. 1–2). The time of this edict can not be exactly determined, but it was not issued during the first years of Claudius. In 41 and 42 A.D. Claudius granted to the Jews in Alexandria, in Rome, and in the empire the free exercise of their religion, with admonitions not to abuse the privilege (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIX., v. 2–3; Dio Cassius, LX., vi. 6). Failure to heed this advice and tumultuous disturbances of the peace ultimately brought about their expulsion from Rome (Suetonius, *Claudius*, xxv.). Dio Cassius doubtless had this later edict in mind when he adds to the year 41 "he did not drive them out," and had he known that it was issued immediately he would have mentioned it. The conclusion is that Paul first went to Corinth between 45 and 54 A.D. He stayed there eighteen months, during which time (or part of it) Gallio was proconsul of Achaia (Acts xviii. 11–12). Attempts to determine the date of Gallio's proconsulship have failed (cf. Ramsay in the *Expositor*, Mar., 1897, pp. 201 sqq.; Schürer in *ZWT*, 1898, p. 41; Hönnicke, pp 26 sqq.).

5. Arrest in Jerusalem.

When Paul was arrested in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 7 sqq.) Felix was procurator of Judea (Acts xxiii, 24); after two years he was succeeded by Porcius Festus (Acts xxiv. 27). Holtzmann, Blass, Harnack, and others have argued lately in favor of 54, 55, or 56 A.D. as the date of this change of officials. But so early a date is inconsistent with clear and unquestioned statements of the historians, especially Josephus, who is the classic authority for the history of Palestine from 50 to 70 A.D., and the older opinion is to be preferred, placing the recall of Felix and the assumption of office by Festus probably in 60, possibly in 59 or 61 A.D. The arrest occurred in 57, 58, or 59, probably in 58 A.D.

The earlier date rests upon the chronicle of Eusebius—a secondary authority. Eusebius, however, appears to have thought that Felix held office from 51 or 52 to 56, Festus from 56 to 61, and Albinus (the successor of Festus) from 61 to 64 A.D. Josephus (*War*, II., xii. 8; *Ant.*, XX., vii. 1) makes it plain that Felix was sent to Palestine toward the end of the reign of Claudius—in his twelfth or thirteenth year (53 A.D.), if an inference may be made from the connection of the latter passage. The inference is supported by the fact that Josephus places his account of Felix's procuratorship (*War*, II., xiii. 2–7; *Ant.*, XX., viii. 5–8) after the accession of Nero (*War*, II., xii. 8; *Ant.*, XX., viii. 2). Furthermore, Josephus says the emperor sent Felix after Quadratus had removed Cumanus just before a Passover (*War*, II., xii. 6, 8). From Tacitus (*Annales*, xii. 52–54) the year when Cumanus was removed appears to have been 52 A.D. (see FELIX AND FESTUS). The interval from the Passover of 52 A.D. to the close of navigation in the autumn of the same year seems very short for all that is related by Josephus (*War*, II., xii. 6–8; *Ant.*, XX., vi. 2–vii. 1, ix. 5) between the removal of Cumanus and the arrival of Felix in Palestine; for this reason also the spring of 53 A.D. is the more probable date for the latter event. When Paul first appeared before Felix the latter had been in office "many years" and he continued two years longer (Acts xxiv. 10, 27; cf. "already for a long time [*jam pridem*] governor of Judea," Tacitus, *Annales*, xii. 54). It is hard to reconcile this with the term of only four or five years assigned by the chronicle. The statement of Josephus (*Ant.*, XX., viii. 9) that Felix, after he had been replaced by Festus, escaped punishment through the influence of his powerful brother, Pallas, can be made to support the new chronology only by assuming that Josephus believed the recall of Felix, the despatch of Festus, and the accusation of the Jews in Rome all to have occurred before the downfall of Pallas (Feb., 55 A.D.). But this means that Josephus believed that Felix ruled only about three and one-half months under Nero (from Oct. 13, 54, to Feb., 55 A.D.), and yet he places the greater part of Felix's procuratorship under Nero. It means also that the voyages of Felix, Festus, and the Jewish embassy were all made in the winter months. It is inconsistent with the account in Acts, which shows clearly that Felix was replaced by Festus, not in the winter, but in the summer (between Pentecost and September; Acts xx. 6, 16, xxiv. 11, 27, xxv. 1, 6, 13, 14, 23, xxvii. 1, 9). And, lastly, it makes Felix's term of office too short. The statement about Pallas in *Ant.*, XX., viii. 9, may be an error (so Bacon in the *Expositor*, Feb., 1898, p. 135; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 640); or, possibly, Pallas regained influence after Feb., 55 A.D. (cf. Schürer, i. 578). There is independent evidence that Felix ruled during the first years of Nero. (1) The "Egyptian" of Acts xxi. 38 belongs to the reign of Nero and the procuratorship of Felix (Josephus, *War*, II., xiii.

5; *Ant.*, XX., viii. 6); he was anterior to Paul's arrest (Acts xxi. 38), after which Felix remained in office two full years (Acts xxiv. 27). (2) In his twenty-sixth year, that is, in the spring or summer of 64 A.D., Josephus went to Rome to attempt the release of certain priests who had been sent thither by Felix for trial before the emperor (*Life*, iii.; for the date, *Life*, i.; *Ant.*, xii., 1, xi. 3); it is incredible that men were kept waiting for trial eight or even ten years, as they must have been if Felix was recalled before the downfall of Pallas. Festus died in office, probably in the first half of 62 A.D., since Albinus appears to have reached Palestine in September or October of that year (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., ix. 1–3; *War*, VI., v. 3; the date is fixed, if, as is probable, the feast of tabernacles mentioned in the latter passage is the same as " the festival " of *Ant.*, XX., ix. 3). His term of office was short (Josephus, *War*, II., xiv. 1; *Ant.*, XX., viii. 9–11)—an additional reason for placing the recall of Felix later than 54 or 56 A.D. With due consideration of all the data, this event must be dated either in 59, 60, or 61 A.D. The year named last is least probable, because it makes Festus rule less than one year (summer of 61–first half of 62 A.D.)—an event which Josephus would hardly have suffered to pass unnoticed. Furthermore, the clause with *tōi stratopedarchei* is undoubtedly to be retained in Acts xxviii. 16 (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, pp. 390–391), and implies that when Paul arrived in Rome there was but one prætorian prefect, which was not the case after the death of Burrus near the beginning of 62 A.D. If Festus assumed office in the summer of 61, Paul must have reached Rome after the middle of Mar., 62; and at this time both successors of Burrus were in office. The year 60 is preferable to 59 since it makes the " many years " of Acts xxiv. 10, five and one-half instead of four and one-half, and only on the assumption that the arrest took place in 58 A.D. can II Cor. xii. 2 be made to fit in with the certain date of Acts xi. 25 (see § 2, above).

6. Conversion.

Assuming that the arrest took place at Pentecost of 58 A.D., reckoning can be carried back to the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (q.v.) with considerable certainty, partly by the help of statements like Acts xviii. 11, xix. 8–10, xx. 3, 6, 31, and hints in the epistles (I Cor. xvi. 8; II Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2; etc.), partly by estimating the length of time required for the events recorded and the time of year in which they occurred. Thus it appears that the Apostolic Council was held in the winter of 51–52, probably at the beginning of 52 A.D. Reckoning backward from this point and assuming that Gal. ii. 1–10, corresponds to the events of Acts xv. 1–33, and that the three years of Gal. i. 18 are not included in the fourteen years of Gal. ii. 1. it appears that Paul was converted seventeen years before the Apostolic Council—that is, in the winter of 34–35, probably near the beginning of 35 A.D. The " new chronology," which puts the conversion in the year of Jesus' death, fails to allow sufficient time for the important events of Acts i.–viii. and is inconsistent with the uniform representation of the conversion as relatively late.

2. Period before Conversion: According to his own statement, recorded in the Acts (xxii. 3; cf. ix. 11, xxi. 39), Paul was born in Tarsus. His Judaizing opponents. perhaps as early as the second century, inferred from this that his parents were heathen (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, XXX., xvi. 25). Modern historians surmise that he was a Hellenist. When he declares himself a " Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. iii. 5; cf. II Cor. xi. 22), he does not contradict this, since what he has in mind is his ability to speak the language of the Palestinian and Syrian Jews (i.e., the current Aramaic). He was a Pharisee, descended from a line of Pharisaic ancestors (Acts xxiii. 6, where the reading is the " son of Pharisees," not " of a Pharisee "; cf. Phil. iii. 6; Gal. i. 13–14). Since the distinction of Pharisee and Sadducee is not heard of in the diaspora, this fact indicates that Paul 's family maintained connections with the mother-land, and he appears to have had a married sister living in Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 17). He was educated in Jerusalem in the school of Gamaliel the Elder, the grandson of Hillel (Acts xxii. 3). He inherited Roman citizenship from his father (Acts xxii. 28) and had also the rights of a citizen of Tarsus (Acts xxi. 39). Following Jewish custom, his father doubtless gave him the name of Saul when he was circumcised (Phil. iii. 5), perhaps after the first king of Israel, as the family belonged to the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5). As son of a Roman citizen he necessarily had also a Roman name—doubtless prænomen, nomen, and cognomen. As the cognomen was the usual designation (cf. Cæsar, Cicero, etc.), it is not strange that it alone (Paulus) has been preserved. He was doubtless called Saul by Jews after as well as before conversion, while as a Roman and missionary to the Gentiles he was always Paul. The change from Saul to Paul in Acts xiii. 9, is perhaps due to a change in sources. Paul's personal appearance seems to have been unimposing (Acts xiv. 12; II Cor. x. 10), perhaps a consequence of the bodily affliction to which he refers in II Cor. xii. 7–10; Gal. iv. 13–14 (cf. II Cor. iv. 7–18). Whatever this affliction was—severe neurasthenia, malaria, eye-trouble, or even epilepsy (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. 122)—he seemed sometimes one smitten by God and beset by an evil spirit. He appears to have aged early. He never married (I Cor. vii. 7–8, ix. 5). In his student days, doubtless, according to rabbinic custom, he learned the trade by which he supported himself later (I Thess. ii. 9; II Thess. iii. 8; I Cor. iv. 12, ix. 6–8; II Cor. xi. 7–12, xii. 14–18; Acts xviii. 3, xx. 34). The Greek *skēnopoios* (Acts xviii. 3) means a " maker of tent-material "; and Paul was a tanner rather than a weaver. The older translators and commentators knew well that the tents of Corinth and Ephesus were made of leather and uniformly classed Paul among the workers in leather. That the weaver's trade was of ill repute in Jerusalem is decisive on this point. Paul won distinction in Gamaliel's school (Gal. i. 14); and this, no doubt, led to his prominence in the execution of Stephen and brought him later the commission to persecute the Nazarenes (Acts vii. 58, viii. 1, 3, ix. 1–2, 14, xxii. 4–5, xxvi. 9–11). As Christian, Paul looked back upon this time with sorrow and regret (I Cor. xv. 8–9; Gal. i. 13–14; Phil. iii. 6–9; Eph. iii. 8; I Tim. i. 12–16) and appreciated the contrast between his pharisaic and his Christian piety and mode of thought; but he always recognized a connection between the two. Like the best of his people who rejected the Gospel, he was actuated by an honest striving after righteousness, a zeal for God, and an impulse to spread his own conviction and knowledge. As a Christian he was still a Pharisee (cf. Acts xxiii. 6) and a disciple of the rabbis in life, in handling of Scripture, in zeal for proselytizing (cf. Matt. xxiii. 15), and also in faith and hope. Passages like Phil. iii. 3–14; Gal. i.

13–15, show that Paul was not ashamed of his earlier pharisaic life.

3. Conversion and Preparation for Missionary Service: Paul's conversion was no gradual development, but a sudden and violent rupture with all his past thinking and activity; the light broke upon him, not like the dawn of day, but as a lightning flash, which revealed the glory of God shining in the face of Christ (II Cor. iv. 6) and at the same time illumined all other things and displayed his previous striving in its true character (II Cor. v. 16 sqq.; Phil. ii. 7–10). He cites his pharisaic training and bias as proof that his faith and understanding of the Gospel were not due to human agency, but were a direct revelation of Christ (Gal. i. 11–16). He gives no information in his writings concerning the outward media and circumstances except that immediately after the event he went to Arabia and Damascus (Gal. i. 17). He saw a vision (*optasia*, Acts xxvi. 19), which resembled other visions in that the supersensuous was perceived by the senses; but both Paul and the Acts (ix. 3–18, xxii. 6–16, xxvi. 9–20) distinguish it sharply from all later "revelations," "visions," and "trances" (Gal. ii. 2; I Cor. xii. 1–4; Acts xvi. 9, xviii. 9, xxii. 17–21, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23) as something unique. Paul believed that he actually saw Jesus as the older disciples had seen him after his resurrection (I Cor. xv. 8) and that for this reason his apostolate, like theirs, rested on personal intercourse with the Lord (I Cor. ix. 1). He received the call to preach at this time (Acts ix. 15, xxii. 15, xxvi. 16–18); but nothing is said about a command to begin at once or a mission exclusively to the Gentiles (cf. the present, *euangelizōmai*, instead of the future, *euangelisōmai*, in Gal. i. 16). The latter was first committed to him three years later (Acts xxii. 21), and he preached first to the Jews in Damascus, Jerusalem, and Judea (Acts ix. 20, 27, 29, xxvi. 20). After three years in Damascus, during which Paul doubtless received from the Christians in the city such instruction as he needed in the Gospel tradition, he returned to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 23–28; Gal. i. 18). Conditions there were more favorable than they would have been earlier. Caiaphas, who had given Paul his commission as persecutor (Acts ix. 1–2), had been removed from office, and Vitellius had succeeded Pilate and established better government (36 A.D.). Nevertheless, the renegade naturally encountered hatred, and the counsel of the Jerusalem Christians and a divine command determined him to leave Palestine and go to the home of his boyhood (Acts ix. 29–30, xxii. 17–21; Gal. i. 21). If Paul was converted in the beginning of 35 and went to Antioch in the summer of 43 A.D. (see 1, §§ 2, 6, above), he must have remained in Tarsus more than five years. There is no reason to believe that he traveled in Cilicia and Syria or that he preached to the Gentiles in Tarsus. It was a time of waiting and preparation for the future. He now understood his mission to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21); and it was natural that he should devote himself to study preparatory to that work. He was called from his retirement by Barnabas and resumed active work in Antioch (Acts xi. 25–26). According to the chronology here followed, the experiences described in II Cor. xii. 1–5 occurred in or before the autumn of 43 A.D., and doubtless they contributed to his decision to go to Antioch with Barnabas.

4. Paul the Missionary: It is impossible here to follow Paul's far-reaching missionary journeys or to depict his work, surpassing all previously accomplished for the spread of Christianity, in detail; no more will be attempted than a characterization of the work. Paul's teaching in Antioch (Acts xi. 26, xiii. 3) from the summer of 43 to about the spring of 50 A.D. was essentially missionary work. It resulted even in the first year in so notable accessions to the already flourishing congregation, especially of Greeks, that the Antiochians coined the name "Christians" in distinction from the synagogue (Acts xi. 19–26). If the visit of Peter to Antioch, mentioned in Gal. ii. 11–14, is rightly placed in this time (cf. *NKZ*, 1894, 435–448), it shows that Paul already had the conception of the Gospel and of the principles to be followed in a Gentile congregation which he developed later in the epistles. When he was sent out to preach by the Antioch congregation (Acts xiii. 2–4) he felt himself an apostle according to the original meaning and current application of the word—one commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel to non-believers. Barnabas accompanied him and worked with him at this time, and he had other associates in this journey and later ones. The methods and principles which Paul followed are seen in this first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 4, xiv. 26). The evangelists went rapidly from town to town and district to district, avoiding the smaller places and preaching only in the large cities. In the larger cities there were generally Jewish congregations and synagogues, and many Gentiles who "feared God" (Acts xiii. 16, 26, 42, 43) were in the habit of attending the Sabbath services. Thus there was opportunity to preach to both Jews and Gentiles; it is a mistake to think that Paul from the very first interpreted his mission to the Gentiles as exclusive of the Jews. Another principle was the consistent refusal of all material support. It was customary for traveling preachers to accept the freely offered gifts of those among whom they tarried, and Paul recognized their right to receive (I Cor. ix. 4–18) and emphasized the duty of the congregations to support their permanent teachers (Gal. vi. 6; I Tim. v. 17–18). But for himself he wished to avoid all appearance that his preaching was a profit-bringing business (I Cor. ix. 18; I Thess. ii. 3–12). Yet he did not refuse contributions offered in a spirit like his own to meet the expenses of journeys to spread the Gospel, or to solicit for his personal needs when, as in imprisonment, he could not work at his trade (II Cor. xi. 8; Phil. i. 3–7, ii. 25–30, iv. 10–19). In nothing is Paul's good sense more apparent than in his readiness to invoke the aid of the civil authorities and to claim his legal rights as a Roman citizen when attacked by the Jews or the heathen populace; and in noteworthy instances he found efficient protection (Acts xvi. 36–39, xxii. 25–29, xxiii. 27, xxv. 9–12, xxvi. 32). While petty officials sometimes showed a disposition to curry popular favor, it was Paul's good fortune that most of the higher representatives of the Roman government with whom he had to deal were intelligent and well-meaning men. His favorable judgment of the Roman order (Rom. xiii. 1–7; I Tim. ii. 2) was founded on personal experience. Lastly, Paul's office as missionary and true apostle imposed the duty of organizing the new congregations which he founded, and of watching and guiding their development. The duty carried with it the right to command (I Cor. vii. 10–13, 17, xi. 17, 34, xiv. 37, xvi. 1; I Thess. iv. 2, 11; II Thess. iii. 4–12) and demanded an obedience which was not always accorded (II Cor. ii. 9, x. 5–6; II Thess. iii. 14). But the relation of the congregations to their founder was that between paternal authority and child-like reverence (I Cor. iv. 14 sqq.), and Paul, in accordance with his conviction that freedom is an inalienable characteristic of Christian morality, left no means untried to convince of the necessity and wisdom of his opinions, recommendations, and ordinances. His command and skilful use of argument, pathos, and irony are evident in his epistles; the correspondence with the unruly Church of Corinth, which is not wholly preserved, gives the best picture of this side of Paul's burdensome work, and shows also how, though absent, he cooperated in local church discipline without imposing his opinion as the only one valid (I Cor. v. 1–8; II Cor. ii. 1–11, vii. 2–12).

5. Contest with Judaism: When the Gospel was first offered to the Gentiles there were some in the mother congregation at Jerusalem who found it hard to accept such as fellow believers (Acts xi. 2–3). Men of this type came to Antioch while Paul and Barnabas were absent on the first missionary journey and endangered the growth, if not the very existence, of the Gentile congregation there by teaching that circumcision and full observance of the Mosaic law were essential to salvation (Acts xv. 1). The Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (q.v.) followed and repudiated the teaching of these Judaizers (Acts xv. 2–29; Gal. ii. 1–10), but they continued active. They visited the South Galatian churches while Paul was on his way to Europe on the second missionary journey and produced an effect there which threw Paul, when he heard of it, into the state of agitation and indignation in which the epistle to the Galatians was written. It must not be assumed that the Judaizers were insincere. They were Pharisees (Acts xv. 5); and they doubted as little as any Pharisee (Matt. xxiii. 15; Rom. ii. 17–20) that it was the duty of the Jews to open to all men the way of salvation revealed to them. They preached Jesus in their way (II Cor. xi. 4) and zealously. But they asserted that Gentiles, in order to be Christians, must first become Jews. Herein lay the ground of controversy between them and Paul; and Paul entered the contest with a strenuousness and carried it through with a fertility of resource which won him the victory. Appealing to his own experience and that of all upright Christians of Jewish origin (Gal. ii. 15–21; Rom. vii. 1–6; cf. Acts xv. 7–11) and to the results of his labors as divine commendation, he characterized the contention of the Judaizers as a misunderstanding of the law and all pre-Christian history, as a perversion of the Gospel, and as a mischievous attack not merely on the Gentile Christians but even on the true freedom of all Christians (Gal. ii. 4). None the less he refrained from criticizing Jewish Christians for observing the law and conformed to it himself. The first period of the contest was closed by the decision of the Apostolic Council (in the winter of 51–52 A.D.) that, instead of the uniformity demanded by the Judaizers, there should be a Gentile Church and a Jewish Church. Thenceforth Paul did not lack the approval and support of the Jerusalem Church, or at least of its leaders. But attempts, always emanating from Palestine, continued to be made to undermine his work and disparage him personally. Judaizers appeared in Galatia, in Corinth, in Rome, and no doubt elsewhere. Distorted reports about Paul (cf. Acts xxi. 21) inflamed feeling against him, and his adversaries were able to cite in their favor with some apparent reason the example and teaching of Jesus (cf. Matt. v. 17–19) and the practise of the Jerusalem Church. He felt it of the highest importance to right himself in Palestine, so far as he could, by visiting Jerusalem before he transferred his activity to the West, and he went thither with a large sum of money for the poor, collected in the congregations which he had founded, and attended by an imposing array of deputies from the Macedonian, Asian, and Galatian churches (Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29; II Cor. viii. 16–24). He evidently wished to show that the Gentiles whom he had converted regarded the original congregation with grateful love and hoped to convince the non-believing Jews that he was not devoid of sympathy with his suffering people (cf. Acts xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 31).

6. Paul's Gospel and Theology: Paul deemed but one Gospel worthy of the name and called it indifferently the Gospel (or testimony or word) of God (Rom. i. 1; I Cor. ii. 1; I Thess. ii. 13; etc.), and of Jesus or Christ or the Lord (Gal. i. 7; I Cor. i. 6; Col. iii. 16; etc.). The genitive in each case is subjective, indicating the originator. Paul's Gospel was the "Gospel of God" because it was a message sent by God into the world and because God spoke to men through human preachers and called them to salvation (Rom. viii. 30; II Cor. v. 19–20; Gal. i. 6; I Thess. ii. 12–13); and it was also the "Gospel of Christ" because Christ was the first preacher of this Gospel (Eph. ii. 17) and continues to offer salvation to men through his ambassadors (II Cor. v. 20; Gal. iv. 14). All apostles truly called preach this Gospel (Rom. i. 1–5; I Cor. xv. 11), and wherever conversions result it is the true Gospel which is preached (Rom. vi. 17; Eph. i. 13–16; Col. i. 7). When he speaks of a "gospel of the circumcision" and "of the uncircumcision" (Gal. ii. 7–8), Paul means different forms of one and the same Gospel—not different Gospels for Jews and Gentiles, but different methods of preaching. The Gospel of the uncircumcision was specially committed to Paul, and because of this unique commission and the far-reaching extent of his missionary labors, he is preeminently the apostle to the Gentiles and the Gospel which he preaches is his Gospel (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; II Tim. ii. 8); though he does not deny that others recognized the need of preaching to the Gentiles and fulfilled the duty before him (Eph. iii. 5–6). Paul had a theology distinctly his own, not indeed elaborated into complete and final systematic form, but nevertheless a general conception of the revelation of God in Christ, the preparation for it, and its consequences resting on consistent thinking and well grounded in its main principles. He was by training and knowledge the only theologian in the modern sense of the word among the apostles. But he was not led to the Christian faith and life by study, but *vice versa*. His theology was experiential knowledge interpreted by the light of the general evolution as he saw it in the Old-Testament history, in the appearance of the historical Christ, in the religious antitheses of his time, and in the world of culture and civilization. This is seen most clearly in his doctrine of the law, of sin, and of justification. It has not always been sufficiently recognized that Paul's teaching has much in common with that of Jesus and the Apostolic Church. For example, his conception of the righteousness of God (Rom. i. 17, iii. 21–22, x. 3; II Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9) is fully understood only when the fact is properly appreciated that Jesus (Matt. vi. 33) and James (i. 20) spoke of a divine righteousness contrasted with one merely apparent attained by human works. As the great preacher to the Gentiles, Paul remained in high honor and his epistles were added to the Gospels as the foundation of the New-Testament canon. His teaching was dominant in the sub-apostolic Church and the entire pre-reformation Church. Marcion was the only one who felt that Paul's doctrine was peculiar and tried to distinguish it sharply from other Christian thinking; and Marcion misunderstood Paul fundamentally.

1. Stated Facts.

7. Paul the Martyr: Paul's epistles throw no light on the events beginning with his arrest in Jerusalem at Pentecost, 58 A.D., and ending with his arrival in Rome nearly three years later (see 1, § 5, above), and what is known of this period is derived solely from the last eight chapters of the Acts. Mommsen (pp. 87 sqq.) has found the narrative trustworthy when tested by knowledge of Roman criminal law and procedure and has even pronounced it a unique and valuable commentary on other sources. Paul was attacked in the temple by a turbulent crowd (instigated by the Jews "of Asia," Acts xxi. 27) and was saved from summary mob vengeance by the intervention of the Roman chiliarch, Lysias. To escape examination by scourging Paul declared himself a Roman citizen, and Lysias then accorded him speedy trial in presence of his accusers and found no offense which called for death or imprisonment. The highest Jewish authority, however, preferred a capital charge against a Roman citizen, and in such a case the chiliarch had no jurisdiction; so he sent Paul to the procurator, Felix, at Cæsarea. Again the accused had prompt trial (" after five days," Acts xxiv. 1) and no crime was proved. Further investigation (Acts xxiv. 22–26) must have removed any doubts that Felix may have had of Paul's innocence. But he delayed to pronounce final judgment, which must have set the prisoner at liberty, and Paul was still confined when Felix was succeeded by Festus two years later. The Jews made haste to press their charge before Festus, whereupon Paul availed himself of the right to have his cause heard in Rome by an appeal to Cæsar. Accordingly he was sent to Rome, being well treated on the way (cf. the entire narrative, Acts xvii. 1 sqq.), was put in charge of the prætorian prefect (at the time the excellent Afranius Burrus; see 1, § 5, above), and was permitted to live for the next two years in his own hired house, to receive freely all who came to see him, and to preach without hindrance. Here the narrative of the Acts abruptly breaks off. The epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, which were written from confinement in Rome, confirm the account of the Acts without adding anything of importance. They name some of the devoted fellow workers who gathered about Paul (Col. i. 1, 7, iv. 7, 10–12, 14; Philemon 23–24; cf. Acts xxvii. 2) and show that his desire to preach the Gospel in Rome, expressed many years earlier (Rom. i. 9–16, xv. 22–29), was being abundantly fulfilled (Eph. vi. 19–20; Col. iv. 3; Philemon 10). Only in Philemon 22 is there a hint that a trial is approaching. When the epistle to the Philippians was written Paul was also imprisoned in Rome, but conditions were different. His case had been taken up by the authorities but was not yet decided. The impression had gone forth that he was imprisoned solely because of his Christian faith and missionary preaching; others, both Paul's friends and some [Judaizers] who were actuated by " envy and strife," were preaching more zealously than ever (Phil. i. 12–18). This seems to imply that Paul was not allowed to preach himself, and also that the authorities were not disposed to adjudge Christian preaching criminal. Paul hopes to be acquitted (Phil. i. 19, 25, ii. 24). What the outcome was is nowhere told.

2. Probable Conjectures.

If, however, the pastoral epistles are genuine, Paul was set free. For these letters imply many facts which can not be fitted into Paul's earlier life and were, for the most part, contemporary with the letters or happened shortly before they were written. They mention a visit to Crete (Titus i. 5, 12), to Miletus, Troas, and probably to Corinth (II Tim. iv. 13, 20), to Macedonia; and an intended visit to Ephesus (I Tim. i. 3, iii. 14); the intention to spend the winter at Nicopolis in Epirus (Titus iii. 12). Furthermore, when II Timothy was written Paul had been for some time in prison in Rome, but the conditions are not those of Acts xxviii. 30–31, or of the epistle to the Philippians. A friend from Asia Minor had found him only after diligent seeking and others had forsaken him (II Tim. i. 8–12, 15–18, ii. 9, iv. 10). There is no more mention of preaching, and Paul is convinced that his end is near (II Tim. iv. 6–8, 18; in iv. 16–17 he says that at his " first answer," cf. Phil. i. 7, 16, the Lord delivered him to the end that he and no other should preach the Gospel to all the Gentiles). If it was Paul who wrote all this, his first trial ended in acquittal, and then he not only revisited the eastern congregations but preached Christ, as he had long desired to do (cf. Rom. xv. 24), in the West. The facts mentioned in II Timothy can hardly have been later inventions. Hence, even if the epistle be not genuine, it testifies to an acquittal and activity in the West. And this activity has independent support in Roman tradition of about 90 or 100 A.D. The First Epistle of Clement (v.) says that Paul preached " both in the East and West, . . . taught righteousness to the whole world, and came to the extreme limit of the West " before he suffered martyrdom in Rome. According to current usage " the extreme limit of the West " means Spain or the Atlantic Ocean (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. 441, 446–49). The same tradition appears in the Gnostic Acts of Peter about 160 or 170 (ed. R. A. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, i. 45–48, 51, 26, Leipsic, 1891), in the Muratorian Canon (q.v.; line 38), and in many later writings. It can not be based upon the pastoral epistles, since these speak only of renewed activity in the East or in general terms without specific designation of place, and say nothing of the West. And so early as 95 A.D. and in Rome, where the older members of the congregation must have had personal knowledge of the facts, it can hardly have been an inference from the desire to visit Spain expressed in Rom. xv. 22 sqq. The tradition of two imprisonments in Rome with an interval of missionary work between them is first connected with II Tim. iv. 16–17, by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* ii. 22), and the Spanish journey with Rom. xv. 24, 28, by Jerome, though not very definitely (on Isa. xi. ed. Vallarsius, iv. 164; Ps. lxxxiii., *Anecdota Maredsolana*, iii., 1895, pp. 2, 80). Against the historicity of the tradition there are neither positive statements of great antiquity nor hypotheses of convincing force. The abrupt termination of the Acts does not necessarily indicate that Paul died at the end of the two years (Acts xxviii. 30–31); on the contrary, if the imprisonment terminated in a glorious martyrdom, the author would hardly have omitted so fitting a conclusion of his narrative. The sad words of Acts xx. 25 are not conclusive (cf. the confident tone of Phil. i. 19, 25, ii. 24). The assumption that Paul suffered in the persecution instituted by Nero after the burning of Rome is improbable (1) on chronological grounds, because this persecution did not begin before the autumn of 64 A.D., and from the end of the two years (spring, 63 A.D.) to this time is too long an interval; (2) according to tradition never contradicted Paul was beheaded (Tertullian, *Præscriptio*, xxxvi.; Acts of Paul, ed. Lipsius, ut sup., pp. 112 sqq.); taking into account Tacitus, *Annales*, xv. 44, the hints in I Clement v., and Paul's Roman citizenship, it is almost incredible that he (like Peter, according to tradition equally old) can have been crucified. The Roman tradition which makes Peter and Paul both suffer on June 29 of the same year can prove at the most only that Paul (like Peter in all probability) suffered under Nero. But this tradition first appears in the fourth century and is a misunderstanding of a common festival of Peter and Paul which originally commemorated a translation of their relics on June 29, 258 (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. 454 sqq.). Even Augustine doubted this tradition because of another which made both apostles die on the same day of the year, but Paul in a later year than Peter. The old Acts of Peter (ed. Lipsius, ut sup., pp. 46, 3, 8) place his work and martyrdom in Rome in the same year which took Paul to Spain, therefore, earlier than Paul's death; and Irenæus, following a later tradition, set the death of Paul a full year after that of Peter (*ASB*, June, v. 423). The older witnesses—Clement, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenæus, Tertullian—and Eusebius in the chronicle (Armenian text) display no exact chronological knowledge and are at one only in that both apostles died about the same time, and, so far as any indication is given of the emperor, under Nero. (T. ZAHN.)

II. Epistles.—1. Preliminary Questions: The canon of the New Testament ascribes fourteen letters to St. Paul. Of this number the epistle to the Hebrews (see HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE) may be put aside. It can not possibly have been written by the apostle. By every test of style and thought it belongs to some other writer. It can not be called Pauline even in a secondary sense, as if it had issued from a Pauline school deeply stamped by the master's mind. The reference to Timothy in xiii. 23 indicates that it was written by a man who belonged to the Pauline group. But in every way he was his own master. After a long and thorough debate it may be fairly said that the case against the Pauline authorship is closed.

1. External Testimony.

There remain thirteen letters passing under the apostle's name. As regards all of them, the external testimony is unanimous and continuous. Its value is heightened by the fact that the testimony of the Church in the second and following centuries, when it came to the epistle to the Hebrews, divided, East and West being at odds. But upon the other thirteen there was never a doubt. The second-century fragment called the Muratorian Canon (q.v.) ascribes them to Paul; and in all probability it publishes the mind of the leaders of the Church of Rome. Marcion accepted all but the Pastorals. It seems probable that he found the thirteen letters at Rome assembled into a Pauline corpus. His treatment of them is not historical but dogmatic. Distinction must be made carefully between what the external evidence can and can not do. It makes no discriminations. The statistics of quotation vary. Certain epistles are more widely used than others. But this does not affect the testimony as a whole, which speaks about every member of the group in the same tone and with the same emphasis, and is conclusive regarding the Pauline literature as a whole. It attests the existence of a man of vast religious genius and executive efficiency.

2. Internal Evidence.

But the external testimony has no value when it faces the new issues in the field of Biblical introduction. One of the assured results of recent Old-Testament and New-Testament work is a profound difference between modern methods of authorship and literary workmanship and the methods that underlie the main body of Holy Scripture. With us the author is a self-conscious individual. His book is his own, no one else's. He has property rights in it which the laws of copyright insure and safeguard. But antiquity as a whole lacked this conception of authorship. The literary man was very apt to be a member of a school or gild. His writings or outgivings were not in any sense his own property, but the property of the community to which he belonged. Their text was preserved by the community, in the hands of which it was in some degree plastic. Pentateuchal criticism, Isaianic criticism, Homeric criticism, the study of Jewish and Christian apocalypses, the synoptic problem, the Johannine problem, contribute an irresistible volume of testimony to the fundamental difference between ancient authorship and modern authorship. When the external testimony to the Pauline epistles, dating from the second half of the second century and the period following, is confronted by the results of this discovery, it becomes silent. When something has been learned about the literary methods of the apostolic age, surprise does not follow when a New-Testament scholar affirms or suggests that one or another Pauline epistle has been worked over or, to use the modern term, edited by a member of the Pauline gild or school, a group of men deeply infused with the apostle's spirit, who had caught, consciously or unconsciously, the secret of his style. Nor is one surprised when scholars assert that this or that epistle was written outright by one of Paul's disciples. When such questions arise, resort is not had to the external evidence to settle them. Internal evidence alone can help. Students are in the same case as the student of Plato or Aristotle when the genuineness of a given dialogue or treatise is questioned, and have to meet the question as students of Philo meet the long-vexed question regarding the genuineness of the essay on the Therapeutæ. Or, once more, investigators are on the same ground as the art-critic who has to deal with questions touching the genuineness of certain paintings issuing from the artistic school or family of Rubens. The internal testimony alone can help. They must study the letters as a whole, find out the deeper, the incommunicable qualities of mind and spirit, and by them test the matter in hand.

3. Character of Epistles as a Collection.

The first impression made on the reader by this body of letters is that their presence within the Holy Scriptures is an extraordinary fact without a close parallel. The Catholic Epistles are not in the strictest sense letters, they are more like homilies; they lack the twofold personal element, the personal outgivings of an individual writer, and the personal presence before the writer's mental vision of definite individuals and specific localities. But the Pauline epistles for the most part are real letters, rich in personal feeling and color, and aimed at concrete and specific human groups. A recent group of scholars, the so-called Dutch school, has assailed the opinion common to both tradition and criticism regarding the Pauline authorship of the Corinthian and Galatian and Roman letters. Even though the matter in question were for the moment conceded, wonder at the part played by the Pauline letters in the canon of Holy Scriptures would not be lessened. They would still remain, both in form and in spirit, true letters. The only possible parallel in the contents and structure of sacred books is the pronouncements of Mohammed in the Koran, and even this is remote. Mohammed's outgivings are consciously delivered as divine oracles; they are oracular both in form and content. The Pauline letters, on the contrary, are true letters, drawn out by special occasions, colored by definite situations. They are a unique element in the Christian Bible. The evidential value of this impression is heightened by the way in which the letters were preserved and afterward passed into a systematic collection. No matter who wrote them, the reason why the people to whom they were addressed kept them with such care was the belief that they had been written by the Apostle Paul. His name gave them their standing. They came into the collection from widely separated congregations. In one case (Philemon) a family treasured a private letter and afterward contributed it to the Church. As the Pauline congregations were drawn into close relations with each other, the letters were copied and exchanged. Finally they were assembled, possibly in the first instance at Rome. Whoever wrote them, Paul's name preserved them. Therefore the very existence of such a body of letters, no matter how judgments regarding individual letters may fall out, is irresistible testimony to an immense and constructive personality, whose work and word were inseparable from the existence and well-being of the Catholic Church.

The questions of introduction pertaining to the Pauline letters can not be separated from the apostle's life. He did not write easily. Possibly his habit of using a scribe or secretary (Gal. vi. 11; Rom. xvi. 22) was due to the fact that, shrinking from writing, he sought to ease the burden. While it would be an over-statement to say that his letters were wrung from him, there is a truth in it. He had not the writer's initiative, but was driven into literary expression by imperious need. His letters were instruments of government whereby he kept in his hand the reins of control and direction over the churches he had founded. The way in which they dovetail into his work is an essential part of the evidence in their favor.

4. Not an Argument in a Circle.

It may appear that this is argument in a circle, making use of the letters to know the man, and then using the man, his work, and his mind, to authenticate one or another letter. The Book of Acts can not give material help. Even though it be assumed that the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the epistles are not two Pauls, but one and the selfsame Paul, with such differences as the time and place of writing and the mood of the writer rendered necessary, yet Acts, it is certain, knew nothing or little of the apostle's inner life, and its author seems to have made small use of the apostle's letters. Indeed, there are points where he writes as if he had not known or, knowing, had forgotten the letters. His story is intensely dramatic, and has both the virtue and the limitation of that kind of history. The Book of Acts gives the framework of Paul's life, but it does not help when one is confronted by the introductional problems of our time, which can be solved only by the letters themselves. Consequently we seem to be moving in a circle. But the case is not so bad as it seems. In the first place, the problem here is not that of the genuineness of all the letters; the letters are used as a whole to determine the Pauline cast of thought and turns of style, in order to test certain letters which have been brought into serious question whether Paul can have written them or no. In the second place, the procedure is identical with the method used to determine the genuineness of certain dialogues of Plato or treatises of Aristotle. The Platonic corpus or the Aristotelian corpus gives the standard or canon by which the student judges the dialogues or treatises in question. The present situation is similar, since the process is that of testing one or another alleged part in the light of the whole.

5. Paul's Personality.

The facts in the apostle's life that deeply concern the student of the Pauline epistles are these: (1) He was born in Tarsus, of a distinguished and wealthy family. His father had possessed himself of Roman citizenship. (2) He went up to Jerusalem to complete his education. He studied under Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). This would indicate that through his teacher he was open to liberal Judaism and so to Hellenism. But Acts ix. 1–2 and Gal i. 14 also indicate that he was a zealous Jew of the Pharisaic type. Probably, like some other men of genius, he did not clearly know himself, and so was drawn both ways. (3) He was an ardent persecutor of Christianity (Acts viii. 1, ix. 1–5; I Cor. xv. 9). (4) He was converted in an altogether extraordinary way. No great man ever underwent so violent and sudden a change. It is a striking testimony to his strength of will that his religious experience did not drive him into the ranks of the religiously insane. (5) The mental consequences of his conversion were twofold. The death of Jesus had struck at the heart of Jewish Messianism. Paul had shared the violent antipathy to it. His conversion, by the law of recoil, carried the death of the Messiah down to the roots of his being (I Cor. ii. 2). The popular Messianism, so far as he was concerned, went into bankruptcy (II Cor. v. 16). The other result was that the institutes of Judaism and Rabbinism became either adiaphora or worse (Gal. iv. 9). The practical motives, though unacknowledged, may have been as strong as the religious and nationalistic motive. Saul was a brilliant candidate for the honors of the rabbinate. But the new prophetism, which was the soul of the society of Jesus (cf. Peter's sermon in Acts ii.) threatened the entire rabbinical establishment with ruin. The magnificent corporation of scholars and lawyers and exegetes, with all the vested interests both religious and social which they represented, was brought in peril. Saul the persecutor belonged to the school of Ezra, and Ezra's program was separatism. The prohibition of mixed marriages, the prohibition of table fellowship, these are the significant milestones in the advance of Ezra's policy. In Paul's time the program of Ezra had practically triumphed. Pharisaism was substantially synonymous with vital Judaism. The Maccabean war had brought the Pharisaic party and platform into the clear light of day. Another great war, the war with Rome, would soon demonstrate that the heirs of Ezra held the power of the keys in Israel. This, then, was the total result of Paul's conversion. The program of Ezra became untimely, the institutes of Pharisaic Judaism were thrown on the scrap-heap. The other prime factor in Paul's mental development was his experience as a missionary. As a missionary to his own people, he was for the most part a failure. He was too radical in his views. His failure here may have been a part of the reason for his assent to the decision (Gal. ii. 9) dividing the missionary field. Shut up to the Gentile world, by a splendid stretch of the imagination he took the whole empire for his province (Rom. xv. 19, 24). He discovered the meaning and value of his Roman citizenship. The empire as a divinely ordained institution dawned upon him (Rom. xiii. 1–6). Thus the two parts of the world he was to deal with in his thought were shaped and placed beside each other. His mind played between and over two historical magnitudes, the Empire and Israel. Finally, he was of an acutely sensitive temperament. His nervous system was finely organized; and possibly his "thorn" or "stake" in the flesh (II Cor. xii. 7; see I., 2, sup.) was some nervous disease. He received quick and deep impressions, which he organized, not after the method of the philosopher or the systematic theologian, but under the spur of necessity and the pressure of occasions.

1. I Thessalonians.

2. First Group: The earliest Pauline letters we possess were to the church at Thessalonica. Whether the apostle wrote earlier letters which have been lost is, possibly, an unanswerable question, though the fact that in I Thess. there is an order of thought, an arrangement of material that persists through all the Pauline letters save Galatians, I Timothy, and Titus may seem to suggest an experienced hand. But so far as data go, I Thessalonians is the earliest Pauline letter. It was written from Corinth or its neighborhood (I Thess. iii. 1–6), in the course of the second missionary journey and not very long after the apostle had left Athens. Critical opinion regarding the letter has on the whole been very favorable. The fundamental characteristics of I Thessalonians are (1) A lively and insistent monotheism. Paul was the first great Jew since the exile to visit the polytheist in his own home. Jewish orthodoxy became in him a prophetic passion for the divine unity. (2) An intense and lively belief in the parousia. Altogether, I Thessalonians gives an insight into the apostle's mind which seems to bring him fairly close to the primitive Christian type of belief and emotion. This is interestingly illustrated by two specific positions. First, the belief in the resurrection of Christ is here inseparable from the belief in the second coming: the masterhood of Christ is expressed in terms of the divine control over history. But later on, as in Rom. i. 4, the resurrection is taken as the installation of Christ in his divine sonship. Secondly, the trilogy of I Corinthians xiii. 13 (faith, hope, love) here appears in its first edition, faith, love, hope (I Thess. i. 3). The absence of the characteristic Pauline doctrines from the letter has been made much of by those who deny its genuineness. But this is due to an alliance between subjective Protestantism and critical methods. Protestantism, taking justification by faith to be an article on which the Church stands or falls, has frequently carried it out of its historical and constructive context. For Paul the supreme end was the religious equality of Jew and Gentile (I Thess. ii. 15). This is his great and controlling theme. Everything else is means to this end. And, considering the nature of his thought and realizing that he was not a systematic thinker but rather one who found himself only under serious pressure, the contrast between I Thessalonians and the letters to the Galatians and Romans argues for I Thessalonians, not against it. Paul's relation to Judaism is the controlling element in his life. But his mind was not academic; he did not seek to anticipate the issues of history, but he met them as they advanced against him. The Jews of Thessalonica who subjected the Christians to humiliating social persecution were classed in Paul's mind with the Jews of the Holy Land who treated Palestinian Christians in the same way (I Thess. ii. 14–16). He did not dream that he would have to fight for his life as a Christian and an apostle, and that, too, on his own missionary field, and that his assailants would be fellow Christians who found their backing in Palestine.

2. II Thessalonians.

II Thessalonians makes a different showing. Ever since critical study of this epistle began there has been a growing body of opinion which either denies the Pauline authorship altogether or concludes that the text of a genuine Pauline letter has suffered change. A comparison of II Thessalonians with I Thessalonians quickly reveals the reasons for the difference in the standing of the two letters. (1) II Thessalonians lacks the lively monotheism which is so characteristic of I Thessalonians. Yet the former, if genuine, must have been written shortly after I Thessalonians, and the same characteristics would be expected. In defense it is alleged that II Thessalonians was called out by the demoralizing and disintegrating effects of a one-sided belief in the parousia. Naturally the letter devotes itself wholly to that one point. (2) The letter is notably lacking in the personal element, by which is meant Paul's intense self-consciousness constantly breaking out into lively expression, and his vivid impressions of concrete situations and definite individuals. He was a born pastor, and saw men not as trees walking. His idealism was not abstract but deeply concrete. The letter contains just one personal touch (iii. 6–12), and affords no impression of the congregation at Thessalonica; it is practically in the class of Hebrews and I John—a homily rather than a letter. (3) The warning against forged letters (ii. 2, iii. 17) is a difficulty. The congregation at Thessalonica was scarcely a year old, and it is difficult to see the possibility, much more the necessity, of such a warning, at so early a date, though it might have been in place later. (4) The climax of difficulty is reached in the little apocalypse, as it is often called (ii. 3–12). There are two elements here. One is the conception of the Roman empire as a divine power holding down the Satanic forces and tendencies of history, and preventing their breaking out into God-defying anarchism. It is an audacious departure from the beaten track of Jewish and Jewish-Christian apocalyptic, which in every known case takes the raw material for the problem of evil from the heathen world-powers. It needed the boldness of genius and a unique experience to break away from the fixed tradition. All this bespeaks Paul as author (compare his view of the Roman state in Rom. xiii. 1–7). But the second element in the passage in question raises a serious difficulty. Orthodox Judaism, persecuting Christianity (cf. I Thess. ii. 14–16), is depicted as giving birth to a monstrous power, the personification of lawlessness, that sets itself up in the Temple of Jerusalem as a deity, to be adored in the place of the true God. Could Paul, even in the white heat of argument and debate, have made such a diagnosis? And is there a wide gulf between this view and Romans ix.–xi., where Paul hopes that all Israel may be saved? The conservative defenders of II Thessalonians take things easily here: they say that the apostle outgrew this emotion. But the little apocalypse, taken in its context, clearly implies explicit thinking and more or less systematic teaching (verse 5), something more deeply rooted than a passing impression, a conviction as clearly thought through as Paul's view of the Roman state. Making all allowances for modern aversion to New-Testament eschatology, the question arises, could Paul have shaped this conception of Judaism? The style of the letter is thoroughly Pauline. The passage in iii. 6–10 is characteristically Pauline in feeling. The view of the Roman state as a divine power holding evil in check suggests a date either before the Neronian persecution or long after it. May it not be that this is a genuine Pauline letter worked over by a gentile Paulinist, who incorporated in his picture the image set up by Daniel and the project of Caligula to set up a gigantic statue of himself in the temple at Jerusalem?

3. Second Group; the "Quadrilateral": The second group of letters, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, is commonly called the "quadrilateral." The name was given by Christian apologetes to these letters after Ferdinand Christian Baur, sweeping the other Pauline letters off the board, took these four as the only indubitably Pauline documents. They are widely separated from I Thessalonians both in thought and in feeling. In I Thessalonians the apostle's mind was in close contact with the heathen world. This is the controlling mental relationship, by which the letter is shaped and colored. But in the so-called quadrilateral the apostle is engaged in a hand-to-hand fight with the Judaizing tendency in Christianity. The shape and color of thought differ correspondingly.

1. General Characteristics; Repulse of Judaistic Attack.

Jewish Christianity, during the first period of its existence, and under St. Peter's leadership, had been Jewish without thinking about it. But in its second period, under the leadership of James, it was Jewish consciously and by intention. Its program was the conversion of Israel. Its method involved conformity to Judaism in everything that did not undo the distinctive tenet of Christianity, the conviction that Jesus was the Messiah. At the Apostolic council a concordat had been reached, which could not, however, in the nature of things, long endure, since it involved the existence of two distinct churches, each retaining its separate character until the parousia should solve all problems. But history had something to say on this subject. At Antioch table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians became the order of the day. But James of Jerusalem was right in feeling that this was a breach of the concordat. It involved the existence of a single church to which the distinctive tenets of Judaism were adiaphora. It completely undid the program of Ezra. Hence the men who came from James opposed the idea of table fellowship (Gal. ii. 12). Here began the first precipitation of the great issue. Jewish Christianity, honestly believing that the Pauline policy involved the ruin of its plan for the conversion of Israel, set istelf to undo Paul's work. It threw the concordat (Gal. ii. 7–9) to the winds. Invading Paul's own field, it assailed his standing as an apostle and sought to undermine the edifice of Catholic Christianity which he was building. This attack identified Paul's person with the Gospel he was preaching, and consequently joined forces with his temperamental tendency to self-consciousness. He could not separate his defense of his apostolic dignity from the defense of Catholic Christianity. Ranke has finely said of Alexander the Great that his life was one of the rare cases in which universal history became identical with a biography. Paul's life is a similar case. Paul's person and the supreme issue in the field of religion were identified and could not be separated. Hence to an extraordinary degree he was driven to clear self-knowledge and to a deep study of the necessary foundations for his great theme and work, the religious equality of Jew and Gentile. The theme of I Thessalonians still remains the supreme thought. But its implications now for the first time come into the light of broad day.

The letters to the Corinthian, Galatian, and Roman churches, then, constitute a group by themselves. As regards their sequence, they are so closely related that no arrangement can be conclusive. But the logical internal arrangement seems to be (1) The Corinthian letters, (2) Galatians, (3) Romans. And so long as no solid external argument can be brought against it, this may be accepted as a good working hypothesis. The group differs widely from I Thessalonians. Paul, as a prince of missionaries, gave his whole attention to the work in hand. In the Thessalonian letters he was in quickening contact with heathenism. In the quadrilateral he is at close quarters with Judaizing Christianity, fighting for his life and honor. So the mental situation is fundamentally different; and the apostle's thought changes accordingly.

2. I Corinthians.

I Corinthians was written near the end of Paul's stay in Ephesus, and was occasioned by party divisions in the Corinthian church. The congregation had grown rapidly. At the same time it was close to a large colony of Jews (Acts xviii.) who were in constant connection with Jerusalem. Here were all the elements of trouble. As to the number of parties that appeared in the congregation, whether three or four, the discussion still continues. The writer of this article believes that there were four, and that the "Christian party" was made up of those who banked upon the connection with the mother-church of Christendom, the congregation of Jerusalem. They appealed to that visible and tactual genealogy of religious ideas which is so potent with the average man, and also seem to have made much of eschatologic visions and of the glossolalia (see SPEAKING WITH TONGUES), two related phenomena that were characteristic of Jerusalemitic Christianity. I Corinthians is not so much a letter as epistolary jottings. Various questions of morals and discipline are taken up, without regard to their connection with each other. None the less, the letter has a real unity of its own, a deep emotional unity underlying its fragmentary details. The theme of chaps. i.–iv. is the unity of the local congregation. That theme returns in chaps. viii.–x., connecting itself with the discussion of the Lord's Supper in xi. 17–34; and in chaps. xii.–xv., the discussion of the charismata, it gets complete control of the writer's mind. It is to be noted that in xiii. 13 the trilogy assumes its second and final shape—faith, hope, love. The reason is that the supreme task of the new religion is now clearly in view. It developed the average man to the limit of his spiritual and moral powers but kept him within the congregation, made him an individual free from individualism.

3. II Corinthians.

II Corinthians was written from Macedonia. Paul had planned to go direct from Ephesus to Corinth. He had changed his mind, and his detractors at Corinth took this, as they took all his actions, in the most ungenerous way. Paul, they said, was a variable person (i. 15–18), not a man of his word. The way in which Paul works out his defense (i. 18–23) represents the rich body of Christology in the epistle. It is a pastor's theology, intimate with specific needs and concrete situations. Perhaps more clearly than any other letter, this illustrates the apostle's habit of mind. It has been strongly urged that it is really two distinct letters stitched together by the Pauline editor, chaps. x.–xiii. constituting a letter by themselves ("four-chapter letter"). A good deal can be said for this thesis. It is difficult to keep from feeling the abrupt change from the self-possession and the joy of chaps. i.–ix. to the intense personal passion and mental strain of the chapters in question. But it is, perhaps, an excessive capitalization of this certainty to cut the four chapters out, for Paul did not cast his letters at one pouring (cf. the two letters constituting Philippians). Yet these four chapters are a distinct literary unit, so close to Galatians in emotional color that the student of introduction may well study them together. In the body of II Corinthians the divergence of Christianity from Mosaism is the main question. In these chapters that issue becomes identified with Paul's person. Opening with the characteristic "I myself" (cf. Rom. vii. 25) and possibly with the "Christ party" in plain view, the apostle, with noble shame, brags his opponents down, seeking to silence these "make-believe apostles" (xi. 13), the arrogant Judaizing Christians from Jerusalem.

The Galatian letter may have been written either from Macedonia or Achaia. In any case, it is close to II Corinthians x.–xiii. in thought and emotion. Paul received from members of his spiritual household news of a serious crisis among the churches of South Galatia; they were backsliding into Jewish Christianity (i. 6). The native religion of that region delighted in sensational ritual (Cybele, the Great Mother, etc.). Paul had won his converts by the contagion of an irresistible personality (iv. 15) rather than through the formation of solid conviction in their minds. His splendid idealism was beyond them. Now came Judaizing Christianity, with its rigid ritualism and its doctrine of tactual apostolic succession. It was near enough to their land to find them at home, yet sufficiently above their level to impress them. Hence the crisis. The Judaizers declared that Paul was a second-hand authority, deriving all that was good in his views from the original apostles (i. 1, ii. 6–7). They seem to have gone further than the Judaizers at Corinth (v. 2–12) and to have insisted on the necessity of circumcision. Paul's defense included three elements: (1) By careful biographical chronology (i. 15–ii. 1) he proves his independence of the original apostles; (2) his carriage in the apostolic council and in the controversy at Antioch manifested his ability to withstand the "original apostles" to their face; (3) the conversion of his followers to Judaizing Christianity is in truth a perversion. Judaism with its law is not the final religion. Its levitical institutes are outgrown rudiments of religion (iv. 9). The true function of the law is not to rival Christianity, but like a loyal household servant (iii. 24–25) to guide men to Christ, who has established a splendid religious and social unity (iii. 28) that recognizes no difference between Jew and Hellene, between free man and slave, between male and female.

4. Galatians.

The Roman letter is the logical climax of the quadrilateral, the most massive and coherent of the epistles. This fact is explained by the apostle's mood at the time of writing. He wrote from Achaia at the end of the second tour. He had carried through the first part of his magnificent missionary plan (Rom. xv. 19). Looking through and beyond Rome his imagination takes fire at the thought of attacking the western part of the empire (Spain, etc.). He is going up to Jerusalem, knowing that the possibility of serious peril awaits him there. But he carries in his hand the great offertory collected by his churches in Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia (I Cor. xvi. 1 sqq.; II Cor. ix.; Rom. xv. 26–27). The letter expresses his sympathy for the Christians at Jerusalem. He also had great hope that it might prove a peace-offering. The opposition in his own field has been for the time being put down. Writing to Rome, the imperial city, the supreme missionary opportunity (i. 13), and standing on the ground made good in the Corinthian and Galatian letters, he clears his mind. Down to a recent date the genuineness of Romans passed as certain and final in all schools of criticism. Baur and the Tübingen school valued it as a stronghold of apostolic feeling and verity. But the group of scholars constituting the so-called "Dutch school" have boldly assailed this apparently impregnable position. A considerable part of the weight of their attack is drawn from the alleged lack of unity in the letter (cf. Van Manen on Romans, *EB*, iv. 4127–45). But their treatment of the epistle suggests that literary analysis and literary combination, modelled after the established standards of Old-Testament criticism, have outgrown patient and deep exegesis. The letter has a truly massive unity. In the salutation (i. 1–7) the apostle asserts his right to the full apostolate; it is grounded in the creative call of God. In i. 14 he claims the entire Gentile world as his province. The Gospel has power to bestow divine righteousness, final religious standing, and perfect character on Jew and Gentile alike (i. 16–17). Both Jew and Gentile, apart from the Gospel, are totally unable to attain the divine ideal of personal and social righteousness. As for the Jew, the glory of his life under the law is that it brings him to deeper self-knowledge, to clearer consciousness of sin than the Gentile has been capable of (i. 18–iii. 20). God has set up in history the person and death of Christ as the atoning-place where man enters into the real and full presence of the divine. Through sheer mercy and grace, independent of inherited or acquired merit, God gives final standing to consciousness. So is human pride barred out and human unity made possible (iii. 21–30). Abraham's life is the classic life of the spirit. As a spiritual adventurer he made no fortune. He made his fortune as God's friend, building a perfect trust on that creative word and power of God which, even while Paul writes, is taking social and religious nothings (iv. 17), and building them into divine society (iv.). The ground of religious certitude can be found nowhere save in God's mercy and Christ's work (v.). The Antinomian is put to flight. The Pauline Gospel does not give rein to desire and lust, but reveals the power of the creative divine spirit to break the power of lust and desire (vi.–vii.). The confidence of the redeemed comes next. Fear is overcome. The holy and creative spirit lifts the human spirit to God. The divine choice takes the soul out of the world into the fellowship of the Savior (viii.). From the pean of redemption the apostle passes to the pain of contemplating his nation's unbelief. But in the end Israel shall be converted. The supreme mystery, the unity of Jew and Gentile, the unity of humanity, will express and realize the unity of God (ix.–xi.). The ethics of Paulinism then emerges. The unity of the local congregation is the supreme aim. Moral maxims, in appearance loosely strung together, find here a deep emotional connection. The mystery of human unity must be embodied in the local congregation (xii.–xv.).

5. Romans.

But while the genuineness of Romans is very strongly attested, there are weighty reasons for thinking that the letter in its present form is not a self-consistent unity. The letter ends with a doxology, in itself a fact that excites suspicion. The suspicion is strengthened when it appears that the doxology is placed by some manuscripts at the end of chap. xiv. Bengel's explanation, that the makers of the Greek lectionary put the doxology here because xv.–xvi. was not good material for public reading, does not satisfy. The suspicion arises that some accident befell the latter part of the epistle, analogous to the

6. Unity of Romans.

misfortune that befell the ending of the second Gospel. The doxology has the internal marks of a genuine Pauline fragment, possibly used by Paul in preaching, kept in the memory of some hearer, and incorporated by the editor into a disordered text. The Phœbe letter in chap. xvi. also presents grave difficulties. It is filled with intimate greetings. Priscilla and Aquila have been appealed to, their knowledge of the Roman congregation being put in evidence. But friendships as intimate as these can not be borrowed nor imported. How then came so many of Paul's intimate friends to be in Rome? Renan's hypothesis that there is here a fragment of a letter to Ephesus makes too large a forced loan. The likeliest supposition is that the Phœbe letter is a separate literary unit. It was probably written by Paul after his release from the first imprisonment (see 4, § 1, below). The Pauline editor, assembling his materials, incorporated this along with the doxology. There is no solid reason for doubting the Roman address of the letter. The documentary evidence for the omission of " in Rome " in i. 7 is not considerable. That fact in itself may not be completely decisive. The history of the New Testament text is inseparable from the history of the Church. When once the great congregation of Rome had appropriated the letter, any other address would have slight chance to survive. But the variant is not hard to explain. Other churches soon appropriated the letter, and some copies of it, with the Roman address omitted, might easily have got into circulation; xv. 28 can not be applied to any church but Rome: nor can i. 8–14, without strain, be applied to any other situation.

7. Criticism by Dutch School.

The most significant turn in the study of the Pauline epistles since Baur's day is indicated by the group of scholars somewhat loosely called the Dutch school. Baur and the Tübingen school left the quadrilateral standing, apparently impregnable and unassailable. But these scholars make the assault with vigor and conviction (cf. especially Van Manen, in *EB*, s.v. Paul and Romans). These scholars do not snatch their conclusions out of the air. They seem to build on good foundations. From the Old Testament they borrow the fixed conclusions that the Moses of history and the Moses of Mosaism are far apart; and that the Isaiah of the canon is a mind widely removed from Isaiah of Jerusalem. Coming nearer home, they use the fact that the " John " of the Johannine writings may be a mind widely removed from the " John " of Ephesus—whoever he was. They come still nearer with the conclusion, accepted as a critical certainty by a large body of scholars, that the Colossian and Ephesian letters are Paulinist, but not Pauline. They capitalize the rising value of Acts, enhancing the value of the Paul of Acts and depreciating the Paul of the epistles. A letter accepted by all schools as Pauline now goes the way of Colossians and Ephesians. But the Old-Testament standards of analysis must be cautiously used. In the quadrilateral we are not dealing with a code of law and a body of sacred history and legend, shaped by the spiritual and social pressure of centuries. Between the " Moses " of the Pentateuch and the " Paul " of these letters there is an immense difference. " Isaiah " is a body of oracles, diverse in historical setting and in literary style. These four letters are real letters. They fit closely into that supreme religious crisis called the founding of the Catholic Church. Moreover, the Apostolic Fathers conclusively narrow the field of time within which that crisis was passed through. Even the " John " of the Johannine writings is not a close parallel. These four letters are intensely, almost extravagantly, personal. The style abounds in egoisms (" my Gospel "—Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; habit of taking the oath, Rom. i. 9; I Cor. i. 23; " I myself "—II Cor. x. 1, xii. 13; Rom. vii. 25, ix. 3, xv. 14). The writer has passed through unique personal experiences (I Cor. ix. 15, xv. 8 sqq.; II Cor. xi.–xii.; Gal. vi. 17; Rom. ix. 1 sqq., etc.). Making full allowance for the Paulinism of the editors, no course of editing can account for such intensely human documents.

4. Third Group; Prison Epistles: If Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians belong to Paul, they constitute another distinct group, and record the final period in a mental development of remarkable symmetry. I Thessalonians records the apostle's state of mind when he was in quickening contact with the Gentiles and before the Judaizing movement drove him to deeper thinking. The quadrilateral records his thinking in defense of the proposition that Jew and Gentile are equal before God. And the letters written during his imprisonment carry his mind forward into conflict with Gnosticism, a view of God and man that dissipated the divine unity and emptied history of its meaning.

1. Philippians.

If Paul wrote the three letters, it seems probable that all of them were written from Rome. As in the quadrilateral, a decisive argument concerning the sequence of the letters is impossible. Scholars of note (e.g., Weiss) place Colossians and Ephesians at Cæsarea, Philippians at Rome. But, on the whole, the internal argument carries all three to Rome. Philippians almost beyond question belongs there. If it was written after Colossians and Ephesians, it is difficult to understand why it fails to show any trace of the terminology peculiar to them. It is better to suppose that Philippians is midway between the quadrilateral and Colossians-Ephesians. In Lightfoot's happy phrase, it is the spent wave of the debate with Judaizing Christianity. The Philippian letter, cashiered by Baur, has fought its way back to wide-spread critical recognition. It is the most intimate of all the Pauline letters. Possibly the reason is found in the fact that the church at Philippi never gave the apostle a moment's anxiety. There were no Jews there worth mentioning (Acts xvi. 13, no synagogue). The Judaizing movement never gained a foothold. The relation of the congregation to Paul was so deeply affectionate that he broke his rule of self-support (iv. 15–16) and permitted them to minister to his needs. This intimate relationship with his readers may explain the free air of the letter. The apostle seems to have nothing on his mind. At Rome Jewish Christians (i. 15–16) are making trouble. In the second part of the letter (iii. 2–9) he takes the reasons for pride in his own Jewish inheritance and casts them away. But he has no doctrinal burden on his mind. So the letter is self-revealing to a high degree. The foundation of thought is laid bare. The supreme concern (as in I and II Cor. and Rom. xii.–xv.) is the unity of the local congregation. Paul finds the root of this unity in the incarnation. Developing a thought struck out in II Corinthians viii. 9, he clears the ground for Christian polity (i. 27–ii. 11). The capacity for service which is the distinguishing mark of Christian fellowship has its base in the self-emptying devotion of the Son of God.

2. The Pauline Style.

The Colossian and Ephesian epistles are so closely related in thought and language that they practically constitute a single letter in two editions. If Paul wrote them, it must be supposed that, having written Colossians, some time later he cleared his mind by writing Ephesians. If Paul did not write them, then a distinguished though unknown Paulinist wrote them both. The history of critical opinion forcibly suggests that Colossians stands on a different footing from Ephesians. Rejected by Baur and his school, it has so far recovered its standing that its possession of a genuine Pauline nucleus is widely recognized. In that case it must be supposed that Paul's unknown disciple, having incorporated the Pauline nucleus into the Colossian letter, proceeded to clarify his mind and systematize his thinking in Ephesians. The student, before he seeks a stable opinion on this difficult question, must discuss the values to be assigned to various kinds of evidence. Beyond doubt, the large number of *hapax legomena* (i.e., expressions not found elsewhere) in these letters is a real difficulty. The conservative appeal to Paul's versatility has been overworked. But it is equally certain that the negative argument from the *hapax legomena* has been emphasized (e.g., Holzmann) to the neglect of a weighty argument from the structure of the sentence. Of the two constituent elements of language, the lexical and the structural, the latter is the more enduring and the more significant. This holds true at large; in less degree, it holds true of individuals. When once a mind of any magnitude has shaped its unit of thinking—the sentence—that sentence in its structure and internal relationships is a far more characteristic thing than single words. Now, while Paul's sensitiveness to new themes and the resulting openness to new terms has been overstressed, there is some truth in it. And it has real evidential value when it is joined to a more solid consideration, the fundamental quality of Paul's style. Characteristic sentences differ according to the degree and the manner in which they utilize and display the power of mental suspense. Paul had the power of mental suspense in large measure. This is proved by his development of the epistolary salutation into a doctrinal summary (Gal. i. 1–5; Rom. i. 1–7). But he had not been deeply schooled in Greek, and did not know enough literary Greek to become self-conscious or afraid. At times, he used Greek most nobly (e.g., I Cor. xiii.). But his characteristic sentence is not literary Greek. He piles perception on perception and clause on clause until not infrequently the sentence almost breaks down under its own weight. When this test is applied to the Colossian-Ephesian letters, they show up strongly. Colossians abounds in Pauline sentences (i. 3–7, 9–21, 24–29, etc.). Ephesians, under this aspect, is, if anything, even more Pauline (i. 3–14, 15–21, ii. 14–17, iii. 1–7, etc.). In fact, the style of this letter in some places appears to be almost beyond question the style of a Paul who is beginning to be victimized by his own habits of expression. It is hardly likely that there were two men in the first century who could write the sentence contained in Eph. i. 3–14. To this must be added the evidential value of unconscious feeling. The apostle had a deep sense of the richness and freshness and many-sidedness of divine grace. It reveals itself in single terms like " riches " and its cognates (Rom. ii. 4, ix. 23, xi. 33; I Cor. i. 5, viii. 2, 9, etc.); in an almost riotous use of compound words; in statements expressing the newness of the redeemed man's experience (II Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15, etc.). Seen from this angle, Ephesians is peculiarly Pauline (i. 7, 18, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16). The consciousness of revelation is deep and fervent, running clear through the letter. Of course, the supposed Paulinist would have caught something of Paul's feeling as well as his style. But the counterweight is found in two facts: (1) The pseudepigraphist was sure to have something heavy on his mind; he would be doctrinaire. (2) His standard of imitation was low. The Christian public was largely uneducated. II Peter is a convincing example of the easy way in which the pseudepigraphist carried himself. The writer takes no pains to imitate the feeling of I Peter. He argues, in a doctrinaire way, for the parousia (see Millennium, Millenarianism), though the rich feeling for it is lacking; moreover, at a critical point, the catalogue of virtue (i. 5–7), he betrays himself,—the master-word " hope " does not appear.

3. Colossians.

Colossians, if its entangling alliance with Ephesians did not handicap it, could defend itself fairly well, were it not for one thing. The writer evidently has some form of Gnosticism before his mind's eye, and it is widely supposed that this fact by itself takes the letter, in its present text, out of Paul's hand. This is the objection urged against the Paulinity of Colossians. Indeed, the difficulty due to the *hapax legomena* and that due to the mental presence of Gnosticism are not two difficulties but one. Grant the possibility of Gnosticism, then the terms to describe it enter as a matter of course. There are strong reasons for the conservative position. (1) The empire was in the throes of a wide-spread religious movement, and during the last half of the first century Asia Minor was its most important strategic point. (2) Gnosticism was in full bloom in the reign of Hadrian. Basilides shaped a speculative system of great power and appeal. Historical probability requires a considerable period for a religious movement to ripen up to such a man. (3) The beginnings of schismatic mysticism are within the ken of the quadrilateral (I Cor. viii. 1–10; Rom. xiv.). Van Manen (*EB*, s.v. Romans, § 17) uses this fact to cast suspicion on Romans. That path, however, is closed to the great majority of those who reject the Pauline authorship of

Colossians-Ephesians. (4) The first period of Gnosticism was Jewish Christian. Cerinthus, a systematic docetist, appeared as early as the last decade of the first century. When it is considered that Gnosticism was a practical religious view before it became a speculative system, it does not seem an excessive strain on historical evolution to find its beginnings twenty-five years after Paul had preached his first sermon to the Gentiles. Christianity, superbly inspirational and organizing, had great precipitating power. Besides, the Pauline churches, outposts of Christ in a vast heathen world, were wide open to danger from Jewish-Christian mysticism. And Paul, a born pastor and church-builder, had a keen scent for danger.

4. Ephesians.

Colossians, if it stood alone, could take care of itself. It is on Ephesians, therefore, that the burden of the defense falls. Here the main battle must be fought. The difficulties are serious. The letter, if Paul wrote it, can not have been addressed to the Ephesians. But this does not explain the almost completely impersonal character of a letter coming from a man so ebulliently personal as Paul. It is almost entirely doctrinal and systematic. " Holy apostles " in iii. 3 has a strong second-century sound. To ascribe knowledge regarding the great mystery of human unity to " all the apostles " is un-Pauline, by the quadrilateral test-stone. Yet there are strong grounds for belief in the epistle's genuineness. The Pauline type of sentence abounds (i. 3–14, 15–23, iii. 1–7, 14–19, iv. 11–16, etc.). The epistle is flushed full of prophetic feeling and consciousness. The conception of the Church is not ecclesiastical (contrast I Timothy and Ignatius), but intensely prophetic. Moreover, it is inherently related to the Pauline doctrine of election (cf. Rom. viii. 28–30) and the conception of the Church as the body of Christ (I Cor. xii., xiv.; Rom. xiii.). The view of the ministry (iv. 11–16) is prophetic and pastoral (contrast I Timothy). The letter thrills with the sense of the supreme mystery, the unity of Jew and Gentile (ii. 11–iii. 13; cf. Rom. xi. 25–36). History does not duplicate great experiences. The quadrilateral vein crops out in a natural way (ii. 1–10), quite unlike the pseudepigraphist. The body of the letter, if taken outside the heroic period of the Apostolic Age, creates difficulties more serious than those now besetting it. Finally, the fact that the mental movement from I Thessalonians to Ephesians presents a mental autobiography as continuous and unique as the body of Aristotle's thinking starts a presumption in favor of Ephesians. The final judgment seems likely to be a compromise. Ephesians is a Pauline letter more or less colored by later feeling.

The little letter to Philemon might well have hoped to escape suspicion, so human is it, so simple and charming. Yet scholars of deserved repute take it to be a Paulinizing allegory. Surely the allegorist who could do this thing so subtly was a master. The mystic who, by deep thinking, has reduced the things that do appear to a diaphanous veil of things that are, would be apt to have a good deal to say. Would he say it in this simple fashion and with such praiseworthy brevity? May it not be questioned whether, if this letter had not had the critical misfortune to find itself within the sacred canon, any such charge would ever have been brought against it?

5. The Pastorial Epistles: The question whether the apostle was released from imprisonment presses the conclusion that knowledge of the Apostolic Age is scanty and full of gaps. But the belief in a second imprisonment is gaining ground. And if full allowance is made for the nature of the evidence, it seems to yield a favoring probability. The Pastoral Epistles contain at least a nucleus of genuine Pauline material which it is difficult to place within the frame of the apostle's life as Acts records it. The long-vexed phrase in I Clement v (" the bounds of the west " to which the apostle came), taken in its context, must be overcharged with rhetoric, if it is to mean Rome, rather than Spain. The Phœbe letter, unquestionably Pauline, demands a situation lying beyond the bounds of Acts. The Phœbe letter (Rom. xvi. 1–16) was written from Corinth or Cenchrea, its eastern seaport. It is a document of high value. The apostle's genius for friendship, for deep and many-sided intimacies, shines out in it. It also throws a bright light upon the social stratum from which Christianity in Rome made its most numerous recruits (I Cor. i. 26). A large majority of those addressed were slaves or freedmen belonging to the immense aristocratic establishments of imperial Rome.

1. The Release from Prison.

2. I Timothy.

The Pastoral Epistles, since the beginning of critical study, have steadily lost ground. The best that some fairly conservative scholars can say for them to-day is that the case against them is not closed. The difficulties besetting I Timothy appear to be insuperable. The fixed order of thought in Paul's letter-writing is broken (i. 3). The apostle, because of his splendid belief in the capacity of man for God and his delight in spiritual beginnings, was wont to go forward from the salutation to praise of his readers and thanksgiving (e.g., I Thess. i. 2 sqq.; Rom. i. 8 sqq.). The one exception is Galatians; but the reason for this exception is found in Paul's attitude toward the Galatians at the time of writing. In I Timothy no such reason exists. Timothy was the most intimate member of his spiritual household. Yet the letter plunges straight into business. Joined to this is the fact that the personal element is a colorless minimum. Timothy himself is hardly more than a homiletic personification (vi. 11–21) to which is addressed an ordination sermon. In i. 3 is what looks like a distinct reference to II Corinthians i. 15–17, and ii. 12–13. If I Timothy is genuine, it places itself in the time and mood of the quadrilateral and so becomes a psychological impossibility. Or else in its behalf there must be assumed a later journey from Ephesus into Macedonia exactly parallel. It is true that the Phœbe letter and the reference in the letter to Titus (iii. 12) to Nicopolis (probably in Epirus) make this possible. But in the face of other considerable possibilities no right exists to capitalize this possibility. The letter is full of intention; there is no hint of the casual. Herein it resembles Galatians and Ephesians. But this parallel becomes disastrous. For, while Galatians and Ephesians thrill with prophetic feeling, I Timothy is wholly institutional, disciplinary, and creedal. The conception of the Church differs from that in Ephesians (iii. 15; contrast Eph. i. 22–23). The offices and the functions of the Church (bishops, deacons, widows) are distinct. The episcopate has clearly emerged from the corporate presbyterate. The creed (iii. 16) is forming. In this connection it is to be noted that the word "mystery" is beginning to take a new turn (iii. 9, 16). Caution, however, is necessary against the bias of the highly subjective individualism of our time. The creedal element in faith was easy for St. Paul to reach. Yet between Ephesians and I Timothy there is a gulf in feeling. And along with this goes the fact that the letter abounds in expressions ("It is a credible saying"; "health-giving teaching"; "contrary teaching") which are not found in the letters of the first three groups. The difficulty is more serious than the difficulty created by *hapax legomena*, in which fixed formulas enter. The cumulative effect of these difficulties is an almost irresistible impression of ungenuineness. The letter seems to have been written by a Paulinist contending with Jewish-Christian heretics, possibly about the end of the century.

3. II Timothy, Titus.

II Timothy is in much better case. At nearly every point where I Timothy fails to meet the test, II Timothy succeeds. It follows the Pauline order of thought (i. 3). The personal element is fresh and varied. Timothy is a real individual (i. 3–6) with flesh-and-blood kinsfolk. The writer abounds in expressions revealing the inner life of the apostle (i. 11–18, ii. 16–17, iv. 6–8). In iv. 9–21 is material which can not have been invented. The institutional element, compared with I Timothy, is a minimum. The single reference (ii. 2) is general. The thought of the quadrilateral crops out (i. 8–9) in a natural way. The feeling of the letter is thoroughly Pauline. Pauline idioms abound ("my gospel"; "I am not ashamed," i. 12; cf. Rom. i. 16). The mental idioms of Paul appear; for example, his use of the aorist in describing the redemptive effects of the death of Christ (ii. 11; cf. Gal. vi. 14 and Rom. vi. 5–10). Yet the fixed formulas of I Timothy ("It is a credible saying, etc.") pervade the epistle. The most probable conclusion is that II Timothy is a genuine Pauline letter touched here and there by the Paulinizing editor. The epistle to Titus, like I Timothy, violates the order of thought (i. 5 suggests the same hand that wrote I Tim. i. 3). The two together may possibly indicate the beginnings of the conscious theory of "Apostolic Succession" (q.v.; also see SUCCESSION, APOSTOLIC). The letter is institutional in its aim, its material being practically identical, so far as it goes, with I Timothy. It also lacks the personal element. The author's way of handling the Cretans (i. 12) does not seem like Paul. To be sure, this is slippery ground for argument. Yet the apostle's regenerating faith in man, part and parcel of the enthusiasm which founded the Catholic Church, is missing. What seems to be heard is the voice of a later generation, deeply aware of the inertia of human nature, vexed with questions of discipline, and substituting the schoolmaster for the prophet. But iii. 12–14 looks like a genuine Pauline element. Zahn has proved (*Einleitung*, l. 434–435) that the Nicopolis here mentioned is in Epirus. There is no ground for supposing that such a detail is due to the historical novelist. Moreover, the salutation (i. 1–4) is strikingly Pauline. May it not be supposed that the fragments of a genuine letter were used by the editor of II Timothy? And that the same writer went on to write I Timothy with a free hand?

It can not be said that all the problems connected with the Pastorals have been finally settled. This is not a favorable field for the dogmatic scholar whether he be conservative or critical. The criticism of the Pauline epistles has some serious questions still unsolved. But if they are tested by no other test than that to which the writings of Plato and Aristotle are subjected, the conclusions may be as certain here as there regarding the main point. The sweeping negative treatment of the letters is indeed a just historical nemesis on a canonizing process that largely dehumanized them. But the sane critic has no commission to execute poetic justice or to illustrate in his own person the law of recoil. There is a solid body of genuine letters. They give us the self-revelation of one of the supreme religious agents. It is a real autobiography, all the more valuable because singularly free from literary consciousness—a wonderfully sensitive and expressive body of thought. Inseparable from the building of the Catholic Church and containing the secret of its life and growth, it is the most fertile portion of the Biblical field for those who would understand the divine method in revelation.

HENRY S. NASH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: I. The literature on the life and work of Paul is very large; only a selection is offered here. Some of the most illuminating discussions are in the works on church history, particularly those dealing with the apostolic age. For English readers the three standard works have long been: W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, London, 1852 and often; F. W. Farrar, 2 vols., London, 1879; T. Lewin, 2 vols., London, 1890. Other studies of the life and work of Paul are: K. Schrader, 5 vols., Leipsic, 1830–36; F. C. Baur, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1866, Eng. transl., London, 1873–75; A. Hausrath, Heidelberg, 1872; J. Stalker, New York, 1884; E. Renan, Paris, 1869, Eng. transl., London, 1890; C. Fouard, London, 1894; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895; P. Seeboeck, Paderborn, 1897; O. Cone, Boston, 1898; G. H. Gilbert, New York, 1899; W. Lock, London, 1899; R. Bird, ib. 1900; A. Whyte, Edinburgh, 1903; C. Clemen, Giessen, 1904; H. Weinel, Tübingen, 1904, Eng. transl., London, 1906; N. Heim, *Paulus der Völkerapostel nach Bibel, Geschichte und Tradition*, Salzburg, 1905; F. X. Poelzl, Regensburg, 1905; *DB*, iii. 696–731; *EB*, iii. 3603–38.

Books on special phases of Paul's life, work, or significance are: J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, London, 1880; J. S. Howson, *Character of St. Paul*, ib. 1883; O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, 2 vols., ib. 1877; idem, *Influence of Paul on the Development of Christianity*, ib. 1885; G. Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, London, 1890; Van Manen, in *ThT*, 1890, 1896, 1900 (cf. *Expository Times*, 1898, pp. 205–211, 257–259, 314–319); C. C. Everett, *Gospel of Paul*, Edinburgh, 1893; A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1894; A. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul. Esquisse d'une histoire de sa pensée*, Paris, 1896; S. A. Alexander, *The Christianity of St. Paul*, London, 1899; H. St. J. Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Jewish Contemporary Thought*, ib. 1900; W. E. Ball, *St. Paul and Roman Law*, Edinburgh,

1901; S. Means, *St. Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1903; B. W. Bacon, *The Story of St. Paul: a Comparison of Acts and Epistles*, Boston, 1904; W. G. Jordan, *The Philippian Gospel; Pauline Ideals*, New York, 1904; T. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, Göttingen, 1905 (on Paul and the development of the Greek language, Paul and the Greek O. T. and Paul and the epistles ascribed to him; the most important recent contribution on Paul); D. Völter, *Paulus und seine Briefe*, Strasburg, 1905; S. Monteil, *Essai sur la christologie de S. Paul*, Paris, 1906; W. P. Du Bose, *The Gospel according to St. Paul*, New York, 1907; E. Moske, *Die Bekehrung des heil. Paulus. Eine exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung*, Münster, 1907; J. M. Campbell, *Paul the Mystic*, New York, 1908; W. E. Chadwick, *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, London, 1906; idem, *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, Edinburgh, 1908; G. Munzinger, *Paulus in Korinth. Neue Wege zum Verstandnis des Urchristentums*, Heidelberg, 1908; F. Prat, *La Théologie de S. Paul*, part i., Paris, 1908; A. T. Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of Paul: a Study of Development in Paul's Career*, New York, 1909; C. E. Woods, *The Gospel of Rightness. A Study in Pauline Philosophy*, London, 1909; A. B. D. Alexander, *The Ethics of St. Paul*, Glasgow, 1910; J. Moffatt, *Paul and Paulinism*, Boston, 1910.

II. Questions of criticism on the writings of Paul are, of course, discussed in the works on Biblical introduction —cf. the literature in and under that article, on the canon (e.g., Zahn's), and on early Christian literature (e.g., Harnack's *Geschichte*). Consult further: G. G. Findlay, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, New York, 1893; P. Gloag, *Introduction to the Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1876; C. H. Waller, *Handbook to the Epistles of Paul*, London, 1887; M. Krenkel, *Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte und der Briefe des Paulus*, Brunswick, 1890; D. Völter, *Die Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, part i., Tübingen, 1890; P. V. Schmidt, *Der Galaterbrief im Feuer der neuesten Kritik*, Leipsic, 1892; C. Clemen, *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1893; idem, *Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1894; F. J. A. Hort, *Prolegomena to . . . Romans and Ephesians*, London, 1895; H. Lisco, *Entstehung des 2. Korintherbriefes*, Berlin, 1896; R. D. Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1901; W. Kelly, *Short Introduction to the Epistles of Paul*, London, 1902; C. G. Baskerville, *Side-Lights on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, London, 1903; J. D. James, *Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles*, London, 1906; A. Steinmann, *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes*, Münster, 1906; W. C. Van Manen, *Die Unechtheit des Römer-briefes*, Leipsic, 1906; D. Round, *The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, Cambridge, 1907; A. Steinmann, *Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes*, Münster, 1908; W. Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth*, Gütersloh, 1908; idem, *Die Irrlehre der Pastoralbriefe*, ib. 1909; R. Scott, *The Pauline Epistles; A Critical Study*, Edinburgh, 1909; A. Schlatter, *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. iii., *Die Briefe des Paulus*, Stuttgart, 1909; H. B. Brumbaugh, *Onesimus the Runaway Slave*, Elgin, Ill., 1910.

Among commentaries are those which cover the whole Bible or the New Testament, such as: Lange's, Eng. transl., New York, 1869 sqq.; Meyer's, Eng. transl., New York, 1873 sqq.; *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, Cambridge, 1879 sqq.; *Bible Commentary*, London, 1881; P. Schaff, *Popular Commentary*, New York, 1882–83; *Pulpit Commentary*, London and New York, 1883 sqq.; *Cambridge Greek Testament*, Cambridge, 1887 sqq.; *Expositor's Bible*, London and New York, 1888 sqq.; *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Freiburg, 1892–93; *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, Munich, 1893 sqq.; *International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh and New York, 1895 sqq. (in progress); T. Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Leipsic, 1903 sqq.; add C. J. Ellicott's *Handy Commentary*, New York, 1880.

Commentaries on all or on groups of the Pauline epistles: B. Jowett (on Romans, Galatians, and Thessalonians), best ed., London. 1859; A. F. Manoury, 4 vols., Paris, 1878–81; K. Heydt, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1882; J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, London, 1886; J. A. Beet, *Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon*, London, 1890; H. Oltramare (Romans, 2 vols.), Geneva, 1882, (Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, 3 vols.), Paris, 1891–1892; J. Drummond, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, Boston, 1899; E. Haupt, *Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe*, Göttingen. 1899; W. G. Moorhead, *Outline Studies in Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians*, Chicago, 1902; R. D. Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1903; J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1904; J. E. Belser (on Timothy and Titus and Ephesians), Freiburg, 1907–08; W. G. Rutherford, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Corinthians*, London, 1908.

On Romans: A. Tholuck, Berlin, 1856, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1848; R. Haldane, New York, 1870; W. S. Plumer, London, 1871; T. Robinson, 2 vols., ib. 1871; G. Volkmer, Zurich, 1875; M. Stuart, Andover, 1876; F. A. Philippi, Frankfort, 1866, Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1878–79; W. G. T. Shedd, New York, 1879; F. Godet, 2 vols., Paris, 1883–90, Eng. transl., of earlier ed., 2 vols., 1880–81; J. A. Beet, London, 1882; F. Moulinie, Geneva, 1883; E. Boehmer, Bonn, 1886; C. Hodge, Philadelphia, 1886; C. J. Vaughan, London, 1890; H. B. Liddon, ib. 1893; W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, Edinburgh and New York, 1895; F. Spitta, Göttingen, 1901; P. Feine, ib. 1903; H. Hoffmann, Leipsic, 1903; G. Stockhardt, St. Louis, 1907.

On Corinthians: J. E. Osiander, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1847–58; A. Neander, Berlin, 1859; C. Hodge, 2 vols., New York, 1860; A. Klöpper, Berlin, 1874; G. Heinrici, 2 vols., ib. 1880–87; A. P. Stanley, London, 1882; J. A. Beet, ib. 1885; T. C. Edwards, Edinburgh, 1885; J. J. Lias, London, 1886 (on I Cor.); J. F. Räbiger, Breslau, 1886; E. P. Gould, Philadelphia, 1888; C. J. Ellicott, London, 1887 (on I Cor.); F. Godet, 2 vols., Paris, 1886–1887, Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1886–87 (on I Cor.); W. Kay, London, 1887; H. H. Henson, ib. 1898; H. Couard, Potsdam, 1901; A. Schäfer, Münster, 1903; F. S. Gutjahr, Graz, 1907 (II Corinthians); G. H. Rendall, London, 1909; J. E. McFadyen, New York, 1909; A. MacLaren, London, 1909; P. Bachmann, Leipsic, 1909 (II Corinthians).

On Galatians: J. B. Lightfoot, London, 1895; H. A. Schott, Leipsic, 1834; F. Windischmann, Mainz, 1843 (Roman Catholic); A. Hilgenfeld, Leipsic, 1852; C. Wieseler, Göttingen, 1859; G. B. Winer, Leipsic, 1859; G. J. Gwynne, Dublin, 1863; G. W. Matthias, Cassel, 1865; J. Eadie, Glasgow, 1869; J. Venn, London, 1878; J. A. Beet, ib. 1885; R. Steck, Berlin, 1888; G. B. Stevens, Hartford, 1890; J. Drummond, London, 1893; W. M. Ramsay, ib. 1899; E. S. Askwith, ib. 1899; V. Weber, Freiburg, 1901; B. W. Bacon, London and New York, 1909; A. L. Williams, London, 1910; H. Lietzmann, Tübingen, 1910.

On Ephesians: B. F. Westcott, London, 1906; F. A. Holzhausen, Hanover, 1833; R. Stier, Berlin, 1848; A. Harless, Erlangen, 1858; J. Eadie, Edinburgh, 1861; A. Monod, Paris, 1867; C. Hodge, New York, 1883; E. Ernst, Herbenthal, 1890; A. Klöpper, Göttingen, 1891; R. W. Dale, London, 1892; J. Macpherson, Edinburgh, 1892; E. Krukenberg, Gütersloh, 1902; G. H. Whitaker, London, 1902; J. A. Robinson, ib. 1903; E. F. Stroeter, London, 1909.

On Philippians: J. B. Lightfoot, London, 1895 (epochal); A. Klöpper, 1893; A. Rilliet, Geneva, 1841; B. Weiss, Berlin, 1859; W. Hoyt, New York, 1883; J. Eadie, Edinburgh, 1884; C. J. Vaughan, 1885: J. Hutchinson, Edinburgh, 1887; H. C. G. Moule, London, 1889; H. von Soden, Tübingen, 1906; N. Bachmann, *Light in Dark Places; or, Lectures on . . . Philippians*, Richmond, 1910.

On Colossians: J. B. Lightfoot, London, 1895; F. Bähr, Basel, 1833; W. Böhmer, Berlin, 1835; W. Steiger, Erlangen, 1835; E. T. Mayerhoff, Berlin, 1838; J. E. Hather, Hamburg, 1841; F. Bleek, Berlin, 1865; A. Klöpper, Berlin, 1882; J. Eadie, Edinburgh, 1884; J. Rutherford, London, 1908.

On Thessalonians: E. Headland and H. B. Swete, London, 1866; A. Koch, Berlin, 1849; J. Eadie, London, 1877; J. Hutchison, Edinburgh, 1884; P. Schmidt, Berlin, 1886 (on I. Thess.); A. Klöpper, Königsberg, 1889; G. Wohlenberg, Leipsic, 1903; G. Milligan, London, 1908; E. von Dobschütz, new ed., Göttingen, 1909.

On the pastoral epistles: K. Knoke, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1887–89; F. C. Baur, Stuttgart, 1835; C. S. Matthies, Greifswald, 1840; M. J. Mack, Tübingen, 1841; P. Fairbairn, Edinburgh, 1874; G. Cuivier, Geneva, 1876; W. Bahnsen, Leipsic, 1876 (II Tim.); H. J. Holtzmann, Leipsic, 1880; H. Kölling, Berlin, 1882 (I Tim.); E. Krukenberg, Gütersloh, 1901; J. P. Lilley, Edinburgh, 1901; B. Weiss, Göttingen, 1902; A. Schlatter, Calw, 1904; A. Schumann, Leipsic, 1908 (Philemon).

PAUL OF THE CROSS. See PASSIONISTS.

PAUL THE APOSTLE, CONGREGATION OF MISSIONARY PRIESTS OF SAINT: A congregation familiarly known as the "Paulist Fathers" or the "Paulists." This congregation, which is the only religious institute of clerics in the United States that is of American origin, was founded in 1858 in the city of New York by five native American priests, all converts from Protestantism, who previously had joined the Redemptorist order and were actively engaged in preaching missions throughout the United States. These men were Clarence Walworth and Francis A. Baker, both former Episcopalian clergymen; Augustine Hewitt, who had previously passed from Congregationalism to the Episcopalian Church; George Deshon, a graduate of West Point where he had been a classmate of General Grant, and Isaac T. Hecker of German Lutheran stock, who, shortly before his submission to the Roman Catholic Church, had been a member of the Brook Farm community of "Transcendentalists" near West Roxbury, Mass.

At that time the direction of the Redemptorist order in the United States was exclusively in the hands of superiors who were German or of German descent, and the German language, together with German customs and methods, prevailed in the various houses of the community. To the recently admitted American fathers this condition of things seemed to constitute a serious drawback, and the question of founding a new house as a headquarters for English-speaking fathers, as a center of attraction for American novices, as a base for missionary work for the non-Catholic American people, and as a residence in which English instead of German should be the language in common use, was brought up for consideration. This project, though heartily endorsed by Archbishop Hughes and by Bishop Bayley of Newark, was rejected by the superiors of the order both in Rome and in America, and Father Hecker, who went to Rome to plead the case before the superior-general, was dismissed from the congregation of the Redemptorists, Aug. 29, 1857. Father Hecker remained nevertheless in touch with his American associates, and some months later the idea was suggested that they establish a new missionary society or congregation which in spirit and methods would be more adaptable to existing conditions in the United States. The plan was endorsed by Archbishop Hughes, and the five fathers having been canonically released from their allegiance to the Redemptorist order, received, Mar. 6, 1858, a papal decree permitting them to organize an independent society of missionaries to be under the direction of the local bishops. Father Hecker was elected the first superior. He drew up a provisory community rule which embodied to a great extent the regulations governing the Redemptorists, and it received the unqualified sanction of Archbishop Hughes, July 7, 1858. It differed from that of the Redemptorists and other religious orders in that it did not require the customary vows, but accepted instead a voluntary agreement on the part of the members to live in common in accordance with the spirit of the evangelical counsels. It specified missions as the chief work of the new community, and parish duties as only a subordinate function. The two cardinal points insisted upon as embodying the fundamental spirit of the new foundation were the personal perfection of the members and zeal for souls, and, in connection with the latter, special stress was laid on the hoped-for conversion of the people of the United States to the Roman Catholic faith through the apostolic labors of the missionaries. Another fundamental characteristic of the new community is worthy of note. While other congregations laid the main stress on fidelity to the rules and exercises of community life as the most important element, the Paulists give the element of personal individuality the first place, and give it free scope as far as is consistent with the exigencies of the common life. In accordance with these general principles and avowed intentions, the activity of the Paulist Fathers has radiated in various directions. Much successful mission work has been accomplished throughout the country among Catholics and non-Catholics; special attention has been given in their churches to the proper carrying out of the liturgical services, and in particular to the reform of ecclesiastical music. In this connection they have organized choirs of men and boys, promoted congregational singing, and have published hymn-books for the spread of devotional music. The Paulists have also striven to elevate the standards of Roman Catholic homiletic literature and adapt it to the needs of the American people. Beginning with 1861 a volume of the Paulist sermons was published annually for seven years, and later appeared three volumes of *Five Minute Sermons for Early Masses.* In their missions and in the parishes under their control the Paulists have been strenuous and consistent advocates of temperance. Their propaganda in favor of sobriety has been exerted through sermons, tracts, articles in their own publications and letters to the public press, through petitions to the legislature and action at the polls, through the formation of total abstinence societies and through the establishment of the Temperance Publication Bureau, with its periodical entitled *Temperance Truth.* Father Hecker, who, while yet a Redemptorist, had published his *Questions of the Soul* (New York, 1855) and *Aspirations of Nature* (1857), was always an enthusiastic advocate of the apostolate of the press, and this mode of exercising religious and ethical influence has been among the dominant ideals of the Paulist community. In 1865 they established the *Catholic World Magazine*, which has ever since been a respected and influential exponent of Roman Catholic topics before the American people. The Catholic Publication Society was organized in 1866 for the purpose of publishing at cost price and distributing books, pamphlets, and tracts for the instruction of Roman Catholics and the enlightenment of non-Catholics. This enterprise did not meet with the success that its promoters had hoped for, and was later supplanted by the Catholic Book Exchange. In 1892 the Paulists inaugurated a press department of their own at their headquarters in W. Sixtieth Street, New York City, from which are issued, besides the publications above mentioned, *The Young Catholic*, a magazine for juveniles, and *The Missionary*, devoted to the interests of the mission work in which a large number of the fathers are always actively engaged. At present (1910), besides the mother house, church, school, etc., in New York and a house of studies at the Catholic University in Washington, the Paulists have establishments in San Francisco, Chicago, Winchester, Tenn., Berkeley, Cal., and Austin, Tex. In the two last-named towns the Paulist communities were established chiefly in the interests of the Roman Catholic students who attend the state universities there located. The congregation has a total membership of 64 fathers, 21 students, and 10 postulants.

James F. Driscoll.

Bibliography: The literature under Hecker, Isaac Thomas; L. W. Reilly, in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Sept., 1897; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 498–500; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 628–630.

PAUL THE DEACON (PAULUS DIACONUS): Italian historian; b. probably at Cividale (65 m. n.e. of Venice) between 720 and 730; d. in the monastery of Monte Cassino (q.v.; 85 m. s.e. of Rome) Apr. 13, 799. He was a learned and amiable man. He long lived at the court of the duke of Benevento Arichis and his wife Adelperga, the daughter of the last Lombard king, for whom he performed literary services. One of these was to expand Eutropius and at the same time Christianize it, continuing it to the middle of the sixth century. This compilation was for nearly one thousand years the historical text-book of Western Europe. He also wrote much verse. The evils of the times drove him to enter the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino in 774. In 782 he is first spoken of as "Paul the Deacon," and by this name he has since been known. In 782 he went to France to secure from Charlemagne the release of his brother and seems to have been successful. Thus he made the acquaintance of Charlemagne and so came into his service in various ways, and was called upon by him to produce works in prose and verse, including a collection of homilies, some original, which proved a great success and for many years supplied the wants of the Western Church; a philological treatise of curious interest; many poems and other works. But at last Paul was allowed to leave the imperial service, and from 786 to his death lived in the quiet of Monte Cassino. There he wrote that "History of the Lombards" which is his chief title to fame.

Bibliography: At the celebration of the eleventh centenary of Paul held at Cividale Sept. 3–5, 1899, preparations were made looking to a collection of all his works to supersede that in *MPL*, xcv. As yet the only result is C. Cipolla's *Note bibliografiche*, Venice, 1901. Recent editions of some of his works are: the *Historia Romana*, ed. H. Droysen in *MGH, Auct. Ant.*, ii (1879), 4–182, 185–224; the *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus*, ed. G. H. Pertz, in *MGH, Script.*, ii (1829), 260–268; *Vita . . . Gregorii I.*, ed. H. Grisar, in *ZKT*, xi (1887), 162–172; *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz in *MGH, Script. rer. Langob.*, 1878, pp. 12–187; the *Carmina*, ed. E. Dümmler in *MGH, Poet. Lat ævi Car.*, i (1881), 35–86; the *Epistolæ*, ed. E. Dümmler, in *MGH, Epist.*, iv (1895), 505–516; a critical edition of the "Poems" by K. Neff, Munich, 1908. An excellent Eng. transl. of the *Historia Langobardorum* by W. D. Foulke appeared, Philadelphia, 1907, containing also a good list of literature and a life of Paul.

For the earlier works on Paul the student must refer to Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 899–905, where manuscripts, editions, and critical works are given with remarkable fulness. Mention may be made here of F. Dahn, *Paulus Diaconus*, Leipsic, 1876; R. Jacobi, *Die Quellen der Langobardengeschichte des Paulus Diaconus*, Halle, 1877; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vols. vii.–viii., London, 1896–99; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 158–164; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 401, 432, 677 sqq.; Bethmann, in *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, x. 247–414; Mommsen, in *NA*, iii. 185–189, v. 51–103; Waitz, in *NA*, v. 417–424.

PAUL, SAINT, BROTHERHOOD OF. See Methodists, IV., 1, § 10.

PAUL, SAINT, HERMITS OF: A monastic order which existed in Hungary, Portugal, and France, and in each had a different origin. The members are known also as the Fathers (or Brothers) of Death. The Hungarian order arose about 1250 by the union of the hermits of Patach and Pisilia. In 1215 Bishop Bartholomäus of Fünfkirchen had united the hermits of his diocese in the cloister of St. Jacob of Patach; in 1246 the hermit Eusebius of Gran returned with associates from the desert and built a cloister in Pisilia in 1250. The same year the two communities united and the congregation thus formed was confirmed by Bishop Ladislaus of Fünfkirchen. In 1308 the community accepted the Augustinian rule and took its name from St. Paul the Hermit (of Thebes). The order became strong and built up 170 monasteries, spreading to Germany, Poland, Sweden, and elsewhere. In Hungary its schools did good service. But in the Turkish war the houses were destroyed, and there exists now only the house at Czenstochau in Russian Poland (a celebrated place of pilgrimage), and the two houses of Rupella and Lesniow in the diocese of Cracow.

The Portuguese order was founded at Setuval by Mendo Gomez about 1420, and confirmed with the Augustinian rule by Gregory XIII. in 1578. It has lapsed and has no special significance.

The French order seems to have arisen about the beginning of the seventeenth century, and its statutes, by Guillaume Callier, were approved by Pope Paul V., and the erection of houses was permitted by Louis XIII. Among the obligations were visiting of the sick, care for prisoners, attendance of the condemned to the place of execution, and burial of the dead. The whole life was to be conditioned by the thought of death, the greeting was *memento mori*, at meal-times a skull was kissed, and a black scapulary was worn with a skull on it. This branch was suppressed by Urban VIII.

(G. Grützmacher.)

Bibliography: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 231–233; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iii. 324 sqq.; A. Eggerer, *Fragmen panis Corvi proto-Eremici, sive reliquiæ annalium eremi-cœnobiticorum Fratrum Eremitarum Sancti Pauli*, Vienna, 1663, continuation by M. Borkovich and N. Benger, Pressburg, 1743; F. Bossl, *Paulus Thebæus*, Neustadt, 1749; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 327–328.

PAUL OF SAMOSATA. See Monarchianism, IV., §§ 2–3.

PAUL OF THEBES. See Monasticism, I., § 4.

PAULA, SAINT: Pupil and companion of Jerome; b. probably at Rome in 347; d. at Bethlehem in 404. She was a woman of unusually distinguished ancestry, the epitaph by Jerome summing up in two lines the fact that she could trace descent from Scipio, Agamemnon, the Æmilian gens, and the illustrious Æmilius Paulus. She was also possessed of very large wealth. She was married when quite young to the Senator Toxotius, a member of the Julian gens, and was the mother of four daughters, one of them Julia, generally called Eustochium, and one son, named after his father. Her connection with Christianity seems to have come through her family, as there is no report of her conversion; she was quite early in life inclined to asceticism, and this bent was probably intensified by her intercourse with Epiphanius of Salamis and Paulinus of Antioch, whom she entertained during their presence at the Roman synod of 382. Through these bishops she became an intimate of Jerome, who so largely dominated her later life. She lost her husband in 380 and one of her daughters in 384 (another of her daughters died possibly in 386); and in that year she decided to leave Rome and take up her residence in the East. She disregarded the entreaties of her unmarried daughter Blæsilla, who desired her mother to delay departure until after her marriage, and the laments of her son, whom she left to the guardianship of the prætor. She then sailed for the East, joined Jerome at Antioch, passed through Palestine to Egypt, and returned to settle at Bethlehem in 386. She was influential in inducing Marcella (q.v.) to reside in Palestine; the letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella is in annotated English translation in *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society Publications* (London, 1896). At Bethlehem Paula and Eustochium built a convent, where they resided, and a hospice, then a monastery, and after that a convent of three degrees for women. She pursued her studies of the Bible with Jerome, having learned Hebrew and already being versed in Greek and of course in Latin. By her incessant charities and largess she impoverished herself and laid a weight of debt upon her daughter, even the counsels of Jerome (who records in *De vir. ill.*, cxxxv., that he wrote daily to her and her daughter) being unavailing in the direction of greater prudence. It was partly by the mortifications to which she subjected herself that her death was occasioned. At her death the bishops of the surrounding cities were present, and her funeral showed by the numbers present and the demonstrations made the estimation in which she was held. She was buried in the cave of the nativity.

Paula was the name also of a granddaughter of Saint Paula, the daughter of her son Toxotius. Under Jerome's influence she was probably sent to Bethlehem and there brought up to the ascetic life under the care of her aunt Eustochium. She figures in Jerome's correspondence, and several of his commentaries are dedicated to her and her aunt (cf. Jerome, *Epist.*, cvii., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vi. 189–195).

Bibliography: The principal source is Jerome, *Epist.*, cviii., reproduced in *ASB*, Jan., ii., 711 sqq., and is in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vi. 195–212; Paula is mentioned in other letters (cf. the index in the cited vol. of *NPNF*, under Paula). Consult further Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*, lxxix.; *DCB*, iv. 218–219; *KL*, ix. 1644–46.

PAULICIANS: An Oriental sect whose members claimed to be the true Church, calling themselves "Christians" and the orthodox "Romanists." They distinguished between the creator and lord of this world and the true God of heaven, to whom alone the spirit returns, and consequently rejected an incarnation through Mary; for them the mother of God was the heavenly Jerusalem from which Christ proceeded and into which he has entered. Out of pity God sent an angel whom he called his son and caused to be born, and faith in him frees from judgment. The significance of Christ they found chiefly in his teaching. Instead of the cross they honored the Gospel, because containing Christ's words. The words of Christ were true baptism, although they allowed their children to be baptized by captive clerics. Toward the Lord's Supper they adopted a similar attitude. They rejected the hierarchy and monasticism, teaching that Peter at baptism had seen the lord of the world fall from heaven in monk's garb and give monastic institutions to men. They appear to have rejected the writings of Peter, but accepted the other New-Testament books. In general, they laid stress upon a pious life rather than on doctrine and external observances, and herein lay their chief ground of offense to the orthodox.

The origin of the Paulicians is obscure. The name occurs first in canon xxxii. of a synod held at Turin (q.v.) in Armenia by the Patriarch John of Otzun in 719 and in a writing of the same John against the sect. The *Scorialensis* (i.) and Gregory the Master (Mkrttschian, p. 148) derive the sect from Paul of Samosata, and Conybeare (p. cv.) strongly favors this assumption; but what is known of the Paulicians does not point to this Paul as their founder. A connection with Manicheism has often been asserted; and the *Scorialensis* (i.) states that a certain Kallinikē sent her sons, Paul and John, to Episparis in Armenia to spread Manichean doctrine. The Paulicians themselves, however, knew of no connection with the Manicheans and were always ready to reject Manes as well as the afore-mentioned Paul and John. Gieseler (pp. 103 sqq.), Neander (p. 344), and Mkrttschian (p. 110) assert a Marcionitic origin. Döllinger (p. 2) favors a connection with Marcionites and Archontici. It is hardly possible to believe there were no relations with earlier heresies; yet the sources ascribe the origin of the sect solely to a certain Constantine of Mananalis near Samosata, who is said to have lived for twenty-seven years as head of a congregation at Kibossa and to have suffered death under Constantine Pogonatus (668–685). He taught that the New Testament was the only guide and wrote nothing. Later leaders, called by their followers by names of companions of Paul (Constantine having been known as Silvanus) and honored as true apostles of Christ and manifestations of the Spirit, were Symeon-Titus; Gegnesius-Timothy, an Armenian; Joseph-Epaphroditus, who is said to have been for thirty years head of a congregation at Antioch in Pisidia; Zacharias (rejected by some as a hireling); Baanes, called the Filthy from his manner of life, which was patterned after that of Diogenes the Cynic; and Sergius-Tychicus. The last-named fled from the imperial officials into Saracen territory and is said to have been murdered there after an activity of thirty years; and even his enemies admitted his upright life and amiable qualities. Six congregations are enumerated under names of apostolic churches: Macedonia (Kibossa), founded by Constantine and Symeon; Achaia (Mananalis), founded by Gegnesius; Philippi; the congregation of Joseph and Zacharias; Laodicea (Mopsuestia); and Colossæ.

Before long the Paulicians appear in predatory bands seriously disturbing the public peace. Constantine Copronymus (741–775) is said to have transported some of them to Thrace, where they appear to have founded the Bulgarian Bogomiles (cf. Friedrich, pp. 99–100, 104 sqq.; see New Manicheans). Nicephorus (802–811) took them into the army and granted privileges in return for their help. Michael I. (811–813) and Theodora (regent for her son, Michael III., 842–856) persecuted them severely. They fled to Saracen territory and thence devastated the imperial provinces. Their leader, Karbeas, founded the fortress of Tephrika, just across the boundary, and made it the headquarters of their forays. Karbeas' successor, Chrysocheir, in 867 penetrated to Ephesus and is said to have claimed the rule of the entire East (cf. Gieseler, p. 96). He was slain in 871 and the might of Tephrika was broken.

The " Selicians " in Constantinople under Theodora who were reconciled to the Church by the Patriarch Methodius were evidently Paulicians (cf. Friedrich, p. 82), and in 866 Photius speaks of converting Paulicians in the capital city. In Armenia they were perpetuated by the so-called Thondracians (Thondraki) under the lead of Smbat (first half of the ninth century). Gregory the Master names six leaders after Smbat and boasts of converting more than 1,000 of the sect by commission of the Emperor Constantine Monomachus (1042–54) and extirpating others (cf. Mrkttschian, pp. 142, 145, 149). Nevertheless manifestations allied to Paulicianism have continued in Armenia even to the present (cf. Mkrttschian in *ZKG*, xvi.). See Catechumenate. (N. Bonwetsch.)

In seeking to reach a just conclusion respecting the doctrines and practises of the Paulicians considerable weight should be accorded to *The Key of Truth*, the manual of the Armenian Paulicians (Thondraki, Thondraketzi), the text of which with English translation and an introduction of nearly two hundred closely printed pages was published at Oxford in 1898 by Fred C. Conybeare. The manuscript in a somewhat mutilated form was taken from a body of Thondraketzi, who had emigrated (1828–29) from Turkish Armenia to the village of Djêwiurm in the canton of Knus in Russian Armenia and were (1837) propagating their principles with considerable zeal. Inquisitorial proceedings resulted not only in the seizure of their authoritative book but also in gathering from members of the body information about their doctrines and practises confirmatory of the teachings of *The Key of Truth*. By an elaborate comparison of the document with Greek and Armenian writings of the early and medieval times Conybeare reaches the conclusion that the liturgical parts of the book (baptism, Lord's Supper, consecration of infants, etc.) originated in the fourth century or only a little later and that the exordium belongs to the ninth century. The doctrines and the practises of the body he believes to represent the type of Christianity that was first propagated in Armenia and to be fundamentally primitive. The naive adoptionism of the writing he finds to be in accord with early Judaistic Christianity and even with the Christology of the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, Justin Martyr, the Disputation of Archelaus with Mani, and like early documents, and their antagonism to the practise of infant baptism, which became widely prevalent in the Greek and Latin churches from the third century onward, to have been based not only upon their sense of the undesirableness of innovation, but also on the fact that they supposed Jesus to have become the Christ and to have been adopted as Son of God in connection with his baptism and inferred that it was the duty of every true believer, having made due preparation, to receive baptism after maturity had been reached and by following the example of Jesus to become in a lower sense sons of God. As the influence of the Greek Church and the Greek empire became dominant in Armenia the believers of the old type, who held to adoptionist Christology and believers' baptism, became a persecuted party and came to regard their politico-ecclesiastical persecutors as the emissaries and representatives of Satan, from whom they had derived their infant baptism, their Christological errors, and their persecuting spirit. The disposition of the Paulicians to attribute to Satanic agency doctrines and practises regarded by them as erroneous and hurtful may have given rise to the charge of dualistic heresy constantly brought against them by their opponents. That they should have made little use of the Old Testament was due no doubt in the case of the Paulicians, as in that of the Waldenses, Anabaptists, and others, to the fact that the theocratic system of the Old Testament was used by their opponents for the justification of union of Church and State, persecution of dissent, and the according of church fellowship to infants through baptism as infants by circumcision became members of the theocratic community. Of course it is possible, if not probable, that Manichean and Marcionitic dualism may in some cases have become blended with the more primitive type of Christianity represented by *The Key of Truth*. Conybeare is of the opinion that the name of the party was derived from Paul of Samosata rather than that of the Apostle Paul, though the latter was no doubt held in great reverence by the Paulicians. Conybeare has also made it highly probable that medieval Evangelical parties, and through these the radical Evangelicals of the sixteenth and following centuries, were due to the propaganda of Paulicians who in the early Middle Ages settled in great numbers in Bulgaria and adjoining regions and spread westward along the lines of travel and trade. A. H. Newman.

Bibliography: Sources: (1) Greek: The account of the Paulicians in the *Codex Scorialensis* [Φ] (a 10th cent. MS. of the chronicle of Georgius Monachus), folio 164b sqq.

ed. J. Friedrich with notes, etc., in *SMA*, 1896, pp. 67–111; Photius, *Adv. recentiores Manichaos i.–iv.*; Georgius Monachos, ed. E. de Muralt, St. Petersburg, 1853; Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Manichaorum qui Pauliciani dicuntur*, ed. M. Rader, Ingolstadt, 1604, and J. C. L. Gieseler, Göttingen, 1846, with which should be noted the appendix, ed. Gieseler, Göttingen, 1849; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxiv (*MPG*, cxxx. 1189 sqq.); a Greek work to be found in J. Tollius, *Insignia itinerarii Italici*, pp. 126–127, Utrecht, 1696. (2) Armenian: A large number of the Sources are in F. C. Conybeare in *The Key of Truth*, Oxford, 1898; others or these repeated are Johannes Osmiensis (John of Otsun), *Opera*, ed. J. B. Aucher, Venice, 1834; Gregory of Narek, Gregory the Master, and Aristakes of Lastivert, xxii.–xxiii., in Karapet Ter-Mkrttschian, *Die Paulicianer im byzantinischen Kaiserreich und verwandte ketzerische Erscheinungen in Armenien*, pp. 130 sqq., Leipsic, 1893; "The Key of Truth," ed. Mkrttschian in *ZKG*, xvi. 1895, pp. 264 sqq. The Greek sources are nearly related, but the exact relationships one to another are not determined. Euthymius Zigabenus states that he copied Photius. The extant work attributed to Photius appears to be composite, book i. 1–10, by Photius himself, the remainder (cf. Friedrich, pp. 86 sqq.; according to Mkrttschian, book i. 15 sqq.) by another writer, who appears to have had Zigabenus before him. This composite work was the source of Petrus Siculus. Friedrich (pp. 81 sqq.) thinks that the *Scorialensis* is the original; if this be correct, the order is as follows: the *Scorialensis*, Photius i. 1–10, Georgius Monachus, Petrus Hegumenus, Zigabenus (pseudo-) Photius i. 10–iv., Petrus Siculus. The valuation of the sources used by the Pseudophotius and Siculus has an important bearing on the history of the Paulicians. The value of the abjuration formula given by Tollius is questionable. The Greek chronographers have an independent knowledge of the Paulicians as early as Theophanes. Genesius is the chief source of his continuators.

Further literature of greater or less value is: Gieseler, in *TSK*, 1829, pp. 79–124; J. L. von Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 462, 517, 574, 611, ii. 70, London, 1863; J. A. Lombard, *Pauliciens, Bulgares, et Bonshommes en orient et occident*, Geneva, 1879; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. liv.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 574–578; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 244–270; *DCB*, iv. 219–230 (valuable); and literature under New Manicheans.

PAULINUS OF AQUILEIA: Patriarch of Aquileia; a Lombard, b. in Friuli (a district at the head of the Gulf of Venice) between 730 and 740; d. Jan. 11, 802. Called to the Frankish court as "master of grammatical science" before 775, he became one of Charlemagne's spiritual advisers and was made patriarch of Aquileia, with his seat at Forum Julii, in 787. He was present at synods which dealt with Adoptionism (q.v.) at Regensburg in 792 and Frankfort in 794 and wrote the memorial of the Italian bishops at the latter, the *Libellus sacrosyllabus contra Elipandum*, seeking to refute the heresy from Scripture. About 800 he sent to the king *Libri iii. contra Felicem*, a work which Alcuin characterized as the final word in the controversy. As an appendix he wrote a *Carmen de regula fidei*, vindicating the doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation. At a diocesan synod at Forum Julii in 796 he defended the addition of *filioque* to the creed (see Filioque Controversy) and commanded all clerics to learn the amplified text with a detailed exposition of the point at issue; the laity were to know at least the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer. Paulinus maintained cordial relations with Eric, duke of Friuli 795–799, at his request compiled a *Liber exhortationis vulgo de salutaribus documentis*, and wrote an elegy on his early death. He presided at a conference of bishops summoned by Pepin to his camp on the Danube when the victory over the Avars (q.v.) in 796 opened a new missionary field. The protocol adopted, of much importance in the history of missions, is preserved in Mansi, *Concilia*, xiii. 921–926, and Jaffé, *BRG*, vi. 311–318. The church of Aquileia received the territory south of the Drave, and Paulinus prosecuted the work of conversion with zeal and success. (Friedrich Wiegand.)

Bibliography: The *Opera*, ed. Madrisi, appeared Venice, 1737, reprinted in *MPL*, xcix. 5–684. For poems ascribed to him (there is difference in views as to genuineness among the editors) cf. also *NA*, iv (1879), 113–118 and *MGH*, *Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, i (1881), 123–148. Sources are: Alcuin's letters and poems in Jaffé, *BRG*, vol. v., and *MGH*, *Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, i (1881), 160–351; and the *diplomata* of Charlemagne in *MPL*, xcvii. 957, xcviii. 1447–49. Consult: the early lives in *ASB*, Jan., i. 713–718, and *MPL*, xcix. 17–130; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, iv. 284–295; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, pp. 88, 356–359, Carlsruhe, 1832; M. Büdinger, *Oesterreichische Geschichte*, i. 141–147, Leipsic, 1858; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 89–91, Leipsic, 1880; *DCB*, iv. 246–248; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. iii.; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 156–157, 464–466; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 157–164, xiii. 632–641.

PAULINUS OF NOLA (PONTIUS MEROPIUS ANICIUS PAULINUS): Bishop of Nola; b. at Bordeaux 353 or 354; d. June 22, 431. He was of distinguished family and inherited so great wealth that his teacher, Ausonius (see Ausonius, Decimus Magnus), calls his possessions *regna* (*Epist.*, xxv. 116). His education was almost exclusively Latin and even here his acquaintance with the literature was one-sided; he knew the poets but disdained the historians. From Ausonius he learned an elegant style both in prose and verse. His family influence as well as his own talents early brought him high honors, but he was not consul in 378, as has been supposed (cf. Reinelt, pp. 60 sqq.). A worldly career, however, did not attract him, and between 380 and 390 he lived in his provincial home and was baptized by Delphinus of Bordeaux (390–404). Men like Martin of Tours, Victricius of Rouen, and, above all, Ambrose became his advisers and taught him to regard Christianity and monasticism as inseparable. He had married a wealthy wife, Therasia; but she shared his views, and, after the death of their only child, they agreed to live apart. Paulinus went to Spain and became presbyter in Barcelona about 394 or 395. Both he and his wife had given away much of their wealth, for which they were praised by Ambrose, Martin of Tours, Augustine, and Jerome. But Siricius, bishop of Rome, seems to have been displeased by the notoriety which Paulinus acquired by his renunciation and made no attempt to keep him in Rome when he visited the city.

From his youth Paulinus had regarded St. Felix of Nola, a reputed confessor of the Decian persecution, as his patron, and he now settled in the Campanian city (394 or 395). There he and Therasia lived lives of self-denial and asceticism which brought on serious illnesses. Paulinus seems to have retained some control over his property, for he built a refuge for monks and the poor near the Church of St. Felix, provided Nola with a much-needed water supply, and built a basilica at Fondi and another at Nola. Most of all he loved to pay the obligations of poor debtors, and his retreat soon became the resort of a disorderly rabble from far and near. He corresponded with Augustine and Jerome, but the two letters to Rufinus (xlvi., xlvii.) do not fit into his life and are probably not genuine. When he became bishop is uncertain—probably shortly before 410. His manner of life and activity were nowise changed thereby; for twenty years he continued to be admired and loved, especially by the monastic party, and enjoyed intercourse with the best of its men and women, who visited him or corresponded with him. He lived to see the beginning of the Pelagian controversy, but apparently suffered neither Augustine nor the Emperor Honorius to draw him actively into it against his friends, Pelagius and Julian.

Of the writings of Paulinus, the following, mentioned by Gennadius (*De vir. ill.*, xlix.), are lost: a panegyric on the Emperor Theodosius (praised by Jerome—*Epist.*, lviii.—as surpassing all of Paulinus's earlier efforts in richness of thought and finished expression), an *Opus sacramentorum et hymnorum*, certain letters to his sister, a *Liber de pœnitentia* and a *Liber de laude generali omnium martyrum.* A poetical version of a lost work of Suetonius *De regibus*, known from Ausonius (*Epist.*, xix. 10 sqq.), has also perished. Forty-nine letters to friends (Sulpicius Severus, Augustine, Delphinus, Victricius, Pammachius, and others) and thirty-three poems are preserved. Of the poems the most important are epistles to Ausonius, thirteen eulogies of Felix of Nola, and an epithalamium for a son of a bishop of Capua. The amiable personality of the author is evident in his writings, which show good and bad features in monasticism. He is convinced of the vanity of all the things of this world. Earthly goods are but a means to the attainment of the kingdom of heaven through their right use, and they serve their purpose best when they are thrown away. From a depreciation of self he passed to a tendency to see the abnormal and exceptional in the simple and natural, to seek and find miracles and see visions, and to exaggerate reverence for saints and relics. In *Epist.* xxxii. 10 sqq., Paulinus describes the basilica which he had built; and in xiii. 11 sqq., he gives what is probably the earliest information about St. Peter's in Rome, thus furnishing data of much importance for the history of Christian art.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The *editio princeps* of the *Opera*, by Johannes Parvus and Jodocus Badius Ascensius, was printed Paris, 1516; subsequent eds. are: H. Gravius, Cologne, 1560, reproduced in J. J. Grynæus, *Monumenta*, Basel, 1569, and by A. Schott, with life, in *Bibliotheca patrum*, Cologne, 1618; H. Rosweyde and Fronton le Duc, Antwerp, 1622; chronologically arranged, with many corrections by J. B. le Brun des Marettes, 2 vols., Paris, 1685, the basis of later eds., enlarged by the addition of some poems by Muratori, Verona, 1736, and in *MPL*, lxi.; Gallandi, *Bibliotheca patrum*, vol. viii., 1772, contains these and other poems, carefully edited, while A. Mai, *Classici auctores*, vol. v., Rome, 1827, included two other pieces in verse. Sources for the history of Paulinus are his own writings and those of Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Sulpicius Severus, and Ausonius. Two interesting early works are: H. Vaughan, *The Life of Blessed Paulinus*, in *Flores solitudinis*, London, 1654; and F. Chifflet, *Paulinus illustratus*, Dijon, 1662. Other monographs are by M. Rabanis, Bordeaux, 1840; A. Buse, Regensburg, 1850 (the best perhaps); M. Fabre, Strasburg, 1862; F. Lagrange, Paris, 1884; M. Lafon, Montauban, 1885; A. Puech, Paris, 1887; P. Reinelt, Breslau, 1904. Consult further: *DCB*, iv. 234–245 (elaborate); *ASB*, June, iv. 198–225; W. Cave, *Hist. literaria*, i. 288 sqq., Oxford, 1740; W. S. Gilly, *Vigilantius and his Times*, London, 1844; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Litteratur*, i. 294 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; W. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 272 sqq., Stuttgart, 1891; G. Rauschen, *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche unter Theodosius dem Grosse*, Freiburg, 1897; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. xiv. 1–146, 720–737; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 50–100, with related documents, vii. 619 sqq., 648, viii. 120, 126, ix. 72–75, 92, et passim.

PAULINUS OF PELLA: Christian poet; born at Pella, probably the son of a prefect of Macedonia named Hesperius, about 376; d. after 459. His father went as proconsul to Africa, and Paulinus, when three years of age, was sent to Bordeaux to be brought up by his grandfather, then consul, who is supposed to have been Ausonius (q.v.). The boy received a good education, but intermittent fever compelled him to give up instruction for the ministry. At twenty he married at the wish of his elders, and gave his time to the property of his wife, then reduced by mismanagement. When he was thirty the barbarian invasions began, and by that of the Goths the destruction of his wealth was completed. Continuous misfortune induced Paulinus to turn his attention to religious studies; he overcame his tendency to a heretical form of Christianity and entered the orthodox Church in 421. He then withdrew into solitude, lived long upon the charity of others, until he came into possession of a limited competence. His autobiographic poem shows him reconciled to his lot in life through his religion. This was written when he was eighty-three years of age, and bears the title *Eucharisticos* (*Eucharisticon*) *Deo sub ephemeridis meæ textu.* In 616 lines it proceeds without bombast, clearly and unpretentiously, to the end; it reveals knowledge of Vergil, Ausonius, Paulinus of Nola, Marius Victor, Sedulius, and Juvencus. It has been edited in M. de la Bigne, *Bibliotheca patrum*, appendix (Paris, 1579); by C. Daum (Leipsic, 1681); by W. Brandes, in *CSEL*, xvi. 263–334 (Vienna, 1888).

(G. Krüger.)

Bibliography: W. Brandes, in *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, xxxi (1880), 248–251, xxxii (1881), 321–330; O. Seeck, in prolegomena to Symmachus, in *MGH, Auct. Ant.*, vii (1883), 1 sqq.; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 405–409, Leipsic, 1889; J. Rocafort, *De Paulini Pallæi vita et carmine*, Bordeaux, 1890; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 213–218, Stuttgart, 1891; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 363; *DCB*, iv. 246.

PAULINUS OF PÉRIGEUX: Christian poet; flourished in the second half of the fifth century. He is the author of an extensive poem of 3,622 lines on St. Martin of Tours (edited in M. de la Bigne, *Bibliotheca patrum*, vol. viii., Paris, 1579; by C. Daum, Leipsic, 1581; in *MPL*, lxi. 1009–76; and by M. Petschenig, in *CSEL*, xvi. 1–190, Vienna, 1888), and of two smaller poems. The first five books describe the life of the saint. At the basis of the sixth book is a report of the miracles wrought by the saint after his death furnished by Bishop Perpetuus of Tours (458–488). There is attached a dedication to Perpetuus. The two lesser poems were also sent with a dedication to Perpetuus. The first relates the recovery of a morbescent grandson of Paulinus through laying upon his person a writing by Perpetuus; the second is an inscription for St. Martin's Church at Tours, built by the latter. Nothing is known further concerning the life of Paulinus. His largest poem shows the influence of Christian poetry (Juvencus, Sedulius), and of Vergil, Ovid, and other ancient poets.

(G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Wopkens, *Adversaria critica*, ed. C. H. Frotscher, pp. 226–285, Leipsic, 1835; M. Manitius, in *Zeitschrift für die oesterreichische Gymnasien*, xxxvii (1886), 253–254, 402–406; idem, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 226–232, Stuttgart, 1891; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 402–405, Leipsic, 1889; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 469 sqq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 89, 120, x. 441–443; *DCB*, iv. 246.

PAULINUS OF YORK: First bishop of York; d. at Rochester Oct. 10, 644. He was probably a native of Rome, though it has been conjectured on the basis of Welsh tradition, which ascribes the conversion of Northumbria to a British priest, that he was a Briton who had taken up his residence at Rome (cf. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 124, iii. 75). With Mellitus (q.v.) and others he was sent by Pope Gregory the Great to join Augustine in England in 601. In 625 he was consecrated bishop by Justus, archbishop of Canterbury, and sent to Northumbria with Ethelburga, princess of Kent, the bride of Edwin, the Northumbrian king. He converted Edwin, and baptized him and many of his nobles on Easter, Apr. 12, 627. It has been conjectured on the basis of a legend concerning the conversion of Edwin that Paulinus was sent on a mission to East Anglia before 616. Paulinus preached zealously and made many converts as long as Edwin lived. A wooden church, dedicated to St. Peter, was built at York and one of stone was begun. In 633 Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, with the help of the Christian Britons, overthrew and slew Edwin at Heathfield in southeast Yorkshire, whereupon Paulinus, with Queen Ethelburga and her children, took refuge in Kent (see EDWIN). Paulinus was made bishop of Rochester. He received the pallium from Pope Honorius I. in 634, after he had left his see at York.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 29, ii. 9, 10, 12–14, 16–20; *Fasti Eboracenses*, ed. W. H. Dixon and J. Raine, i. 35–46, London, 1863; *ASB*, Oct., v. 102 sqq.; W. Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 55, 111–123, 126–149, Oxford, 1897; W. Hunt, *The English Church 597–1066*, passim, London, 1899; *DCB*, iv. 248; *DNB*, xliv. 96–98 (where a number of references to scattered sources of value are given).

PAULIST FATHERS. See PAUL THE APOSTLE, CONGREGATION OF.

PAULSEN, FRIEDRICH: Educator, philosopher, and ethicist; b. at Langenhorn (90 m. n.w. of Hamburg) July 16, 1846; d. at Berlin Aug. 14, 1908. He received his education in the gymnasium at Altona, and at the universities of Erlangen, Bonn, and Berlin (Ph.D., 1871); became privat-docent in philosophy at Berlin, 1871, extraordinary professor, 1877, and professor, 1894, thus spending practically the whole of his life in the service of that university. He was the author of *Symbolæ ad systemata philosophiæ moralis historicæ et criticæ* (Berlin, 1871); *Versuch einer Entwicklungsgeschichte der kantischen Erkenntnisstheorie* (Leipsic, 1875); *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart* (1885; Eng. transl., *The German Universities: their Character and historical Development*, London and New York, 1895); *System der Ethik mit einem Umriss der Staats- und Gesellschaftslehre* (2 parts, Berlin, 1889, 8th ed., 2 vols., 1906; Eng. transl., *A System of Ethics*, London, 1899); *Das Realgymnasium und die humanistische Bildung* (Berlin, 1889); *Einleitung in die Philosophie* (1892, 16th ed., 1905; Eng. transl., *Introduction to Philosophy*, London, 1895); *Immanuel Kant, sein Leben und seine Lehre* (1898; Eng. transl., *Immanuel Kant: his Life and Doctrine*, London and New York, 1902); *Schopenhauer, Hamlet, Mephistopheles* (1900); *Philosophia militans* (1901); *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universität-Studium* (1902; Eng. transl., *German Universities and University Study*, London, 1906); *Die höheren Schulen Deutschlands und ihr Lehrerstand in ihrem Verhältnis zum Staat und zur geistlichen Kultur* (1904; Eng. transl., *German Education, Past and Present*, London, 1908); *Gesammelte Vorträge und Aufsätze zur Ethik, Politik und Pädagogik* (2 vols., 1907); and *Moderne Erziehung und geschlechtliche Sittlichkeit* (1908).

PAULUS, HEINRICH EBERHARD GOTTLOB: Protestant theologian; b. at Leonberg (8 m. w.n.w. of Stuttgart) Sept. 1, 1761; d. at Heidelberg Aug. 10, 1851. He studied theology at Tübingen (1779–1784); after which he served as vicar at the Latin school at Schorndorf; then as professor of the oriental languages at the University of Jena (1789–1793); and third professor of theology (1793–1803). He lectured on the Old and New Testaments and on dogmatic and ethical theology; edited the *Neues Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* (Jena, 1790); and wrote *Philologische Clavis über die Psalmen* (1791), *Jesaias* (1793), and *Philologisch-kritischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Lübeck, 1800–04). In 1803, he became professor of theology and consistorial councilor at Würzburg.

The Protestants declined at first to attend the lectures of Paulus and the attempt was made to draw the Roman Catholic students to his lectures on encyclopedia, but they soon fell away. In 1807 he went as district and school councilor to Bamberg and in 1808 to Nuremberg, and from there in 1810 to Ansbach. From 1811 to 1844 he made his name synonymous with educational progress at Heidelberg. His lectures embraced all branches of Old and New Testament exegesis. He had also to teach church history. His literary activity meanwhile assumed an extensive scope. His most significant work was *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (2 vols., Heidelberg, 1828). To this he added a scholarly supplement: *Exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien* (3 vols., 1830–33). In this work Christianity is summed up in the words, "Be ye of a different mind, for the reign of deity is at hand."

Paulus distinguished between the purpose and the person of Christ. The former was, by appealing first to a change of mind, to effect a transformation of the will of the individual in the image of God, resulting in a divine kingdom for the many. The wonderful thing about Christ is his moral character. Such a spirit as his in a human body is in itself a miracle. The spiritual operations proceeding from him were supported by individual events, not then explained according to their natural causes and for the most part not handed down with their self-explaining circumstances. But the proof for the truth of Christianity does not rest upon those miracles. Paulus was sharply attacked by the Roman Catholic exegete Hug and suffered still more from the crushing blow which fell from Strauss' *Leben Jesu*. He was characterized by a colleague as the man who thinks that he believes and who believes that he thinks. He remained uninfluenced by the philosophical, ethical, or political revolutions of his time and continued till his death as the representative of the enlightenment of 1790.

(P. TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. A. von Reichlin-Meldegg, *H. E. G. Paulus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1853 (authoritative); H. von Busche, *Die freie religiöse Aufklärung*, Darmstadt, 1846; S. Brunner, *Die vier Grossmeister der Aufklärungs-Theologie*, Paderborn, 1888; and much of the literature under ENLIGHTENMENT, THE.

PAUPERES CATHOLICI: A Roman Catholic order confirmed by Innocent III. in 1208, composed of former Waldensians who had become reconciled with the Church. They formed two groups, one adhering to Durand of Osca (Huesca) and the other to Bernardus Primus. Both classes retained the principle of apostolic poverty (Luke x. 4), while their desire to win souls led them to a life of constant wandering. The group over which Bernard presided devoted themselves to manual labor in addition to their spiritual duties, while those directed by Durand were restricted to the religious edification of their friends and disputations with heretics. Bernard's followers seem to have been drawn from the Lombard Waldensians, and the adherents of Durand from the French sectaries. Neither of the groups enjoyed a long existence, since simultaneously with them arose the Franciscans and Dominicans with an aim similar to their own, but with a strength which made the continuance of the order of Pauperes Catholici superfluous.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. W. Dieckhoff, *Die Waldenser im Mittelalter*, pp. 188 sqq., Göttingen, 1851; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Church Hist.*, iv. 286, 298, v. 348, 466 sqq., New York, 1868–80; Neander, *Church History*, iv. 612–613.

PAVIA, SYNOD OF: The Synod of Pavia is closely related to the Council of Constance, which in the celebrated *Frequens* decree, Oct. 9, 1417, had ordered that general councils be held more frequently than before; that the next be held in five years, another seven years after, and thenceforth one every tenth year; and that the place was to be designated by the pope, subject to its approval, a month before the close of the preceding council. Accordingly Pope Martin V. appointed the city of Pavia, near Milan. Provincial and diocesan synods were ordered to be held in which preliminary propositions were to be discussed for the general council. There were episcopal synods between 1418 and 1423 at Salzburg, Passau, Regensburg, Mainz, Cologne, and Treves. The pope, however, made little preparation, and neither he nor any cardinal or Italian prelate (excepting a president of the council) appeared. The pope excused himself and the cardinals on the ground of extra work and had the sessions opened on Apr. 23, 1423, by four obscure prelates. The attendance was small and there were present at adjournment to Siena four German, six French, and several English prelates, but no Italian or Spanish. The synod had not finished settling the order of business before the plague broke out in the city; and on June 22, 1423, it was decided to adjourn to Siena. The synod ended without any important results for the Church.

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 375–392; Mansi, *Concilia*, xxviii. 1081 sqq., 1057 sqq.

PAVILLON, NICOLAS: French Roman Catholic bishop; b. at Paris Nov. 17, 1597; d. at Alet (6 m. s.e. of Limoux) Dec. 8, 1677. He studied the classics at the Collège de Navarre and theology at the Sorbonne. Vincent de Paul ordained him deacon and entrusted him with the spiritual and material care of the prisoners at Paris. He earnestly studied the writings of Francis of Sales and felt a special call to teach the common people. In 1627 he was ordained priest before a great assemblage of the poor. He was charged with conducting the Assemblées de Charité at St. Lazare, where clergymen met every Saturday to deal with matters concerning the relief of the poor. Annually he preached to the deacons in their devotional retreats and to a select audience of men and women of rank in the church of Ste. Croix de la Bretonnerie, Paris. Upon recommendation by Vincent, Richelieu appointed him bishop of Alet and the pope confirmed the appointment in 1639. Pavillon arrived in November, and by his efforts reformed the diocese which had been in complete decay. He visited every parish; encouraged, by his example, the curates to preach; founded a seminary in his own house, and of all applicants he required the experience of three years of teaching as preparation; established schools for boys and girls and a congregation of sisters of mercy; and protected the common people from the exactions of the nobility. When Louis XIV. sent a circular to all the bishops asking them to condemn the well-known Five Articles of Jansen (see JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM) Pavillon with three other bishops refused to sign the sentence, persisting in their attitude even after the brief of Alexander III., Feb. 15, 1665; the four bishops were placed under the ban. Finally in 1668, by reason of respect and discipline, Pavillon allowed the clergymen of his diocese to reject the five articles if they chose to do so. Pavillon was no less firm in his resistance to the *Regale* (q.v.). Exhausted by overwork he passed away, lamented by all the poor and afflicted, to whom he had been a friend and comforter.

G. BONET-MAURY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Vie de M. Pavillon*, Saint Mihièl, 1739; *Life of M. Pavillon, Preface by the . . . Bishop of Lich-*

feld, London, 1883; C. Lancelot, *Voyage à Alet*, Paris, 1723, Eng. transl., *Narrative of a Tour . . . to . . . Alet*, 2 vols., London, 1816; H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte von Port-Royal*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1839–41; Mary A. Schimmelpenninck, *Select Memoirs of Port Royal*, 3 vols., London, 1858; C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal*, Paris, 1867.

PAYNE, CHARLES HENRY: Methodist Episcopal; b. at Taunton, Mass., Oct. 24, 1830; d. at Clifton Springs, N. Y., May 5, 1899. He was graduated from Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 1856; studied theology in the Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H. (now the Boston School of Theology); was pastor from 1857 until 1876, when he became president of Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O. He was a member of the committee to revise the hymn-book of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in 1876; and was the author of *Methodism, its History and Results* (New York, 1881), *Women, and their Work in Methodism* (1881), and *Guides in Character Building* (1883).

PAYNE, DANIEL ALEXANDER: African Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. in Charleston, N. C., Feb. 24, 1811; d. in Baltimore Dec. 2, 1893. He studied theology at the Lutheran theological seminary at Gettysburg, 1835–38; entered the ministry of the Lutherans in 1838, but joined the itinerancy of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1843; in 1848 he was chosen historiographer for his denomination, and in 1852 was elected bishop; he was also president of Wilberforce University, Ohio, 1865–76. Among his publications the most important were *History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (3 vols., Baltimore, 1865); and *Domestic Education* (Cincinnati, 1886).

PAYNE, PETER: Wycliffite; b. at Hough-on-the-Hill (15 m. s.s.w. of Lincoln) c. 1380; d. at Prague, Bohemia, 1455. He was educated at Oxford, imbibed Wycliffite opinions and never swerved from them. He became M.A. c. 1406, principal of St. Edmund Hall, 1410, and also of the adjoining White Hall. These positions he gave up in 1414. Shortly afterward he left the country and, being defamed for heresy, never came back. He found a welcome among the Hussites and was till his death one of their leaders. He belonged to the extreme orthodox party, the Orphans, and was one of the most unyielding of them. He never completely mastered the Bohemian language, yet was trusted by the Orphans and thrust forward as their representative and defender on all occasions. In this way his name appears frequently in Hussite history both as private and public advocate of their views and always coupled with respect. He manfully shared the adverse fortunes of his party. In 1437 he was cited by the pope for heresy and in consequence compelled to leave Prague. In 1439 he was imprisoned in the castle of Gutenstein, not far from Mies (15 m. w. of Pilsen), Austria, and was ransomed by the payment of 12,000 groschen. He was in the town of Tabor when it was taken by King George Podiebrad (1452) and thus the party was destroyed, and as he was unwilling himself to yield, he probably died in prison. He seems to have played a large and honorable part in his day, but owing to the fact that no works of his have been preserved, or are now accessible, his reputation has suffered an eclipse.

Bibliography: For Payne's career in England the one source is T. Gascoigne's *Dictionarium theologicum* (MS. in Lincoln College Library, Oxford), extracts from it printed by J. E. T. Rogers as *Loci e libro veritatum*, Oxford, 1881. For his career in Bohemia the principal authorities are collected in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium sæculi XV.*, vols. i.–iii., Vienna, 1857–94. Other scattering notices are indicated at the end of the detailed sketch in *DNB*, xliv. 114–118. A not well balanced monograph, J. Baker's *A Forgotten Great Englishman*, London, 1894, is based largely upon F. Palacky's *Geschichte von Böhmen*, books vii.–ix., 5 vols., Prague, 1836–67. Interesting matter is found in Creighton, *Papacy*, ii. 237–255, 312. Consult further the literature under Basel, Council of; and Huss, John, Hussites.

PAYNE SMITH, ROBERT: Orientalist and theologian; b. at Chipping Campden (27 m. n.n.e. of Gloucester) Nov. 7, 1819; d. at Canterbury Mar. 31, 1895. He was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford (B.A., 1841; M.A., 1843; Boden Sanscrit scholar, 1840; Pusey and Ellerton scholar, 1843); was ordained deacon (1843) and priest (1844); and became successively head-master of the Kensington proprietary school (1853), sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (1857), canon of Christ Church, Oxford, regius professor of divinity, and rector of Ewelme (1865), and dean of Canterbury (1870). He was Bampton lecturer in 1869, and an Old-Testament reviser (1870–84). He edited *S. Cyrilli commentarii in Lucæ evangelium quæ supersunt Syriace* (Oxford, 1859); and published the English translation, *A Commentary upon the Gospel according to St. Luke* (1859). He also published an Eng. transl., *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus*, as edited in Syriac by William Cureton (1860). Other works are *The Authenticity and Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah* (1862); *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ* (1869); and a commentary on Jeremiah in the "Speaker's Commentary" (London, 1875), the exposition of the books on Samuel in the *Pulpit Commentary* (1883, 1888), and on Genesis in *An Old Testament Commentary* by C. J. Elliott (London, 1885); and the posthumous *Sermons on the Pentateuch*, with *Memoir* (1896). His chief work on which he spent the last thirty-six years of his life, the *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford, 1868–1901), a Syriac dictionary, was exhaustive and epoch-making. Before his death all but the last of the ten fasciculi had appeared, and this was issued by his daughter.

Bibliography: Besides the Memoir in the *Sermons*, ut sup., consult *DNB*, xliv. 125–127.

PAYSON, EDWARD: b. at Rindge, N. H., July 25, 1783; d. at Portland, Me., Oct. 22, 1827. He was educated at Harvard, studied divinity with his father, Dr. Seth Payson, and was pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Portland from 1807 until his death. He was a man of exalted piety and not without marked intellectual and spiritual gifts, which gave him a high place in church circles of New England. His biography and published sermons are widely read at home and abroad. His *Complete Works* (Sermons) appeared in 6 vols., Portland, 1852, with *Memoir* by Asa Cummings (independently published, 1829), and also in 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1853.

PÁZMÁNY, PETER: Hungarian Roman Catholic prelate; b. at Grosswardein (Hungarian, Nagyvárad, 137 m. e.s.e. of Budapest) Oct. 4, 1570; d. at Pressburg Mar. 19, 1637. His parents, noble landlords of the Reformed creed, sent the moderately talented son to the school of Jesuits at Kolosvár, who during four years of instruction converted him and sent him for higher studies to Rome. In 1597 he became professor of philosophy and theology at the University of Gratz. Singled out for a missionary by his superior he soon returned to his fatherland, where the archbishop of Esztergom, Francis Forgacs, took him under his patronage, because the young missionary in three weeks converted the archbishop's brother. The first Hungarian war for religious freedom (1604–06) fought under Bocskay ended with victory. The public mind in the diet of the kingdom (1608) urged the banishment of the Jesuits who excited the war. Pázmány boldly defended them by voice and pen, thus advancing the cause of the Roman Catholics. Only the right of possessing landed property was prohibited to the Jesuits, but in a more favorable epoch this law was frustrated by duplicity.

Literary activity, printing, and books had been mostly in the hands of Protestants. Pázmány gave a new impulse to the Roman Catholic cause by his books written in a powerful style. After 1603 he made a vigorous attack upon both the persons and tenets of Luther and Calvin by means of two pamphlets followed by two polemics: " The worship of Saints " and " Calvin's Credo." Upon Peter Alvinczy, Reformed preacher at Kaschau, he turned with his " Five Handsome Letters " (Pozsony, 1609). His most powerful book, which called forth many attempts at refutation, was the " Guide to Divine Truth " (Pozsony, 1613), the first apology for Roman Catholicism in Hungary, given in animated and picturesque form, which compelled the Protestants to defend their views. In the following three years sixteen publications appeared on both sides. Passion and hatred reached their climax during the period of the first centennial jubilee of the Reformation. Alvinczi issued his " Mirror " (1614) and *Itinerarium Catholicum* (Debreczin, 1616), showing that the new doctrine was based on the Bible. Pázmány's answer, " The Calvinist Mirror," was full of biting scorn. The Lutheran pastor of Zsepreg, E. Zvonarics, translated M. Hafenreffer's *Vom den biblischen Glauben* (1614) as a defense against Pázmány. The second edition of the " Guide " stirred up agitation anew among the Protestants. The widow of the Palatine George Thurzó sent the " Guide " in a Latin version to Wittenberg University, asking the professors to refute it; the demand was met by Balduinus in his *Phosphorus verus Catholicismi* (Wittenberg, 1626) in which he refuted the Jesuitic sophisms. Pázmány's last book, " Sermons " (Pozsony, 1636), exhibits in 105 sermons his oratorical power. His " Prayer Book " (1606; 17th ed., 1869) proved exceedingly popular. He was the author of thirty-seven works, of which twenty-two enrich Hungarian learning and earned for him the epithet " the Hungarian Cicero " as well as " the terrible scourge of Protestantism." He was the founder of Roman Catholic scientific literature in Hungary.

After Forgács' death Matthias, king and emperor, satisfying the ardent wish of the Roman Catholic party, raised (1616) Pázmány to the archbishopric and primacy. Here begins his career as politician. His chief aim was to strengthen the power of the Hapsburg dynasty and by this way to lead Roman Catholicism to victory and to destroy Protestantism. Being according to the state constitution, after the king, the second in rank, he filled the Protestant party with fear. The king having no direct descendant, the Jesuits decided to raise to the throne Ferdinand, duke of Styria, a pupil of the Jesuits, who had extirpated Protestantism in his domain. Pázmány, upheld by about fifty aristocratic families, most of whom he had won to Roman Catholicism, secured, after heated debate in the diet, the king's election. The Protestant party required the oath from the king that he secure them the free use of their churches against the patriarchal right of the Roman Catholic landlords who usually drove away the Protestants from their estates. Pázmány's sentiment was revealed by his declaration, " that they might rather leave his country desolate than take the churches for themselves against the rights of his rural patron." Through the influence of Pázmány, the Roman Catholic party omitted from the text the important phrase *una cum templis*. The highest state-offices went into the hands of Roman Catholics, who thus had the balance of power.

The war of thirty years broke out in Bohemia; Gabriel Bethlen, the Hungarian Reformed prince of Transylvania, seized this favorable opportunity to save his brethren in the faith and in 1619 invaded the territory of Ferdinand so successfully that Pázmány had to flee to Vienna, while the king was forsaken by his subjects in Hungary. The Bohemians having been suppressed, Bethlen and Ferdinand made peace (1622). Transylvania obtained seven counties, and religious freedom was guaranteed as in the time of Bocskay. The throne of the Hapsburgs was saved, and Pázmány, regaining his dignities, maintained his supremacy and continued his policy. Count Nicolaus Eszterházy, styled " the second Pázmány," was chosen palatine 1625, while Pope Urban VIII. congratulated the Roman Catholic dignitaries upon the acclamation of Ferdinand III. as king, and the king of Spain rewarded Pázmány with a pension of 3,000 ducats. After the death of Bethlen in 1629, Pázmány obtained a freer hand. The prince's widow, Catherine of Brandenburg, embraced the Roman Catholic faith, although by doing so she lost the throne. In 1629 Pázmány was made cardinal. Gustavus Adolphus put in hazard the results of the Hapsburg policy. Ferdinand II. sent Pázmány as his ambassador to Rome (1632) where he presented a proposition in the name of the king to unite the Roman Catholic powers of Europe for the extirpation of heretics and Turks, the territory to be divided among these powers. But the papal policy was rather in favor of the French interests.

The Roman Catholic Church had almost perished when Pázmány appeared. A third part of Hungary lay under Turkish domination; bishoprics, abbeys, monasteries, and parsonages had disappeared. The archbishop's residence belonged to the Turks, and he resided at Tyrnau (Nagy Szombat). Many places were without priests, only licentiates officiating. The eastern part of the kingdom (Transylvania) flourished under Calvinistic princes (Bocskay, Bethlen, Ràkocy), where no Roman Catholic bishops existed. Pázmány secured educated priests and founded (1623) a new seminary at Vienna, which still exists under the name of Pazmaneum. He gave 100,000 gulden ($48,500) to that institution and placed it under the guidance of Jesuits. Students of distinction were sent to Rome to the Germanico-Hungaricum Collegium, over which he was appointed protector. He revived the school at Tyrnau (1626) where the number of students increased to 1,000; and for poor boys of noble extraction he erected the Convictus nobilium. He enlarged it to a seminary under professors of the Jesuit order (1630), and finally elevated it by his endowment of 100,000 gulden to the rank of a university, sanctioned by the king and the pope and opened by himself Nov. 13, 1635, with the greatest pomp, assisted by the first rector, the Jesuit Dobronoky. This was the nucleus of the present great university of Budapest. The citizens of Pozsony, mostly Protestants, protested in vain. Pázmány, under royal authority, established there (1626) a Roman Catholic school, giving toward it 50,000 florins of his revenue and endowing it with his library and a printing-press. Into this school he introduced the Jesuits, and one of the four Lutheran preachers, because of his speech defending the free city's rights, suffered banishment. In similar fashion he treated the towns of Sopron and Szatmár, while bishops and other dignitaries followed the leadership of their spiritual head. Count Eszterházy expelled from his dominions Protestant pastors, and others did the same. Pázmány held a synod at Tyrnau (1630) which adopted the *Missale Romanum* and *Breviarium*. With the aid of his intimate friend Lamormain, confessor to the king, he secured the royal decree permitting priests to use their fortunes for ecclesiastical purposes. This was the forerunner of the German "Restitution-Edict." Pázmány was determined upon regaining the former welfare, riches, and splendor; to this he sacrificed the interests of his country and constitutional liberty. He bitterly hated the Protestant princes, and remained a Jesuit to the last. That Europe lost in Hungary a Protestant nation is the work of Pázmány.

FRANCIS BALOGH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An edition of Pázmány's works was begun by the University of Budapest, the Hungarian series, 1894, and the Latin series the same year; six volumes have appeared. The most complete biography is by W. Fraknói, 3 vols., Pesth, 1868–72. Others are by J. Podhraczky, Budapest, 1836; and I. Kankoffer, Vienna, 1856. A sketch of his life appears also in the "Works," *Series Latina*, vol. i. Consult also Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 211.

PEABODY, ANDREW PRESTON: Unitarian; b. at Beverly, Mass., Mar. 19, 1811; d. at Boston Mar. 10, 1893. He was graduated from Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., 1826, and from Harvard Divinity School, 1832; was pastor at Portsmouth, N. H., 1833–60; and professor of Christian morals, and preacher to Harvard University, 1860–81. He edited *The North-American Review*, 1852–61; wrote *Lecture on Christian Doctrine* (Boston, 1844, 3d ed., 1857); *Christian Consolations* (1846, 6th ed., 1872); *Conversation, its Faults and Graces* (1856, 3d ed., 1882); *Christianity the Religion of Nature* (Lowell Lectures, 1864); *Sermons for Children* (1866); *Reminiscences of European Travel* (New York, 1868); *Manual of Moral Philosophy* (1873); *Christianity and Science* (Union Seminary Lectures, 1874, new ed., 1890); *Christian Belief and Life* (Boston, 1875); *Baccalaureate Sermons* (1885); *Moral Philosophy:* Lectures (1887); *Harvard Reminiscences* (1888); *Harvard Graduates whom I have known* (1890); and King's *Chapel Sermons* (1891); and made translations of Cicero's *De officiis* (1883), *De senectute* (1884), *De Amicitia* and "Scipio's Dream" (1884), "Tusculan Disputations" (1886); and "Plutarch on the Delay of the Divine Justice" (1885).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. De Normandie, *Andrew Preston Peabody: Memorial Sermon*, Boston, 1893.

PEABODY, FRANCIS GREENWOOD: Unitarian; b. at Boston Dec. 4, 1847. He was educated at Harvard College (A.B., 1869) and Harvard Divinity School (1872). From 1874 to 1880 he was minister of the First Parish Church, Cambridge, Mass., and in 1880 was appointed Parkman professor of theology in Harvard Divinity School. Since 1886 he has been Plummer professor of Christian morals in Harvard University. He has written *Mornings in the College Chapel: Short Addresses to Young Men on Personal Religion* (Boston, 1896; 2d series, 1907); *Afternoons in the College Chapel: Addresses to Young Men on Personal Religion* (1898); *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (New York, 1900); *The Religion of an Educated Man* (1903); *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character* (Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale; 1905); and *The Approach to the Social Question* (1909).

PEACE OF GOD. See TRUCE OF GOD.

PEACE MOVEMENTS.

History to the Seventeenth Century (§ 1).
William Penn; the Eighteenth Century (§ 2).
The First Peace Societies (§ 3).
The First Period, till 1867 (§ 4).
Recent Period, from 1867 (§ 5).
Peace Congresses (§ 6).
Interparliamentary Union (§ 7).
Arbitration (§ 8).
First Hague Conference, 1899 (§ 9).
Second Hague Conference, 1907 (§ 10).
Recent Events (§ 11).

1. History to the Seventeenth Century.

The international peace movement had its origin in the intellect, conscience, and heart which had been developed by Christianity. The preaching for centuries of the great group of truths lying at the very heart of Christianity—the fatherhood of God, the essential oneness and brotherhood of mankind, love, goodwill, forgiveness of injuries, disinterested service of others, self-sacrifice, patience, and the like—however imperfectly these were put into practise, finally had such an effect on the mind and heart and upon the hereditary character of society that men began to ask whether there were not some way of getting rid of the savageries and brutalities which had so evidently nothing in common with the spirit and the virtues insisted on and blessed by the founder of Christianity, and so faithfully observed by the early Christians in general for more than a hundred years. Private war was first to begin to go; it has finally disappeared (see WAGER OF BATTLE, DUEL). The duel is no longer resorted to in most of the civilized countries. No sooner had the seventeenth century opened than public war began to be arraigned by a few advanced Christian thinkers as unworthy of Christian princes and of peoples who claimed to live under the control of Christian principles. Indeed, this arraignment had already been made by Erasmus a hundred years before and still earlier by Wyclif. The "Great Design" of Henry IV. was worked out with a view of bringing about a federation of Christian Europe to prevent so much quarreling and fighting. Though defective in being directed against the house of Hapsburg and against Islam, and in basing its reliance chiefly on force in the form of a large international army, it nevertheless was valuable in introducing into practical political thought the idea of federation as a remedy for the untold ills and lawlessness of a régime of brute force. Émeric Crucé, in his *Nouveau Cynée* (1623; Eng. transl., *The New Cyneas of Émeric Crucé*, Philadelphia, 1909), followed closely the underlying thought of the "Design" of Henry IV., but was more radical in his condemnation of war as irrational and incompatible with the Christian professions of Europe. His scheme for doing away with war proposed the establishment of an international arbitration tribunal at Venice (the first ever suggested) for the settlement of disputes. Hugo Grotius made his great plea, in his *De jure belli ac pacis* (Paris, 1625), for the amelioration of war and for the application of arbitration in the adjustment of controversies between states on the basis of the ideals which Christian teaching had so long emphasized. In the middle of the same century George Fox (q.v.) demanded in the name of the Christian profession that all war should cease throughout Christendom, and that the very spirit of war should disappear from the souls of men.

2. William Penn; the Eighteenth Century.

These interpretations of the Christian spirit and teaching were carried still further by William Penn (q.v.) toward the end of the seventeenth century. He carried the doctrine of peace, which lay enfolded in the Gospel, to its logical limit. He felt that governments, if they were to deserve the right to be called Christian in any real sense, should in their organization and policies recognize and definitely follow the principle of peace. His attempt to carry out his conclusion in practise, in the founding and management of the colony of Pennsylvania on peace lines, is one of the most instructive episodes in the whole history of civilization. The Christian ideal of the proper attitude and relation of the nations to each other reached its final and complete expression in his "holy experiment," which, after two generations of extraordinary success, at last broke down, though only because men were "faithless and unbelieving."

The eighteenth century did little, until the time of Kant, in the way of peace work, except to repeat and emphasize the ideals which the previous century had produced. The Abbé de St. Pierre, in his plan for perpetual peace, followed closely the thought of Penn's *Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (1693–94, reissued, Boston, 1891). At the end of the eighteenth century Kant gave to the world in *Zum ewigen Frieden* (Königsberg, 1795) his famous conception of a world state, through which the perpetual peace of the world was to be secured. At the opening of the nineteenth century the peace movement entered upon its practical stage. The idealism of peace, which had of necessity to precede any practical work, had reached its culmination in expression. The hour had struck for an organized effort to secure, if possible, the realization of the great dreams of the two preceding centuries, which had so far not affected perceptibly, in a practical way, the relations of the nations. War was as universal as ever as the only practicable way of settling serious disputes between states. With Napoleon running his ruthless course, it looked as if war were destined to be eternal. Arbitration between independent and sovereign nations was virtually unknown. The so-called settlements by arbitration preceding that time had usually been between different branches of a family or a dynasty, or between vassal states, with the suzerain lord acting as arbitrator.

3. The First Peace Societies.

In 1815, when Napoleon's career came to an end, the first peace societies were organized. For half a dozen years previously the subject of organized peace work had been under consideration both in the United States and England. David Low Dodge, a New York Presbyterian merchant, wrote *The Mediator's Kingdom not of this World* (New York, 1809), the first pamphlet on this subject except the various manifestoes of the Society of Friends. In 1812 he published a still more important work, *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ*. On Christmas Day, 1814, Noah Worcester, the distinguished lexicographer, issued his famous *Solemn Review of the Custom of War*, which aroused the Christian conscience in both the United States and England. The next year in August, in his parlor in New York, Dodge founded the first peace society. The Ohio Peace Society followed. The day after Christmas of that year, 1815, Worcester, with the support of William Ellery Channing (q.v.) and a few others, organized in Channing's study in Boston the Massachusetts Peace Society, which at once took the lead in peace work in the United States. Dr. Worcester immediately commenced the publication of *The Friend of Peace*, a journal which continued for twelve years. Thus the peace movement was fairly launched by men who were all distinctively Christian. In Great Britain a similar movement ran parallel to the American, beginning about the same time under the leadership of William Allen, a prominent member of the Society of Friends. The Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace (now called simply the Peace Society) was organized in 1816 by Allen and a few associates, and soon began the publication of *The Herald of Peace*. It has continued its labors and the publication of its journal ever since and is still one of the most active and influential of the peace organizations. In 1828 the American Peace Society, on the initiative of William Ladd, the American "apostle of peace," was organised in New York as a national society, to unify the work which the single societies had undertaken and to save the movement from failure because of the difficulty of keeping the local associations alive and active. The society has continued its activities ever since. It has a dozen branch and auxiliary societies in different parts of the nation, distributes widely its pamphlet literature and its monthly journal, *The Advocate of Peace*, and in all possible ways continues its propaganda. Several of the local societies, as for example those of New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, continued their work for a number of years, but finally were all either merged into the national society or ceased to exist. In recent years new local societies have been organized in New York, Philadelphia, and other cities.

4. The First Period, till 1867.

During its first period, which lasted for about forty years, the peace movement exhibited great vitality and vigor. The reaction of sentiment against the direful scourge of war was strong and wide-spread. Peace organizations were effected all up and down the Atlantic Coast, in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and to a less extent toward the interior of the country. Many of the foremost men of the first half of the century associated themselves with the movement, or gave it their hearty support. The same was true in Great Britain, where branches of the Peace Society were formed in different parts of the United Kingdom, and prominent men, both in and out of Parliament, made the movement felt far and wide in British thought. In the way of literature this first period produced much that was of fundamental and durable value. In addition to the peace papers —*The Friend of Peace*, *The Herald of Peace*, *The Advocate of Peace*—and many able addresses and pamphlets which were printed and widely circulated, this period bequeathed Dodge's treatise referred to above, N. Worcester's *Solemn Review of the Custom of War* (Boston, 1814), J. Dymond's *Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with . . . Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1834), W. E. Channing's *Discourses*, Emerson's Essay, Charles Sumner's *The True Grandeur of Nations* (1845) and *The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations* (1849), W. Ladd's *Essay on the Congress and Court of Nations* (Boston, 1840), William Jay's *War and Peace* (New York, 1848), Cobden's and Brights' speeches and tractates, H. T. J. Macnamara's *Peace, Permanent and Universal* (London, 1841), T. Clarkson's *Essay on Doctrines and Practices of the Early Christians as they Relate to War* (London, 1832), poems of Whittier and Longfellow, etc. Nearly all of this literature still has great influence in the support of the peace propaganda. This first period closed with the series of peace congresses held in Europe from 1843 to 1851, at London, Frankfort, Paris, and Brussels. From this time for nearly twenty years the peace movement simply marked time. The war spirit, after nearly forty years of general peace, flamed forth anew. The Crimean War came on in 1854; the Italian-Austrian War in 1859; the American Civil War in 1861; the Prussian-Danish War in 1864; the Prussian-Austrian War in 1866; the Franco-Prussian War in 1870; and the Russo-Turkish War in 1878. It was a period of intense passions, of fierce gigantic struggles, of incalculable slaughter and destruction; and the spirit of peace had to wait till the storm of war had passed before it could do constructive work. The leading peace societies maintained their organizations, pubilshed their papers and issued their manifestoes, but the spirit of the times made their work difficult and for the most part ineffective.

5. Recent Period, from 1867.

Before this war period closed, however, the peace movement began anew. About 1867, under the inspiration and leadership of Hodgson Pratt of England, the movement began to take hold of continental Europe in a systematic way. Up to this time peace work had been nearly entirely confined to the United States and Great Britain. The horrors and economic waste attending and following the great wars above referred to had again aroused the intelligence and conscience of men to try to make the recurrence of such a period impossible. Following the establishment of the International Arbitration and Peace Association in London by Pratt and his friends, and the Workingmen's Arbitration League (since known as the International Arbitration League) by William Randal Cremer, came the organization of societies in France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, and elsewhere. In the United States at the beginning of this period the Universal Peace Union was founded in Philadelphia by Alfred Henry Love and his friends. Later came the German and Austrian societies and their branches. The organization of societies has steadily spread until to-day there are more than one hundred general societies with no less than four hundred branches, or in all about five hundred associations devoting themselves in the different countries to the realization of permanent international peace. Scarcely a year passes that some society, general or branch, is not organized. The latest of the important organizations are the Peace Society of Japan at Tokyo, with about two hundred and fifty members, composed of prominent missionaries and eminent Japanese citizens, and the Universal Peace Association of South America at Buenos Ayres, founded by the distinguished Señora de Costa, whose labor in securing the erection of the great peace monument, the "Christ of the Andes," has made her famous throughout the world. The Nobel Institute at Christiania, Norway, established in the years 1897–1900, in connection with the Nobel Peace Prize Foundation, with its splendid building, its large and growing library, and its able administrative committee, is one of the most remarkable outgrowths of the peace movement, and is fast becoming one of the most conspicuous and influential of all the centers of peace propaganda.

The year 1889 constituted an important epoch in the history of the peace cause. Then the organization of the movement began to take on a wider scope and greater completeness, and at Paris the first of the series of modern peace congresses was held. This was followed by congresses at London, Rome, Berne, Chicago, Antwerp, Budapest, Hamburg, Paris, Glasgow, Monaco, Rouen, Boston, Lucerne, Milan, Munich, and again at London in 1908. These congresses have grown in size and influence from year to year till they are now recognized as important annual international events, and are welcomed and supported by both municipal and national authorities. Scarcely less noteworthy are the national peace congresses, growing out of the international, which have been held in France, Great Britain, Italy, Scandinavia, Germany, and the United States 1903–09. Along with these international and national peace congresses have been organized certain important special conferences like the two national arbitration conferences held at Washington in 1896 and 1904, and the annual Lake Mohonk Conference on international arbitration organized by Albert Keith Smiley in 1895, which has grown to be one of the great agencies for promoting the pacific settlement of controversies between nations. In connection with the peace congresses a general International Peace Bureau was organized in 1891 with headquarters at Berne, Switzerland, to serve as a means of communication between the peace societies in the different nations and as an agency for executing the resolutions adopted by the congresses. This bureau, supported by the voluntary contributions of individuals and peace societies, and by subventions from several of the smaller powers of Europe, has steadily grown in efficiency and influence, and has made of the peace congresses and societies a coherent and powerful international organization, the ideals and wishes of which are making themselves more and more felt upon the governments of the world.

6. Peace Congresses.

In 1889 the Interparliamentary Union was organized at Paris for the promotion of interest in arbitration and peace among statesmen. The year before, a few members of the British House of Commons and the French Chamber of Deputies had met at Paris to discuss the question of an Anglo-French arbitration treaty. The meeting awakened so much interest that it was decided to call a meeting the next year in the general interests of arbitration, and to invite to it members of other parliaments. With its membership of 2,500, its organized groups in nearly all of the parliaments of the world, holding its conferences in the capitals and other leading cities of the nations, outlining programs for the Hague conferences, welcomed by rulers and cabinets of the mightiest nations, like England, Germany, and the United States, the Interparliamentary Union is in important respects the greatest existing agency of an unofficial kind for promoting good understanding, unity, and harmony among the nations. It has brought the ideals of the friends of international peace into immediate touch with the legislative and the executive branches of the different governments. It speaks with a certain authority not possessed by the more popular branch of the peace movement, as its members are men counted worthy to be entrusted with the highest legislative functions in their different nations. It was in part the influence of this union, through its conference at Budapest in 1896, to which an official Russian messenger was sent, that induced the emperor of Russia to issue the call for the first Hague conference. The groups of the union form in each of the parliaments a strong bulwark against war legislation, and at the same time a medium for the proper study and understanding of all important international controversies that may arise.

7. Interparliamentary Union.

During the century within which this great movement of public opinion has grown up and organized itself in the various ways above outlined, the practical application of the principle of arbitration to the settlement of international controversies has been no less remarkable. Beginning in a small and tentative way with the three settlements provided for under the Jay treaty of 1794, the arbitration of disputes has grown in frequency until to-day it is the settled practise of the nations. It has developed rapidly during the past twenty years. Whereas during the first half of the nineteenth century only about thirty cases of arbitration occurred, during the last decade of the century more than sixty were recorded, and about the same number have taken place since this century opened. It is not easy to overestimate the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of international affairs which has led to the settlement of not less than six cases of dispute every year for the last twenty years. The total number of important cases of arbitration within the century has risen to about 260, and there have been almost as many more settlements of a minor character. These arbitrations have dealt with nearly every possible kind of controversy, from questions of money claims up to serious and delicate boundary differences, and controversies like the Alabama dispute which involved both vital interests and national honor. In every one of these arbitrations the award, though in a few instances severely criticized, has been loyally accepted and faithfully carried out by the defeated party. Instead of leaving behind ill-will and the seeds of subsequent misunderstandings, they have brought the participating nations into closer friendship and greater mutual respect and confidence. They have contributed to the creation of the general new and better attitude which is to-day more and more prevailing among the peoples of the earth. Arbitration has won its case at the bar of international public opinion, and may henceforth be considered a settled part of the public international law of the world.

8. Arbitration.

The two Hague conferences and what they have accomplished, or put in the way of accomplishment, are the fullest expression, on the political side, of the magnitude to which the peace movement has attained. When the czar of Russia issued his famous rescript Aug. 24, 1898, suggesting the holding of an international conference to deal with

9. First Hague Conference, 1899.

the subject of armaments and their growing burdens, there was great skepticism and pessimism as to the prospect of any good coming of his proposals. Even his second rescript, sent out in the following January, did not remove this feeling. Largely out of courtesy to the czar, as the head of a great and powerful nation, the governments of the twenty-six powers which had been invited to send delegates to a conference one by one accepted the invitation. On May 18, 1899, the delegates of these governments, about 100 in number, met at The Hague. There was a general feeling among them when they arrived, that little would come except the decent burial of the czar's proposals. This feeling, however, did not continue long. From all parts of Western Europe and the United States, especially those sections where the peace movement had developed most, telegrams, cablegrams, memorials, and private letters urging upon the conference the necessity of doing something to establish a substitute for war in dealing with international differences began to arrive at The Hague in immense volume. Several days were devoted by the delegations and by the president of the conference to the reception and consideration of these messages, which represented the wishes of great numbers of the most intelligent citizens of the different countries from which they came. The result was that the skepticism as to results disappeared, and the conference set itself diligently to work to accomplish the task which had been given it by the mandate of powerful pacific public opinion. After ten weeks of most patient and careful study, three conventions were signed and sent to the governments for their ratification. The most important of these was that for the pacific settlement of international controversies, under which provision was made for the establishment of a Permanent International Court of Arbitration. After two years this convention was ratified by a majority of the twenty-six powers (subsequently by all of them except Turkey and Montenegro) and the Court of Arbitration was declared to be duly established and ready for business. In spite of the skepticism which still prevailed in all the countries which participated in the conference, as to whether anything further would ever come of the Court of Arbitration, in due time the United States and Mexico called the tribunal into operation by an agreement to refer to it the long-standing dispute about the Pious Fund of the Californias. The speedy and inexpensive settlement of this dispute cleared away for the most part the skepticism which had prevailed, and in due time other disputes were referred to the court for adjustment. The settlement of these controversies called to the bar of the court nearly all of the great powers.

10. Second Hague Conference, 1907.

The large and unexpected success of the work of the First Hague Conference soon led to the feeling among the friends of peace that another should be held to continue and complete its work. This wish was voiced particularly by the Interparliamentary Union at its session at St. Louis in 1904. The result was that, on the initiative of the government of the United States, the second peace conference was assembled by the czar, and met at The Hague in June, 1907. This conference showed great advance over the first. Whereas only twenty-six powers had been represented in 1899, forty-four, or practically all of the important powers of the world, sent representatives. It was essentially a world assembly. For the first time in history all the nations of the earth, with the exception of two or three unimportant ones, had met in council to consider the important problems affecting their common interests, and to develop still further the foundations of universal and perpetual peace among them. The men who composed this conference had been selected from among the ablest ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, and jurists of their respective countries. In its results this conference went much beyond what had been accomplished by the first. The convention for the pacific settlement of controversies was revised, enlarged from sixty-two to ninety-seven articles, and much strengthened, and the nations which had not been represented at the first conference became parties to it. The Court of Arbitration has become a world court open to all of the powers on equal terms. Of the other conventions signed by the second Hague conference the more important from the point of view of the peace movement are: That forbidding the collection of contractual debts by force until arbitration has first been tried or refused; that prohibiting the bombardment from the sea of unfortified coast cities, towns, and ports; one making the international mail service immune from disturbance during war time; another neutralizing coast fishing fleets; another making the territory of neutrals inviolable; still another forbidding the throwing of projectiles and explosives from balloons. All these agreements are strictly peace pacts. They exclude war and its destructiveness from certain very important fields. The other conventions, which deal with the laws and customs of war on land and sea, as to the opening of hostilities, the laying of mines, the conversion of merchant into war vessels, the duties of neutrals, etc., are all of a nature to make the commencement of hostilities more difficult and to restrict their violence after they have begun. The international prize court, provided for by the conference, has been considered by some a very notable achievement. In case a war breaks out hereafter, this court, as one of final appeal, will take the passing of final judgment upon prizes captured out of the power of the captor and put it into the hands of a disinterested international tribunal. The interests of justice will thereby be served even in time of war, and whatever promotes impartial justice tends to the further discrediting of violence and the final suppression of war. The great accomplishments, however, of the conference of 1907 were outside of the formal conventions signed. The delegations voted without a dissenting voice for periodical meetings of the conference hereafter, determined the time of the next meeting, and recommended the creation of an international commission, two years in advance, to prepare the program. This means, essentially, the establishment of a regular advisory congress of the nations, to meet periodically. This is the greatest step yet taken toward the establishment of universal and permanent peace. They further voted unanimously for the establishment of a Permanent International High Court of Justice with judges always in service and holding regular sessions. They could not agree on the method of selecting the judges, but they recommended to the governments to take the matter up, and to find a way of doing this that would satisfy all the nations. The conference therefore virtually laid the foundation of a supreme court of the world in accordance with the great ideals of Ladd, Burritt, Sumner and Jay, of Cobden, Bright, Richard, and Victor Hugo. The problem of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration to be signed by all the powers, though the subject of one of the greatest debates in the conference, was not fully solved, but it was advanced a long way toward final solution. The same was the case with the question of the immunity of private property from capture at sea in time of war, or, in other words, the permanent neutralization of all unoffending private commerce. These important subjects will, without doubt, constitute the chief features of the program of the next Hague Conference. Thus through the Hague conferences the principles and the practical ideals which the peace workers have, for nearly a hundred years, advocated, have been in the main approved by the governments of the world, and their full realisation in no distant future assured.

II. Recent Events.

Since the close of the second Hague conference in October, 1907, the peace movement has shown in various ways signs of extraordinary life and energy. All the peace and arbitration societies have been carrying on their propaganda with increased earnestness and an enlarged faith in the speedy triumph of the cause. Beyond their limits among the people at large, the movement has called forth much greater interest and activity than ever before. This increased interest has manifested itself in important journals and magazines, in the great chambers of commerce and boards of trade, in associations of business men, and in clubs of every description. It has likewise shown itself in the churches and in the educational institutions, in the fuller observance of special peace days, in oratorical peace contests, and in the giving of prizes for essays on various phases of the peace problem. The year 1908 was marked by an unusual number of events indicative of the strength and momentum which the movement for world peace has attained. The negotiation of special treaties of arbitration between the governments in pairs, begun four years before the second Hague conference, went steadily on, in accordance with the wish expressed by the conference. More than eighty such treaties had in 1909 been concluded, under the provisions of which all questions of a judicial order and those arising in the interpretation of treaties are for a definite period to be referred to the Hague court. The earliest of this class of treaties, those concluded in 1903, are now being renewed for another similar period. In the spring of 1908 the British government, through the chancellor of the exchequer, established an international hospitality fund for the entertainment of foreign guests and deputations. This was the first time in history that a great power officially undertook the promotion of international friendship and good-will in a regular systematic way. The London Peace Congress of 1908 was received by the British government in a manner entirely unique. A deputation of twenty-four members of the congress, representing all the nations which had sent delegates, was received by the king and queen in Buckingham Palace in a very cordial and entirely sincere way. Two months later the Interparliamentary Union was received at Berlin, in the Reichstag building, by the German government with equal cordiality and generosity. The agreement between France and Germany in the autumn of 1908 to refer their Casa-Blanca difference to the Hague court was also a striking evidence of advance in the acceptance of the principles and ideals advocated by the pacifists. Up to that time no such agreement between these two powers had been possible.

But the greatest of all the European events, in its bearing on the strength of the peace movement, was the pacific revolution in Turkey, where one would have naturally supposed that no such pacific transformation could take place. But the Young Turk Party had become imbued with a sense of the moral value and the conquering power of the pacific methods and policies advocated by the friends of peace. These they employed in their efforts to transform the public opinion of the Turkish Empire, and in this way they were able to carry through their revolution and transform Turkey into a constitutional government, without the shedding of blood. The remission to China of a considerable portion of the Boxer indemnity, and the agreement between the United States and Japan setting forth the pacific intentions of the two governments in regard to the waters of the Pacific Ocean and the open door in the Far East, are likewise remarkable evidences of the new spirit and order which have begun to prevail within the family of nations.

Taking a comprehensive view of these various lines which the peace movement has followed in its evolution during the past century, keeping in mind the substantial accomplishments of the two Hague conferences, and noting the wide-spread interest in the cause at the present time, manifested both by the people and by the governments of the different countries, one is compelled to believe that the permanent peace of the world is no longer merely an ideal and a dream. The conclusion is unescapable that the world has already entered upon the practical realization of this ideal, and that the final culmination of it in the abolition of war and the complete organization of the world on a basis of good-will, friendly cooperation, and the peaceful arbitration of all controversies is to be expected in the near future. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. D. Mead, *The Literature of the Peace Movement*, Boston, 1910; *Prize Essay on a Congress of Nations*, ib., 1840; M. Jaehns, *Ueber Krieg, Frieden und Kultur*, Berlin, 1893; J. de Triac, *Guerre et christianisme*, Paris, 1896; B. F. Trueblood, *The Federation of the World*, Boston, 1899; G. F. W. Holls, *The Peace Conference at the*

Hague and its Bearings on International Law, New York, 1900; C. Sumner, *Addresses on War*, in his *Works*, Boston, 1900; Baroness von Suttner, *Die Haager Friedenskonferenz*, Dresden, 1900; idem, *Lay Down Your Arms*, New York, 1905; O. Kellerman, *War and Peace*, London, 1901; T. T. Martens, *La Paix et la guerre*, Paris, 1901; J. de Bloch, *The Future of War*, Boston, 1902; G. Ferrero, *Militarism*, London, 1902; J. Barr, *Christianity and War*, Glasgow, 1903; W. E. Channing, *Discourses on War*, republished Boston, 1903; E. Duplessix, *Vers la paix; droits et devoirs des nations*, Paris, 1903; W. E. Darby, *International Tribunals*, London, 1904; J. W. Foster, *Arbitration and the Hague Court*, Boston, 1904; C. Meurer, *Die Haager Friedenskonferenz*, Munich, 1904; H. Weissenborn, *Blessings of Universal Peace*, Jersey City, 1905; R. L. Bridgman, *World Organization*, Boston, 1906; F. W. Hirst, *Arbiter in Council; Papers on War, Peace, and Arbitration*, New York, 1906; L. A. Mead, *Patriotism and the New Internationalism*, Boston, 1906; W. Walsh, *The Moral Damage of War*, Boston, 1906; J. Addams, *Newer Ideals of Peace*, New York, 1907; H. Davis, *Among the World's Peace-Makers; Epitome of the Interparliamentary Union*, New York, 1907; V. H. Duras, *Universal Peace*, New York, 1908; W. I. Hull, *The Two Hague Conferences*, Boston, 1908; J. B. Scott, *Texts of the Peace Conferences at the Hague*, Boston, 1908; J. B. Moore, *International Arbitrations*, Washington (government publication); and the *Proceedings* and *Reports* of the various congresses, conferences and peace societies.

PEACOCKE, JOSEPH FERGUSON: Church of Ireland archbishop of Dublin, and primate of Ireland; b. in County Queens, Nov. 5, 1835. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1857) and was ordered deacon in 1858 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of St. Mary's, Kilkenny (1858–61); secretary of the Hibernian Church Missionary Society (1861–63); curate of Monkstown (1863–73); incumbent of St. George's, Dublin (1873–78); and rector of Monkstown (1878–1894). He was also prebendary of Dunlavin and canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, from 1875 to 1894, when he was appointed professor of pastoral theology in Trinity College, Dublin. He was select preacher at the University of Dublin in 1876–77, 1882–83, and 1888, and at the University of Cambridge in 1899. In 1894 he was consecrated bishop of Meath, and in 1897 was elevated to the archdiocese of Dublin. He is also bishop of Glendalough and of Kildare, and prebendary of Cualaun.

PEAKE, ARTHUR SAMUEL: English Primitive Methodist layman; b. at Leek (27 m. s.e. of Manchester), Staffordshire, Nov. 24, 1865. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford (B.A., 1887; M.A., 1890), and was fellow of Merton College, Oxford (1890–97). He was lecturer in Mansfield College, Oxford (1890–92), and since 1892 has been a tutor in the Primitive Methodist College, Manchester, lecturer in Lancastershire Independent College since 1895, and since 1904 he has also been professor of Biblical exegesis and dean of the theological faculty in the University of Manchester. In theology he holds to "liberal evangelism of the Pauline type, with special emphasis on Paul's doctrines of the solidarity of the race and the mystical union of the believer with Christ." In Old-Testament criticism he is Grafian, and in New-Testament criticism defends the validity of the critical method, but is not radical in his results. He "accepts the doctrines of the Trinity and the deity of Christ, and the redeeming quality of his death and the reality of his resurrection." He has edited the current literature section in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review* since 1892 and a volume of inaugural lectures by members of the theological faculty of Victoria University (Manchester, 1906), to which he contributed his own lecture on *The Present Movement of Biblical Science*, and has written *A Guide to Biblical Study* (London, 1897); *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament* (1904); *Reform in Sunday School Teaching* (1906); *Christianity: Its Nature and Truth* (1908, 6th ed., 1909); *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (1909); and *Heroes and Martyrs of Faith* (1910), and has prepared the volumes on *Hebrews* and *Job* for *The Century Bible* (Edinburgh, 1902, 1905) and *Colossians* for *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (London, 1903).

PEARSON, ELIPHALET: American theologian; b. at Byfield, Mass., June 11, 1752; d. at Greenland, N. H., Sept. 12, 1826. He was educated at Harvard and soon after graduation was called to teach a grammar-school at Andover, Mass., where in 1778 he was appointed principal of the newly founded Philips Academy. He held this position until 1786; then was professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages at Harvard, 1786–1806. In 1806 he resigned his professorship at Harvard, was ordained in the Congregational Church, and went to Andover. He was one of the founders of the Andover Theological Seminary, was professor of sacred literature 1808–09, and president of the board of trustees for nineteen years. He was founder of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, secretary of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was the most conspicuous man in forming the American Education Society. Pearson wrote comparatively little, his most important publication being *A Letter to the Candid* (Boston, 1831).

Bibliography: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 126–131, New York, 1859.

PEARSON, JOHN: Church of England bishop and scholar; b. at Great Snoring (23 m. n.w. of Norwich), Norfolk, Feb. 28, 1613; d. at Chester July 16, 1686. He was educated at Eton (1623–31) and at Cambridge (admitted at Queen's, June 10, 1631; elected scholar of King's, Apr., 1632; fellow 1634; B.A., 1635; M.A., 1639; D.D., 1660); and took orders in 1639. In 1640 he became prebendary of Salisbury and rector of Thorington in Suffolk. He was an outspoken royalist and in 1645 acted as chaplain to Lord Goring's forces at Exeter. After the king's cause was hopelessly lost he retired to London and remained there till the Restoration. From 1654 he preached weekly as lector, without remuneration, at St. Clement's, Eastcheap; and he wrote much in defense of the English Church against both Roman Catholics and Puritans. He supplied prefaces for various books, his reputation for scholarship making his commendation much sought for. Walton's Polyglot (see Bibles, Polyglot, IV.) was indebted to him for pecuniary aid, but he seems to have done no work upon it. After the Restoration he became rector of St. Christopher-le-Stocks, London, prebendary of Ely, archdeacon of Surrey, royal chaplain, and master of Jesus

College, Cambridge (1660). He was prominent in the Savoy Conference (q.v.), and the same year (1661) was chosen to superintend the translation of the prayer-book into Latin. In June, 1661, he became Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge and, in 1662, master of Trinity. He was consecrated bishop of Chester in 1673.

Pearson was probably the ablest scholar and systematic theologian of the English Church in the seventeenth century. The work which made his reputation (still a standard in English divinity) was *An Exposition of the Creed* (London, 1659), a development of sermons delivered at St. Clement's. It is a masterful attempt to expand the creed so as to embrace a summary of the arguments and authorities of the orthodox faith; marked by a judicious selection of proofs, scholastic treatment, vigorous definition, and exact deduction; and set forth in an accurate style. The best edition is that of T. Chevallier, revised by R. Sinker (Cambridge, 1899). There are abridgments by Basil Kennett, Charles Burney, and C. Bradley, and an analysis by W. H. Mill (London, 1837, and often). Pearson's great work in the field of historical criticism was the *Vindiciæ epistolarum S. Ignatii* (Cambridge, 1672; ed. E. Churton for the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1852), an answer to an attack by Jean Daillé (Geneva, 1666) on the authenticity of the letters attributed to Ignatius of Antioch, which Pearson was led to defend by scholarly interest and, still more, by his views concerning the age and origin of the episcopate. For two centuries the book was the chief writing in favor of the authenticity of the letters, and late investigations by J. B. Lightfoot and T. Zahn confirm Pearson's judgment. In his *Lectiones de Deo et attributis ejus* (professorial lectures, first printed in the complete edition of Pearson's *Minor Theological Works*, ed. E. Churton, 2 vols., Oxford, 1844), he attempted to provide a Protestant *Corpus theologiæ*, following the Thomistic method but aiming to correct the faults of the old scholasticism by more fundamental dependence on Scripture and critical examination of the ancient councils and authorities. His chronological writings, *Annales Cyprianici* (prefixed to Bishop Fell's edition of Cyprian, Oxford, 1682), *Annales Paulini* (in *Opera posthuma*, 3 parts, London, 1687–88; Eng. transl. by J. M. Williams, Cambridge, 1825, and by J. R. Crowfoot, Cambridge, 1851), and *Dissertationes de serie et successione primorum Romæ episcoporum* (in *Opera posthuma*) have still considerable value; likewise his *Determinationes theologicæ* (published by Churton, ut sup.), brief treatises on the origin of the episcopate and on Anglican orders, two Christological essays, and a discussion of baptism. His *Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum* (in *Opera posthuma;* Eng. transl. by Crowfoot with the *Annales Paulini*, ut sup.) and collaboration in the *Critici sacri* (a companion work to Walton's Polyglot, 9 vols., London, 1660), for which he wrote the preface and edited the last two volumes, are his important works in the exegetical field. Lastly, mention should be made of *Orationes vii in comitiis publicis academicis habitæ* and *Conciones ad clerum vi* (published by Churton, ut sup.) and of two English sermons, the *Excellency of Forms of Prayer*, preached just before the Westminster Assembly in 1643, boldly declaring his theological and political views, and *No Necessity of Reformation of the Public Doctrine of the Church of England* (London, 1660).

(C. Schöll†.)

Bibliography: The best sketch of Pearson's life is that by Churton prefixed to the *Minor Theological Works*, ut sup. Consult further: J. Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, pp. 2320–21, London, 1854; S. Cheetham, *John Pearson*, in A. Barry's *Masters in English Theology*, London, 1877; G. T. O. Bridgman, *Hist. of the Church and Manor of Wigan*, vol. xv. of the Publications of the Chetham Society, Manchester, 1888; *DNB*, xliv. 168–173 (contains a list of the minor works, and references to scattering sources).

PEARSON, WILLIAM LAZARUS: Friend; b. at Coonsboro, N. C., July 4, 1849. He was educated at Earlham College (A.B., 1875), after which he was principal of the high school at Fairmont, Ind. (1875–76) and of Southland College, Ark. (1876–77). He then entered Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1881, becoming a minister of the Society of Friends in the same year. He continued his theological studies at the universities of Berlin (1881–83) and Leipsic (1883–85; Ph.D., 1885), after which he was minister of the Friends' Church at Minneapolis, Minn. (1886–87). Since 1887 he has been connected with Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia., where he has been professor successively of modern languages (1887–91) and of Biblical literature, as well as principal of the Bible department (since 1891). He was the virtual founder of the Quinquennial Conference of American Friends, to which he was a delegate in 1892 and 1897, as well as to the American Friends' Peace Conference in 1901. He was European correspondent of *The Friends' Review*, 1882–84, and literary editor of *Western Work*, 1903–06. He has written *The Prophecy of Joel, its Unity, its Aim, and the Age of its Composition* (New York, 1885); *Notes on the Sacraments* (Oskaloosa, Ia., 1898); and *Studies in the Life of Christ* (1904).

PEASANTS' WAR, THE.

I. Virtual Serfdom of the Peasants.
II. Growth of the Movement.
  The Urban Lower Classes Join the Peasants (§ 1).
  Western Germany and the Heilbronn Plan (§ 2).
  In Thuringia and Saxony; Münzer (§ 3).
III. Luther and the Peasants' War.
IV. Open Hostilities and Repression.
V. Result of the Insurrection.

I. Virtual Serfdom of the Peasants: The Peasants' War was the armed rising of the peasants of central and southern Germany in the year 1525. It was the violent and awful final catastrophe of a social process starting from the social and legal system of the Middle Ages and continuing for centuries. The view that the greatest of all popular risings in German history was brought about by the Reformation is not supported by the facts. Long before the actual beginning of the religious movement, it had been firmly fixed in the peasant's mind that the original condition of their race had been one of universal personal freedom, which had been forcibly and unjustly replaced by serfdom or villeinage. The demands of the peasants were therefore not impelled by a false conception of the Evangelical liberty proclaimed by the Reformers, but by a deeply rooted consciousness of their rights. The oppressed peasants saw in the powerful superiors who had taken away their freedom, and in the law which they hated as foreign, no hope of improvement or of justice; but only if the Scriptures, which were read more eagerly after Luther had turned them into the vernacular, were accepted as the inspiration and counsel of reform.

The development of the feudal system and the weakening of the royal power had almost destroyed the old free peasantry. At the end of the fifteenth century the old communal rights, the symbols of freedom, were enjoyed nowhere but in the Tyrol and in Friesland. The peasants had been forced almost everywhere to surrender them as a consequence of the vicious legal relations which drove the poorer to seek protection by giving themselves over to powerful temporal or spiritual lords, and burdening their land by the obligations of all kinds of services and rents. The lines about the peasant were drawn closer and closer, until he was finally bound inseparably to the clod which he cultivated. If the peasant could not free himself by any payment from the obligations accepted by him or gradually imposed on him, he must stay where he was, because his lord had a right to his labor and the produce of his fields—this is what characterized his lot as that of serfdom. The pressure of the system, especially in those parts of Germany where petty lords held sway, had become almost unbearable. Besides the payments in money or kind, the most various compulsory services were exacted, which were often increased to an intolerable degree. If a peasant resisted, he rendered himself liable to a heavy penalty, exacted by his lord without pity or reason, unless there happened to be some concurrent governmental authority in the district. But in many cases the government and the land were in the same hands; and the whole legal system of Germany was in great disorder. The peasant had lost confidence in processes of law. The transition from the primitive system of barter to a monetary one had also done him more harm than good. If the peasant needed money, he had to pay the most exorbitant interest (thirty, forty, or more per cent.), while several features of the system, especially the encroaching monopolies of the commercial gilds, prevented him from disposing of his produce at remunerative rates. The peasant suffered more than any one else from the increasing evils of private warfare which in the fifteenth century prevailed to an unlimited degree; his house and barn were liable to be destroyed and his fields trampled under foot. The other classes, especially the nobles, came to regard the peasant as a degraded being against whom anything was lawful. This mutual hatred between classes destroyed all possibility of understanding or sympathy. The numerous local risings in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries proved the seriousness of the conditions, but gave no hope for the future. When the different rulers defeated the attempts of the poorer classes to regain their ancient rights and to throw off the increasing burdens, they did nothing to disperse the cloud which, in the social situation, hung over the country. On the contrary, discontent and bitterness only increased, and with them the feeling that a great catastrophe was impending, as predicted by astrologers and other prophets. Things were in this state when the religious reformation took the center of public affairs; after a few years, however, the social question claimed attention all the more insistently.

II. Growth of the Movement: The great Peasants' War of 1524–26 is historically important mainly from the fact that it was not alone the rural population that took part in it, but that the lower classes in the towns were in opposition to the existing social order, and felt themselves drawn close to the peasants by the desire to reshape things in the same spirit. Now for the first time there was a distinct effort to organize the entire peasantry of Germany, and the feeling of unity was expressed in a more or less generally accepted program. The most powerful and in a certain sense the most enlightened of the peasant organizations was that of Swabia in the southwest, formed by the union of three smaller bodies. The members of these started the movement, proposed plans of federation, and formulated their demands in a deliberative assembly, the so-called Peasants' Parliament of Memmingen. The clear and consistent program put forth by them was the basis of negotiations with the nobles united in the Swabian League, the failure of which is to be ascribed to the anti-popular activity of the crafty and influential Bavarian chancellor, Leonhard von Eck. The program, probably drawn up by Sebastian Lotzer, a furrier of Memmingen, under the influence of the preacher Schappeler, is based on the Gospel as the book of truth and justice; it upholds the communal principle, and contents itself with the formulation of agrarian demands, not touching other questions much discussed at the time. Its twelve articles, moderate and yet powerful in expression, contained the main things which oppressed the whole peasantry, and thus found general approval. If there had been a strong central government in Germany, some agreement might possibly have been reached with them for a basis. It was to that and not to violence that the Swabian peasants looked in the first instance. Their intentions were sincere; and on the other side, in the Swabian League, men were not wanting who would have been glad to avert bloodshed. But the actual leader of the latter refused to hear of a peaceful solution, preferring to try and stamp out once for all, in the peasant movement, the spirit of progress. The pretended negotiations with the peasants were carried on only to gain time for the assembly and preparation of the League's forces, and to dispose of a threatened alliance between Duke Ulrich of Württemberg and the peasants. The commander of the League's army, Georg Truchsess von Waldburg, felt so little assured of success that he neglected no means, not even that of treachery, for winning it. On the success of the first attack in southern Swabia depended the outcome of the whole movement. If, as Truchsess feared, the peasant societies, deceived by the League, had taken the field *en masse* in April, 1525, and won a victory, the peasantry of all Germany would have risen to join

1. The Urban Lower Classes join the Peasants.

their standards. After the defeat of the separate bodies on the Danube, at Wurzach, and at Gaisbeuren, the movement was no longer one, even in regard to its aim. Besides the purely agrarian question, other views and evil elements entered.

2. Western Germany and the Heilbronn Plan.

This is evident in considering a second group made up of the Franconians and Swabians in the Main and Rhine districts and the inhabitants of the Palatinate. Leaders and followers were characterized by violent passions, inhuman cruelty, and absurdly extravagant objects. The idea appeared of a radical political reconstruction of Germany, of the abolition of the countless petty lords and a constitution of an empire which should leave the emperor alone as ruler of all. This "Heilbronn Plan," as it was called, was not in itself so unreasonable; its weakness lay in the fact that, instead of solving the agrarian questions, it made them more difficult by involving them with political matters.

4. In Thuringia and Saxony; Münzer.

This only increased the confusion, which reached its climax in a third group, forming around the famous Thomas Münzer (q.v.) and the theocratic and communistic radicalism which he preached among the Thuringian and Saxon peasantry. Never has the indiscriminate hatred of the mob for everything and everybody been more fully expressed, never has a war of extermination been more warmly preached, than in the incendiary pamphlet (ascribed without sufficient evidence to Münzer), *An die Versammlung gemeiner Bauerschaft*. Referring to James v. 1–6, it prophesies a day of slaughter for the fat cattle who have nourished their hearts on the misery of the common people. God has heard the cry of the laborers, and will take pleasure in the destruction of Moab, Agag, Ahab, Phalaris, and Nero. As a consequence or parallel of this may be cited the *Landesordnung* of the Tyrolese Michel Gaismair which appeared in Jan., 1526; it demanded complete equality, and pushed a strictly agrarian socialism to its utmost consequences.

III. Luther and the Peasants' War: It will easily be seen how far this movement departed from the moderate and logical demands of the Twelve Articles, and how this anarchical insanity could not fail to alienate the sympathies of every reasonable man, even if he had been previously disposed to favor the amelioration of the condition of the oppressed peasantry. This aspect of the struggle must be borne in mind in order to do justice to Luther's position. The more his opponents tried to father the whole movement upon him and his gospel, the more he felt obliged to explain his position. In his "*Exhortation to Peace*" he expressed the hope that by speaking the plain truth to both parties, he might bring them both to a better understanding. He found some of the Twelve Articles reasonable and just; but the injustice of the authorities could not excuse riotous turbulence. Because both parties were in the wrong and sought to avenge or defend themselves they would only destroy themselves, and God will scourge them both. A commission of councilors from the nobility and the towns was suggested to advise means of conciliation. He would not hear of himself and other theologians being made the "mouthpieces of divine justice," but saw in the attempt to mix the Gospel with these disturbances only another device of the devil, who sought to destroy him through bloodthirsty prophets of murder when he had failed through the pope. He defends his point of view and hopes for good results from his admonitions, though his proposition was not likely, especially at that moment, to lead to the desired end. He has been unduly blamed; but it only shows that he failed to understand the real nature of the movement, as did Melanchthon, who wrote a counterblast to the Twelve Articles in which he put forth the unlimited right of the government and duty of obedience on the part of the governed as the immovable foundation of the social and political order. This was Luther's honest view and it explains his later behavior. When his admonitions were unheeded and the die was cast for bloodshed, he threw himself with all the passion of his strong nature on the side of the State and of order, and published his terrible tractate *Wider die mordischen und raubischen Rotten der Bauern*, in which he called upon the authorities to crush the "brands of hell" and "limbs of the devil." The peasants would have been crushed even without his exhortation; and it was unfortunate for him that he was forced by the circumstances and by his convictions to speak such hard and even terrible words.

IV. Open Hostilities and Repression: Affairs meanwhile ran their destined course. Truchsess defeated one body of peasants after another; he crushed those of Württemberg on May 12, 1525, between Böblingen and Sindelfingen, and those of the Neckar valley and the Odenwald at Königshofen on June 2; two days later Florian Geyer and his followers fell before him at Sulzdorf and Ingolstadt; and Würzburg on the 7th. Philip of Hesse, George of Saxony, and other princes and nobles had met Münzer and a considerable mass of Thuringian and Saxon peasants at Frankenhausen on May 15, routed them, executed their leader, and severely punished the town of Mühlhausen, which had been a center of the insurrection. In Alsace, in the Breisgau, around Rothenburg, in the bishopric of Bamberg, in the Franconian margravate, and elsewhere, the peasants had risen and, spreading terror by their numbers, forced nobles, clergy, and citizens to join them or treat with them. But their temporary successes were soon avenged a hundredfold. After the Elector Palatine Ludwig had suppressed the rising on the left bank of the Rhine at Pfeddersheim on June 23, that in southern and central Germany was almost entirely put down. In Swabia the peasants made one last stand of desperate rage; but Truchsess hastened to bring up the League's forces and conquered them once more. The survivors retired to the mountainous country of the Tyrol and around Salzburg, where the revolt lasted into 1526, and only ceased with the "Bloody Assizes" of Radstatt on July 20 of that year.

V. Results of the Insurrection: The lot of the German peasantry was even worse after the rising. With diabolical zeal all who were in the slightest degree to blame were pursued and punished. It is estimated that in all at least 150,000 perished. The economic loss which Germany suffered by this catastrophe is incalculable; and the peasantry, impoverished, dejected, and exposed to severer servitude than ever, issued from the insurrection to face a well-nigh hopeless future. (W. VOGT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is necessarily treated in most of the works on the Reformation in Germany. Special works are: *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 174–194, Cambridge, 1904 (excellent bibliography, pp. 752–754); W. Wachsmuth, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, Leipsic, 1834; H. M. Bensen, *Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Ostfranken*, Erlangen, 1840; K. Klüpfel, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des schwäbischen Bundes*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1846; J. E. Jörg, *Deutschland in der Revolutionsperiode, 1522–26*, Freiburg, 1851; W. Zimmerman, *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges*, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1856; idem, *Grosser deutscher Bauernkrieg*, Stuttgart, 1907; C. A. Cornelius, *Studien zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*, Munich, 1861; H. Schreiber, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, 3 vols., Freiburg, 1863–66; A. Stern, *Ueber die Zwölf Artikel der Bauern*, Leipsic, 1868; K. Zöllner, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Bauernkriegs*, Dresden, 1872; L. Friess, *Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Ostfranken*, 2 vols., Würzburg, 1876–83; F. L. Baumann, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Ober-Schwaben*, Stuttgart, 1879; idem, *Die Zwölf Artikel der oberschwäbischen Bauern*, Kempten, 1896; idem, *Akten zur Geschichte Bauernkrieges aus Oberschwaben*, Freiburg, 1881; P. Harer, *Beschreibung des Bauernkrieges*, Halle, 1881; W. H. Hutton, *The Disturbances which Accompanied the Reformation in Germany*, Oxford, 1881; A. Czerny, *Der erste Bauernaufstand in Oberösterreich 1525*, Linz, 1882; R. Neumann, *Zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*, Frankfort, 1882; C. Hartfelder, *Zur Geschichte des Bauernkriegs in Südwest Deutschland*, Stuttgart, 1884; J. N. Sepp, *Der bayerische Bauernkrieg*, Munich, 1884; W. Vogt, *Die Vorgeschichte des Bauernkrieges*, Halle, 1887; idem, *Die bayrische Politik in Bauernkriege*, Nördlingen, 1883 (chiefly against Jörg); idem, *Die Korrespondenz des Schwäbischen Bundes-Hauptmanns, 1524–27*, 4 parts, Augsburg, 1879–83; F. Leist, *Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte des Bauernaufruhrs in Salzburg*, Salzburg, 1888; F. von Bezold, *Der Bauernkrieg*, Berlin, 1890; J. Loserth, *Die Stadt Waldshut und die vorderösterreichische Regierung in 1523–26*, Vienna, 1891; J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, 8 vols., Freiburg, 1892–94, Eng. transl., 12 vols., St. Louis, 1896–1907; K. F. Lehnert, *Studien zur Geschichte der Zwölf Artikel vom Jahre 1525*, Halle, 1894; K. Krebs, *Beiträge und Urkunden zur deutschen Geschichte*, Leipsic, 1895; A. Nabholz, *Bauernbewegung in d. Ost. Schweiz, 1524–25*, Zurich, 1896; C. Kautsky, *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*, London, 1897; E. B. Bax, *The Peasants' War in Germany*, London, 1899; W. Stolze, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Bauernkrieges*, Leipsic, 1900; idem, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, Halle, 1907; W. Lucke, *Die Entstehung der "15 Bundesgenossen" des Joh. Eberlin von Günzburg*, Halle, 1902; B. Sastrow, *Social Germany in Luther's Time*, Westminster, 1902; J. Guerber, *Bauern und Schwedenkönig in Elsass*, Strasburg, 1905; P. Vinogradoff, *Roman Law in Mediæval Europe*, London, 1909.

PÉCHENARD, PIERRE LOUIS: Roman Catholic; b. at Gespunsart, near Charleville (48 m. n.e. of Reims), France, Dec. 5, 1842. He received his education at the petit seminaire of Charleville and Reims, the grand seminaire at Reims, and the École des Carmes, Paris; was made priest in 1868; was cure of La Neuville-aux-Tourneurs, 1869–72; associate professor in the petit seminaire at Reims, 1872–73; professor of history in the college at Charleville, 1873–76; superior of the petit seminaire at Reims, 1876–80; vicar-general of the archdiocese of Reims, 1880–1896; rector of the Institut catholique of Paris, 1896–1907; and was made bishop of Soissons 1906. His principal writings deal with local history or biography or with the history of institutions. Among them may be noted: *Jean Juvenal des Ursins, archevèque de Reims* (Paris, 1876; crowned by the academy of Reims); *De schola Remensi decimo sæculo* (1876); *Histoire de Gespunsart* (1878; new ed., 1906); *Histoire de l'abbaye d'Igny* (1883); *Histoire de la congrégation de Notre-Dame de Reims* (2 vols., Reims, 1886); *Histoire de La Neuville-aux-Tourneurs* (1887); *De Reims à Jerusalem* (1891); *Étude historique sur les conférences ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1896); *L'Immaculée Conception dans l'ancienne université de Paris* (1905); *L'Institut catholique de Paris, 1875–1907* (1907); *Vers l'action* (1907); and *Panégyrique du bienheureux Jean de Montmirail* (1909).

PECKHAM, JOHN: Archbishop of Canterbury; b. probably at Lewes (1 m. n.e. of Brighton), Sussex, in 1240 or earlier; d. at Mortlake (9 m. w.s.w. of St. Paul's, London, Mar. 20, 1292. He was educated at Oxford where he spent some time in the Franciscan Monastery; and after 1250 at Paris where he graduated in theology. He became eleventh lector of his order at Oxford in 1270; a little later ninth provincial minister; a year or two later the first theological lecturer in the schools of the papal palace at Rome, where his lectures were attended by many cardinals and bishops and obtained great fame; and in 1279 archbishop of Canterbury. Throughout his tenure of office, Peckham favored the papal policies at the expense of the temporal power, which in 1282 precipitated a war in Wales; and he lost no opportunity of advancing the Dominican and Franciscan orders, especially the latter. He was a voluminous writer of treatises on science, such as: *Perspectiva communis* (Milan, 1482), *Theorica planetarum*, and *De sphæra;* all of which are represented by manuscripts in the British Museum. In theology, he left *Collectanea Bibliorum*, printed as *Divinarũ sententiarũ librorũ biblie* (Paris, 1513); and *De trinitate*, printed as *De summa trinitate et fide catholica* (London, 1510). He published also, besides other poems, *Philomela*, extant in manuscript in British Museum and Bodleian Library, and printed with the *Centiloquium* (Paris, 1503) of St. Bonaventura, to whom it was wrongly ascribed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal source is Peckham's *Registrum epistolarum*, ed C. T. Martin for the *Rolls Series*, 3 vols., London, 1882–86; the prefaces gather up in excellent form what is known of Peckham's life. The account in *DNB*, xliv. 190–197, is detailed and critical, and gives adequate references to other sources. Consult also W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, 12 vols., London, 1860–76.

PECOCK, REGINALD: English prelate; b. in Wales about 1395; d. probably at Thorney Abbey (9 m. n.n.e. of Peterborough) in 1459 or 1460. He was educated at Oxford, became a fellow of Oriel College in 1417, and taught in Oxford till 1425, when the duke of Gloucester introduced him to the court at London as one of his train. By 1420 he had entered the church, and in 1431 through Gloucester's influence he became master of the college of St. Spirit and St. Mary, commonly called Whittington's College, which was in the Vintry, London, and rector of St. Michael de Paternoster Church, in Riola, near by. The two positions went together, and he held them till in 1444 he was made bishop of St. Asaph. In 1450 he was translated to Chichester, and became a member of the privy council.

He was a learned man and a faithful son of the Church, but, unfortunately for his personal comfort, he took too independent a course. He first comes prominently forward in 1447, when he boldly defended the bishops against the charges that they did not preach and that they were frequently absent from their sees. His sermon gave offense to the friars and to the progressive element of the clergy. When in 1455 he issued his best-known book, *A Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy* (ed. C. Babington, with biographical notice, in *Roll's Series*, 2 vols., 1860) which was intended to shut the mouths of the Lollards, he awoke a storm of criticism because in his candor he acknowledged that the Church could not be defended by appeal to Scripture, but only on philosophical grounds which he proceeded to state, and maintained that church practises which had no Scripture warrant were yet proper. In 1456 he brought out another book, *The Book of Faith* (ed. from MS. in Trinity College, Cambridge, with Introduction, by J. L. Morison, Glasgow, 1909), in which he again presents his rational, not to say rationalistic, grounds for the church doctrines. But the latter book was still less acceptable to the hierarchy. He was condemned for heresy by the archbishop of Canterbury (1458), forced to make a public recantation and retractation, to resign his see, and then was confined in a monastery till he died. But the modern world honors him as among its forerunners.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xliv. 198–202 (should be consulted for the sources, a considerable list of scattering notices being given); J. Lewis, *Life of . . . R. Pecock*, London, 1744, new ed., Oxford, 1820; W. Brute, *Writings and Examinations of . . . Pecock . . . and Others*, ib. 1831; W. W. Capes, *English Church in the 14th and 15th Centuries*, ib. 1900; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 202–238, 255 sqq., London, 1908 (important).

PECTORAL CROSS. See VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

PECULIAR: The technical ecclesiastical title given to certain Anglican parishes which were exempt from the jurisdiction of the ordinary of the diocese, having an ordinary of their own. Their origin was in the papal Exemption (q.v.) exercised when England was Roman Catholic; at the Reformation, through oversight, these parishes remained under the sovereign or other superior. During the reign of William IV. their exemption or exclusion from ordinary jurisdiction was abolished, with the sole exception of Westminster Abbey and the chapels of the Inns of Court.

PEKAH: Eighteenth king of Israel, son of Remaliah and successor of Pekahiah. His dates according to the old chronology are 758–743; according to Kamphausen 736–730; according to Whitehouse (*DB*, iii. 736) 736–733. Taking advantage of his position as *shalish* (E. V. "captain") of Pekahiah, he conspired against him, assassinated him, and seized the throne. Tiglath-Pileser of Assyria attacked him, took certain cities, "all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria." Hoshea the son of Elah then rose against Pekah, slew him, and reigned in his stead (II Kings xv. 25, 29–31). Other notices (II Kings xv. 37; xvi. 5 sqq.) show that Pekah, in alliance with Rezin of Damascus, attacked Jotham and Ahaz of Judah. There was evidently an attempt to unite the Syrian states against Assyria, from which the kings of Judah held aloof and thus invited the hostility of the allies. Their invasion was repelled but the ultimate outcome was the dependence of Judah on Assyria, which proved fatal to the former (see AHAZ) and probably hastened Pekah's downfall. The immediate effect of the invasion upon the people and king of Judah and the policy advocated by the prophetic party are evident from Isa. vii.

The inscriptions (annals of Tiglath-Pileser, additions to the eponym canon, and the Babylonian chronicle) accord with the Biblical data. Tiglath-Pileser IV. came to the throne in 745 B.C. In pursuance of his policy to restore the Assyrian rule over the West, he captured Arpad in 740 B.C.; the rest of northern Syria was subjugated in the following year. A like course of events was repeated in 738 B.C., when Menahem of Israel bought him off for 1,000 talents of silver. In 734 B.C. Tiglath-Pileser again marched westward and attacked Philistia first to isolate Damascus. On the way he devastated Israel and made a part of its territory an Assyrian province (cf. II Kings xv. 29). This must have been in 733 B.C., since Tiglath-Pileser states under this year "they overthrew Pekah their king and I set Ausi [i.e. Hoshea] over them" (*KB*, ii. 33). This is not necessarily inconsistent with the Biblical narrative (cf. Kittel's commentary on Kings, p. 267, Göttingen, 1900). Evidently Hoshea was the leader of an Assyrian party in Samaria which asserted itself after Pekah's defeat. (R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources are II Kings xv. 27–31; Isa. vii. Consult the pertinent sections of the literature given under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; and KINGS, BOOKS OF; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 264 sqq. et passim, and *COT*, ii. 321 sqq.; *DB*, iii. 736–737; *EB*, iii. 3643; *JE*, ix. 584.

PEKAHIAH: Seventeenth king of Israel, son and successor of Menahem. His dates according to the old chronology are 760–758, according to Kamphausen and modern chronographers 737–736. The latter chronology is fixed by the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III., showing that Menahem was alive in 738, and that Pekah, Pekahiah's successor, was dethroned in 734–733. The source for Pekahiah's history is II Kings xv. 22–26, though corruptions have affected the passage; the picture of the northern kingdom given by Hosea is good for his period. The indications of the events under his successor Pekah (q.v.) are that Pekahiah desired to carry out his father's policy of friendship for the Assyrians, and that the opposing (national or anti-Assyrian) party was represented by Pekah (q.v.), the "captain" who assassinated Pekahiah and usurped the throne. Cheyne (*EB*, iii. 3643) questions the existence of Pekahiah, and supposes that his name in the succession is due to a literary misunderstanding of the longer form of the name of Pekah (Hebr. *Peḳayahu*). But this would necessitate a revolution under Menahem, for which there is no room in the history; II Kings xv. 22 implies a peaceful death for Menahem. GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the pertinent sections in the literature under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; and KINGS, BOOKS OF; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 264, 320; *DB*, iii. 737; *EB*, iii. 3643; *JE*, ix. 584.

PELAGIUS: The name of two popes.

Pelagius I.: Pope 555–561. He was the son of a Roman official, and first appears as deacon accompanying Agapetus I. (q.v.) to Constantinople in Feb., 536. He remained in Constantinople after the death of Agapetus and was made his permanent representative, or apocrisiarius, there by Silverius. As such he gained great influence, enjoyed the confidence of Justinian, and was able several times to intervene decisively in the ecclesiastical disputes of the Orient. In Jan., 543, he contributed not a little to the condemnation of Origenism. He returned to Rome in 545 and acted there for Vigilius (q.v.) during the latter's absence. On Dec. 17, 546, Rome was forced to surrender to the Goths under Totila, and Pelagius had to acknowledge the barbarian as master and act as his ambassador in peace negotiations with Justinian in 547. He returned home without having arranged matters to the satisfaction of the Gothic king, and the latter ordered all the clergy to leave Rome. Pelagius remained in Sicily until about 551.

Pelagius was strongly opposed to the Three Chapter edict (see THREE CHAPTER CONTROVERSY) and used his influence with Vigilius to induce the latter to recall the *Judicatum* of 548. In the spring of 553 he succeeded, and on May 14 of that year the pope signed the so-called *Constitutum*, drawn up by Pelagius (cf. L. Duchesne, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxxvi. 425), protesting against the edict. As a consequence Pelagius, who had been in Constantinople since about 551, was imprisoned by Justinian. He used his enforced leisure to write *Sex libri in defensionem capitulorum* (preserved in part in a MS. of Orléans), and when in Dec., 553, Vigilius again turned about and conformed to the wish of the emperor, Pelagius sent forth from his cell a violent attack upon the unstable pope. Early in 555, however, he followed the example of Vigilius, while Justinian designated Pelagius as the successor of Vigilius. In Rome, however, they did not want Pelagius as pope, and when Vigilius died (June 7, 555) they chose the presbyter Mareas in his place. Mareas died in August, but all hesitated to consecrate the choice of the emperor, and it was not until Apr. 16, 556, that Pelagius could ascend the papal throne. His position was difficult, but he strove, not without success, to conciliate the opposition. To repair the ravages of war was another duty which devolved on the new pope, and herein he appears in more pleasing light. He rehabilitated the Roman finances, refurnished the plundered churches, and consecrated forty-nine bishops, twenty-six presbyters, and nine deacons, at the same time not forgetting the poor. When he died, Mar. 3, 561, the worst of the evil consequences of the Gothic war in Rome and its neighborhood had been removed. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, i. 303–304, Paris, 1886, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i. 155–156. The Briefs are in *MPL*, lxix. 393–394, *NA*, v. 533 sqq., and Jaffé, *Regesta*, 124–136; L. Duchesne, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxxvi (1884), 428 sqq.; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, v. 50 sqq., Oxford, 1885; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 341 sqq., Bonn, 1885; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, i. 425–426, 488, London, 1894; A. Knecht, *Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Justinians I.*, i. 125 sqq., Würzburg, 1896; H. Hutton, *Church in the 6th Century*, pp. 162 sqq., London, 1897; H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste*, i. 549 sqq., 580 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 786, 798, 911, 916, Eng. transl., iv. 351–357, and especially Fr. transl., iii. 1, pp. 141–145, which has a rich apparatus of notes; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 471–474; Bower, *Popes*, i. 370–374; Platina, *Popes*, i. 130–132; and literature under THREE CHAPTER CONTROVERSY.

Pelagius II.: Pope 579–590. He was the son of a Goth living in Rome and was consecrated pope Nov. 26, 579, while the Lombards were besieging the city. Two difficult problems disturbed his reign, the war with the Lombards and a contest with schismatics in Upper Italy. In 585 the exarch Smaragdus brought a temporary relief from the barbarians, and their ravages worked indirectly to the advantage of the papacy since, because of the danger of foreign rule, a party friendly to Rome grew up in Genoa and Milan. In Istria the bishops stubbornly refused even to discuss the three chapters (see THREE CHAPTER CONTROVERSY) and Pelagius, by inducing Smaragdus to intervene, made them more incensed against Rome than ever. With the Eastern Church Pelagius maintained good relations, although toward the end of his pontificate he had to protest because Patriarch John IV. of Constantinople (q.v.) had assumed the title of ecumenical patriarch. In Rome he left a good memory by making his house a refuge for the old and by his church endowments. The basilica of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura is a monument of his zeal for building as well as of the artistic poverty of his time. Pelagius died early in Feb., 590, of pestilence; he was buried in St. Peter's Feb. 6. (H. BÖHMER.)

His great discovery in men was Gregory, who was his immediate successor. He sent him to Constantinople in 578 as his apocrisiary and kept him there till 585, and transacted through him some delicate negotiations. He also employed Gregory to write an elaborate defense of the condemnation of the three chapters. Gregory introduces a reference to Pelagius (see PELAGIUS, PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES) in his epistles and says that when Pelagius was building the monument to St. Lawrence the body of the martyr was accidentally uncovered and all who saw it died within fifteen days (*Epist.*, IV., 30, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., xii. 155).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For sources cf. *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, i. 300–301, Paris, 1886, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i. 160; Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Langobardorum*, book iii., chap. xx., xxiv. sqq., in *MGH*, *Script. rer. Langob.*, pp. 12 sqq. Consult further: A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und dem Occident*, i. 127–128, ii. 649 sqq., Munich, 1864–65; B. Niehues, *Geschichte des Verhältnisses zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum*, i. 383 sqq., Münster, 1877; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 403 sqq., Bonn, 1885; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, ii. 18, 26, 28, London, 1894; H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste*, i. 596 sqq., 675 sqq., 745 sqq., 813 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; Bower, *Popes*, i. 382–389; Platina, *Popes*, i. 135–136; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 476; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 917–918; Mann, *Popes*, i. 101, 140.

PELAGIUS, PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.

I. Pelagius.
  Place and Life (§ 1).
  Works (§ 2).
  Original Sin (§ 3).
  Christian Redemption (§ 4).
  Pedobaptism, Original Sin, and Perfection (§ 5).
  Doctrine of Grace (§ 6).
  Letter to Demetrias and Celestius (§ 7).
II. Pelagian Controversies.
  Rejection of Celestius (§ 1).
  Diffusion of Pelagianism (§ 2).
  Mission of Orosius (§ 3).
  Synods of Diospolis, Carthage, and Mileve (§ 4).
  Zosimus and the African Church (§ 5).
  Rescript of Honorius (§ 6).
  Julian of Eclanum (§ 7).
  Decline and Disappearance (§ 8).

1. Place and Life.

I. Pelagius: The author of the teachings which racked the western Church in the fifth century was born probably in Britain in the fourth century; and died, as may be assumed, in Palestine at the age of about seventy. Together with his friend Celestius, he is mentioned by Augustine in a letter of 418 as the author or promoter of a heresy which sought to undermine the ancient faith by assailing the doctrine of divine grace. Until 411, however, Pelagius had been regarded as perfectly orthodox, nor did he gain his evil fame until he came within the domain of the dogmatic influence of Augustine. It was from Africa that the condemnation of Pelagianism proceeded, and in the East it was only after the Pelagian controversy had been complicated by Nestorianism that Pelagius was deemed a heretic, which was not till after 428. Pelagius had lived long in Rome, when, about 411, he made the fateful journey to Africa which was to brand him as a heresiarch. It is not improbable that he was an old man by 410, and after 418 his name vanished. Of his life little is definitely known, and even his birthplace is uncertain. Augustine, Prosper, Marius Mercator, and Orosius refer to him as a Briton. Jerome, on the other hand, states that he was from Albion or Scotia (i.e., Ireland). It seems probable, however, that Pelagius was of British birth. He was a monk, though whether in his native land or not is unknown. It is not improbable that he had visited the East before settling at Rome, especially as he was well acquainted with Greek (though this is by no means a conclusive argument). He can scarcely be identified with the monk of the same name mentioned by Chrysostom in 405, for in this year he was living in Rome; or with a monastic gormand to whom Isidore of Pelusium refers. If Pelagius visited the East before 400, he might there have become a monk; but in Rome he was neither connected with any monastery nor did he hold any ecclesiastical position. Nevertheless, even without school or position, an educated and upright ascetic, such as Pelagius was acknowledged to have been, readily found a public, and his fame became wide-spread. By 405 he was in correspondence with Paulinus of Nola (q.v.) and enjoyed an honorable reputation with Augustine. Jerome and Orosius describe him as a man with broad shoulders and a strong neck, and corpulent in person.

2. Works.

According to Gennadius, Pelagius had written two works of value before he became known as a heretic: *De fide Trinitatis libri tres* and *Eclogarum ex divinis scripturis liber unus*. The former has entirely disappeared; the latter is plainly identical with the *Testimoniorum liber* and *Capitulorum liber* to which Augustine and Jerome refer, from the latter of which the synod of Diospolis cites several propositions. The fragments of this work, however, which consisted principally of citations from the Scriptures with only the chapter-headings written by Pelagius, are of little value for a knowledge of his system. The greater importance attaches to the *In apostolum Paulum commentarii*, mentioned by Marius Mercator. This work was known by Augustine by 412; and Marius Mercator is doubtless right in dating it before 410. This commentary may be regarded as preserved by the fortunate discovery of H. Zimmer in a manuscript of St. Gall. From this it has become evident that the recension of the commentary of Pelagius which has become incorporated with the writings of Jerome (*MPL*, xxx. 646–902) can no longer be termed "pseudo-Jeromian"; for, although two Pelagian statements in the commentary on Romans preserved by Augustine and Marius Mercator and contained in the St. Gall codex are lacking in the "pseudo-Jerome," and the discovery of other differences between the original by Pelagius and our texts may be the result of researches still in progress, nevertheless the "pseudo Jerome" may be considered as containing nothing not derived from Pelagius. From the data thus gained it becomes possible to see the views of Pelagius at a time when he was still deemed orthodox, which would be impossible from the polemics of Augustine.

3. Original Sin.

As early as his commentary on Romans Pelagius denied the tenet of original sin inherited from Adam, not only citing the similar views of others (possibly including Celestius) but himself directly controverting it. Only the flesh of man, not the immortal soul, comes from Adam, and even the "substance of man's flesh" comes from God and is, therefore, good; and he regards it as Manichean (see MANI, MANICHEANS) to assert that sin is innate in the body. Man accordingly still possesses the power not to sin, and is free to do either good or evil. He implies that natural death is not due to Adam, nor does he regard the natural death (i.e., death without subsequent abiding in Hades) as a result of the fall or as coming under the category of death. At the same time Pelagius held that sin had come into the world through Adam, who had brought death upon himself and his descendants. But although the flesh is good, its desires, so soon as they pass beyond "the limits of nature," are contrary to reason. The applications of these views bear a decidedly ascetic stamp: to sell all one's possessions, as he himself had done; to refrain even from what was permitted; to be content, like pilgrims, with bare necessities; and to live in celibacy—these were his ideals. Nevertheless, Pelagius carefully refrained from upbraiding nature. He did not oppose marriage; though the desires of the flesh, which are not without justification when kept within the bounds of nature, stand in opposition to the soul and may become intensified into passions. While reason may oppose these "passions of irrational animals," Pelagius, betraying the influence of the Stoics, was far from failing to recognize the power of sin in the world. Many were made sinful by the example of Adam's disobedience; the very "habit of sin" had attained such power over all the race, that Pelagius could speak of a "necessity" rooted in this habit; though this was created by each man for himself. Since all have sinned, so all die. Adam is the type of them that die, as Christ is the type of them that rise again. Since man had forgotten the law of nature, God had given the law of the letter, which might have been fulfilled to be rewarded with eternal life, but no one had fulfilled it because of the weakness of the flesh. This law knew no forgiveness of sin, though God had from eternity purposed to save them that believed through his Son. When Christ came the time had been fulfilled, since no one could keep the law because of his habit of evil; and now salvation is solely by faith in him.

4. Christian Redemption.

In answer to the questions what Christ had done and given, Pelagius repeatedly replied in twofold fashion; as when he said (on Rom. iii. 20): "He giveth remission of sins to them that believe and teacheth how the vices of the flesh ought to be avoided and pruned by understanding." In this remission of sins Pelagius distinguished between redemption and justification; the former is emphasized only where Paul speaks of redemption, but the latter is continually emphasized by Pelagius. This justification, given through baptism, is secured through faith alone; and Pelagius was the most strenuous representative of solafiducianism previous to Luther. At the same time he held that none should think that faith alone was sufficient to salvation without sanctity of mind and body. If, moreover, the Christian were to remain in a state of justification without the works of faith, his faith would be dead. The faith which is thus associated by Pelagius with justification, though given to each individual by God in so far as each one is called by the divine will to believe, nevertheless lies within the free will of each man. Pelagius is thus no predestinarian, and he expressly holds (on Rom. xi. 5) that "faith is the election of grace as works are the election of the law"; faith, moreover, is reliance on the promises of God, the "hope of the recompense of good works," without which "none can accomplish virtues" (on Rom. i. 17). While he who is baptized is sanctified, he must hold fast to his sanctification. Sins previous to baptism should distress no one; and every one overtaken by sin should take refuge in penitence. Thus Pelagius leads to the second blessing of Christ, the grace whereby the baptized may learn from Christ's doctrine and example. This doctrine and example teach how to overcome the passions; for it was the distinctive characteristic of the New Testament that Christ taught how to put away not only sin, but even the occasions of offenses. This, in a word, he teaches by inculcating asceticism: since, "by being born of a poor mother he hath scorned riches; since while he learned not letters he refuteth worldly wisdom; and since, when betrayed he resisted not, he forbiddeth to boast in human bravery" (on I Cor. i. 27).

5. Pedobaptism, Original Sin, and Perfection.

The commentaries of Pelagius contain all the erroneous doctrines later alleged against him, with a single exception. This, however, was the one which was preeminently to lead to his condemnation—doubts regarding the baptism of children for the remission of sins. He had no occasion to mention pedobaptism, for his high estimate of solafiducian justification evidently concerned only those baptized as adults; but obviously, had he needed to allude to it, he would have condemned it. From this a double conclusion follows: first that Pelagius' doctrines can not have been offensive of themselves to wide circles of the Church of his period; second, infant baptism was to prove fatal to him so soon as it was recognized by the Church for the remission of sins. According to Augustine, the three chief errors of the Pelagians were: their denial of original sin; their view that justifying grace is not given freely, but according to merit; and that they regarded sinless perfection as possible after baptism. The first and third charges were well founded. While recognizing that sin was general almost without exception, Pelagius acknowledged no inherited taint; and the possibility of post-baptismal sinlessness, though rarely realized, followed from his premise that Christians are called to perfection. Yet in neither of these positions was Pelagius without predecessors. The doctrine of original sin was unknown in the Eastern Church, and Pelagius could even claim some degree of support in Lactantius (*Divina institutio*, iv. 24–25; *MPL*, vi. 522; Eng. transl., *ANF*, vii. 125–127). Universal sin was for the Origenistic theology a presupposition of this temporal period. In the Old Testament, Abraham, Noah, Enoch, and Abel were declared "acceptable to God"; and Athanasius accepted this in the sense of active integrity and regarded also Jeremiah as sinless. The ancient view was wide-spread that it was the duty of the Christian to live sinlessly after baptism, a view expressed by Athanasius and Justin and regarded as entirely possible of realization.

6. Doctrine of Grace.

Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to say that the views of Pelagius represented nothing but what was already current in the East. Augustine was wrong in charging that Pelagius held justifying grace to be conditioned by human merit; for one of the cardinal principles of Pelagius was that man is justified in baptism by faith alone, and not by any merits of his former life. It was only assisting grace of another kind that could be merited according to the system of Pelagius. The error of Augustine is due to the fact that by justification he has in mind something different from the sense of Pelagius. Elsewhere, however, he accurately expressed what he failed to find in Pelagius; namely, the concept of that grace (*gratia inspirationis;* see AUGUSTINE, SAINT, BISHOP OF HIPPO, II., § 2) without which, in Augustine's view, nothing good could happen, it being the inward communication of supernatural strength for good, and the bestowal of a share in the well-being of God, without which justification does not fulfil itself. It is true that Pelagius speaks of a "strength through the Holy Ghost" given by Christ to his followers, and of a "seal of the Spirit" received by the Christian in baptism, and that he was also aware that the Spirit aids man's infirmity (Rom. viii. 26); but he understood this aid of the Spirit to be either the baptismal sealing of the earnest of future inheritance, or the strengthening of man's weak powers by reviving the hope of recompense (Rom. v. 5). It is true, not every mention of "aid of the Spirit" is explained in this way by Pelagius, but his general tendency was to stamp Biblical ideas with clear concepts in accordance with his general purview. And this was opposed to every physical or hyperphysical basis of morality, and had its source in the intellectualism of ancient ethics. Augustine was influenced by the mysticism of the Neoplatonic school (see NEOPLATONISM); Pelagius, by the older moral, rational, popular philosophy, especially that of the Stoics (see STOICISM). Consequently his opinion of "natural and common death" has few parallels in the Eastern Church. It is to be noted that his idea of the sinful state of man is more closely analogous to that of collective sin and collective guilt in the modern Church than the Augustinian, and that his doctrine of justification squares more closely in many respects with that of Paul than does Augustine's. His concept of faith, in like manner, is deeper, though he is prevented from perfectly understanding the religious by his intellectualistic moralism, just as Augustine is prevented by his mystical bias. But, again like Augustine, Pelagius meant more than his teaching expressed. To him the hope of recompense is founded on the remission of sins, and remission rests upon the cross. For this reason he frequently emphasizes gratitude; and such words as "he proveth that he hath God in mind who, having God ever before him, dareth not sin" (on Rom. i. 21) conclusively proved that Pelagius knew of a personal relation to God and Christ which his moralistic formulas could no more describe than could Augustine's physical and hyperphysical concepts do justice to the depths of his personal piety.

7. Letter to Demetrias and Celestius.

It is clear, nevertheless, that the main interests of Pelagius were not centered where his thoughts most closely approximated those of Paul. This is shown by his letter to the virgin Demetrias (cf. Augustine, *De gestis Pelagii*, ii. 1099–1120; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 1 ser. v. 225 sqq.), written in 413 or 414 and preserved among the works of Jerome (*MPL*, xxx. 15–45). While maintaining that God forgives in baptism all the sins of the Christian, the letter lays special stress on the admonition that the baptized "must so be mindful of their heavenly birth that, living among the wicked, they may conquer every evil." The power of good and evil is a fundamental presupposition, and the glory of the rational soul; even many philosophers, although strangers to God, had been able to please him in virtue of the "good of nature." The letter also alludes to the "grace of the remission of sins," laying more stress, however, on the "grace of doctrine," with mention of the "graces of assistance" (by the Holy Ghost); though the latter graces are but obscurely developed in this epistle. Even meditation on the Bible is here urged by Pelagius only in the interest of moral instruction and stimulus. It is thus evident that the religious concept of Pelagius retired into the background when he spoke on morality or holiness of living; and he lived, despite his thorough acquaintance with the writings of Paul, in an atmosphere of ascetic morality more akin to the views of Seneca than to those of the great Apostle. More energetically than Pelagius, and at an earlier date, his pupil Celestius, a lawyer of noble birth, emphasized the negative side of the views which he and his teacher held in common. According to the testimony of the *Liber prædestinatus* (i. 88; cf. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, xxiv., xxxiv.; *MPL*, l. 670–671), Pelagius derived from Celestius the theses set up against original sin; but this does not say that these were citations from a book by Celestius entitled "Against Original Sin." The citations of Jerome from a work by Celestius, probably entitled "Syllogisms," as well as a series of sentences by which Celestius was challenged at Carthage in 411, may be derived from the same book from which Pelagius drew. It is not impossible, on the other hand, that the author of the *Liber prædestinatus* and Vincent may have had in mind several works of Celestius when they termed him the first opponent of the doctrine of original sin. At all events, the literary activity of Celestius, so far as is known, no more caused a controversy at Rome than the commentaries of Pelagius.

II. Pelagian Controversies: The Pelagian controversy began when Pelagius and Celestius visited northern Africa. According to Marius Mercator, the latter left Rome before the end of 409. Pelagius, on the other hand, may still have been in Rome when the city was sacked by Alaric in 410. By 411 Pelagius was at Carthage, probably with Celestius, during the colloquy with the Donatists. Soon afterward Pelagius went to the East, while Celestius remained in Carthage, where he hoped to be ordained presbyter. He was denounced as a heretic in a brief presented by Paulinus, a deacon of Milan, however, and in 411 was refused ordination by a synod of Carthage, though apparently spared excommunication. The theses for which he was rejected were as follows: (1) Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he had sinned or not; (2) the sin of Adam injured himself only, not the human race; (3) infants are born in the state in which Adam was before the fall; (4) neither does the whole human race die through the death or sin of Adam, nor does it rise again through the resurrection of Christ; (5) the law, as well as the Gospel, gives access to the kingdom of heaven; and (6) men had been without sin even before the advent of Christ. It is noteworthy that even at this synod which rejected him, Celestius was attacked on the problem of infant baptism, so that he was forced

1. Rejection of Celestius.

to admit that infants should be baptized. After his condemnation he appealed to Rome, but soon went to Asia Minor and sought, apparently with success, to be ordained presbyter.

2. Diffusion of Pelagianism.

Henceforth, though the problems raised by these controversies continued to be mooted at Carthage, Pelagius and Celestius were both absent in Asia, and the former was meanwhile held in the highest esteem by Augustine. As the problems became more and more widely discussed, Augustine, about the beginning of 412, wrote his two books *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* and *De baptismo parvulorum* followed by his letter to Marcellinus and his *De spiritu et littera*. The points in controversy, original sin and the necessity of infant baptism, as well as the possibility of being without sin through the aid of God, and the difference between the Old and the New Testaments, are here discussed without mentioning Celestius, and with only a courteous allusion to Pelagius. In 413, sermons preached on the baptism of infants by Augustine at Carthage stirred up a tumult and proved how widely diffused were Pelagian views; and in 414 Augustine was informed by a certain Hilarius that some Christians at Syracuse held the following views: (1) man may be without sin and may easily keep the commands of God if he will; (2) unbaptized children who die can not justly perish; (3) a rich man retaining his riches can not enter into the kingdom of God unless he sells all that he has; (4) no oaths should be taken; and (5) the church without blemish is the visible one, which is able to be without sin. The first of these theses was derived directly from the *Eclogæ* of Pelagius; and the fourth and fifth may also be derived from his writings. The second and third are attributed by Augustine to Celestius. Somewhat later Augustine received from Sicily the so-called *Definitiones Cœlestii*, while between 413 and 418 an anonymous Sicilian author wrote six Pelagian tractates which seem almost a commentary on the theses recorded by Hilarius. It is thus clear that Pelagianism was far more widely extended in 412–415 than the personal activity of Pelagius and Celestius could have spread, this being due partly to a natural tendency toward a Pelagian mode of thought, and partly to the bond between the culture of the period and the ancient quasi-Stoic popular philosophy. At the same time there is a marked avoidance of polemics by Augustine against either Pelagius or Celestius.

3. Mission of Orosius.

After 415, however, a more personal animus entered into Augustine's polemics. The exact cause of this change of attitude is unknown, but it is evident that when, in the spring of 415, Augustine sent Orosius (q.v.) with certain problems to Jerome in the East, he also sought to put Jerome on his guard against Pelagius, and to arouse the Eastern Church to oppose the heresiarch. Not only was the attitude of the East, as in the ordination of Celestius, disturbing to Augustine, but he had also received through two of Pelagius' pupils, Timasius and Jacobus, the heresiarch's book *De natura*, which had probably been written in 414. Though the doctrines of this book were no more heretical than the views he had advanced in his Biblical commentary which had long been known to Augustine, nevertheless Augustine was deeply offended, probably because in this work Pelagius sought to quote earlier authorities in support of his doctrines. Augustine replied in his *De natura et gratia*, he still did not polemize against Pelagius by name. In July, 415, a few months after the arrival of Orosius, John of Jerusalem convened a synod of all or a part of his presbyters to consider the position of Pelagius. This body was apparently summoned at the instance of Orosius and because of his antipathy to Pelagius, who was publicly called to defend his position. The majority of those present clearly sided with Pelagius, but the latter subscribed to the formula of John and anathematized all who declared that man could attain to perfect virtue without divine aid. This he could honestly do, though under divine grace he did not include the inspiration requisite for each act, as in Augustine's view. Although, according to Orosius, John and Pelagius acquiesced in his requirements, Orosius was compelled to defend himself against charges of heresy, while the bishop's attitude toward Pelagius was so friendly that more than a year later Augustine in a letter to John felt himself obliged to refer to Pelagius as "our brother." It is thus evident that Orosius was unsuccessful in his attack on Pelagius at Jerusalem.

4. Synods of Diospolis, Carthage, and Mileve.

Equally futile was a second attack made by the Gallic bishops Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix. Both had been compelled, as partizans of the usurper Constantine, to resign their sees after his defeat in 411. What called them to Palestine, however, is unknown; but at all events they presented to Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea, a brief against Pelagius. In Dec., 415, accordingly, a synod of fourteen bishops was convened at Diospolis, the ancient Lydda. The accusers were unable to be present, one of them being ill. The majority of the allegations against him Pelagius was able to refute by simple interpretation; the chief accusation, that he thought that man could be without sin if he would, he defended, as at Jerusalem, by making this power dependent on the assistance of God. The writ of accusation approximated the real points of the Pelagian controversy only in the theses taken from the writings of Celestius; in reply Pelagius pointed out that the theses, in so far as they were not already explained, were set forth by another, and he also condemned them. In consequence, the synod confirmed the orthodoxy of Pelagius. The East had at last answered the challenge which the Carthaginian Pelagians had made in 413. In 416 Orosius brought the news with a letter of Heros and Lazarus to Africa. Recognizing, however, that they must enforce their views by some episcopal authority, the Africans, even before seeing the acts of the Synod of Diospolis, convened two synods in the autumn of 416: the first at Carthage, with the bishops of the Carthaginian province; and the second at Mileve, with the Numidian bishops, including Augustine and Alypius. Neither of these synods pronounced a direct anathema on Pelagius or

Celestius; but in view of the previous measures against Celestius, the information received from Diospolis, and the verdict of those who had read the writings of Pelagius and Celestius, the latter two were declared to be the authors of grave heresy in that they made no allowance for grace side by side with free will and since they assailed the necessity of infant baptism. The Africans appealed, moreover, in two letters to Pope Innocent I. for the authority also of the "Apostolic Chair"; but since the outcome of this might be doubtful, especially as Pelagius had many friends in Rome, Augustine and four other bishops (Aurelius of Carthage, Alypius, Evodius, and Possidius) appended to the synodical letters a private epistle in which they advocated that either Pelagius be tried orally at Rome or negotiations with him be taken up in writing. Innocent answered these three letters in an equal number of replies on Jan. 27, 417, evidently without having convened a synod. He declared it impractical to cite Pelagius for trial, evidently holding the judgment of the Africans as sufficient for decision. In his private letter the pope questioned the authenticity of the acts of the synod of Diospolis, which he utterly ignored in his official communications to Carthage and Mileve. He likewise declared that Pelagius and Celestius could have no part in the Church until they should come to their senses.

5. Zosimus and the African Church.

On Mar. 12, 417, Innocent I. died, and was succeeded by Zosimus, who was soon obliged to take cognizance of the Pelagian controversy. According to Marius Mercator, Celestius had gone from Ephesus to Constantinople, whence he was banished by Bishop Atticus. He appeared at Rome and submitted to Zosimus a request that the charges alleged against him be investigated. Zosimus accordingly, together with his clergy, considered the problem of Celestius' orthodoxy and decided in his favor. These results were communicated by the pope to the Africans, whom he at the same time reproved for their hasty judgment, and he demanded that they revise their verdict or deliver Celestius to him at Rome within two months. This letter can hardly have been sent before Zosimus found himself plunged into the affairs of Pelagius. The latter, who had made a detailed presentment of his views in the four books of his *De libero arbitrio* (written after the Synod of Diospolis), had sent this work and a creed which is still extant, together with a letter of appeal to Innocent, of whose death he was unaware. The documents were received by Zosimus. In this work on the freedom of the will the basal concepts of Pelagianism are very evident. Pelagius endeavored to show that the assertion of a divinely given "natural power" did not exclude God's support of man's volition and action "that what they are commanded to do through free will they may the more easily fulfil through grace." The accompanying letter and the creed of Pelagius expressly stated that children should be baptized, and that man ever needs the help of God. Both these documents were publicly read by the pope's command, to the intense joy of Pelagius' many friends in Rome. In a letter of Sept. 21, 417, Zosimus informed the Africans of these facts, and sending them the statements of Pelagius urged them to rejoice that Pelagius and Celestius, though accused by false judges, had never been outside the limits of the Church. At the same time apparently Zosimus cited Paulinus, the former accuser of Celestius, to appear at Rome. These measures of Zosimus naturally aroused opposition in Africa, but only a portion of the excited controversies which ensued is known. Three things however, are certain. Before the end of Feb., 418, a synod was held at Carthage, where a reply was formulated to the letter of Zosimus. This reply was couched in sharp terms, declaring that no general submission to the decision of Innocent could justify Celestius, who must condemn the erroneous doctrines he had advanced; or else the Roman see, which had adjudged his views to be orthodox, must be deemed to approve his errors; and Paulinus, writing on Nov. 8, 417, declared that it was unnecessary for him to go to Rome. On Mar. 21, 418, Zosimus replied that no change had been made in what Innocent had done. This letter reached its destination on Apr. 29, and two days later, in the presence of the Roman envoy, a synod of more than 200 bishops convened at Carthage. In a letter to Zosimus it was agreed to abide by Innocent's decision until Pelagius and Celestius should acknowledge beyond all doubt that the grace of God assists man not only to know justice, but to perform it. At the same time a number of anti-Pelagian canons were formulated. These affirmed (1) that Adam first became mortal through the fall; (2) that children must be baptized for the remission of sins because of their original sin; (3) that it is an error to think "that the grace of God whereby we are justified avails only for the remission of sins, and not also for aid against their commission"; and (4) that sinless perfection is impossible on earth.

6. Rescript of Honorius.

Since these ecclesiastical measures could scarcely overcome the sympathy with Pelagius at Rome, the Africans prevailed upon the Emperor Honorius to issue a sacred rescript at Ravenna on Apr. 30, 418, in which, lamenting the spread of Pelagianism at Rome and elsewhere, he commanded Celestius and Pelagius to be banished from Rome and their adherents to be exiled. This decree can scarcely have affected Pelagius himself; for though Marius Mercator states that he was banished from Jerusalem by a synod held late in 417 or early in 418, and presided over by Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, there is no reason to suppose that he had come to Rome before the promulgation of the imperial rescript. As late as the summer of 418 Augustine alludes to Pelagius as being in Palestine, but henceforth nothing whatsoever is known concerning him. Celestius, who seems to have been in Rome on Mar. 21, 418, fled probably to avoid the execution of the rescript. The promulgation of the emperor's edict and the general council at Carthage were followed by Zosimus' famous *Epistula tractoria* which has unfortunately perished. It is equally certain that the acts of the synod at Carthage were in the hands of Zosimus before he wrote this epistle, which can scarcely have appeared many weeks after the end of April, 418. It was an extremely comprehensive document which gave a history of the entire controversy, with copious excerpts from the writings of both Celestius and Pelagius. The Africans expressed their thanks for this condemnation of their two arch-opponents in a letter (likewise lost) written after a synod had been held. To demonstrate the impossibility of any reconciliation, Augustine wrote his last books against Pelagius and Celestius, the *Libri duo de gratia Christi* and the *De peccato originali*.

7. Julian of Eclanum.

Pelagianism was officially dead in the West, but the imperial edicts of 419 and 421 show that the heresy still exercised a secret influence. The chief figure of this second period was Julian of Eclanum (q.v.). How he had been won over to Pelagianism is unknown, but it would seem that his studies in Cicero and his Stoic and especially Aristotelian philosophy, combined with the influence of his friend Paulinus of Nola, made Julian a Pelagian as soon as he became a theologian. The *Epistola tractoria* of Zosimus gave Julian the opportunity to present his views, since it made the condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius incumbent on the orthodox. Before going into exile either because he had refused to subscribe to the *Epistola tractoria*, or because he had disobeyed the edict of 419 which punished by deposition and banishment refusal to subscribe to the condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius, Julian wrote two letters to Zosimus criticizing the condemnation of Celestius at Carthage in 411. In Rome itself Julian pleaded against the doctrine of original sin, probably during the pontificate of Zosimus, who anathematized him. In the brief schism which followed the death of Zosimus in Dec., 418, the Italian bishops were largely Pelagian. This tendency was aided by a letter now lost, but probably written by Julian to Valerius, the influential "count" in Ravenna. The charge made in this letter that Augustine condemned marriage was answered (late in 418 or early in 419) by the great bishop's first book *De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium*. This book was answered by Julian, in the summer of 419, in his four books (of which only fragments have been preserved) *Ad Turbantium;* and to the same period belongs a Pelagian document, doubtless composed by Julian himself, sharply opposing "Manichean" opponents and exhorting the Pelagians to stand firm. This document is closely related to the letter, written probably in the summer of 419, which Julian sent in the name of eighteen Pelagian bishops to Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica. This letter was apparently designed to gain a home for the writers during their exile in the East; but the number of these exiles, many of whom soon returned repentant, is uncertain. Not later than 421 Julian himself, after many wanderings, came with his friends, including Florus, Orontius, and Fabius, to Theodore of Mopsuestia (q.v.), who was Pelagian in sympathy. Despite the banishment of Julian, the polemic between him and Augustine still continued. In 420 Augustine wrote his second book *De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium*, quickly followed by his *Libri quatuor contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*. Both of these works mention Julian but do not oppose him directly. When Augustine, however, received the complete copy of his opponent's *Ad Turbantium*, he wrote, not earlier than 421, his *Libri sex contra Julianum*. Julian was unaware of this latter work when in Cilicia he again attacked Augustine in his *Octo libri ad Florum*. Of this polemic Augustine heard nothing before 427; and his detailed reply broke off with the sixth book, the work being accordingly called *Opus imperfectum*. There is nothing to show that Julian replied to either of the two works specifically directed against him by Augustine, nor is much known of his life after the completion of his *Ad Forum*. He presented no new theses, but summed up in a system the principles of Pelagius; formulated the sharp distinction from Augustinianism; and, retiring the ascetic, emphasized the intellectual-moral element. Shortly after the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia in 428, Julian, with his friends Florus, Orontius, and Fabius, was in Constantinople where he sought to win the emperor and the new patriarch, Nestorius (q.v.), over to this side. The friendship between Theodore and Nestorius, combined with the affinity of Pelagianism with Nestorian Christology (see CHRISTOLOGY, IV., § 1), may have moved Julian to make this step; but Nestorius, not knowing of the course of events in the West, sought for information from Pope Celestine I. For some reason the pope remained silent, and Nestorius, apparently regarding Julian and his comrades as orthodox, though not himself a Pelagian, permitted them to remain for the time in Constantinople. The patriarch seemed also friendly to Celestius, probably in 429. In the latter part of the same year, however, Marius Mercator published at Constantinople his *Commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii*, to demonstrate that Celestius, Pelagius, Julian, and his companions were heretics who had long been under the ban in the West and among all the orthodox of the East. Early in 430, therefore, the Pelagians were expelled by the emperor from Constantinople, and the verdict of the West was likewise adopted by the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus in 431. According to Prosper, Julian, about 439, sought to regain his bishopric by a feigned repentance, only to be successfully opposed by Pope Sixtus III. at the instance of Leo, later the Great.

8. Decline and Disappearance.

Meanwhile Pelagianism lingered on, not only in Britain, where Agricola disseminated Pelagian views until checked by Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, in 429; and Ireland, where the commentaries of Pelagius were long popular, but also throughout the West, and even in North Africa. Pope Celestine I. relinquished his active support of the Augustinians against Gallic Semi-Pelagianism (q.v.) after the death of Augustine and the Vandal invasion of Africa; and the accession, in 432, of Sixtus III., who before the time of the *Epistula tractata* had figured as the most influential patron of the Pelagians, probably accounts for the change of situation in the view of Julian. About this same time the *Liber prædestinatus* appeared from Roman circles which were Pelagian at heart, though they reckoned Pelagius among the heretics. But where the doctrines of Pelagius had been anathematized, Pelagianism, in the strict sense of the term, could no longer exist. After Julian's failure to regain his diocese, he seems to have remained in Italy, for he was in Campania in the pontificate of Leo the Great (440–461). Gennadius implies that he died between about 441 and 445, but where is unknown. Of Celestius, moreover, all traces vanish in 429.

(F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: The sources are fairly well indicated in the text. They are the anti-Pelagian treatises of Augustine, handiest in W. Bright's ed. Oxford, 1880, also in Augustine's works in *MPL*, xxxii.–xlvi (cf. the collection of material useful for the history of the controversy, *MPL*, xlv. 1609 sqq.), and the Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 1 ser., vol. v., which contains an "Introductory Essay" by B. B. Warfield, and a bibliography; the remains of Pelagius, Celestius, and Julian, in *MPL*, xxi.; the works of Marius Mercator in *MPL*, xlviii (Garnier's ed., with seven dissertations on the history of Pelagianism, and a number of scattered sources appeared, Paris, 1673); the anti-Pelagian writings of Jerome, *MPL*, xxii.–xxx.; Orosius, *Liber apologeticus*, *MPL*, xxxi.; and the acts of the synods and council named in the text as reported in the standard works of Mansi and Hefele. For discussions consult: G. F. Wiggers, *Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1833, Eng. translation of vol. i., *Historical Presentation of Augustinism and Pelagianism*, Andover, 1840; J. L. Jacobi, *Die Lehre des Pelagius*, Leipsic, 1842; A. Short, *The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit*, Oxford, 1846; J. Müller, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, vol. i., Breslau, 1849, Eng. transl., *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Edinburgh, 1868; W. Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, i. 321–358, Edinburgh, 1863; C. E. Luthardt, *Die Lehre vom freien Willen*, Leipsic, 1863; J. F. Nourisson, *La Philosophie de S. Augustin*, i. 452 sqq., ii. 352 sqq., Paris, 1866; F. Wörter, *Der Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1866; J. B. Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, chap. iii., London, 1878; F. Klasen, *Die innere Entwickelung des Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1882; idem, in *TQS*, lxvii (1885), 244 sqq., 531 sqq.; C. P. Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten*, Christiania, 1890; A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum*, Leipsic, 1897; B. B. Warfield, *Two Studies in the History of Doctrine: Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy; Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation*, New York, 1897; R. Seeberg, *Duns Scotus*, Leipsic, 1900; H. Zimmer, *Pelagius in Irland*, Berlin, 1901; H. von Schubert, *Der sogenannte Prädestinatus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus*, Leipsic, 1903; E. Riggenbach, *Unbeachtet gebliebene Fragmente des Pelagius-Kommentars zu den paulinischen Briefen*, Gütersloh, 1905; S. Hellmann, *Leontius Scottus*, Munich, 1906; *DCB*, iv. 282–295; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 783–870; *DNB*, xliv. 240–243; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. ix.; and in general the works on the church history of the period; also the works on the history of doctrine such as those by Harnack, Boston, 1895–1900; Hagenbach, 1840, Eng. transl., New York and Edinburgh, 1861–80; and Shedd, 8th ed., New York, 1884; and the literature under Augustine, Saint, of Hippo.

PELAYO, ALVAR (ALVARUS PELAGIUS): Spanish Franciscan; d. at Seville Jan. 25, 1352. He studied law at Bologna, and theology at Pisa and at Paris, where he was a pupil of Duns Scotus. He taught canon law at Bologna and elsewhere, and later became papal penitentiary at Avignon under John XXII. In 1332 he was made titular bishop of Coron, in Greece, and in 1335 actual bishop of Silves, Portugal. While at Avignon he wrote his work *De planctu ecclesiæ* (Ulm, 1474, Lyons, 1517, Venice, 1560; cf. J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform*, i. 84–89, Berlin 1903). In this treatise he proclaimed the theory of unlimited papal authority. He differed from Agostino Trionfo merely in that he, as a strict Franciscan, extended the conception of poverty, which his order was bound to observe, to the Church at large; and deduced all the evils of the age from the fact that the Church had become rich and worldly. In his theory of the papacy he maintained that the pope stood above all, even the councils. The tribunal of Christ and that of the pope he maintained were one and the same, and all power on earth, both spiritual and secular, inhered in the pope. Incidentally the work contains an abundance of anecdotes of curiosities and confessional casuistries from the author's own experience.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, vol. iii., 24 vols., Naples, 1731–1860 (for account of unprinted works); J. B. Schwab, *Joh. Gerson*, pp. 24–28, Würzburg, 1858; Birck, in *Jahresbericht der höh. Bürgerschule zu Mülheim*, 1868; S. Riezler, *Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste*, Leipsic, 1878; A. Finke, in Supplement IV. to *Römische Quartalschrift*, Rome, 1896; Pastor, *Popes*, vol. i. passim; *KL*, i. 667–668 (gives list of his writings).

PELEG. See Table of the Nations, § 2.

PELLIKAN (KUERSNER), KONRAD: Hebrew scholar; b. at Ruffach (47 m. s.w. of Strasburg) Jan. 8, 1478; d. at Zurich Apr. 6, 1556. His parents were in straitened circumstances and his earliest education was provided for at Heidelberg and Tübingen by an uncle through whom came his change of name from Kürsner. In 1499 he began the study of Hebrew, which he pursued under the greatest difficulties, studying far into the night, and having as his principal aid the *Stern Meschiah* of the Dominican Peter Schwarz or Petrus Nigri (Esslingen, 1477), which included a chrestomathy. On the basis of this he began a Hebrew glossary; a hint from Reuchlin aided much in the prosecution of his studies, and Reuchlin may have used his help in making his Hebrew dictionary. In 1501 Pellikan wrote his *De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebræum* (first printed at Strasburg, 1504), and the same year he became priest and entered the monastery at Ruffach. In 1502 he became reader in theology at the Carmelite monastery at Basel, and there he continued the study of Hebrew under Matthew Adrian, a convert to Christianity from Judaism; he was transferred in the same capacity to Ruffach in 1508, was "guardian" at Pforzheim in 1511, at Ruffach in 1517, and at Basel in 1519. He had meanwhile accompanied the papal legate Raymund de Petrandi to Italy in 1504, and the provincial of the order, Kaspar Satzger, on his visitation 1514–17. In 1523 he was called with Œcolampadius as professor of theology to Basel, and in 1525 went to Zurich. The next year he laid aside his monk's hood and married. The remainder of his life was spent at Zurich as professor of Greek and Hebrew and librarian.

His importance is not to be measured by his textbook on Hebrew mentioned above, which was superseded by Reuchlin's *Rudimenta*. As a teacher he was highly successful, also as an exegete and translator (*Commentaria Bibliorum*, Zurich, 1532–39). As early as 1512 he pronounced against transubstantiation, and in 1524 in favor of marriage of priests. Yet his was essentially a peaceable nature, abhorring strife. He promoted the reprinting at Basel of Luther's writings, and had friendly relations with that Reformer, though he was not in agreement with him in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He was also closely connected with Zwingli, to whom he owed his call to Zurich. Among his characteristics were a sincere piety, great modesty, an iron diligence, and hospitality.

(H. L. STRACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources of knowledge are: his *Chronikon*, ed. B. Riggenbach, Basel, 1877; a Germ. transl. of the *Hauschronik* by T. Vulpinus (Renaud) appeared Strasburg, 1892; J. Fabricius, *Miscellanea Tigurina*, iii. 413–439 (funeral sermon); and A. Horawitz and K. Hartfelder, *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*, pp. 547–548, Leipsic, 1886. Consult: Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, III., xv. 226–237; E. Silberstein, *Conrad Pellicanus*, Berlin, 1900; R. Reuss, *Konrad Pellicanus*, Strasburg, 1892; L. Geiger, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1876, pp. 202–217. A photographic reproduction, ed. E. Nestle, of the *De modo legendi* appeared Tübingen, 1877.

PELOUBET, pe-lū'bet, **FRANCIS NATHAN:** Congregationalist; b. in New York City Dec. 2, 1831. He was educated at Williams College (A.B., 1853) and Bangor Theological Seminary (1857). He then held Massachusetts pastorates at Gloucester (1857–1859), Oakham (1860–65), Attleboro (1866–71), and Natick (1872–84). He retired from the active ministry in 1884, and since 1874 has been engaged as an editor of Sunday-school literature. In theology he is a liberal conservative. He is the author of *Select Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons* (36 vols., Boston, 1875–1910; partly written in collaboration with his wife and with Amos Russel Wells); Sunday-school quarterlies in three grades (1880 sqq.); *Suggestive Illustrations on the New Testament* (3 vols., comprising John, Acts, and Matthew; Philadelphia, 1898–99); *Loom of Life* (Boston, 1900); *The Teacher's Commentary* (2 vols., comprising Matthew and Acts; New York, 1901); *The Front Line of the Sunday School Movement* (Boston, 1904); *The Book of Job, the Problem of the Ages* (New York, 1906); and *Gates to the Prayer Country* (1907). He also edited a revision of W. Smith's abridged *Bible Dictionary* (Philadelphia, 1884) and *Select Songs for the Sunday School* (2 vols., 1884–93).

PELT, ANTON FRIEDRICH LUDWIG: German theologian; b. at Regensburg June 28, 1799; d. at Kemnitz (5 m. e.s.e. of Greifswald) Jan. 22, 1861. He studied philosophy and theology at Jena, Kiel, and Berlin; became privat-docent in Berlin in 1826; professor at Greifswald in 1829, and at Kiel in 1835. He lost his position at Kiel in 1852, after the subjugation of Sleswick-Holstein by the Danes; and was then called as pastor to Kemnitz. In 1857 he became superintendent of the diocese. Pelt was originally Hegelian in philosophy, but he drew near to Schleiermacher in theology. He was closely associated with Claus Harms (q.v.) in Kiel, but, in opposition to Harms, he approved the union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches as well as all other efforts at Evangelical unity. His lectures at Kiel covered the field of exegetical, historical, and systematic theology, and the warm personal interest he showed in his students added much to his influence. His great work, the *Theologische Encyklopädie als System, im Zusammenhange mit der Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaft und ihrer einzelnen Zweige* (Hamburg, 1843), witnesses to his untiring industry and comprehensive study, is characterized by spirituality of conception, and is executed in a scholarly manner. He published also a *Commentarius in Epistolas ad Thessalonicenses* (Greifswald, 1829); collaborated in editing *Theologische Mitarbeiten*, a periodical which aimed to combine the old supernaturalism and rationalism into a higher unity (Kiel, 1838 sqq.); and wrote much for the later years of H. F. Reuter's *Repertorium* (Berlin, 1845–60).

(I. A. DORNER†.)

PENANCE.

- I. Biblical Teaching.
  - The Old-Testament Conception (§ 1).
  - Christic Teaching (§ 2).
  - Apostolic Teaching (§ 3).
- II. Development in the Church.
  - Development of Penance (§ 1).
  - Penance as a Sacrament (§ 2).
  - Luther (§ 3).
  - Later Non-Catholic Teaching (§ 4).

I. Biblical Teaching: Among Protestants Repentance (q.v.) usually expresses sorrow for sin and the turning away from it to lead a new life, while penance refers particularly to acts of external self-castigation produced by this sorrow for sin. Among English-speaking Roman Catholics, however, the word penance commonly includes both these meanings. Repentance in the sense of the New-Testament word *metanoia* is a complete change of mental attitude consequent upon a realization of the obligation of God's commandments and of human sinfulness. It can have its full effect only when the power to overcome sin is assured and forgiveness and reconciliation are offered.

1. The Old-Testament Conception.

Even in the Old Testament a consciousness of guilt and a need of forgiveness are constantly recognized. This latter is promised by God on condition of real inward conversion. Victims are brought to sacrifice as a means of ensuring it; but, while sacrifice may be designated an external satisfaction, it is not as though it had power in itself to ensure forgiveness, which is the outcome of the free grace of God. The whole tendency of the prophetic revelation and of the Psalmist's spiritual consciousness is to emphasize the necessity of a change of heart (Ps. li. 16, 17; Joel ii. 13 sqq.), the motive for which is not merely a consciousness of guilt with a fear of God's judgment, but a belief in God's merciful will to take away sin (Isa. xliv. 22). The change is God's own work (Ps. li. 10; Jer. xxxi. 18). In characteristic contrast with other oriental religions, which emphasize external penance, the prophets require fasting only as the outward expression of real sorrow for sin (Joel ii. 12). Under the Mosaic law the only day of fasting, as an expression of inward abasement, was the Day of Atonement (see ATONEMENT, DAY OF). The sufferings of the captivity and the subsequent oppression of the people brought about more frequent expressions of this attitude; a deeper and more abiding consciousness of sin shows itself among the pious Israelites, with, at the same time, a danger of confidence in the power of external forms to express this spirit, or even of themselves to effect the removal of sin (Dan. iv. 27).

2. Christic Teaching.

The redeemer, like his herald, John, begins the proclamation of his message by a call to repentance (Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17; Mark i. 15). How thorough this inner change and purification must be is set forth by the act of immersion; and Christian baptism is to be with the Holy Spirit, who imparts new life from above. As part of the Gospel, the good tidings of the kingdom which he preaches, Jesus represents himself as " come to save that which was lost " (Matt. xviii. 11–14, ix. 10–13; Luke xv.). In the Sermon on the Mount he declares the nature of the righteousness which must characterize those who share in the blessings of the new kingdom, and begins with poverty of spirit, mourning, hunger and thirst, as expressions of sorrow for the previous state of sin. Dying upon the cross, he accepts the penitent thief who bows to his punishment and with beseeching faith turns toward him. He has nothing to say of fasting or other external performances as productive by their own value of forgiveness.

3. Apostolic Teaching.

The preaching of the apostles calls for a change of heart, the possibility of and impulse to which is found in the exaltation of Christ as the savior (Acts v. 31, xi. 18), and with this baptism in his name is connected. The deepest expression of a fundamental moral change at the passage from a state of sin into the communion of saints is found in Paul's conception of being buried with Christ, or of putting off the old man and putting on the new (Rom. vi. 2 sqq.; Col. ii. 12; Eph. iv. 22 sqq.), and in John's doctrine of the new birth from above (John i. 12, 13, iii. 3). Here appears the fundamental unity between real repentance and the process called Regeneration (q.v.). For those, however, who are at heart in the communion of the new life, but are still conscious of the rebellious motions of the flesh, Paul has an exhortation to a continuous renewing and putting on of Christ (Rom. xii. 2, xiii. 14); a fresh change of heart must take place when men have yielded to sinful desires or grown lax in the spiritual life (Rev. iii. 15–19). For this, however, the New Testament knows no different essential elements from those which constituted the primary repentance; forgiveness is once more imparted in virtue of the atoning blood and continued intercession of Christ (I John i. 7–9, ii. 1, 2).

1. Development of Penance.

II. Development in the Church: In considering the doctrine of repentance as it developed in the Church in the post-apostolic period, distinction must be made between the repentance preceding baptism and that prescribed for Christians who had fallen into grievous sin after baptism, and between the conditions imposed in the two cases. In baptism complete forgiveness is imparted in virtue of the redeeming work of Christ, repentance being required of the subjects only in the sense of a thorough change of heart. In the penance of baptized Christians, which is compared by Jerome and Ambrose, and even as early as Tertullian, to a plank grasped by a shipwrecked man, there are required on the one hand certain external works of penance by which the sinner is to be freed of his guilt, and on the other his readmission into the fold by an ecclesiastical, hierarchic body, whose priests hear the confession of sin, give absolution, and impose certain external acts by way of satisfaction (see Excommunication; Penitential Books; Keys, Power of the). At first this ecclesiastical action took place only in the case of grave sins, especially idolatry, adultery, and murder, and had reference to the scandal given to the Church and the necessity of its taking part in the act of readmission. This act occurred only after a prescribed period of public penance and the pronouncement (originally only in the form of an intercessory prayer) of the divine forgiveness. (For the controversies in regard to the restoration of penitents, see Cyprian; Lapsed; Montanism; Novatian.)

2. Penance as a Sacrament.

Public penance was abandoned, first in the East, with the general relaxation of discipline and of the ties of church life, about the end of the fourth century. It went on longer in the West, at least for notorious sins; a restoration of the old discipline was attempted in the Carolingian period. But from the end of the eleventh century its place was taken by the private penance which had long been growing up by the side of it and was now imposed by the Church. All grave sins were to be confessed to the priest, who was to pronounce forgiveness (though not until the thirteenth century in a declaratory formula), and impose a fitting satisfaction. This act is called a sacrament as early as Peter Damian. The combination of absolution and subsequent satisfaction is explained (especially, in early days, by Abelard) by the theory that absolution indeed remits the guilt and the eternal punishment of sin, but that there still remains a temporal punishment which must be worked off by these satisfactions. With this theory is allied that of Indulgences (q.v.). For any necessary satisfaction not made in this life, the suffering of Purgatory (q.v.) is provided. The sacrament of penance, as described by scholastic theologians from Peter Lombard down, and in the canons of the Council of Trent, consists of three distinct acts on the sinner's part—contrition, confession, and satisfaction. A distinction is made between true contrition, by which a man sorrows for his sins because they have offended the good God, whom he loves, and attrition, or " that incomplete repentance which exists when a man fears the divine judgments, abhors the hideousness of sin, makes a firm resolution to sin no more, and begins to love God as the source of righteousness " (H. Klee, *Katholische Dogmatik*, 3 vols., Mainz, 1835–41). Most of the scholastic theologians, whose opinion was confirmed by the Council of Trent, maintained that the operation of the sacrament supplied what was lacking in such attrition—that the Holy Ghost was at work even in it, and that while it was not sufficient to justify a sinner, it could give him the necessary dispositions for receiving the sacrament.

3. Luther.

The Reformers' revision of the doctrine of penance, especially Luther's, took for its starting-point the Scriptural term *metanoia*, "to signify a transmutation in the mind and the affections" (Luther, *Briefe*, ed. de Wette, i. 116–117). In this sense Christ wills, as Luther maintained in his *Theses*, that a Christian's whole life shall be one of repentance. Of repentance, however, in the sense of restoration to divine grace after sin, the dominant element is faith, which lays hold on the promise of that grace; for contrition of itself, were it ever so perfect, could not merit God's grace. According to the Augsburg Confession repentance is composed of "contrition, or the terrors of a conscience shaken by the realization and acknowledgment of sin," and "faith, which is conceived of the Gospel or of absolution, and believes that sin is remitted for Christ's sake." Amendment and forsaking of sin are supposed to follow as fruits of repentance. Luther knows nothing of penance in the sense of exactly regulated penalties; the divine visitations which sometimes come upon pardoned sinners he considers in the light not of penalties but of trials and means of grace coming from divine love. Though Luther and Melanchthon still occasionally call penance a sacrament, it clearly falls in their view not under that head but into the class of various administrations of the Word of God as means of grace; the penitent may receive the declaration of pardon from the minister or from another Christian brother, but this does not differ from that which he may get for himself from the Gospel.

4. Later Non-Catholic Teaching.

When the teaching of the first Reformers, in which Calvin did not differ essentially from Luther, had degenerated into formalism and a dead faith, without a real conversion of heart and will, Pietism in Germany and Methodism in England laid special emphasis on the change of heart. In connection with this they insisted on the necessity of a period, more or less prolonged, of inner conflict and of a sorrow approaching despair. Spener himself did not exaggerate this aspect, admitting that God had different ways of dealing with his children; but some of his followers went to great extremes, in which Zinzendorf was brought up—though he and his brethren afterward reacted from them into a position more nearly approaching that which Agricola had defended, in which the principal stress was laid upon the all-embracing love of God. The idea of the conflict has been characteristic of not a little Methodist practise, though less in England than in America. With the Pietists agreed both the rationalistic and the supernaturalistic movements in laying stress on the practical side of repentance; but while the former had lost the conception of the heartfelt faith which was to found an entire new life, the latter did not sufficiently understand the significance of this faith for the creation and stimulation of a new good-will, and this defect has characterized a good deal of modern Protestant teaching. Schleiermacher explained conversion as consisting of repentance (a combination of sorrow for sin and change of heart) and faith, in the sense of an appropriation of the perfection and blessedness of Christ. According to Ritschl, the will must, by virtue of its assent to good, renounce sin, and faith is substantially the direction of the will to God as the end of its being, with confidence in his guidance; true repentance is to strive after the good end proposed by the whole body, in the belief that as a member of that body one is no longer in sin. It is scarcely necessary to point out the divergence of these views from those of the Reformers, to whose position, however, there is a tendency to return among not a few of the more modern writers.

(J. Köstlin†.)

Bibliography: Study of the subject as treated in the Bible can best be pursued in the standard works on Biblical theology, such as Schultz for the Old Testament and Beyschlag for the New (see Biblical Introduction); for the dogmatic treatment consult the works on systematic theology given in the article Dogma, and in treatises on ethics. Consult further: Bingham, *Origines*, XVI., iii. 2–4, and XVIII.; N. Marshall, *Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church for the first 400 Years*, London, 1714, reissue, Oxford, 1844; Muratori, *Antiquitates Italici medii ævi*, vol. v., Milan, 1741; L. Hahn, *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten*, Breslau, 1864; G. E. Steitz, *Das römische Busssakrament nach seinem biblischen Grunde und seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Frankfort, 1854; J. Arndt, *True Christianity; a Treatise on sincere Repentance*, new ed., Philadelphia, 1868 (a classic); F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, Tübingen, 1872; W. Elwin, *Confession and Absolution in the Bible; a Study of . . . Holy Scripture upon the Doctrine of Penance*, London, 1883; R. A. Lipsius, *Luthers Lehre von der Busse*, Brunswick, 1892; K. Müller, in *Theologische Abhandlungen K. von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, Freiburg, 1896; *The Church's Ministry of Grace* ("Penance" by Bishop C. C. Grafton), New York, 1893; F. Sieffert, *Die neuesten theologischen Forschungen über Busse und Glaube*, Berlin, 1896; J. Köstlin, *Theology of Luther in its Historical Development*, ii. 425–426, Philadelphia, 1898; G. Gerhard, *Eucharistie und Busssakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche*, Freiburg, 1908; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 381–385, v. 1, pp. 729 sqq.

PENDLETON, WILLIAM FREDERICK: New Church; b. at Savannah, Ga., Mar. 25, 1845. After serving as captain in the Civil War he was educated at Savannah Medical College (M.D., 1869), New York Medical College (1870), and the theological seminary at Waltham, Mass., from which he was graduated in 1873. He was pastor of the Chicago Society of the New Church in 1877–84, vice-chancellor and professor in the academy of the New Church, Philadelphia, in 1881–88, and professor of theology in the same institution since 1888. In 1887–97 he was assistant bishop and since 1897 has been full bishop in his denomination, and besides having been president of the academy of the New Church, Bryn Athyn, Pa., since 1897, is also pastor of the Society of the General Church of the New Jerusalem in the same town. He has compiled *A Book of Doctrine for the New Church* (Bryn Athyn, Pa., 1897) and *A Liturgy for the New Church* (1908).

PENICK, CHARLES CLIFTON: Protestant Episcopal; b. in Charlotte County, Va., Dec. 9, 1843. He received his education at the Danville Military School, Hampden-Sidney College, and Alexandria Theological Seminary (1869); served during the Civil War in the Thirty-eighth Virginia Regiment, and reached the rank of quartermaster; at the end of the war he took his theological course, as above, was made deacon, 1869, and priest, 1870; he then served his church at Bristol, Va., St. George's, Mount Savage, Md., and the Church of the Messiah, Baltimore; he was consecrated missionary bishop of Cape Palmas, Africa, in 1877, and did good service in healing divisions and establishing missions in Africa; in 1883 he resigned, and became rector of St. Andrew's, Louisville, Ky., and later at Frankfort, Ky. He has written : *More than a Prophet: a Series of Expository Chapters of the Life of St. John the Baptist* (New York, 1881); *Our Deeds, our Memories, our Duties* (1888); and *Hopes, Perils, and Struggles of Negroes in the United States* (1893), besides missionary reports and briefer papers.

PENITENTIAL BOOKS (*Libri pœnitentiales*): Collections of rules for the guidance of the confessor, prescribing the satisfaction he ought to demand before granting absolution. The pre-Reformation Church taught, like the modern Roman Catholic, that the forgiveness of sins required, besides contrition and confession, the performance of some act of penance, which in the early Church was taken as evidence of the sincerity of the repentance (see PENANCE, REPENTANCE). Later, under the influence of Teutonic legal customs, the payment of a sum of money appears as compensation for an act displeasing to God. The earlier good works required for this purpose consisted usually in acts of self-denial prescribed by custom, which the sinner imposed upon himself for a time; the later money payment, to be devoted to pious and benevolent ends, was taken in their stead as an act pleasing to God. It was the function of the confessor to determine, according to the gravity of the sins confessed, the amount of this payment; and rules grew up as a standard for the regulation of penances. Collections of rules for the performance of the confessor's office were known as *libri pœnitentiales*. In the early Church, the synods and councils held at Ancyra (314), Nicæa (325), and elsewhere, laid down such rules; and further influence on their development was exercised by three letters of St. Basil of Cæsarea (d. 379), which contain directions for penance. John Scholasticus (d. 578) selected therefrom sixty-eight canons for his *Syntagma*, and the Second Trullan synod (692) confirmed them.

The later development of this literature in the Church of the East has little importance for the West; Basil was studied there, but the Church of the West had worked on the problem for itself a century before his time. Thus about the middle of the third century, Cyprian mentions the compilation, from the decisions of African councils on the question of the Lapsed (q.v.), of a little book of particular directions. The monastic discipline had its influence, and so had the secular law with its system of graded fines for all offenses, giving impulse in the old British and Irish Church to a whole literature of penitential books prescribing particular penance for respective sins. Fragments of these are preserved in later compilations; such as the *Canones Patricii* (c. 546), a *Liber Davidis* (St. David, bishop of Menevia, d. 544), and a penitential of Gildas (d. 583). Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (d. 690) made use of these works for the Anglo-Saxon Church, though he was in connection with Greek and Roman tradition also. The names of Bede (d. 735) and Archbishop Egbert of York (d. 767) are also attached to similar compilations.

These regulations were brought over to the Frankish kingdom by Columban (q.v.), when he came from Bangor to Gaul about 590; he wrote a *Liber de pœnitentia* which was much esteemed and served as a foundation for later works. Still greater influence on the Frankish discipline was exercised by some of the confessional books ascribed to Theodore and by a *Pœnitentiale Commeani*, dating probably from the beginning of the eighth century. The confusion resulting from this variety of authorities induced the Frankish synods to condemn them generally, in favor of a stricter discipline based on the old canons, Holy Scripture, and ecclesiastical custom. About 829 Ebo, bishop of Reims, induced Halitgar of Cambrai to compile a book of the kind himself; of this the first two parts are taken from Gregory I. and Prosper, books III.–V. are an extract from an independent collection of his own; and book VI. is attributed to a Roman source, though it is certainly Frankish.

Entirely independent of this is the *Pœnitentiale Romanum* of which there is frequent mention from the first half of the eighth century, and upon the significance of which different opinions have been offered. The proof, however, that a universal system of penance approved by the Curia does not exist is accepted. The title *Pœnitentiale Romanum*, never applied to one and the same work, really represents the source of the principles of universal application, as distinguished from local or national bodies of penances. Other penitential books arose in the Frankish kingdom of the ninth century, and finally every diocese had its own; but all employed the same material, which passed from one to another, from the above-mentioned sources through the collections of Regino, Burchard, and others, down to Gratian. (E. FRIEDBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A rich article is to be found in *DCA*, ii. 1608–16, with minute bibliographical detail. Consult further: F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, Halle; 1851 (learned and full); E. Friedberg, *Aus deutschen Bussbüchern*, Halle, 1868; F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Litteratur des kanonischen Rechts im Abendlande*, Grats, 1870; R. Gibbings, *The Taxes of the Apostolic Penitentiary*, Dublin, 1872; E. Kats, *Grundriss des kanonischen Strafrechts*, Berlin, 1881; H. J. Schmits, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisziplin der Kirche*, Mains, 1883; H. C. Lea, *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, Philadelphia, 1892; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, v. 90 sqq., Berlin, 1895; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 371 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 137 sqq., 451 sqq.

PENITENTIAL ORDERS: A general name for numerous orders and religious corporations submitting to classification according to their practical relations and functions, for (1) the instruction of the young; (2) nursing of the sick; (3) spiritual ministration; (4) redemption of captives; (5) controversy with infidels; (6) public preaching (Franciscans and Dominicans); and (7) home and foreign missions (Lazarites of France). All have the one aim in common, to attain heaven by a life of asceticism or penance. Besides this general aim some of the individual orders have penance as their special object, either to cultivate the spirit of repentance in themselves and obligate themselves outwardly to strenuous works of contrition, or in the mission of charity to afford a rescue for fallen persons and lead them to repentance. The following are mentioned: (1) The Regular Tertiaries of the Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic. See FRANCIS, SAINT, AND ORDER OF THE FRANCISCANS, IV., ii. 3; and DOMINIC, SAINT, AND THE DOMINICANS. (2) The Hermits of St. Augustine. See AUGUSTINIANS. (3) The Order of Fontévraud. See FONTÉVRAUD, ORDER OF. (4) The Carmelite Nuns. See THERESA, SAINT. (5) Orders of St. Magdalen. See MAGDALEN, SAINT, ORDERS OF. (6) The Women of the Good Shepherd. See WOMEN, CONGREGATIONS OF. (7) *Ordo pœnitentiæ sanctorum martyrum* or *Ordo Mariæ de Metro de pœnitentia,* which flourished in Poland and Bohemia at the beginning of the sixteenth century; and (8) the *Ordo religiosus de pœnitentia* called Scalzetti at Rome and sometimes Nazaretti, founded by the Spaniard John Varella y Losada (d. 1769) and approved by Pope Pius VI. in 1784; and a considerable number of organizations of only local significance.

PENITENTIAL PSALMS: The Church catholic classifies under this name Pss. vi., xxxii., xxxviii., li., cii., cxxx., and cxliii. The arrangement of these seven psalms in a class by themselves is probably later than Augustine, but was known in the seventh century (cf. Cassiodorus on Ps. vi., *MPL,* lxx. 60, cf. 65, and on Ps. cxlii., p. 1014). He associated them with the seven "remissions of sin in the Gospels," viz: baptism, sufferings in martyrdom, almsgiving, conversion of another, charity, forgiveness, and penitence. Since that time the penitential psalms have often been the subject of comment and were used in private devotions and in the liturgy. The Roman ritual prescribes their use in prayer for the sick, during the anointing with the sacred oil. In the Protestant Church the term was retained (cf. Luther's exposition published 1517 and 1525, and in his *Werke,* Erlangen ed. xxxvii. 340), without, however, making use of the penitential psalms for liturgical purposes. (A. HAUCK.)

PENITENTIARY: The term applied in the Roman Catholic Church to a priest who imposes penance, especially one who represents the bishop. The penitentiaries must not be confused with the father confessors. Something of the sort is mentioned at an early date in the East (Socrates, *Hist. eccl.,* V., xix.), and employment of them is enjoined by the tenth canon of the Lateran Council of 1215. Accordingly, in many dioceses episcopal penitentiaries were introduced and specially empowered as members of the chapter. At the same time, the innovation was by no means universal, and some bishops laid stricter claim to jurisdiction in reserved cases (see CASUS RESERVATI). Under the modern organization of cathedral chapters increased regard is shown for the representation of the bishop in reserved cases by the appointment of one of his own canons. A distinct *pœnitentiarius major* ("chief penitentiary") stands at the head of the *Pœnitentiaria* in Rome, and is officially represented by the *pœnitentiarii minores* who are stationed at St. Peter's, at the Lateran, and in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore for the faithful of all languages.

E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines,* XVIII., iii. 11–12; R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity,* VI., iv. 8–9; J. C. W. Augusti, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie,* 3 vols., Leipsic, 1836–37; *DCA,* ii. 1616–17.

PENITENTS: The term applied to those Christians in the early Church who, having fallen into sin, were under Church Discipline (q.v., I.) and were submitting to Penance (q.v.). The essential condition of penitents was that of probation prior to readmission into the Church. This period of probation differed at different times and in different places, varying from a few weeks to twenty years (the last only in a later period). In the early period the penitents were in four classes: mourners, hearers, kneelers, and co-standers, these degrees representing in a rough way progress toward reconciliation with the Church. Duties in the first grade were repeated confession before the church with tears and lamentations, abstention from ornaments of dress and signs of repentance in dishevelled hair and the like, abstention from gratification of the senses, marriage being prohibited during the term; in all grades positive signs of repentance were to be given by works of charity and benevolence. For discussion of the treatment of those who fell under temptation in times of persecution see LAPSED.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature and sources are fully indicated in and under the articles to which reference is made in the text.

PENN, WILLIAM: Quaker; b. in London Oct. 14, 1644; d. at Ruscomb (5 m. e.n.e. of Reading), Berkshire, July 30, 1718. His parents were Admiral Sir William Penn and Margaret, daughter of Johann Jasper of Rotterdam. The family-name is Welsh, meaning the crest of a hill. 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 non-conformity (1661), he was harshly treated by his father, who because of his strict life sent him to France with a party of young nobles and gentlemen to be cured of the same. 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, Moïse Amyrault (q.v.). After a short stay in northern Italy, he returned to London in 1664, 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 afterward, 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, acquitting himself 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 at once and forever, and spent the rest of his life as a devoted servant of Christ. Attaching himself to the Society of Friends, he suffered much from persecution. Imprisoned in 1667, for attending a religious meeting of his fellow worshipers 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." His father was very angry, disowned him, and turned him out of doors.

However excessive his scruples may have been, the servility of that age made greater 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 disappoint the fond and ambitious hopes of his father. But he never wavered. His father, the admiral, was before his death (1670) reconciled to him, and advised him to keep his "plain way" of life and of preaching.

Penn holds a high place as a champion of English liberty and of universal toleration. Imprisoned in the Tower of London from Dec. 12, 1668, to the end of July, 1669, at the instance of the bishop of London, for publishing without license a tract entitled *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, he sent 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 apprehensions? Am I therefore incompatible with human societies? I know not any unfit for political society, but those who maintain principles subversive of industry, justice, fidelity, and obedience." "It 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." He was released from the Tower by the king, through the intercession of the duke of York.

On Aug. 14, 1670, on going to the meeting at Grace-church Street, London, 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 he was again imprisoned for preaching. He traveled 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, granddaughter of James I., sought his society, and confided to him the story of her religious conflicts and experiences.

From early years Penn had nourished dreams of a home for the oppressed in the wilds of America. Becoming connected with New Jersey, and one of the proprietors of East Jersey, he drew up liberal laws for the province, and many Friends migrated thither. In 1681 he obtained from Charles II. a grant of the lands now constituting the states of Pennsylvania and Delaware, in satisfaction of a claim of his father's against the crown for sixteen thousand pounds, and became the greatest landowner 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. But he recovered himself, and his second wife was an excellent manager. He made two visits (1682–84; 1699–1701) 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 special care he had been entrusted 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 and Mary, and afterward 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."

He was twice married: 1. Gulielma Maria Springatt (1672–1693–94), who bore him three sons and four daughters; 2. Hannah Callowhill (1695–1696), who survived him, dying in 1726. She bore him two daughters and four sons. 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 defense of Quakerism, 1668); *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 throughout the World, A Call or Summons to Christendom* (1677); *A Persuasion to Moderation* (1686); *Good Advice to the Church of England, and Catholic and Protestant Dissenters, for the Abolition of the Penal Laws and Fasts* (1687); *A Key* (elucidating the peculiar tenets and features of Quakerism); *The New Athenians no Noble Bereans* (1692); *An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Diet, Parliament, or Estates* (1693); *Fruits of Solitude* (1693); *Travels in Holland and Germany, anno 1677* (1694); *Primitive Christianity Revived* (1696); *The Quaker a Christian* (1698). An edition of his *Works,* with *Life* by Joseph Besse, appeared in 2 vols. (London, 1726), and his *Select Works,* ed. J. Fothergill (1771); in 5 vols. (1782) and 3 vols. (1825).

W. J. MANN†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal sources of knowledge are Penn's *Journal;* the publications of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vols. i.–ix.; and the life by Besse in the *Works,* ut sup. A good list of lesser authorities and secondary materials is given at the end of the sketch in *DNB,* xliv. 311–319. Consult: Mrs. C. Grant (a descendant), *Quaker and Courtier. The Life and Work of W. Penn,* London and New York, 1908; J. Marsillac, 2 vols., Paris, 1791; T. Clarkson, 2 vols., London, 1813; M. L. Weems, Philadelphia, 1835; E. Lewis, Philadelphia, 1837; W. H. Dixon, London, 1856, new issue, New York, 1905; S. M. Janney, Philadelphia, 1852; J. Sparks, *American Biography,* vol. xii., Boston, 1852; C. Vincens, Paris, 1877; T. P. Cope, *Passages from the Life and Writings of William Penn,* Philadelphia, 1882; W. J. Mann, Reading, 1882 (in German); J. Stoughton, London, 1882; B. Rhodes, *Three Apostles of Quakerism,* London, 1885; W. J. Buck, *William Penn in America,* Philadelphia, 1888; F. E. Cooke, London, 1899; A. C. Buell, *William Penn as the Founder of Two Commonwealths,* New York, 1904; C. E. Hewitt, *Spirit of Penn,* ib. 1909. The *British Museum Catalogue* gives about ten pages to works by and on William Penn.

PENOLOGY. See PRISON REFORM.

PENRY (AP-HENRY), JOHN: English Puritan and separatist; b. in the parish of Llangamarch, northern Brecknockshire, Wales, 1559; hanged in London May 29, 1593. He studied at Peterhouse, Cambridge, and at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford (B.A., Cambridge, 1584; M.A., Oxford, 1586). He is said to have been brought up a Roman Catholic, but became an extreme Puritan at Cambridge; preached there and at Oxford with fervor and acceptance, although it is doubtful if he ever took orders. In 1587 he published at Oxford a plea for the better preaching of the Gospel in Wales; he criticized unsparingly the non-residence and incompetency of the clergy and other abuses, was brought before the high commission court in consequence, and suffered an imprisonment of a few days. In 1588 he was at Moulsey, Surrey, connected with the surreptitious press from which the Marprelate tracts were issued. When the press was seized by the authorities at Manchester in Aug., 1589, he escaped to Scotland, was well received and protected by the clergy there, and remained till Sept., 1592, maintaining his attacks on the bishops. Returning to London he joined Johnson and Greenwood's congregation of separatists; was arrested as a suspicious character in Mar., 1593, brought to trial in May on a charge of inciting a rebellion, was found guilty on somewhat forced testimony, and executed at St. Thomas-a-Watering, Surrey. It is admitted that he was the chief agent in publishing the Marprelate tracts, and it is held by many that he was their principal author [though this distinction seems rather to belong to Henry Barrow (q.v.) A. H. N.]. His acknowledged writings are very similar in tone and manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature on the Marprelate Tracts (q.v.), consult: J. Waddington, *John Penry the Pilgrim Martyr,* London, 1854; C. H. and T. Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses,* ii. 154–158, London, 1861; H. M. Dexter, *Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years,* pp. 246–252, New York, 1880; *DNB,* xliv. 346–350.

PENTATEUCH. See HEXATEUCH.

PENTECOST: The name of two feasts, one Jewish and the other Christian, so called from their observance fifty days after the offering of the first sheaves and after Easter respectively.

I. Jewish: For the ancient Israelites Pentecost was the second of their three pilgrimage festivals, and formed a religious close for the harvest time, so that it was called " the feast of harvest " in Ex. xxiii. 16. More often, however, it was termed " the feast of weeks " (Ex. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10), since seven weeks were counted from the solemn act of the opening of the harvest, the offering of the first sheaves, to the closing festival of thanksgiving. Like the offering of the first sheaves, this harvest festival, fifty days later, was to be held on the morrow after the Sabbath (Lev. xxiii. 11, 15–16), and consequently on the first day of the week. In Josephus' time, the offering of the first sheaves was fixed on the sixteenth day of Nisan; at a later period Pentecost was observed on the sixth of Siwan, regardless of the day of the week.

In Ex. xxiii. 16–17 (cf. Ex. xxxiv. 22–23) Pentecost was counted among the three principal feasts on which every male must come to the place of worship. It was a joyful festival in which the poor, the Levites, and the strangers were not forgotten. A more definite idea of the celebration is gained from the regulations in Lev. xxiii. 15–21; Num. xxviii. 26–31. One of the principal offerings was that of two loaves, made of fine flour and leavened. This bread must be offered from " your habitations " (Lev. xxiii. 17), i.e., from grain grown on the sacrificer's own land, since it was a symbolic offering of the whole community, like that of the first sheaves. Besides the bread, there was to be a burnt offering of seven lambs, one bullock, and two rams, as an accompaniment to the meat and drink offerings. One kid was also to be sacrificed as a sin offering, and two lambs as peace offerings; these latter were to be waved like the bread, and, like this leavened bread, did not belong to the altar, but to the priests.

Besides these sacrifices of the whole community, individuals brought voluntary offerings according to the size of their harvest (Deut. xvi. 10). The day was to be marked by Sabbath rest and festive assemblies (Lev. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26; Deut. xvi. 11). In later times, since the date of the Passover, upon which that of Pentecost depended, could be known only after the appearance of the new moon, and as the news of this could not always reach the distant diaspora in time, a second holiday was added, so that all should celebrate at least one day in common.

Pentecost, which is mentioned only once in the historical books (II Chron. viii. 13), was originally an agrarian festival, a thanksgiving for the completion of the harvest. At a later period, however, a historical basis was ascribed to it. In *Jubilees*, vi. 17 sqq., Noah is commanded to observe the feast as a memorial of the covenant made with him after the flood. A theory formed in Talmudic times, which was accepted by Maimonides (*Moreh Nebukim*, iii. 43) and gained general recognition, was that Pentecost was a memorial feast of the giving of the law on Sinai. (C. VON ORELLI.)

II. Christian: Pentecost, the fiftieth day after Easter, is the third great annual Christian festival and the last in the cycle of the festivals associated with our Lord. It appears to be not only essentially connected with the Hebrew feast of first-fruits by the historical event recorded in Acts ii., but the Christian festival of thanksgiving for the first-fruits of the Spirit also corresponds to the Jewish festival of the first-fruits of nature (Rom. viii. 23), a view advanced as early as Augustine. In Christian literature the name Pentecost originally signified the whole period of fifty days from the first Easter to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and was so understood by Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, the Apostolic Constitutions, the *Ordo Romanus*, and other sources. During this time fasting was forbidden, prayer was offered standing, the theaters were closed and games were suspended in the circus, the book of Acts was read in the liturgy, and the Hallelujah was frequently sung.

The name Pentecost was first used in its restricted sense of the closing day of the fifty days' festival in the canons of the Council of Elvira, in 305, where the occasional custom of celebrating the feast of Pentecost on Ascension Day, the fortieth day after Easter, was forbidden as heretical. At an early date the feast of Pentecost became one of the most important in the calendar. Its vigil was soon observed with fasting, and became a favorite time for the administration of baptism. In like manner the entire octave of Pentecost came to be honored much as was the octave of Easter; but from the eighth century, in order to limit the number of holidays, this celebration was often abridged, so that it first ended on Thursday, then on Wednesday, and was finally confined to three days. In the Anglican and Lutheran Churches only the Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun Week are now observed. The name Whitsunday, frequently applied to Pentecost, is derived from the custom of wearing white garments at this festival. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Add to the pertinent literature for I. given under EASTER, FEASTS and FESTIVALS, and PASSOVER, F. Hitzig, *Ostern und Pfingsten*, Heidelberg, 1837; C. C. W. F. Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, iii. 613 sqq., 645 sqq., Heidelberg, 1839; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxi., cols. 119–123; *JE*, ix. 592–595; *DB*, iii. 739–742; *EB*, iii. 3649–53 (these deal also with the feast in the N. T.). For II.: Bingham, *Origines*, XI., vi. 7, XIV., iii. 3, and especially XX., vi.; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, ii. 343 sqq., 384–385, Leipsic, 1818; J. E. Riddle, *Manual of Christian Antiquities*, pp. 679 sqq., London, 1843; H. E. F. Guericke, *Lehrbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Archäologie*, pp. 190–196, Leipsic, 1847; N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale*, ii. 279–280, 431–432, Innsbruck, 1897; K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortologie*, pp. 72–76, Freiburg, 1901.

PENTECOST, GEORGE FREDERICK: Presbyterian; b. at Albion, Ill., Sept. 23, 1841. He was educated at Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky., leaving college in 1862, before taking his degree, entering the Eighth Kentucky (Union) Cavalry as chaplain, and leaving the service in 1864 with the rank of captain. In 1864 he entered the Baptist ministry, and held pastorates at Greencastle, Ind. (1864–66), Evansville, Ind. (1866–67), Covington, Ky. (1867–68), Hanson Place Baptist Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1868–71), and Warren Avenue Baptist Church, Boston (1871–77); he was engaged in evangelistic work (1877–81), and in 1881 became pastor of Tompkins Avenue Congregational Church, Brooklyn, where he remained until 1887. He was then engaged in evangelistic work in Scotland in 1887–88 and as a missionary to English-speaking Brahmans in India in 1889–91; was minister of Marylebone Church, London, until 1897; was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Yonkers, N. Y. (1897–1902); and since 1902 has resumed evangelistic services. He became a member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1884, and in 1902–04 was a special commissioner of that organization to the Philippines, China, Japan, and Korea. In theology he is a conservative Evangelical, and, besides his work as editor of *Words and Weapons for Christian Workers*, has written: *The Angel in the Marble* (Boston, 1876); *In the Volume of the Book: or, The Profit and Pleasure of Bible Study* (New York, 1876); *A South Window: or, Keep Yourselves in the Love of God* (1876); *Bible Studies* (10 vols., New York, 1880–89); *Out of Egypt: Bible Readings on the Book of Exodus* (London, 1884); *Birth and Boyhood of Jesus* (New York, 1896); *Grace Abounding in the Forgiveness of Sins* (1896); *Systematic Beneficence* (1897); *Precious Truths* (1898); *The Coming of Age of America* (Yonkers, N. Y., 1898); and *Protestantism in the Philippines* (Manila, 1903).

PENTECOSTAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE: A body formed in 1907–08 by the union of several organizations of churches holding to the doctrine of entire sanctification as a work of grace distinct from and subsequent to justification. Independent holiness churches in New England associated themselves together as early as 1890. Subsequently a similar association was formed in New York and these were united in 1897 under the name "Association of Pentecostal Churches of America." In 1895 a body called "The Church of the Nazarene" was organized in Los Angeles, Cal. This, with similar congregations, resulted in an association. In 1906, a delegation from the Eastern body attended a general assembly of the Church of the Nazarene in Los Angeles to propose the union of the two bodies. The general assembly, finding that the Church of the Nazarene and the Pentecostal Churches were "at one in doctrine, basis of church membership, general superintendency, basis of ownership of church property," and as to "Scriptural holiness," adopted resolutions in favor of the union of the two bodies. The merging was accomplished at Chicago, Ill., in Oct., 1907, and a manual adopted. There was a further union, in Oct., 1908, at Pilot Point, Texas, with the Holiness Church of Christ, a Southern body composed of churches in various southwestern States, some of which were organized as early as 1888. At the time of union this organization had about 100 churches, the other having about 130.

The manual contains a statement of belief in eight items, assent to which is required as a basis of church membership: the Trinity, the divinely inspired Bible, the fall of man, the eternal loss of the finally impenitent, the atonement of Christ, the entire sanctification of believers by faith subsequently to justification, the witness of the Spirit to justification and sanctification, the return of the Lord, and the resurrection and final judgment. General rules, similar to those formulated by John Wesley, are set forth for the conduct of members. A chapter on special advices declares against the use of spirituous and fermented drinks and tobacco and membership in secret societies.

The polity provides for a general assembly and district assemblies. The general assembly elects general superintendents to hold office in the interim. They are to preside over the general assembly and over the district assemblies, arrange the assembly districts, ordain elders, appoint evangelists, and have general charge of the work of the Church. Licensed preachers, after having served as pastors, may be elected to elder's orders by district assemblies. Church boards arrange with ministers directly for the pastoral relation.

The Church has foreign missions in India, Japan, Cape Verde Islands, and Mexico, and home missions in various parts of the United States. It has a collegiate institute at North Scituate, R. I., doing preparatory work and giving theological training, the Deets Pacific Bible College, at Los Angeles, Cal., for Bible training, and a Bible Institute and Training School, at Pilot Point, Tex. It recommends to the patronage of its people the Texas Holiness University, Peniel, Tex., and the Arkansas Holiness College, Vilonia, Ark. As official organs of the church the *Nazarene Messenger*, Los Angeles, Cal., the *Beulah Christian*, Providence, R. I., and the *Holiness Evangel*, Pilot Point, Tex., are recognized. There were reported at the close of 1908, 575 ministers, 230 churches, and 12,000 members.

H. K. Carroll.

PENTIN, HERBERT: Church of England; b. at London Jan. 31, 1873. He received his education at Weymouth College (B.A., 1898; M.A., 1901); was made deacon in 1896 and priest in 1897; was curate of Chilvers-Coton, Nuneaton, 1896–99, and of Stratford-on-Avon, 1899–1901; and has been vicar of Milton Abbey, Dorset, since 1901. He became fellow of the Royal Historical Society, 1895, and of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland, 1904, and is a member of the Royal Asiatic Society. He is the founder of the International Society for Promoting the Study of the Apocrypha, has been its warden since its inception (1905), and is interested in antiquarian matters, having lectured on the subject extensively. His theological position is that of a loyal but liberal-minded member of the Anglican Church, in full sympathy with reasonable but reverent, as opposed to rationalistic, criticism. He has edited or written: *The First Book of the Acts* (London, 1904); *Deutero-Canonica* (1905–06); *Memorials of Old Dorset* (1907); *The Book of Judith* (1908); *Devotions from the Apocrypha* (1909); *Readings from the Apocrypha in Japanese* (1910), and other works dealing with antiquarian subjects. He is general editor of *Apocrypha in English Literature*, and of the Apocrypha in *English and Foreign Drama Series;* and editor, since 1907, of the *International Journal of Apocrypha.*

PEPPER, GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN: Baptist; b. at Ware, Mass., Feb. 5, 1833. He was educated at Amherst (A.B., 1857) and Newton Theological Institution (1860). In 1860 he was ordained to the ministry of his denomination; was pastor of the First Baptist Church, Waterville, Me. (1860–1865); professor of ecclesiastical history at Newton Theological Institution until 1867, and of systematic theology at Crozer Theological Seminary (1868–82), and president of Colby University (1882–89). In 1889 he resigned on account of failing health, and spent the next three years chiefly in travel; he was professor of Biblical literature at Colby University (1892–1900), and retired in 1900. He has written *Outlines of Theology* (Upland, Pa., 1873).

PERÆA.

Varied Use of Term (§ 1).
Inhabitants in Early Period (§ 2).
Early History; Roads and Cities (§ 3).
Jewish Peræa (§ 4).
Non-Jewish Peræa (§ 5).

1. Varied Use of Term.

Peræa is the Greek form for the Hebrew expression "(the land) beyond the Jordan." Inasmuch as the Hebrew expression took form west of the Jordan, it follows that the region referred to lay east of the river. The Greek word *Peraia* as first found in Polybius and Strabo is applied to the coast regions of Asia Minor; Josephus introduced it into Palestine and applied it to that part of the region east of the Jordan which was inhabited by Jews. Eusebius used the word in a more general way. The New-Testament reproduction of the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew "beyond the Jordan" (Mark iii. 8; Matt. iv. 25) refers to the more limited region. This article, however, deals with the larger area connoted by the word, viz., that from the Yarmuk to the boundaries of the Moabites in the district of Heshbon, a region closely connected with Hebrew history from the period of the settlement until the conquest by the Assyrians, and again in Maccabean times. For the natural features of the country see Palestine, II., § 12.

2. Inhabitants in Early Period.

The name usually applied in the Old Testament is Gilead, originally belonging to a place and a mountain and then extended to the district. As given to a city, Gilead is found in Judges x. 17; Hos. vi. 8, xii. 11, for which the Septuagint sometimes uses Gilgal, located by Burckhardt at Jal'ad or Jal'ud three hours south of the Jabbok. The mountain of the name is probably the modern Jebel Jal'ad, on the northern declivity of which the ruins are situated. Probably Gen. xxxi. has reference to this mountain as the boundary between Jacob (Israel) and Laban (Aram), and Gilead is taken as compounded of the two Hebrew (and Aramaic) words for "stone-heap" and "witness," a popular etymology. The mention in Cant. iv. 1, vi. 5, implies that the mountain was used as a pasture land for goats. In the Old Testament Gilead, meaning a region, is used in widely different senses. It may designate the entire land east of the Jordan (Gen. xxxvii. 25; Josh. xxii. 9; II Kings x. 33; Amos i. 3); sometimes a distinction is made between Gilead and Bashan (Josh. xiii. 11; II Kings x. 33), and a third district is sometimes added, viz. Jazer (II Sam. xxiv. 5). At the entrance of the Hebrews this region was inhabited by the Ammonites, while immediately north of them dwelt Aramean tribes. Schumacher's discovery in the year 1900 of Bet Rihab, doubtless the Beth-rehob of II Sam. x. 6–8, makes probable that Aram Zobah is to be sought east of the Jordan and in the eastern part of Gilead, a fact which explains the campaigns of both Saul and David. From II Sam. x. 6, it is likely that the Land of Tob (cf. Judges xi. 3, 5) is to be placed in this region. That Gilead was anciently thickly inhabited by Arameans is clear. The "people of the east" of Gen. xxix. 1 must have been Arameans (cf. Gen. xxxi.). The Israelitic tribes settled here were Manasseh and Gad. The family of Jair (q.v.) had the northern part, that near the Jabbok; the family of Machir was settled southward of Jair, but probably at a later time owing to the campaign of Saul. These two families seem to compose the half-tribe of Manasseh which inhabited Gilead, the rest of the Manassites dwelling in Argob and Bashan, and the family of Machir was doubtless the leading one (Josh. xvii. 1). The southern part of Gilead was inhabited by Gad (a tribe which in the genealogical scheme is not accredited with full blood but is derived from Zilpah the maid of Leah, Gen. xxx. 10). This is corroborated by the Moabite Stone (q.v.): "And the men of Gad occupied the land of Ataroth from of old, and the king of Israel built Ataroth for himself." The possessions of Gad were not clearly defined, especially toward the south, where those of Reuben joined them. II Sam. xxiv. 5 uses the order Gad, Jazer, Gilead, as though Gad was on the extreme south; elsewhere the Jabbok is the northern boundary of Gad (Deut. iii. 16), while Mahanaim is also said to be the boundary between Manasseh and Gad (Josh. xiii. 24–27). According to the delimitation indicated in Josh. xiii. 24–27, 30–31, the larger part of Gilead belonged to Gad, and in Judges v. 17 Gilead is used for Gad, while according to verse 14 Machir (Manasseh) had not settled in Gilead. In I Sam. xiii. 7 Gad and Gilead designate the region east of the Jordan, in Num. xxxii. 26 Gilead is the land of Reuben and Gad (cf. Deut. iii. 12). So that Jair and Machir inhabited the northern half of Gilead, and Reuben and Gad the southern half.

3. Early History; Roads and Cities.

According to the preceding, therefore, Gilead, properly the name of a region (not of a tribe), denotes the districts of el-Belka (south of the Nahr el-Zerka) and 'Ajlun (northward to the Yarmuk). In early Hebrew times the name Gad was applied to the southern part; Josh. xiii. 24–27 deals with the frontiers of the tribe Gad. Gilead was celebrated for its pasturage (Mic. vii. 14) and for its balsam (Jer. viii. 22). For Gilead Israel was often compelled to give battle. On the south dwelt the Moabites, on the east the Ammonites, and on the northeast the Arameans. The conquests of Saul and David ensured the possession to Israel for a long period. Between 900 and 780 B.C. it was often in the hands of the Syrians; Jeroboam reconquered it, but in 733 B.C. it was taken by the Assyrians, though in post-exilic times Jews formed a part of the population. Of the roads in Gilead not much can yet be said. From Edrei (see Bashan) there went a road to the Jordan; from El-Muzeirib, the old Astaroth, one led to the west shore of the Sea of Tiberias; two roads from north to south follow in part the watersheds. Of the cities but little is known. Concerning Camon (Judges x. 5) see Jair. Of Jabesh (I Sam. xi.) no certain traces have yet been found. Thisbe, the home of Elijah, is probably to be located at the ruins of Lisdib south of the Wadi Yabis, near which is a hill which bears his name, while the wadi itself sometimes has his name. The name Mahanaim (Josh. xiii. 26) is perhaps preserved in the village Mihne, an hour north of Listib. Complete uncertainty attaches to the site of Mispeh, the home of Jephthah and an ancient sanctuary (Judges xi. 11). Judas Maccabæus captured and burned it about 164. Depending upon Gen. xxxi. 49, xxxii. 2–3, it has been sought north of Mahanaim; it has also been identified with Ramath-mizpeh in Gad (Josh. xiii. 26) and with the Levitical city of Ramoth in Gilead (Josh. xxi. 38). Schumacher discovered a Maẓfa northwest of Jerash, a name which reproduces the Hebrew name. In the neighborhood a Ramath is to be placed (Josh. xiii. 26) which is to be differentiated from the Ramah of II Kings viii. 29 and the Ramoth-gilead of I Kings iv. 13. Eusebius placed it fifteen Roman miles west of Philadelphia (Rabbath Ammon), but in all probability mistakenly. The Zaphon of Josh. xiii. 27 is explained in the Talmud by *'Amato*, the modern Tell 'Amate, not far from the Jordan. Succoth (Gen. xxxiii. 27) is given in the Talmud as *Tar'ala*, which corresponds to the modern Tell Deir Alla on the lower Nahr el-Zerka. The site of Penuel (Gen. xxxii. 31) is uncertain. Jogbehah (Judges vii. 11) is found in the ruins of Ajbeihat near the sources of the Zerka. The Amoritic city of Jaazer (Num. xxi. 32), later belonging to Gad (Josh. xiii. 25), and in a region noted for its wine (Isa. xvi. 8–9), is located by Eusebius ten Roman miles west from Philadelphia and fifteen from Heshbon on a brook flowing into the Jordan, possibly the modern Khirbet Ẓar.

4. Jewish Peræa.

The second period of the attachment of this region to the Hebrews was brought about through the Maccabees. At the beginning, according to I Macc. v. 9–54, Judas removed the Jews then living in Gilead to Judea as his brother Simon did with those living in Galilee, and no thought was then entertained of permanent conquest of trans-Jordanic territory. Fifty years later John Hyrcanus conquered Medaba in the old Moabitic region, and Alexander Jannæus determined to add Gilead to his realm. The control of the Seleucidæ had been loosened, and the land was partly in control of Greek cities like Gadara, Pella, etc., and partly under remnants of the Moabites and Ammonites, while other parts were attached to the realm of Demetrius of Gamala and Theodore of Amathus. In numerous campaigns Alexander Jannæus succeeded in subduing the whole district, except Philadelphia, and judaized it (see Hasmoneans). But when in 63 B.C. Pompey "freed" large portions of Syria from Jewish dominions, they reverted to their old religious preferences. But the region of Peræa after the time of Pompey remained attached to the Jewish realm (for its area and boundaries at that time cf. Josephus, *Wars*, III., iii. 3). The eastern boundary is closely fixed by Josephus (*Ant.*, XX., i. 1), who relates that there was a strife between the Jews of Peræa and the Philadelphians over the boundary of Mia, identified in the *Onomasticon* as Zia, fifteen Roman miles west of Philadelphia.

5. Non-Jewish Peræa.

The rest of Peræa fell to the "free" cities, probably united with the permission of Pompey to the Decapolis. In this region were Gadara, Abila, Pella, Dium, Gerasa, and Philadelphia. For Philadelphia see Ammonites. Gadara is the modern Mukeis, an hour south of the hot springs in the valley of the Yarmuk, on an elevated ridge. According to its coins, its era was reckoned from the time of Pompey, 64–63 B.C. About 30 B.C. Augustus granted it to Herod, at whose death it regained its independence under Roman protection. It controlled the district north to Hippo, and that northwest to Tiberias and Scythopolis, thus touching the Sea of Galilee. Gerasa corresponds to the modern Jerash, the ruins of which comprise a heathen temple, two theaters, a basilica, a mausoleum, etc. Abila is given in an inscription of the time of Hadrian as belonging to the Decapolis (*CIG*, no. 4501). Pella is placed by the *Onomasticon* six Roman miles from Jabesh, and is possibly indicated by the ruins of Tabakat Fahil, the name given to it in the Talmud. Pella seems to have taken its name from the Macedonian Pella; it was the refuge of the Christians of Jerusalem during the siege of that city. Dium is located by Ptolemy to the east of Pella. Gadara, metropolis of Jewish Peræa (Josephus, *War*, IV., vii. 3) is the modern al-Salṭ. Tell 'Amate on the Jordan marks the site of the old fortress Amathus taken by Alexander Jannæus. The noteworthy ruins 'Arak al-Emir in the upper Wadi al-Ẓir mark the site of the fortress of the Hyrcanus whose doings are related in Josephus, *Ant.*, XII., iv. 11. At the foot of the highlands of Jericho is Tell Nimrin, which corresponds to Beth-nimrah of Num. xxxii. 36. Tell al-Rameh is the Bethramphtha of Josephus, the Beth-Haram of Josh. xiii. 27, and the Beth-haran of Num. xxxii. 36. (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: A. Reland, *Palæstina*, pp. 103 sqq., Utrecht, 1714; A. Neubauer, *La Géographie de Talmud*, Paris, 1868; S. Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, London, 1881; L. Oliphant, *The Land of Gilead*, New York, 1881; C. R. Conder, *Heth and Moab*, London, 1883; idem, *The Survey of Eastern Palestine*, vol. i., ib. 1889; G. Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*, ib. 1886 (contains G. Le Strange, *A Ride through 'Ajlun and the Belka during the Autumn of 1884*); idem, *Pella*, ib. 1888; idem, *Abila of the Decapolis*, ib. 1889; idem, *Northern 'Ajlun*, ib. 1890; idem, in *ZDPV*, xviii., 1895, xxiv., 1901; Schürer, *Geschichte*, vols. i., ii., Eng. transl., I., i., II., i.; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Études d'archéologie orientale*, pp. 139 sqq., Paris, 1897; *DB*, iii. 743–744; *EB*, ii. 1729; *JE*, ix. 595.

PERATÆ. See Ophites.

PERCIVAL, JOHN: Church of England bishop of Hereford; b. at Brough (36 m. s.e. of Carlisle), Westmoreland, Sept. 27, 1834. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford (B.A., 1858; fellow, 1858–63); was ordered deacon in 1860 and ordained priest in the following year; was headmaster of

Clifton College (1862–78), president of Trinity College, Oxford (1878–87); and headmaster of Rugby School (1887–95); examining chaplain to the bishop of Exeter (1869–82), and to the bishop of London (1884–86); prebendary of Exeter (1871–1882); canon of Bristol (1882–87); select preacher at Oxford in 1882 and 1888. In 1895 he was consecrated bishop of Hereford.

PEREIRA DE FIGUEIREDO, ANTONIO: B. at Maçao (85 m. n.e. of Lisbon) Feb. 14, 1725; d. at Lisbon Aug. 14, 1797. He was educated by the Jesuits at Villa-Viçosa, and entered the society of the Fathers of the Oratory; he devoted himself to art and literature, and attracted much attention by his *Exercicios da lingua Latina e Portugueza* (Lisbon, 1751–52) and his *Novo methodo da grammatica Latina* (1752–53). In the contest between Don Jozé I. and the ultramontanist party, he threw himself with violence on the royal side; wrote *Doctrina veteris ecclesiæ* (1765), *Tentativa theologica* (1766; French transl., Lyons, 1772; Eng. transl., *Episcopal Rights and Ultramontane Usurpations*, London, 1847). He was a protagonist of Pombal in his contention for the supremacy of the State over ecclesiastical persons and property; was appointed a member of the board of censors, 1768; counselor of foreign affairs and war, 1769; retired from his order in the same year; became minister of public instruction, 1772; and soon after a member of the Portuguese Academy of Science, and dean in 1792. The list of his works numbers 169. He translated the entire Bible into Portuguese with introduction and notes (23 vols., Lisbon, 1778–90). The translation is circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society (London, 1819, 1821) and the American Bible Society (New York, 1857).

Bibliography: J. C. F. Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, xxxix. 572, 46 vols., Paris, 1852–66; *KL*, ix. 1805–07; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, x. 455–456.

PERFECTION: In the widest sense of the term, realization of the ideal harmony of the phenomenon with its ideal expression. Within the sphere of religion and morality it is that purity and potency of divine fellowship and human activity which evokes the full approbation of the religious and moral conscience. At the same time, genuine perfection must be distinguished from the lower grade of subjection to the law, such as was possessed by Paul while still a Pharisee (Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 6). In Greek philosophy the Stoic system, followed here by Cicero, distinguished between the morality of the virtuous sage, who had attained perfection through the suppression of all passion, and the average morality practised by the masses. Rabbinical literature made a threefold ethical division into perfect, ordinary, and deficient morality, the criterion being the degree in which each individual concerned fulfilled the law. Jewish concepts such as those just noted were carried over into the early Church, and a twofold standard of perfection arose, as is shown not only by the Didache, but also by the *De opere et eleemosynis* of Cyprian and the *De officiis clericorum* of Ambrose. The process was aided by the rise of monasticism, which came to be regarded as the type of perfection, with its exaltation of celibacy and asceticism. Augustine, on the other hand, maintained that grace is necessary to perfection, and that, since sinlessness is impossible on earth, perfection can be realized only in the life to come.

The typical medieval doctrine of perfection was developed by Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, II., ii., *quæstio* 184). He accepted the distinction between "beginners, progressing, and perfect," and he delimited earthly perfection as compared both with the perfection of God and that of those made perfect. The highest perfection attainable by the "beginners" and those "progressing" is that which excludes both the mortal sins which oppose love of God, and also all that hinders the soul from turning entirely to God. Thus the condition of perfection was found in monasticism, although Thomas held that ascetic practises were only a means to an end. But while the laity can, and must, reach a certain stage of perfection, the highest is attained through a "spiritual augment." For the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church see Perfectionism.

Protestantism, proceeding from the theory that ethical conduct is evidenced in love of one's neighbor, denied all value to asceticism and rejected the distinction between clerical and lay perfection, maintaining that it was equally possible of attainment by all (cf. *Augsburg Confession*, xxvii.). At the same time, Protestant dogmatic theologians emphasized the imperfection of the utmost holiness possible on earth, though with the rise of pietism was involved a marked tendency to seek absolute perfection.

From the time of the primitive Church perfection and sinlessness have been identified (I John i. 9). The Gnostics, influenced by Platonic and Stoic philosophy, ascribed perfection to the Pneumatics (q.v.), and Anabaptists likewise claimed to be able to attain perfection. Similar views are held by many Methodists. While, however, the concept of perfection is essential to Christian ethics (cf. Matt. v. 48; Col. iii. 14), perfection and sinlessness are not to be equated (cf. I John iii. 6, 9 with i. 10). John, in the passages just noted, implies simply that sinful activity as such is not included in the regenerated personality, even though the fleshly nature may still sin in defiance of the vital impulses of the child of God. Adherents of the teaching of perfection are apt to take a superficial view which passively measures perfection by the absence of faults, and neglects the active discharge of virtuous obligations, these evils being intensified by a failure to recognize personal faults since such recognition would stultify the claims made to perfection.

Perfection is not a universal Christian predicate, as is shown by Paul's distinction between children and perfect, between carnal and spiritual (I Cor. ii. 6, iii. 1, xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13–14). Discipleship and its moral authentication are clearly differentiated by Christ himself (Matt. vii. 21 sqq., xxv. 34 sqq.; John xv. 2 sqq.), who also represents the life of faith as a process of development (Luke xix. 12 sqq.; John viii. 31, etc.). The same position is held in apostolic teaching (Eph. iv. 13–14; Col. i. 28; II Tim. iii. 17). Paul sees Christian perfection in love (I Cor. xiii.; Col. iii. 12–14); and the same position is maintained in the Gospels, where perfection, analogous to that of the Heavenly Father, is made to consist in free, unselfish, and independent love (Matt. v. 44 sqq.). From his disciples Christ expected self-sacrificing and unselfish love (John xiii. 12 sqq., 34–35, xv. 12 sqq.); and in like manner John taught that the divine love revealed in Christ was realized where brotherly love was manifested in deeds, not in mere words. James found perfection of faith displayed in deeds, the working out of the perfect law of liberty and of the Golden Rule, and in love to one's neighbor (James i. 25, ii. 8). The feeling of imperfection is a necessary part of Christian practise, and Paul himself condemned the excesses of the perfective theory (Phil. iii. 12–15), since to him perfection in its complete sense belonged to the life to come (I Cor. xiii. 10). See Perfectionism. (L. Lemme.)

Bibliography: Consult the literature in and under Perfectionism.

PERFECTIONISM: The doctrine which teaches a possibility or actuality of freedom from sin in the present life. Calvinists and Lutherans deny any perfection in this life; the theory is, however, advocated in other branches of the Church. (1) Roman Catholics teach that in some cases by a special privilege of God one who is justified may avoid all sins. He may even offer an obedience beyond the demands of the law (cf. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, sess. vi., chap. xi., and can. 23, 25, given in Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 100–102, 115). (2) Wesleyan Arminians teach a perfection which is not angelic, Adamic, or absolute, but relative, i.e., "according to the special economy introduced by the atonement, in which the heart, being sanctified, fulfils the law by love." "The highest perfection," says Wesley, "which man can attain while the soul dwells in the body does not exclude ignorance and error and a thousand infirmities." The cause of this perfection is variously conceived, as due, e.g., to repression of unholy thoughts and desires (R. S. Foster, *Christian Purity*, New York, 1869), to eradication of unchristian dispositions (A. Lowrey, *Possibilities of Grace*, New York, 1884), to maturity of grace and holiness, to be distinguished from the fulness of glory of the redeemed in heaven (J. Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols., New York, 1892–94). (3) Friends teach that, 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 the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; there remaineth a possibility of sinning where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord" ("Confession of the Society of Friends," prop. viii.; cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 974–975). (4) The Oberlin school (A. Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine of Perfection*, Boston, 1839; C. G. Finney, *Systematic Theology*, Oberlin, 1878; cf. J. H. Fairchild, *Elements of Theology*, ib. 1892) teaches that "as virtue and sin belong only to voluntary action, and are contradictory in their nature, they can not coexist in the soul. The beginning of the Christian life is entire obedience. Every lapse into sin involves, for the time, an entire interruption of obedience. The promises of God and the provisions of the Gospel are such that, when fully and continually embraced, they enable the believer to live a life of uninterrupted obedience—an attainment which may be properly encouraged and expected in the present life." (5) In addition to the above are scattered groups of Christians, either members of or offshoots from several denominations who advocate entire holiness or sanctification or perfection in this life. In such persons this theory is commonly associated with an impossible psychology of moral action, and with defective ethical standards, and those who claim to have attained to this singular virtue are often characterized by an exaggerated individualism, a loose antinomianism, and by unsocial conduct even though dwelling in communities. See Communism, II., 8. C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: Besides the literature named in the text consult: S. J. Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, 615, New York, 1896 (Roman Catholic); C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, iii. 245, New York, 1873 (Presbyterian); W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ii. 551, New York, 1889 (Presbyterian). The following are principally from the Methodist standpoint: J. Wesley, *Works*, vi. 483–531, New York, n.d.; J. Fletcher, *Works*, ii. 491–669, New York, 1833; W. Bates, *Spiritual Perfection Unfolded*, London, 1848; S. A. Franklin, *Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection*, Cincinnati, 1867; J. A. Wood, *Perfect Love*, Boston, 1862; J. T. Crane, *Holiness the Birthright of All God's Children*, New York, 1874; D. Steele, *Love Enthroned: Essays on Evangelical Perfection*, New York, 1875; idem, *Defence of Christian Perfection*, ib., 1899; A. Hovey, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared with the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, Boston, 1876; P. T. Forsyth, *Christian Perfection*, new ed., London, 1909.

PERFECTIONISTS. See Communism, II., 8.

PERGAMOS: A city of Mysia in Asia Minor, the modern Bergamah, situated on the river Selinus, which flows through the city and is a tributary of the Caicus, which last, being navigable, gives access to the Ægean Sea, twenty-two and a half miles away. The ancient city was connected by road with Adramyttion to the north, Sardis to the southeast, and Ephesus to the south. According to tradition, the place was founded by Telephus, the son of Heracles, or by Asclepias. It was an obscure place till Lysimachus, one of Alexander's generals, chose it as the repository of his treasure. Philetærus, the guardian of the treasure, made himself independent 283 B.C., and inaugurated the continuous policy of the city which involved favor to the Romans in their eastern conflicts. This course met reward from the Romans in the gift of all Asia Minor west of the Taurus, and thus the city became the capital of a powerful kingdom. In 133 B.C. the direct line lapsed, the last king, Attalus III. Philometor, bequeathing the kingdom to the Romans, who made of it the province of Asia. The city long retained its eminence, so that Pliny could speak of it as "by far the most distinguished in Asia." But it declined under the Byzantine dominion. It gave its name to parchment (*charta Pergamea*), which was one of its chief manufactures, and its library, said to consist of 200,000 volumes, went to Alexandria by gift from Antony to Cleopatra. For the Biblical relations see Asia Minor, IV.

PERICOPE, pe-ric′o-pe.

Meaning of the Term (§ 1).
Scripture Reading in the Early Church (§ 2).
Series of Lections not Fixed (§ 3).
Indications of the Liturgies (§ 4).
Early Eastern and Western Lectionaries (§ 5).
The Comes as a Lectionary (§ 6).
Early Western Pericope System (§ 7).
Evidences of Orderly Planning (§ 8).
Effects of Use of Latin in Worship (§ 9).
Roman Catholics and Early Lutherans (§ 10).
Luther's Position; its Consequences (§ 11).
Anglican System (§ 12).
Defense and Attack on the Continent (§ 13).
Historical Conclusions (§ 14).
German Revisions (§ 15).
Theory of the Pericope (§ 16).
Suggestions for a Lectionary (§ 17).
The Anglican Readings (§ 18).

1. Meaning of the Term.

Pericope, a word not found in Biblical Greek, means in ordinary Greek a short passage. Justin Martyr cites as pericopes Isa. xlii. 5–13; Jer. xi. 19, and other like short sections (*Trypho*, chaps. lxv., lxxii., etc.). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, III., iv., VII., xiv.) so uses the word; Origen (*Hom.* xix. on Jer. xx. 1–6) applies the word to a selection of Scripture read in worship by appointment, and further divides the whole text into pericopes, so that a Scriptural lesson may have several pericopes. Later teachers of the Church use the word in the sense of a passage or selection of Scripture. But among neither Greeks nor Latins did the word become a liturgical term; even yet the Greeks call the prescribed lessons from Scripture *anagnoseis* or *anagnosmata*, the Latins *lectiones epistolæ et evangelica*. The use of "pericope" to denominate set Scriptural lessons—the "epistle and Gospel" of the early Church—is (German) Protestant and dates from the sixteenth century (cf. the work of Brenz, *Pericopæ evangeliorum expositæ*, 1566). In theological literature the word has its general signification, only in the modern period has it the sense of prescribed Scriptural lessons.

The development of what "pericope" stands for depends upon the lectionaries, and these upon the practise of reading Scripture in the early Church.

2. Scripture Reading in the Early Church.

In the uncertainty which attaches to the early history of liturgies and lectionaries (see EVANGELIARIUM; LITURGICS), one must depend upon incidental notices. I Tim. iv. 13 refers not to Timothy's private reading, but to his activity for the congregation in the reading of the Scriptures (of the Old Testament). Col. iv. 16 and Rev. i. 3 refer to other passages which are to be authoritative for the community. A passage in the liturgy of James mentions the reading forth of holy words of the old covenant and the prophets, but speaks of the exposition of the incarnation, the passion, etc., during divine worship. Here there is a distinction between reading before the congregation and instruction; the Old Testament is read, the New is set forth. But Justin Martyr (*I Apol.*, lxvii.) speaks of reading also from the New Testament at divine worship on Sunday, using the words "memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets." Tertullian's expression (*Hær.*, xxxvi.): "(The Church) unites the law and the prophets in one volume with the writings of evangelists and apostles," makes in the same direction as showing an authoritative source of Christian teaching. From the practises involved in the foregoing the custom of reading from the Old and the New Testament developed. From the East there is the testimony of Cyril of Jerusalem ("Catechetical Lectures," iv. 35; the Scriptures "which we read openly in the Church"), Apostolic Constitutions (VIII., v. 5), and Basil (*Hom.* xiii. on Baptism); and for the West Ambrose (*Epist.*, xxii. 2) and Augustine (Sermon xxix. 1)—all of these implying the reading of Scripture at divine service. Heaping up of testimony is unnecessary. Probably in Justin's time the church at Rome had its prescribed readings from both Testaments; the later Roman Church had its "epistle and Gospel." But custom varied, even in the same church (cf. Augustine, Sermon xlv.). A completed and fixed system of lessons one may not yet assume (cf. Justin's expression, "as long as time permits," *I Apol.*, lxvii., showing that definite length was not yet prescribed). On the other hand, Chrysostom ("On Lazarus," iii. 1; and also his *Hom.* on John x. 1) urges his hearers to read in advance the selections which will be read before them at worship; and his *Hom.* lvii. 1 further implies a fixed series of lessons recurring year after year. The fact that in certain seasons of the year definite Biblical books furnished the readings in divine service is established. In some ecclesiastical districts during Quadragesima Genesis was the book read (cf. Chrysostom in his seventh "pillar homily"); it is probable that the homilies of Basil on the Hexaemeron were delivered in the fasting-season, when daily sermons were delivered. Possibly Genesis was chosen because in some parts of the Greek Church the church-year began in spring. Another book which served as the basis for selections in the fasting-season was Job (cf. Origen on Job, at the beginning; Ambrose, *Epist. ad Marcellum*, xx. 19; possibly here belongs the beginning of the homily ascribed to Chrysostom, which implies a yearly return to that book as the source of lections). A third book used in this way was Jonah (Ambrose, *Epist. ad Marcellum*, xx. 25: "according to custom, the lesson will be from Jonah"; in a Gallican lectionary given by Mabillon Jonah i. is the reading for Holy Saturday; in the Mozarabic Liturgy [q.v.] the entire book is so set). In some communities it was the practise between Easter and Whitsuntide to read from the Acts, a practise to which Augustine testifies (*Tract.* 6 on John xviii.).

But the reading of such books was not so definitely settled as to prescribe fast-fixed excerpts. In this respect the sixty-seven homilies of Chrysostom on Genesis are instructive. The first thirty-two deal with Gen. i.–xii.; in the thirty-third the author says that the series has been interrupted by the coming of the celebration (of passion week), and then follow the thirty-five other homilies on selected portions of the book. That is to say, the

3. Series of Lections not Fixed.

reading in course of Genesis was interrupted by the passion season; it appears that special seasons had their appropriate lessons (Chrysostom, *Cur. in Pentec. . . . , in Princ. Act., Hom.* iv.; Augustine on I John); Augustine speaks of the "order of the lections," the indispensable history of the celebration, and the free choice of the preacher. Augustine says further (*Hom.* ccci., chap. 1) that "on the day of the resurrection, according to custom, there are readings taken from all the books of the holy Gospel," and a closer description of these readings is found in *Hom.* ccxxxii., chap. 1. Still, the order given there is not absolutely binding, and he himself made changes—to the discomfort of some who had not heard what they were accustomed to hear. The preacher had a certain independence over the reading, this being in the interest of his discourse or in view of congregational needs (Augustine, Sermon ccclxii.). The first attempt, at least for a diocese, to fix definite readings for a part of the year was in Gaul in the middle of the fifth century. Gennadius (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, lxxix.) reports that Musæus of Marseilles excerpted from the Scriptures readings for the year suited to the days celebrated. The second comes from the present Clermont, where Bishop Apollinaris Sidonius reports in an epitaph of a certain Claudianus that he prepared lections for the annual celebrations. Both these were, however, only for special seasons, not the whole year. The *Lectionarium Gallicanum* (*MPL*, lxxii.) belongs to a later period and to Burgundy. For the same period there is known a Greek lectionary. But in general, so far as present knowledge goes, the reading in course never extended, in this early period, to the whole Scriptures; yet the custom was gradually becoming fixed of reading certain passages or from certain books at certain seasons, though the choice was not yet narrowly limited.

4. Indications of the Liturgies.

The liturgies confirm the conclusions reached. Yet it must be confessed that the liturgies themselves offer a difficult problem as to origin and age, worked over and altered as they have been, some bearing celebrated names which are supposititious or unreal so far as authorship goes. The Syrian edition of the Liturgy of St. James names the reading from Paul and the Gospel. The Armenian Liturgy mentions prophetical, apostolic, and Gospel readings. That of the Coptic Jacobites omits the Old-Testament lection, but has two from the epistles, one from the Acts, and one from the Gospel, and the Ethiopic liturgy agrees with this. The Nestorian Liturgy for Ascension Day has lections from II Cor., Acts, I Tim., and Luke. Renaudot (*Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, ii. 61–62, Paris, 1716) notes that among the Syrians the Scriptures were read in Syriac with an interpretation in Arabic following; the interpretation of the Gospel was twofold, literal and paraphrastic. This last confirms what appeared from the sermons of the Church Fathers, that the sermon pericopes developed from the lections, and that entire freedom was not the fact. For indexes and indications of just what selections were chosen for certain times the libraries of churches and monasteries in the East must be searched; but the lections of the East and the pericope system of the West are not interworked. The *Evangelarium Hierosolymitanum* was apparently completed 1030, but probably depends upon a collection of readings much older. The lectionary is in Syriac, and was for the use of the Melchites; it begins with Easter; the lessons till Whitsuntide are from John, those till September 11 (feast of the cross) from Matthew, from then till Septuagesima from Luke, and after that from Mark with selections from the other Gospels. A second lectionary, Palestinian-Syriac, has among the epistolary selections many from Old-Testament books and from Acts, while a sort of series appears for the sixteen Sundays before Christmas.

5. Early Eastern and Western Lectionaries.

The lections of the present Greek Church reach back into the Middle Ages. A distinction is made between *synaxarion* and *menologion*, the former corresponding broadly to "church year," the latter to the calendar called in Roman usage *De sanctis*. Synaxarion may also mean exposition of the lives of saints and martyrs (see ACTA MARTYRUM, etc., II., § 1). Allatius describes among the books of the Greek Church the lectionary, then the Evangelium, the latter adapted for use on certain days and festivals (*De libris ecclesiæ Græcæ*, dissertatio 1), and the Sundays take the name from the lection, as also the week preceding that Sunday. The partition of the Gospels among the church seasons resembles that of the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* (ut sup.; cf. F. A. H. Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.*, pp. 74 sqq., London, 1894). Another lectionary is named by Allatius as inferior in dignity, named by some *Apostolos* because in great part it is taken from the Pauline writings, by others *Praxapostolos* because it contains also readings from Acts. The third book contains selections from the Old Testament fitted to the days of the year, and is called *Anagnosmata* or *Anagnoseis* (see § 1 above). The Greek Church has a second series of lections, for days of saints and martyrs, contained in the Menaion or Menologion (qq.v.), corresponding to the *Proprium missarum de sanctis* of the Roman missal. Some lectionaries of the Western Church have distinct interest as being the predecessors of the lessons or pericopes. Some of these, as they have come down, are of early date—pre-Carolingian—like the two Gallican lectionaries found at Luxeuil and Bobbio (in *MPL*, lxxii.). Others, like the Mozarabic and the Milan forms, had their beginnings in the early period, though their present form is that developed in the Middle Ages. The oldest is the *Liber comicus* (ed. G. Morin, in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. i., Oxford, 1893 sqq.), the form of which is of the sixth century, being threefold, Old Testament, epistle, and Gospel, covering Advent to Whitsuntide, special festivals, and twenty-two Sunday readings. Morin makes it Carthaginian. This is the region of the Mozarabic form (see MOZARABIC LITURGY), which has much in common with *Liber comicus* and also many divergencies. These western lectionaries are distinguished from the Greek by emphasis upon Advent.

6. The Comes as a Lectionary.

In the history of the (German) pericope system it is to be remembered that Luther retained the epistle and Gospel selections used before the Reformation on Sundays and festivals. There are also remains of a medieval lectionary which is most probably derived from that introduced into the Frankish realm by the founders of that kingdom, which was superseded by the later national church lectionaries. Present opinion is that Jerome was not the compiler, as the prologue (or title) states (cf. E. Ranke, *Das kirchliche Pericopensystem*, appendix III., Berlin, 1847). Morin (*Revue Bénédictine*, 1890, pp. 416 sqq.) suspects that Victor of Capua was the compiler for Bishop Constantius of Aquino. The book is interesting as teaching what is meant by the term *Comes* which is so frequently met in this relation. The word occurs in the title of this book and in the preface; it appears also as marking a special collection alongside "codices, Gospels, the Apostolum, and the Psalter," and clearly means a collection of "heavenly readings," and not merely an index with the data of day, place in Scripture, and extent. Thus the *Liber comicus* was a comes, containing as it did the selections in full. The same conclusion is reached through the *Comes Albini* corrected for Charlemagne, the copyist of which notes that the *Comes* is in many hands, but mostly in defective form; for this reason the king had Alcuin correct it, and the copyist, having made a correct exemplar, hopes that it will be kept in that shape by following transcribers. The word *comes*, "companion," arose from the book's being used at the service, for which it was designed, private use being only secondary. The clerics used it at the altar since the sacramentary did not contain the lections. From such a "comes," indeed from a lectionary which may be called "the comes," are the early ecclesiastical (German) pericopes derived. But this source lies in several differing recensions —the *Comes Albini, Comes Theotinchi, Liber Comitis secundum Pamelii codices expressus*, and *Lectionarius missæ juxta ritum ecclesiæ Romanæ*. While these do not go back of the age of Charlemagne, they embody older lectionaries, indeed the pre-Carolingian Roman lectionary is their root. Present pericopes embody epistle and Gospel, as did the Roman mass. With this agrees the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* (*MPL*, lxxviii.). Two lections to the mass is the rule with the complete recensions of the comes. The comes has more selections simply because Luther lopped off many occasions of special service.

7. Early Western Pericope System.

With the exception of Milan, which retained the old lectionary with the old mass, and some Spanish churches which retained the Mozarabic liturgy, the Western Church had an essentially identical pericope system, not derived immediately from the needs of the medieval period but from the past usage of the church at Rome. Whether it goes back to Gregory the Great or his time is uncertain, though in his time a system of lections was in use (cf. the preface to Gregory's forty homilies on the Gospels). The medieval expositors also give no clue. The Advent group of pericopes find explanation in the construction of Isidore of Seville, that the Advent refers first to the birth of Christ and then to his coming in a wider sense. The epistles are selected from a like point of view. The Gospels of Christmastide are self-explanatory; the Gospel of the flight into Egypt and of the slaughter of the innocents fall on the days which precede the Gospel of the Epiphany; also, since the second part of the narrative precedes the first, it is indicated that the first pericope is not to be regarded as the continuation of the others. With Jan. 6, called in the comes "Theophany" and in the homiliarium "Epiphany," a new point of view comes in—the revelation of the glory of Jesus.

8. Evidences of Orderly Planning.

It is not sought here to show how every epistolary and Gospel pericope has been set for its day, but merely to illustrate that, choosing the fasting season *par excellence*, certain groups reveal a definite orderliness and plan. A double point of view comes into sight —preparation for the passion and the resurrection, and the discipline of fasting. It can not be said that the Gospels for the fasting-season have exclusive reference to the fasting and penitential discipline of catechumens, for in Quinquagesima the thought is directed to the passion (Luke xviii. 31–43) and in Quadragesima in the sixteenth century some places read on the first or second Sunday the transfiguration instead of the temptation. Other points of anticipation of the period of the passion might be cited. The second point of view, the discipline of fasting, appears in other Gospel pericopes of this period. For this reason the history of the temptation is placed at the beginning of Quadragesima (Gregory the Great, *Hom.* on the Gospels, xvi., chap. 5); the two following Sunday pericopes deal with expulsion of demons. It is not improbable that the purpose of these selections was, by calling attention to the attacks and power of the devil, to urge the faithful to fasting, almsgiving, and prayer (cf. Augustine, Sermon ccx., chap. 6). The epistolary pericopes bear out this construction and so fall into the general scheme. The examples cited show that they were selected with due care, and that the point of view involved is in part still available, though also in part obsolete. It is not improbable that other portions of the collections of readings, the plan of which is not now perceptible, were not put together at haphazard. In the Homiliarium the Gospels for the Trinity period are in four groups: after Pentecost, after June 29, after Aug. 10, and after Sept. 29. In the second section, which is that of Peter and Paul, on the first Sunday was read the call of Peter, and on following Sundays addresses and commissions of Jesus to his disciples. While this last construction is only hypothetical, if it is true, it shows purpose within certain groups.

In the West during the centuries in which the pericope system developed, a second transformation occurred which had the highest importance for the reading of Scripture as lessons in worship. The language of the service ceased to be intelligible to the people. The high opinion of the lection held in the early Church is easily shown: the lector

9. Effects of Use of Latin in Worship.

was a prophet for whom was besought at ordination the Holy Ghost, and the prophetical gift (Apostolic Constitutions, viii. 22). Augustine declares (Sermon clxx., chap. 1) that the lections hang together because all proceed from one mouth, not that of the minister, but of him who fills the reader's mouth. The lection so highly valued in the early Church became in the Middle Ages worthless to the congregation because it was in Latin. Then came the demand for the sermon in a tongue intelligible to the worshipers, and later this became a fixed custom. It is a question, however, how far in the early part of the Middle Ages the lection was made understandable to the people. Walafrid (q.v.) indicates (*De exordio*, vii.) that this was done among the Goths, and Æneas Sylvius reports (*Historia Bohemica*, chap. xiii.) a like practise among the Slavs which seems to deal with the lections. John VIII. directed in 880 that the Gospel be read in Latin and afterward translated. Lingard (*History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, i. 307, London, 1845) reports the rendering of epistle, Gospel, and sermon in the vernacular, and this is confirmed by the Evangelarium of Cuthbert (ed. W. W. Skeat, Oxford, 1871–1887), in which the Latin text is accompanied by an Anglo-Saxon interpretation, which may have been meant to assist in making the lesson intelligible to the people. According to Harduin (*Concilia*, vi. 1, p. 783) it was desired of priests that they be able to read well the epistle and Gospel and to give the sense. The second item here refers to the sermon, which was then in part the rendering of the pericopes into the vernacular or the paraphrasing of them. Many preachers prefixed an interpretation of the pericope. After the rise of printing came the "plenaries" (see PLENARY), the forerunners of which were in England manuscripts containing the Gospels and epistles for the church year. The printed plenaries (cf. J. Alzog, *Die deutschen Plenarien*, Freiburg, 1874) contained much more matter, e.g., translation of the liturgy, sermon, epistle, and Gospel, aiming to give to those unskilled in Latin knowledge of the service (cf. preface to the plenary printed at Basel, 1516). But the Church held fast to the reading of the pericopes in Latin. The Hussite delegates to Basel in vain sought permission to use in the vernacular the Gospel, epistle, and Apostles' Creed.

10. Roman Catholics and Early Lutherans.

The fact that demand for the use of the vernacular came from the opponents was more influential with the later papal theologians than the interest in instructing the people. So Clichtoveus (*Propugnaculum ecclesiæ contra Lutheranos*, book i., chap. 4, 1526) gives expression to the fear that the laity would wrest Scripture to their own hurt, though that the lections be made intelligible is not forbidden. This was the tenor of the conclusions of the Council of Trent, but the lectionary was revised. Hence, in spite of their common origin, the Evangelical pericope system and the Roman do not coincide, though the differences are not great, some lections having fallen out of the Evangelical system because the observances at which they were read have lapsed, because transpositions have been made, additions have been interpolated, or new sections substituted. When Luther first took up the improvement of the church service, for the sake of scholars he desired to retain the Latin mass and consequently the Latin lections, though later he was not unwilling to permit the use of other languages in worship; for the congregation he wished the lection in the vernacular. Probably his Bible translation was made with this in view, though direct proof of it is not forthcoming. He was also aware of the defects of the existing pericopes. In the *Formula missæ* Luther distinguishes between the selections for the Gospel and the epistle, regarding the former as much better chosen than the latter. In fact the epistle is usually chosen from the hortatory portion of the book from which it is taken. From this Luther proceeded to express the necessity for reform, and pronounced judgments upon individual lections showing the erroneous views of the authority which had chosen them, in other cases, however, admitting the suitability of the readings. Accordingly, numerous instances can be pointed out in which the choice of the Reformer has resulted in a betterment of the selection read. In some cases, while the lection was retained, new sections were added to those already in use. It can be alleged that a new choice altogether would have been better in some of these instances, such as that between Easter and Whitsuntide the significance of the period might be noted and instruction given respecting the resurrection from the dead by using I Cor. xv.

In order rightly to understand Luther's position with regard to pericopes and the system, distinction must be made between lections and sermon texts.

11. Luther's Position; its Consequences.

So far as the existing pericopes served as selections for reading, he would have set them aside or at least radically revised them, though as a sermonic basis he retained them—with improvements, though he was not a decided advocate of the prescribed text pericopes. As early as 1523 he had no objection to the preacher using in the morning the usual Gospel and in the afternoon the epistle, but thought that the preacher might use one or two books which seemed to him most useful. Indeed, in the *Deutsche Messe* of 1526 he disclaimed criticism of particular matters of this sort. Preaching along the lines of the pericopes he recognized as having its own rights; but as he himself preached a great number of sermons in series, it is clear that he preferred to expound books in successive sermons rather than to preach on the pericopes. If the lectionary, from which the Sunday and festival pericopes were only in small part taken, had been used, at least by the clergy, in its completeness (supposing that they performed their duty conscientiously), then it was as a whole completely lost by a singular proposal by means of which Luther would introduce a sort of serial readings while avoiding monotony. For week-days he set a series of readings for worship: on Monday and Tuesday the catechism, on Wednesday the Gospel of Matthew, on Saturday the Gospel of John, on Thursday and Friday the daily lections for the week in the epistles and other New-Testament matter. A remainder of this infelicitous arrangement has in some places continued till the present in the usage of reading weekly a chapter of some Biblical book in series. Unfortunately, the projected lectionary was not provided by Luther or by any other, but through the church orders the traditional Sunday and festival readings were placed in authority, though sometimes with improvements. This was the case with the Brunswick church order of 1528 and the agenda of Pomerania of 1568. There were demands for more of Scripture in the Sunday service than the old lections afforded, and this was provided for in the Brandenburg-Nuremberg church order of 1533 and that of Württemberg of 1536. Provision was made for sermons on whole books alongside those from the Sunday Gospel, and the Pomeranian agenda provided for sermons on the most useful books of the Bible. In general, however, in the chief service the old pericopes remained the principal basis. To this end not merely need and pedagogical considerations led, confessional reasons had their influence. Carlstadt in 1522 retained the mass as a concession to the weak in faith, and so introit, epistle, and Gospel were still used. Thomas Münzer declared in 1523 in favor of entire chapters in place of the epistle and Gospel. In Switzerland abolition of the pericopes had been begun; in Zurich Zwingli preached upon whole books—Matthew, Acts, I and II Timothy, Galatians, Peter, Hebrews, and in 1525 he began Genesis; Bullinger, in the course of his first twelve years, preached on nearly all the books of the Bible. Official abrogation of the pericopes may not be cited, but practically they had fallen out of use; this was the case with Calvin.

12. Anglican System.

In the Anglican Church the lection and pericope system had a singular development. A sort of forerunner was the *Reformatio ecclesiarum Hassiæ* (1526), which directs reading through the Old Testament at morning service and through the New at evening service. But this work was never introduced and may have been unknown to the compilers of the Anglican liturgy. Another pattern was the lection system in the reconstruction of Franciscus Quignonius (1536), which sets out to read through Scripture in the year and the Psalms once a month. The first edition of the Book of Common Prayer (Introduction, "Concerning the Service of the Church," with notes reproduced in J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 100–101, New York, 1908) remarks upon the decay of the early system of reading Scripture and the use of the Latin. Its new system follows mainly the Latin translation of 1549; each day has morning and evening service, at each of which a selection from each Testament is read, the Biblical books being read in course (e.g., on Jan. 2, morning, Gen. i. is read, evening, Gen. ii.; the New Testament is so divided that at morning service Gospels and Acts are read, at evening the epistles), except Chronicles, Canticles, and part of Leviticus; during Oct. 5–Nov. 27 readings are from the Apocrypha. The New Testament, except Revelation, is read through three times a year, and Psalms once a month, so that a complete break is here made with the strict pericope system. In the calendar nearly all the saints' days disappear, though the old Sunday terminology is retained with the related pericopes. The later editions have besides for Sundays and festivals special lections, mostly from the Old Testament; the alterations in these later issues follow the same principle—to read much of Scripture and to retain at least as readings the old pericopes. See further, § 18 below.

13. Defense and Attack on the Continent.

On the continent the question of retention or abolition of the traditional pericopes developed into a confessional controversy. Westphal proposed to Calvin in the sacramental controversy that the pericopes be sanctioned as sermonic basis, and Calvin replied with an attack upon them (*Defensio II contra Westphalum*), the one ground for their retention being their convenience for the preacher. The Lutherans entered the battle as defenders, though they were not blind to the defects of the pericopes; they could not dispense with the system while looking to the interests of the congregation, which to a great extent the pericopes served. The preachers needed helps, and collections of sermons on the pericopes existed; the postillæ (see Postil) were in great use by preachers. The Lutherans were demanding that preaching should deal with the necessary truths of salvation, a result, they thought, better obtained by dealing with selections than with whole books; so the Lutheran sermon brought about affection for the old pericope (cf. Simon Saccus, *Erklärung über die Sonntagsevangelien*, 1599). The very repetition, it was urged, brought about the better instruction of the hearer. Calvin's attack upon the pericope system and Saccus' defense of the same contain practically all that can be said against and for it. Among Lutherans, Luther's free position regarding it was forgotten. Habermann began his sermon on the pericope for the fourth Sunday in Advent with the remark that the teachers of the early Church were led, not aimlessly or thoughtlessly, but for weighty causes, to read that text on that day. Yet Spener regretted the restriction of the preacher which the use of the pericopes had brought about, such that often essentials had to be dragged in as if by the hair. A growing opposition developed among Lutherans. Mosheim (*Anweisung erbaulich zu predigen*, Erlangen, 1771) noted that the pericopes furnished only a partial basis, and that often not the most seemly. Indeed, many prominent teachers wished that the established custom with respect to these might be abolished. Mosheim pointed, in addition, to the danger to the form of the sermon inherent in the system—the preacher is likely, when bound to certain texts, to mold his discourses in a certain manner; the text is often repeated, yet the sermon must be changed. Reinhard notes that the consequence is to awaken and sharpen inventiveness. Herder opposed the system, though with no new arguments (*Revision der Liturgie*, 1787); yet he thought the reading of the Gospel necessary on account of the peasantry, for whom it provided a means of instruction while it also served as a sort of calendar; the enlarging of the lections, he argued, opened up a wider field for a richer teaching of doctrine. While these objections were founded upon considerations of usefulness, difficulty, or limitations in the pericopes, the rationalistic party objected on account of the contents of the readings; they regarded them as the legacy of the darkest Middle Ages, of which only few were considered as worthy while the rest fostered superstition or offended good taste or committed some other offense. To this the defense was weak and practically yielded the case (C. Harms, *Pastoraltheologie,* lecture 6, Kiel, 1830).

14. Historical Conclusions.

These conclusions rested upon personal experiences, practical and doctrinal considerations, and subjective impressions. Little attention was paid to the question of origins; even Mosheim was satisfied with the most general results. Ernst Ranke was the first to approach the subject from this side (*Das kirchliche Perikopensystem aus den ältesten Urkunden der römischen Liturgie,* Berlin, 1847), and reached the conclusion that, apart from some lections for the chief festivals, a great part of the pericopes were set for purposes, days, feasts, and actions which have fallen into disuse or even into oblivion, that they belonged to a church year which coincided only in part with our own. Then came to consciousness what might have been learned from Luther, that from the old pericopes only fragments had been retained for the Lutheran service. Schleiermacher (*Praktische Theologie,* p. 137, Berlin, 1850) followed this up by asserting that no special wisdom underlay the system. But this opposition had for long no results, it did not reach the congregations in its effects. Moreover, the lections, especially the Gospels, had become established as an essential part of the cultus, were more than what Herder called " a calendar." They had become a sort of Bible for laymen, containing a great store of necessary and priceless truths made living through the serial preaching upon them. The very sparsity of instruction in the schools aided to render the hold of the system upon the people abiding. The Ulm church order of 1747 directed the use of the Gospel for sermonic basis on Sundays and other celebrations, and ordered the reading of the epistle, proclaiming the utility for the congregation of instruction depending from certain known recurring texts, and asserting that in them was afforded opportunity sufficient for the true teacher.

15. German Revisions.

The development in Germany was somewhat as follows. In Brunswick-Lüneburg in 1765 in the village churches preaching was permitted alternately on epistle and Gospel; in Hanover, 1769, the old pericopes in revised form together with Biblical lectures upon short instructive selections from the canonical books became the order. Since 1876 four new series, for the afternoon service, have been introduced. The Baden-Durlach order of 1793 favors free choice of texts, but does not approve entire abandonment of the pericopes, while advancing a plan for newly selected texts from the Old Testament, epistle, and Gospel; the church year is abandoned. Since 1881 there have been in Baden two series of Gospels and two of epistles, the first in each being a revision of the old pericopes. In Weimar three new series were introduced, the old Gospel remained as reading selection, the fourth year witnessed the use of the old pericope system of epistle and Gospel. In Nassau the system of Heydenreich is recommended, the third and fourth series containing dogmatic texts for teaching. In Saxony in 1810 a new series of texts came into use; since 1890 there has been a fourfold series of pericopes, the first and second the old pericopes revised; there are two series of lections in place of the old epistle and Gospel when these are used as sermonic basis. In Württemberg in 1830 and 1894 a second and third series of pericopes covering each a year were introduced. Bavaria has permitted the use of the series compiled by Thomasius, and the course of readings covers four years. In the Bavarian Palatinate there is a four-year course; Gospel, freely chosen texts, epistle, and a new series of pericopes furnish the textual basis. In Prussia, for the older provinces, for epistle and Gospel first come the old pericopes, then a new series, including selections from the Old Testament; in the Rhine province the old system alternates with a new series, with a year upon the Old Testament for the minor services. In 1897 in Mecklenburg-Schwerin selections from the four Gospels practically displaced the old Gospel for reading, which is retained for preaching texts. The efforts of the German Evangelical Church Conference (1896) through its commission were directed toward a revision of the old pericopes, selection of a series of readings from the Old Testament for the church year, the fixing of a series setting forth the sufferings and death of Jesus, the setting up of a second series of epistles and Gospels parallel to the old system. The results have not led to a general acceptance, and the matter is still in flux, conditions in different parts changing the situation with reference to adoption of the new series.

16. Theory of the Pericope.

The course of the development of the sermon has been away from treatment of whole books of Scripture—indeed, the intrusion of festivals always hindered this. The necessities of the congregation led to the insertion of other selections, and this was the beginning of pericopes. Strictly serial preaching would be in fact abrogation of church festivals. Even for the periods when special observances do not occur all books of Scripture are not wholly suitable; there must be selection of books in any case. Then, where the custom obtains of preaching not on any one book in series but on individual selections, shall the preacher have the choice or be restricted to pericopes? Existence of a series of pericopes does not protect the congregation from arbitrariness or other vagaries of the preacher; if so disposed, he will treat pericopes as he would his own selections. Determining factors here are the relation of the preacher to the congregation, of the latter to the denomination, of this to the Church at large, of the last to Scripture, and of Scripture to the truths of salvation. What is to be brought out in worship is the distinctive character of Christianity, then of the denomination. With this would fit well a prescribed recurring order of pericopes, chosen with fitness for this purpose.

While the old system is but a fragment of a lost whole, related originally to what is no longer in existence, and suffering from special faults, it has one great advantage in that it contains indispensable selections setting forth the person, life, and work of the Lord Jesus. A new system must contain or parallel these, conserving variation and incitement for the preacher, but not changing the essentials. Especially in the epistle is there room for improvement. If in the pericopes the choice is restricted to the New Testament, the series can hardly cover more than two years; if in the epistle the really choice parts are in the first series, the second can be little more than supplementary.

17. Suggestions for a Lectionary.

The Reformed churches vary in practise as to possession of a lection system alongside the text. German Lutheran and union congregations have an independent lection system. This is regarded as a necessity for the life of the congregation, because of the importance for it of the Bible; this requires not merely sermon texts but independent lections. When the sermon pericopes are derived from the New Testament, the Old Testament falls out of use in case the lection is missing. A requirement of the lection is that it have inherent significance, since the difference between this and the text is that the latter is explained in the discourse while the lection has to speak for itself. To install a lectionary which shall meet the demands implied in all that precedes is a task the Protestant Church should no longer defer. In doing this the experiences of the past should be utilized, especially the fact that the serial reading of the Bible has not maintained itself. Indeed, this sort of reading is based upon a wrong principle, inasmuch as all books of the Bible are not equally suited for the edification of the congregation, which last is one aim of the Church in its reading of Scripture. On this account the Church will install pericopes, that is, a fixed and obligatory system of lections. This will meet the needs of the congregation in that it will represent the great things of God and will minister to personal Christianity. Both these ends are provided for in the church year, the former in the special celebrations, the latter in the ordinary Sundays. Appropriateness in these two directions is consequently to be sought in the pericopes; moreover, both Testaments are to be represented; but in this department the Psalms are to be at best only slightly used. In the lection God speaks to the congregation; the Psalms are largely prayers —the address of the congregation to God, therefore unsuitable for lections proper. For the lections read at special celebrations of the Church the Old Testament is not a source. The spirit of these is foreign to the Old Testament, hence a full year's course of readings can not be derived from that part of the Bible. Yet in the periods which are the preparation for particular observances, such as the Advent season and passion week, passages from the prophets are appropriate; similarly, when the catechism is the basis of the service, and the Decalogue, e.g., is under review, passages from the Old Testament are seasonable. So single passages from Revelation, like the letters to the seven churches, and other parts having an eschatological bearing, are available. And, finally, the wording, for example, of the introduction to the reading is to be so looked after that abruptness and infelicities shall be avoided. (W. Caspari.)

18. The Anglican Readings.

The portions of Scripture selected and appointed for reading in the congregation in the Anglican prayer-books fall first under two heads —those appointed for the service of the Eucharist or the Holy Communion, and those appointed for the daily services of morning and evening prayer. The former corresponds with the Latin missal, the latter with the breviary. In the former there are always read two passages, one from the epistles and one from the Gospels. In the latter there are, beside the appointed portion of the psalter (so arranged that the whole shall ordinarily be recited in every month), a lesson from the Old Testament and a lesson from the New Testament. The epistle and Gospel at Holy Communion are selected as specially appropriate to the season, holy day, or occasion. The epistles and Gospels for Sundays and holy days in the prayer-book follow the arrangement of the fifth century given in the *comes* more closely than does the present Roman use. The general principle of the selection seems to be this. In the earlier half of the Christian year, from Advent to Trinity, the appointed Gospels set before the people declarations or illustrations of the great facts of the creed commemorated at the different seasons, and the epistle is adapted to the Gospel or to the season. In the second half of the year, from Trinity to Advent, the epistles take the lead, with teaching concerning the Christian life, which the Gospels for the most part serve to illustrate.

At morning and evening prayer the Old- and New-Testament lessons for Sundays and holy days follow the same general rule of appropriateness to the season or special commemoration, while on week-days the readings are in course, providing for the reading through of the greater part of the Old Testament once in each year, and of the New Testament twice. In this way an attempt is made to familiarize the people with the whole of the Scriptures, safeguarding them from the narrow preferences of the individual minister, while on the other hand he is not bound in sermons to confine himself to the Scriptures appointed to be read in the congregation. A. C. A. Hall.

Bibliography: A long list of printed editions of lectionaries in Greek, Latin, English, and polyglot, with commentaries, etc., is given in the *British Museum Catalogue*, under "Bible," columns 1016–30, and Appendix, columns 404–410. Special note may be made of *Evangelarium Hierosolymitanum*, ed. M. Erizzo, Verona, 1861–1864; *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, and *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels*, ed. A. S. Lewis and M. D. Gibson, London, 1897–99. For description of lectionaries consult: F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to Criticism of N. T.*, i. 74–77, ii. 413–414 (i. 80–87 gives the table of lessons for the year in the Greek synaxaria), London, 1894; C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the N. T.*, pp. 384–393, New York, 1907; idem, *Prolegomena*, ii. 687, Leipsic, 1890 (discussion and catalogue of manuscript lectionaries). Consult further: J. Goar, *Euchologium*, pp. 711 sqq., Paris, 1647; E. Ranke, *Kritische Zusammenstellung der . . . neuen Perikopenkreise*, Berlin, 1850; H. A. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus*, iv. 213 sqq., Halle, 1855; W. Benham, *Companion to the Lectionary*, London, 1884; B. Wohlfahrt, *Perikopen- und Textbuch*, Gotha, 1888; J. L. Kibbon, in *Hartford Seminary Record*, iii. (1892–93), 292–295; P. Batiffol, *Hist. du bréviare romaine*, Paris, 1893; P. Savi, in *Revue biblique internationale*, ii (1893), 303–328; C. J. Ellicott, in *Expositor*, 1896, pp. 241–253; *Siona*, xxii (1897), 5–11; F. Wiegand, *Das Homiliarium Karls der Grossen*, Leipsic, 1897; A. C. A. Hall, *Use of Holy Scripture in the Public Worship of the Church*, New York, 1903; F. Procter and W. H. Frere, *New Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, 1905; S. Beissel, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches*, Freiburg, 1907.

PERIODEUTÆ (Gk. "travelers, visitors"): Presbyters appointed in the Eastern Church to aid the bishops in rural districts. They were first established by the Phrygian Synod of Laodicea (c. 350), which enacted that no bishops should be appointed for the country regions, but that the *periodeutæ* should be subject to episcopal jurisdiction. This ruling was adopted in the *Corpus juris canonici*, chap. v., dist. 80; and as the *periodeutēs* was designed to replace the Chorepiscopus (q.v.), the two orders, though distinct, had much in common. The *periodeutæ* had no fixed residence and could not ordain, but were empowered to dedicate baptistries and churches, administer chrism, and supervise the regular and secular clergy. Their prerogatives varied widely at different times and places. The office seems to have survived in the East till the end of the twelfth century, outliving that of chorepiscopus, with which, as with that of Exarch (q.v.), it was often identified. (H. Achelis.)

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, II., xiv. 12; J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, iii. 2, pp. 829 sqq., Rome, 1728; and older literature noted in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 159.

PERITRACHELION. See Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical.

PERITZ, ISMAR JOHN: Methodist Episcopalian; b. at Breslau, Germany, Jan. 8, 1863. He is of Jewish origin, but in 1880, while in Berlin, became a convert to Christianity. He then went to London, where he entered the Church of England. Three years later he was called to New York City to engage in mission work. Meanwhile, he had become a Methodist Episcopalian, and, after studying for the ministry of that denomination at Drew Theological Seminary (1884–87), held various pastorates until 1895. He pursued advanced studies in Semitics at Harvard from 1892 to 1895 (A.M., 1893; Ph.D., 1898), and since 1896 has been professor of Semitic languages and Biblical literature at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. In theology he is conservatively progressive, standing midway between the traditional and radical extremes.

PERIZZITES. See Canaan, Canaanites, § 10.

PERKINS, JUSTIN: American missionary in Persia; b. at West Springfield, Mass., Mar. 12, 1805; d. at Chicopee, Mass., Dec. 31, 1869. He was graduated at Amherst College, 1829; studied at Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1833 was sent by the American Board to the Nestorians in Persia. He established himself at Oroomiah (1834), and for thirty-six years conducted the mission. He translated the Bible into modern Syriac, and also other books. In 1842 he made a tour through the United States, accompanied by Mar Yohanan, an early convert, who had been a Nestorian bishop. In 1843 at Teheran he successfully defended the Protestants against misrepresentation and persecution. He wrote: *A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians* (Andover, 1843); *Missionary Life in Persia* (Boston, 1861).

PERKINS, WILLIAM: B. at Marston Jabet in Warwickshire, Eng., in 1558; entered Christ's College, Cambridge, 1577; was chosen fellow of the same in 1582; entered the ministry, and was appointed lecturer at Great St. Andrews, Cambridge. He married in 1590. He was called before the High Commission for inquiry as to his 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 doleful echo in his auditor's ears a good while after." He was an extreme Calvinist in doctrine. His *Armilla aurea*, published in 1590 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. His catechism, entitled *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, and published in three volumes folio, Cambridge, 1603, London, 1606. He died in 1602. C. A. Briggs.

Bibliography: C. H. and T. Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, ii. 335–341, London, 1861; F. L. Colvile, *Worthies of Warwickshire*, pp. 573–576, ib. 1870; W. H. Frere, *The English Church (1558–1625)*, pp. 343–345, ib. 1904; *DNB*, xlv. 6–9.

PEROWNE, JOHN JAMES STEWART: Church of England bishop; b. at Burdwan (60 m. n.n.w. of Calcutta), Bengal, India, Mar. 13, 1823; d. at Southwick, near Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Nov. 6, 1904. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (B.A., 1845; M.A., 1848; B.D., 1856; members' prize Latin essay, 1844, 1846, 1847; and Tyrwhitt Hebrew scholar, 1848). He was ordained deacon, 1847, and priest, 1848; was examiner for classical tripos, 1851–52; select preacher to the university, 1853, 1861, 1873, 1876, 1879, and 1882; vice-principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, 1862–72; examining chaplain to the bishop of Norwich, 1865–78; prebendary of St. Andrew's, and canon of Llandaff Cathedral, 1869–78; prelector in theology in Trinity College, Cambridge, 1872–78; fellow of Trinity College, 1873–75; Hulsean professor of divinity, 1875–78. In 1868 he was Hulsean lecturer; in 1874–75, Margaret preacher; in 1874–1876, Whitehall preacher. He was a member of the Old-Testament company of Bible revisers, 1870–84, and of the royal commission on ecclesiastical courts, 1881–83. In 1875 he was appointed honorary chaplain to the queen; in 1878, dean of Peterborough; and in 1890 he became bishop of Worcester, but retired in 1901. He was the author of *The Book of Psalms, a New Translation, with Notes, Critical and Exegetical* (2 vols., London, 1864; 9th ed., 1898); *Immortality* (Hulsean Lectures for 1868; 1869);

Sermons (1873, 1889); and *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (1887, 1899). He was general editor of *The Cambridge Bible for Schools* (Cambridge, 1877 sqq.; New York, 1879 sqq.), of which Haggai and Zechariah (1888), Obadiah and Jonah (1889), and Malachi (1890) were his own.

PERPETUA, SAINT: North African martyr; b. about 180; d. at Carthage Mar. 7, 202 or 203. The historicity of her martyrdom is confirmed by the *Depositio martyrum* of the Liberian chronicle of 354, Tertullian (*De anima*, lv.), and the Latin *Passio ss. Perpetuæ et sociorum*, which are essentially authentic (ed. T. Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta*, Regensburg, 1859, pp. 137–146). The latter source contains a wealth of historically interesting details. While essentially Montanistic in spirit, its author, who can not have been, as some have maintained, Tertullian, had not broken with the Church.

Perpetua and her fellow martyrs were among the first victims of the persecution of Septimius Severus (q.v.), coming under the scope of the edict of 202, which forbade conversion to Judaism or Christianity under heavy penalties. According to the *Passio*, she and three of her companions were catechumens. The Governor Hilarianus condemned them all indiscriminately to fight with the wild beasts in the amphitheater for treason in refusing to sacrifice to the genius of the emperor and his eldest son, Antoninus Caracalla. Herein he was guilty of an illegal act, for Perpetua, whom her passion describes as belonging to the higher classes, could lawfully be punished for high treason only by being beheaded.

The *Acta* of Perpetua are extant in several recensions, notably a Latin version (ed. B. Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain*, pp. 521–525, Paris, 1881), and one in Greek (ed. J. A. Robinson, *TS*, vol. i., part 2, Cambridge, 1891). Both these recensions erroneously date the martyrdom of Perpetua in the persecution of Valerian and Gallienus (254 or 255). Authorities differ as to which is the original recension, the Latin or the Greek, and Adolf Hilgenfeld has even maintained (*ZWT*, xxxiv. 367–369) that both the Greek and the Latin versions are based on a Punic original.

(FRANZ GÖRRES.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASB*, Mar., i. 632 sqq.; B. Aubé, ut sup., pp. 53–277, 509–525; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Tertullian*, pp. 75–84, Bonn, 1878; F. Görres, in *JPT*, iv (1878), 273–327, 313–315; idem, in *ZWT*, xxxiv (1891), 235–243; A. Pellet, *Les Martyrs d'Afrique*, Lille, 1885; P. Allard, *Hist. des persécutions*, ii. 2–157, Paris, 1886; J. Führer, *Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Felicitas-Frage*, Leipsic, 1890; L. Duchesne, *En quelle langue ont été écrits les Actes des saintes Perpétue et Félicité?* Paris, 1891 (cf. on the same subject Massebiéau, in *RHR*, 1891), 97–101; *CQR*, xxxii (1891), 68–69; *Analecta Bollandiana*, xi (1892), 100–102, 369–373; *DCB*, iv. 305–307; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 818–819.

PERPETUAL ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT: A continuous act of worship performed by several orders in the Roman Catholic Church. It consists in the constant presence of some one or more of the members of the particular order before the altar engaged in devotion which has the sacrament as its special object. Probably the earliest of the orders was that founded in Paris in 1654 by Mother Mechtilde, a Benedictine nun and abbess whom the troubles of the period had driven from her position. The foundation was stimulated by Picotté, a Sulpician priest, at the instance of Anne of Austria, who wished a vow made in behalf of the deliverance of France from war. The order adopted the rule of St. Benedict (see BENEDICT OF NURSIA AND THE BENEDICTINE ORDER), to which special constitutions were added and printed in 1705. The order spread through France and is represented in Holland and Poland. The perpetual adoration is observed also by the Monachette del Corpus Domini (founded in 1683), a body of Dominican tertiaries; and numerous congregations of Franciscan, Augustinian, and other monks and nuns have adopted the ceremony.

PERRIN, WILLIAM WILLCOX: Church of England bishop; b. at Westbury-on-Trym (3 m. n. of Bristol) Aug. 11, 1848. He received his education at King's College, London, and Trinity College, Oxford (B.A., 1870; M.A., 1873; D.D., 1893; honorary fellow of King's College, London, 1902); he was made deacon in 1871 and priest in 1872; was curate of St. Mary's, Southampton, 1871–81; and vicar of St. Luke's, Southampton, 1881–93; being consecrated bishop of British Columbia in 1893.

PERRINISTS. See LIBERTINES, 2.

PERRONE, GIOVANNI: Italian Jesuit; b. at Chieri (9 m. s.e. of Turin) Mar. 11, 1794; d. at Rome Aug. 28, 1876. He studied at Turin, and in 1815 entered the Society of Jesus. Soon afterward he was appointed professor of dogmatics at Orvieto, and in 1823 was transferred to the Roman College at Rome. After being rector of the College of Ferrara in 1830–33, he resumed his professorship in Rome, but in 1848 he was obliged to flee on account of the revolution. He found refuge at Stoneyhurst, England, but as soon as the Jesuits were reestablished in Italy, he returned to Rome. He was head of the Roman College in 1853–73, and finally became rector of the Gregorian University, as well as consultor to several congregations and theologian of the Dataria. Perrone aided materially in the condemnation of Hermesianism (see HERMES, GEORG); and no less important was his participation in the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (Dec. 8, 1854). His chief work is the *Prælectiones theologicæ* (9 vols., Rome, 1835–1842; abridged ed., 5 vols., 1845; 47th ed., 2 vols., Turin, 1896). He also wrote many dogmatic, ethical, and ecclesiastical treatises, of which the most important are the following: *De immaculato Beatæ Virginis Mariæ conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit* (Rome, 1847); *Il Protestantesimo e la regola di fede* (3 vols., 1853; a storehouse of modern Jesuit polemics against Protestantism); *San Pietro in Roma, ossia la verità storica del viaggio di San Pietro a Roma* (1861); *De Domini nostri Jesu Christi divinitate adversus hujus ætatis incredulos, rationalistas et mythicos libri tres* (3 vols., Turin, 1870); and *De Romani pontificis infallibilite seu Vaticana definitio contra novos hæreticos asserta et vindicata* (1874).

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la société de Jésus*, ed. C. Sommervogel, vi. 559 sqq., Paris, 1891 sqq.; *KL*, ix. 1813–15.

PERRY, GEORGE GRESLEY: English church historian; b. at Churchill (13 m. s.w. of Bristol), Somersetshire, Dec. 21, 1820; d. at Waddington (4 m. s. of Lincoln) Feb. 10, 1897. He received a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1837 (B.A., 1840; M.A., Lincoln College, 1843); was fellow of Lincoln College, 1842–52, in which he was tutor, 1847–52; master of the schools, 1847–48; ordained deacon, 1844, priest, 1845; was rector of Waddington, Lincolnshire, after 1852; rural dean of Longoboby and canon and prebendary of Milton Manor in Lincoln Cathedral from 1861; proctor for the diocese of Lincoln, 1867–81; proctor in the convocation of Canterbury, and archdeacon of Stow, 1894–97. He was the author of *History of the Church of England from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Century* (3 vols., London, 1861–64); *Victor: a Tale of the Great Persecution* (1864); *Life of Bishop Grosseteste* (1865); *History of the Crusades* (1865; 3d ed., 1872); *Croyland Abbey* (1867); *Christian Fathers* (1870); *Vox ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (1870); *The Students English Church History* (First Period, 1871; Second Period, 1878; and Third Period, 1887; New York, 1879); *Life of St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln* (1879); and *The Reformation in England* (1886).

PERRY, WILLIAM STEVENS: Protestant Episcopal bishop; b. at Providence, R. I., Jan. 22, 1832; d. at Dubuque, Ia., May 13, 1898. He was educated at Harvard College, 1850–54, and at the Alexandria Theological Seminary; was ordained deacon in 1857; was assistant at St. Paul's, Boston, 1857–58; rector at Nashua, N. H., Portland, Me., Litchfield, Conn., and Geneva, N. Y., 1858–1876. For a short time president of Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., he was consecrated bishop of Iowa in 1876. He was one of the editors of *The Church Monthly* (Boston, 1864). A full list of his numerous writings is contained in *The Sketch-book of the American Episcopate*, H. G. Batterson (Philadelphia, 1884). He was author of *The Connection of the Church of England with Early American Colonization* (Portland, 1863); *Historical Collections of the American Colonial Church* (vol. i., *Virginia*, 1871; ii., *Pennsylvania*, 1872; iii., *Massachusetts*, 1873; iv., *Maryland*, 1875; and v., *Delaware*, 1878); *Historical Notes and Documents Illustrating the Organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1874); *Historical Sketch of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1784–1884* (New York, 1884); *The History of the American Episcopal Church, 1587–1883* (vol. i., *The Planting and the Growth of the American Colonial Church, 1587–1873;* ii., *The Organization and Progress of the American Church, 1783–1883*, Boston, 1885); and *The Episcopate in America* (New York, 1895). With F. L. Hawks he edited the *Documentary History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina* (No. 1, 1862); and the *Documentary History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* (containing documents relating chiefly to the Church in Connecticut; 2 vols., New York, 1863–64).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult his own *Episcopate in America*, ut sup., pp. 245–247.

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE DOWN TO DECIUS.

- I. The Historical Record.
  - New Sect Distinguished from the Jews (§ 1).
  - Legal Status before Decius; Trajan (§ 2).
  - Persecutions under Decius (§ 3).
  - Political Character of Persecutions (§ 4).
  - Results (§ 5).
  - Subsequent Persecutions (§ 6).
- II. The Ten Persecutions.

1. New Sect Distinguished from the Jews.

I. The Historical Record: The persecution of Christians in the Roman Empire will be treated here in its relation with legal enactments. Just when the Roman State first began to regard the Christians as a sect distinct from the Jews can not be stated with certainty. Tertullian's statement (*Apol.* v.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 21–22) to the effect that Tiberius was aware of the distinction between Christianity and Judaism and submitted to the senate the question of the recognition of the former by the State is incredible. But the differentiation seems presupposed in view of the Neronian persecution (64 A.D.) when, according to Tacitus (*Annals*, xx. 44), the Christians were visited with punishment not as incendiaries, but as those who had brought down upon themselves the "hatred of mankind." Yet in spite of the clear prominence in which the adherents of the new sect appeared at this time, it is very probable that, for a generation at least, the Christians continued to be regarded and dealt with by the magistrates as a Jewish sect. A change must have ensued when (especially under Domitian, 81–96), in order to enforce the payment by the Jews of tithes to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter at Jerusalem, odious investigations were instituted, and the non-Jewish Christians undoubtedly refused to pay the tax. In addition, the Roman magistrates must have been aware that the attitude of the Christians toward the great calamity which overtook the Jewish nation was different from that of the rest of the people, and that the Jews unceasingly persecuted the Christians as their enemies, and that the customs and religious practises of the Christians were radically different. It may therefore be accepted that, from the time of Domitian, Christianity appears everywhere as a new religion, and in that character was subject to the application of the laws directed against new and secret associations, which, owing to the peculiar character of the Christian faith, were applied with more than the usual rigor. This policy probably attained complete development under Trajan (98–117 A.D.), in the second half of whose reign the relations of the State toward Christianity must have assumed definite shape. Pliny could not otherwise have written his celebrated letter (*Epistolæ*, x. 92 sqq.) opening with the statement: "In the examination of Christians I have never taken part; therefore I know not how and to what extent it is the custom to punish them and to investigate." Long, therefore, before the year 112 the trials of Christians in the provinces must have been carried on in the same manner as they were carried on subsequently.

As to the period from Trajan to Decius (249–

251) a summary of the facts which are known may be reviewed before proceeding to the underlying principles which it is much more difficult to grasp.

2. Legal Status before Decius; Trajan.

Up to the middle of the third century the number of Christian martyrs was small, although there was no decade, perhaps no year, without its victim. In all classes and vocations there were to be found Christians whose faith, though it was a matter of public knowledge, brought them no harm; but in single provinces and under particular emperors they were subjected to severe persecutions. Christians brought to trial were punished as Christians, that is, the "name" itself was punished by the magistrates, who, as a rule, did not seek to discover actual transgression (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., i. 44; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 series, i. 216; Tertullian, *Apol.*, ii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 18–20). To what extent the name represented what was regarded as worthy of punishment is not shown by the apologists; but Celsus has positively indicated in the introduction to his writings: "The Christians form secret associations among themselves outside of the legal order." Whenever the Christian apologists speak of laws that were invoked against the Christians, they always mean the general laws under which Christians presumed guilty of certain transgressions were punished, and not laws directed specially against the Christians. In addition, however, to the general regulations of the State, there were, after the time of Trajan, imperial rescripts relating to the new sect occasioned by varying conditions in different provinces, the different attitude of the emperors, and deficiencies of the existing penal law. These rescripts were collected by Domitius Ulpian in the time of Caracalla (211–217); they were not included in the body of the criminal law, but were inserted under the heading of *De officio proconsulis*, which dealt with extraordinary proceedings and police jurisdiction. A universal imperial law specifically prohibiting Christianity as such can not have existed before Decius, and before the time of that emperor the Christians in general were not hunted out.

3. Persecutions under Decius.

The question how the Christians were brought to trial in the time of Decius is obscure: probably at the instance of private persons; yet private denunciations had become more and more restricted, being, for instance, especially forbidden to slaves and held in check by punishments. Christians brought to trial might obtain instant freedom by denying their faith (see LAPSED) unless the magistrates assumed that they had committed a penal offense. The methods of exculpation were negative, such as invoking maledictions on the name of Christ, or positive, such as sacrificing before the images of gods and especially before the image of the emperor, or the taking of an oath by the genius of the emperor. The last method was the common one, and it shows that what constituted the essence of criminality was the denial of the state deities, the withdrawal of devotion due to them and to the emperor, which was regarded as the motive of their obstinacy. The magistrates as a general rule exerted themselves to persuade the accused by representations, admonitions, and even tortures, to undergo the test; and the very fact that the magistrates under certain circumstances during the process used torture bears proof that the Christians were regarded as charged with the crime of *majestas*. This is more clearly evidenced by the mode of punishment, which was decapitation for Roman citizens, exile for Roman matrons, and burning, crucifixion, or the amphitheater, for all others. It is certain, however, that the magistrate acting on his discretion might dismiss the accused Christian or sentence him to various terms of imprisonment.

4. Political Character of Persecutions.

From these facts Mommsen has drawn the conclusion that adherence to Christianity was not a defined and codified crime like highway robbery or murder, and, therefore, was not punished through the ordinary process of criminal law, but fell rather within the province of the general police power, which might be regarded as an extraordinary process of the law. The series of marks of procedure indicated above do not admit the ordinary process; besides the great multitude of Christians were not prosecuted and the religion continued to flourish. It is incorrect, therefore, to say that the Christians were directly touched by the laws against murder, incest, *majestas*, *sacrilegium*, or magic; but they formed an organization which, being religious, demanded toleration but could not be recognized, and as an unlawful society became subject to magisterial repression. Of all accusations brought against the Christians those of *sacrilegium* ("atheism") and *majestas* ("treason") were the commonest. There was no Latin equivalent for "atheist," but the political loyalty of the people was involved in the Roman religion, typified especially in the cult of the emperor; and a test of loyalty to the state deities and in the main to the emperor-cult was a test of loyalty to the empire. Hence, *sacrilegium* and *majestas* became more and more to be merged in the latter.

5. Results.

This discussion explains (1) why the Christian problem was seldom brought before the senate, the authority of which extended to matters of religion; (2) the relative scarcity of Christian trials before the time of the Emperor Decius, for if the crime of the *nomen christianum* was a political one it was nevertheless a patent fact that the Christians were not enemies of the State, but quiet citizens; and (3) the uniform process pursued in the trials of the Christians. The accused were called upon to clear themselves of the suspicion of *majestas* through certain acts. If they complied they were free *ipso facto;* if they refused, their refusal was equal to a confession of apostasy from the state religion and of sedition against the emperor and State. It explains (4) why Christianity in the beginning was treated not as a new religion, but why stress was laid rather upon the seditious character of the Christians. The monotheistic principles of Christianity did not appear to the politicians and pagans of the time as a religion so much as a form of atheism and as a vicious and inordinate obstinacy. Only with the beginning of the third century, as the national religion entered upon its decay and the principles of monotheism gained ground, does the religious character of Christianity seem to have been recognized. There explain themselves (5) also the policies pursued by emperors like Hadrian (117–138) and Antoninus Pius (138–161), who, in response to the petitions addressed by fanatical provincial assemblies asking power and permission for the persecution of the Christians (in Greece especially), ordered that trials for purely religious causes should not be initiated and that charges brought by individuals should be made the basis of prosecution only when those were accompanied by evidence of criminal guilt. The magistrates thus were naturally left free to adopt such repressive measures against the Christians as public necessity might dictate, but a policy of general persecution such as the provincial assemblies demanded was not allowed in the Roman state before Decius.

6. Subsequent Persecutions.

Although their *collegia* (churches) were illegal, in practise they were tolerated. They could not acquire the rights of a legal person; but, in indirect ways, the churches by the time of Decius had acquired possession of landed property, buildings, and movable treasures throughout the empire. Persecutions in the strict sense of the word there were not on the part of the State, but whenever the observance of the imperial religion had to be insisted upon, the result was an increase in the number of Christian trials. The rescript of Severus against the missionary activity of the Christians issued in the year 202 aims at restricting their growth and not at destroying them. It was a law of Maximinus Thrax (235–238) that first aimed at the destruction of the organization of the Church and therefore of the Church itself through the annihilation of its leaders. The law, however, was never put into execution, and it is with Decius that the great struggle began which was to decide the fate of the old national religion. Only then was the injunction laid upon every citizen publicly to testify his adhesion to the old national religion on a certain day. The failure of this persecution was as rapid as its first measures were sanguinary and overwhelming. Monotheism triumphed by its own inherent power and served for the termination of the absoluteness of imperialism.

(Adolf Harnack.)

II. The Ten Persecutions: From the fifth century tradition tells of the " Ten Persecutions of the Christians." The number, however, has no basis in fact and was probably suggested by the ten plagues of Egypt or the ten horns of the beast in the Apocalypse. As already pointed out, there was probably no time from an early date when persecution or annoyance was not going on somewhere, induced by local circumstances or the character of the governor, and only two persecutions (that under Decius and that under Diocletian and his successors) were even theoretically coextensive with the empire. The traditional ten persecutions with approximate dates are: under Nero, 64; Domitian, 96; Trajan, 112–113; Marcus Aurelius, 177; Septimius Severus, 202; Maximinus, 235; Decius, 249–251; Valerian, 257; Aurelian, 274; and Diocletian and his successors, 303–313. For further information see the articles on the various emperors.

Bibliography: The sources are to be found in the writings of the Fathers of the Church (the " Apologies " of Justin Martyr, Melito, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Origen, and Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum;* in the early church histories, e.g., of Eusebius), and in the *Acta Martyrum*—see the article. Great care is necessary in the use of this literature and of the earlier treatises named below, in accordance with the principles enunciated in the text. The subject is, of course, treated in the works on church history dealing with the first three centuries. Consult further: Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xvi (in some respects epochal; it caused a reexamination of the subject and a reversal of part of the traditional position respecting the extent and motives of the judicial processes and persecutions); H. Kritzler, *Die Heldenzeiten des Christenthums*, Leipsic, 1856; O. Hunziker, *Regierung und Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Diocletianus und seiner Nachfolger*, Leipsic, 1868; T. Preuss, *Kaiser Diocletian und seiner Zeit*, Leipsic, 1869; B. Aubé, *Hist. des persécutions de l'église*, 2 vols., Paris, 1875–78; A. J. Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian*, Cambridge, 1876; K. Wieseler, *Die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren*, Gütersloh, 1878; A. Thibault, *Les Empereurs romains et l'église chrétienne*, Paris, 1879; G. Uhlhorn, *Der Kampf des Christenthums mit dem Heidenthum*, Stuttgart, 1879, Eng. transl., *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, New York, 1879; C. T. Keim, *Rom und das Christenthum*, Berlin, 1881; T. W. Allies, *Church and State in the Formation of Christendom*, London, 1882; H. Doulcet, *Essai sur les rapports de l'église avec l'état romain durant les trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1883; P. Allard, *Hist. des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles*, Paris, 1885; idem, *Hist. des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle*, Paris, 1886; idem, *La persécution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'église*, Paris, 1890; P. Hochart, *Études au sujet de la persécution sous Néron*, Paris, 1885; C. F. Arnold, *Die neronische Christenverfolgungen*, Leipsic, 1888; R. Plehwe, *Die Christenverfolgungen der ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Berlin, 1889; C. J. Neumann, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, Leipsic, 1890 (indispensable); J. Belser, *Zur diokletianische Christenverfolgung*, Tübingen, 1891; E. Le Blant, *Les persécuteurs et les martyrs aux premiers siècles*, Paris, 1893; T. Mommsen, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, new series, xxviii. 389–429; idem, *Abriss des römischen Staatsrechts*, passim, Leipsic, 1893 (both important); E. G. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, London, 1894 (of importance); L. E. le Bourgeois, *Les Martyrs de Rome d'après l'histoire et l'archéologie chrétiennes*, Paris, 1897; M. Cohn (afterward Conrat), *Der Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen*, Leipsic, 1897; J. A. F. Gregg, *The Decian Persecution*, Edinburgh, 1897; D. C. Munro and E. Bramhall, *The Early Christian Persecutions*, Philadelphia, 1897 (contains bibliography); B. Reynolds, *Church History. The Early Persecutions and Martyrs*, London, 1897; G. Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme*, 2 vols., Paris, 1901; J. E. Weis, *Christenverfolgungen*, Marburg, 1901; *The Epistle of Psenosiris. A Document from the Diocletian Persecution*, ed. A. Deissman, London, 1902; O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Unterganges der antiken Welt*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902; H. D. M. Spence, *Early Christianity and Paganism*, London, 1902; J. Herkless, *Early Christian Martyrs and their Persecutions*, London, 1904; P. J. Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*, ib. 1905; A. J. Mason, *Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church*, ib. 1905; E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, New York, 1906 (contains considerable on the subject); H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church*, London, 1906; E. T. Klette, *Die Christenkatastrophe unter Nero*, Tübingen, 1907; G. Schoenaich, *Die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius*, Jauer, 1907; Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, i. 266–307, 373–446, 450–462, 2042–47 (contains much illustrative matter); F. X. Kraus, *Realencyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, i. 215–288 (" *Christenverfolgung*," by F. Görres, covering the first six centuries), Freiburg, 1880–85.

PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS: The fifth of the so-called " Five Points of Calvinism " is thus set forth in the Canons of Dort (cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 592 sqq.).

> "Whom God calls, according to his purpose, to the communion of his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and regenerates by the Holy Spirit, he delivers also from the dominion and slavery of sin in this life, though not altogether from the body of sin and from the infirmities of the flesh, so long as they continue in this world." (Art. I.)
>
> "By reason of these remains of indwelling sin, and the temptations of sin and of the world, those who are converted could not persevere in a state of grace if left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who, having conferred grace, mercifully confirms, and powerfully preserves them therein, even to the end." (Art. III.)
>
> "Of this preservation of the elect to salvation, and of their perseverance in the faith, true believers for themselves may and do obtain assurance according to the measure of their faith, whereby they arrive at the certain 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 real source of humility, filial reverence, true piety, patience in every tribulation, fervent prayers, constancy in suffering and in confessing the truth, and of solid rejoicing in God; so that the consideration of this benefit should serve as an incentive to the serious and constant practise 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 perseverantiæ*), was renewed by the Reformers, and is held by all Calvinistic churches, as a logical consequent of the doctrine of election (cf. Westminister Confession, chap. xvii.). Arminius at first hesitated about it, and then left it an open question. The later Arminians took strong ground against it, and affirmed the possibility of a total and final fall from grace. This is the position of the Wesleyan Arminians to-day in Europe and America. The Lutheran Confessions hold a middle position. The Church of England leaves room for both theories.

The doctrine of the perseverance of saints is becoming difficult to maintain, even theoretically, in view not merely of the well-known Arminian objections to it, but of the disclosures made by the psychology of Christian experience. The difficulty arises from two directions. (1) The theory of conversion: this, instead of being explained by reference to a miraculous cause or a cataclysmic act of choice, is in many cases a normal adolescent experience, with more or less of unification of the emotions and of permanence in the character (see CONVERSION). (2) Induction of religious experience puts it beyond question that the Christian life may after conversion be partially arrested or radically overthrown. This conception, however, in no way militates against the real grounds of Christian assurance, drawn from God's purpose of redemption and from the influence of the Spirit of God, nor even against predestination, which, since it is subject to historical conditions, will, if not in this world yet in the future world, attain its goal in the final perfection of all souls in God (cf. F. D. E. Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube*, §§ 117–120, new ed., Gotha, 1889). C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature pertinent is contained in the doctrinal systems by Calvinists (e.g., Turrettin, C. Hodge, W. G. T. Shedd; see also bibliography under PRESBYTERIANS) and Methodists (C. Sheldon, B. P. Bowne; see also bibliography under METHODISTS). Note further: D. Whitby, *A Discourse on the Five Points*, London, 1817; E. Colet, *Practical Discourse of God's Sovereignty, with . . . Perseverance*, Philadelphia, 1854.

PERSIA. See MEDO-PERSIA.

PERSIA, MISSIONS IN.

I. The Early and Medieval Periods.
  Christianity till the Arab Conquest (§ 1).
  Medieval Period (§ 2).
II. The Modern Period.
  Beginnings (§ 1).
  Work of Congregationalists and Presbyterians (§ 2).
  Other Protestant Missions (§ 3).
  Roman Catholic and Greek Church Missions (§ 4).
  Results (§ 5).
  Conditions of Work (§ 6).

1. Christianity till the Arab Conquest.

I. The Early and Medieval Periods: The first great center of Christianity in the East was Edessa as early as the second century (cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, New York, 1904). According to Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, Leipsic, 1902, 2d ed., 1906; Eng. transl., *Expansion of Christianity*, 2 vols., London and New York, 1904–05, new ed., 1908) there were Christians in the same century also in other parts of Mesopotamia and along the lower Tigris. Legendary Christian history of course goes farther back and ascribes the origins of Christian missions to the Apostle Thomas (q.v.) or to Addai, supposed to have been one of the Seventy, or even to the Magi. Perhaps the first authentic name in connection with missions is that of Mari, the founder of the see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (see MARONITES, § 2). During the third century Christianity spread through Mesopotamia, and by the fourth century it seems to have entered the Iranian highlands in the southwest (Khuzistan, Hormisdshahir, Ahwaz) and farther north about Holwan. This expansion was due to the transportation of Christian captives from Syria as well as to conversions. The establishment of Christianity as the imperial Roman religion marks also the beginning of its persecution by the Persian Sassanian kings. The Syriac Acts of the martyrs show that there was in spite of persecution a very true missionary spirit evidenced by conversions of Zoroastrians and by a fairly definite apologetic of Christianity. The names of the martyrs and the high rank of some of them would indicate that Christianity was gaining followers from Iranians as well as from Arameans. Meantime it spread eastward. There is mention of a bishop of Tus in Khorasan in 422, of the martyrdom in 447 of Pithion, a successful missionary among the mountaineers, and a generation later of Mar Saba, a convert from Zoroastrianism, who spent his life as a missionary to the Kurds. The great figure in the Sassanian period,* both as a church administrator and as a missionary leader, is the Nestorian Patriarch Mar Aba (d. 552). He was himself a convert to Christianity and, rather than renounce the right to evangelize, he endured nine years of imprisonment, which terminated only shortly before his death. The remainder of the Sassanian period was marked by the vigorous extension of Monophysite (Jacobite; see JACOBITES) tenets, probably almost altogether among Christians and not among heathen. Jacobite bishops were established in the sixth century in Seistan, Herat, and Azerbaijan. In general, it may be said that in the Sassanian period Christianity, and especially Nestorianism (see NESTORIANS), extended steadily in spite of the opposition of the State and the state religion, and also steadfastly refused to abjure its right to win converts. Many of the higher Nestorian clergy were themselves converts to Christianity. There were bishoprics in every section of the country. Nevertheless, Christianity did not become properly naturalized in Persia. Its strength was among the Arameans of the plains of the Tigris and the Euphrates and among captives transported into the eastern provinces. Its language was Syriac and there was no popular translation of the Bible into the Iranian tongues.

2. Medieval Period.

Probably the Arab conquest, by overthrowing the organized foes of the Christian propaganda, gave an increased opportunity to Christian missionaries, and in the early centuries of Arab rule Christianity extended so far eastward as to make an entrance into the Chinese empire. There is evidence of missionary work along the borders of the Caspian, in the valley of the Araxes, and in the mountain regions of Kurdistan. The extension of Christianity in central and eastern Asia is outside the scope of this article; though it should be noted that it went from Persia eastward and that the Turkish tribes bordering on Iran and steadily pressing westward were affected by it. Probably the Christians from the first tacitly at least accepted the terms of toleration given by Islam, viz., abstention from the proselyting of Mohammedans, missionary efforts being confined to non-Mohammedans. It should be noted, however, that there are evidences of oral and literary discussion of the two religions by Christians and Moslems. The glory of the Sassanian period had departed and martyrology ends. The Mongol conquests of the thirteenth century gave for a brief time a new hope to the Christian propagandists; for none of the conquerors were fanatical or even zealous in religious matters, and some were Christians. The Christianity, however, was of a very low order, and Islam carried the day with the leaders. These hopes perished in the general ruin resulting from the Mongol and Tatar invasions. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the only remains of Christianity were the ruins of ancient churches and the little bodies of Nestorian and Armenian Christians, in all not over 100,000 souls. As all through the Nearer East, so in Persia there is an almost forgotten chapter of medieval Roman Catholic missions. During the Mongol rule in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries several embassies (of Dominicans and Franciscans) were sent by the popes to the Mongol rulers both in the Far East and in Persia, but their efforts brought no permanent results; similarly without success were the attempts to bring the Nestorians into the Roman communion. In the early part of the seventeenth century political considerations led the Suffavean kings to desire friendship with Europeans, and the Roman Catholics again made an attempt to establish Roman Catholicism in Persia. Ispahan was the scene of the most determined efforts and was made an episcopal seat. Carmelites, Minorites, and Jesuits had establishments there, while Augustinians and Capuchins were also represented, and their converts were not only from the Armenians but also from Mohammedans. But the tide turned again and persecution and anarchy followed. The foreign missionaries were forced to flee, and the number of Christians in Ispahan was greatly diminished. This was in the early part of the eighteenth century. A hundred years later the number of Syrian Christians in the region of Urumia and Salmas had increased and among them were some who had joined the Roman Church, through influence emanating from the efforts to proselyte the Nestorians of the Mosul plain.

II. The Modern Period: The modern era of missions begins with Henry Martyn (q.v.), whose heroic career left the legacy of an undying inspiration and also the translation of the New Testament and Psalms into Persian.

1. Beginnings.

The published accounts of the journeys of Joseph Wolff (q.v.) served to draw the attention of American Christians to the remnants of the Nestorians. A few years before this the Basel Missionary Society and the Scotch Missionary Society each began work in Transcaucasia and each, compelled by the Russian government to leave its dominions, sent its missionaries into Persia. Among the Basel missionaries was Karl Gottlieb Pfander (q.v.), the author of the *Mizan ul Haḳḳ* ("Balance of Truth"; see MOHAMMEDANS, MISSIONS TO), one of the most remarkable contributions to the controversy with Islam; and among the Scotch missionaries was William Glen, whose translation of the Old Testament into Persian is still in use. These all attempted to work directly for Moslems. The societies that have established permanent work in Persia have all, to a greater or less degree, found a basis for their work in the non-Mohammedan population. In proportion to the total population this is an insignificant part, but from the missionary point of view it is important. Out of about nine millions population, there are about 150,000 non-Mohammedans, divided as follows: Armenians (originally all Gregorians) 70,000, Syrians (originally all Nestorians) 40,000, Jews 25,000, Parsis 10,000. The bodies which support missionary work are the following: of Protestants: Presbyterians, who took up work begun by Congregationalists; Church of England, Church Missionary Society, and the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission; Roman Catholic; Russian Orthodox.

---

* It should be remembered that the name Persia does not represent a constant geographical quantity. Its meaning varies with the political status and hence in the Sassanian period was far wider than at present, extending then as far west as the eastern boundary of the Roman Empire.

2. Work of Congregationalists and Presbyterians.

The American Congregationalists in 1834 sent Justin Perkins and in 1835 Asahel Grant (qq.v.) as missionaries to the Nestorians, commissioning them to strive "to enable the Nestorian Church, through the grace of God, to exert a commanding influence in the spiritual regeneration of Asia." They settled in Urumia in 1835. Perhaps it was not to be expected that Puritan Christians would be able long to work within the bounds of the most ancient of the separated Eastern churches. The separation of the Evangelicals was perhaps inevitable, but it was gradual and not until about 1870 was it complete. The Evangelical church thus formed is recognized as a member of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system. It has about 3,000 communicant members. In 1870 the work of the A. B. C. F. M. was transferred to the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and since has been expanded by the establishment of stations at Tabriz, Teheran, Hamadan, Resht, Kazvin, and Kermanshah. The branches of the work that have been most strongly developed and have had the largest general influence in the country are the educational and medical. The best known and most efficient schools and hospitals in Persia are those connected with this mission. (Perhaps the names that best deserve special mention are those of Justin Perkins, who established the mission and more than any one else reduced modern Syriac to literary form; Fidelia Fiske, who began female education and whose life has become a classic in missionary annals; John H. Shedd (q.v.), who did much to organize the work; Benjamin Labaree, who perfected the translation of the Scriptures, and J. P. Cochran, M.D., who gained a very unique influence over Persians of every class.) In connection with this mission the American Bible Society has done an important work in publishing and distributing the Scriptures, especially in Syriac. The present statistics (1909) are as follows: Missionaries, 37 (besides wives and including 6 male and 3 women physicians); native ministers 35, communicants 3,110, adherents about 7,000; contributions $4,200; 62 schools with 2,692 pupils (of whom 1,120 are girls, and not less than 500 Moslem children), school fees over $3,000; 4 hospitals, 617 in patients, out patients over 50,000, and medical fees nearly $10,000.

3. Other Protestant Missions.

Similar to the work of the Presbyterians is that of the Church Missionary Society in southern Persia. The work was established in Isfahan in 1869 by Robert Bruce, who will also be remembered for the revision of Henry Martyn's translation of the New Testament into Persian. Special prominence has been given to medical and educational work. Stations have been established in Kerman, Yezd, and Shiraz as well as Isfahan. The statistics of the work is as follows: 33 missionaries, including 4 men and 5 lady physicians; native clergy 1; native teachers 28; communicants 189 and Christians 412; schools 8 and scholars 409, of whom 161 are girls; hospitals 6. The British and Foreign Bible Society does an extensive work in southern Persia.

After a series of communications with the Nestorian patriarch and repeated appeals, Archbishop Benson founded the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission. The headquarters were established in Urumia in 1884, and were removed to Van, Turkey, in 1907. Most of their work has been for the Syrians in Turkey, especially since the adhesion of most of the Syrians in Persia to the Russian Orthodox Church. The purpose of the mission has been to strengthen the Nestorian Church to resist propaganda from without and to stimulate spiritual life within that body; and this purpose has been adhered to in a very conservative sense. The main work of the mission is educational and literary. The present statistics of the work in Persia are as follows: Missionaries 2, schools 30, scholars 470 (of whom about 150 are girls). There are 12 other Nestorian schools with about 300 pupils. The number of Nestorians in Persia is probably about 4,000.

4. Roman Catholic and Greek Church Missions.

The present Roman Catholic mission was founded in 1840 by the Lazarists, in consequence of the representations of M. Boré, a French savant. In 1856 they were reinforced by Sisters of Charity. The Lazarists and the Sisters of Charity (Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul) have establishments in Urumia, which is the episcopal seat, Salmas, Tabriz, and Teheran. There are also Armenian Catholics at Isfahan, and Chaldeans in Sena. At the head of the work is the apostolic delegate, at present Mgr. Lesné, titular archbishop of Philippopolis. Most of the native Roman Catholics are of the Chaldean rite with Archbishop Audo, at their head, whose seat is at Urumia. Under the vigorous direction of Mgr. Cluzel (died 1882), their propaganda among the Syrians made rapid though not solid progress; but recently it has been stationary. In their schools are Moslem as well as Christian pupils. The statistics of the work are not obtainable, but the number of adherents is probably about 5,000.

The Syrians (Nestorians) living in northwestern Persia, have long had close industrial relations with Russia, and the expectation that long existed was that Russia would ultimately be political master of northern Persia. The Russians were looked on as the expected saviors from Mohammedan rule. Accordingly repeated petitions were offered by the Syrians to the Holy Synod and orthodox bishops to receive them into the Orthodox Church. The priests sent to investigate the conditions were received in 1897 with an enthusiastic welcome and the next year the large majority of the Syrians in the Urumia district were received into the Orthodox fold after renouncing the errors of their national church. A monastic mission under the headship of an archimandrite has been established and the Orthodox Syrians were organized under two Syrian priests. The clergy are mainly converted Nestorians. At first not only the bulk of the Nestorians, but also not a few members of the Protestant and Roman communions joined the new movement, but the tide turned again. There is, however, every probability that the majority will remain in the Russian Church. Statistics for 1909 are as follows: Russian clergy, 1 archimandrite, 3 priests, 1 deacon; Syrian clergy, 3 bishops, 30 priests, and 3 monks; Orthodox Syrians about 15,000; schools, 2 higher with 55 boys and 30 girls, 68 village schools with about 2,000 pupils.

Four missions representing the great divisions of Christendom might well suffice for a body of Christians not exceeding 30,000 souls; but neither the importunity of the Syrians nor the foolish zeal of western Protestants has been content. The result is that Urumia has been the seat of constantly changing but usually wasteful efforts by Lutherans, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, and others. The outburst of sympathy among German Christians caused by the massacres of Armenians in Turkey in 1895 left its mark in the establishment by the "German Orient Mission" of Berlin of two orphanages, one in Khoi for Armenian boys and one in Urumia for Syrian girls, each containing about 60 children.

There is, it will be seen, an extended missionary work by Protestants in every part of the country, except the extreme East, and by Roman Catholics in the three chief cities. Besides there is a concentration of missionary effort on the part of all the great churches in the region of the Syrians. This work for Syrians is, except on the part of the Russian mission, connected with work for the larger body of Nestorians living in the Turkish Empire, carried on either by the same body or on the part of the Roman Catholics by a different body, the Dominicans instead of the Lazarists.

5. Results.

The question of results can best be answered by considering separately the different classes. Among the Syrians the most obvious effect has been to project into a very small compass the great divisions and some of the smaller divisions of Christendom, with the result that in Persia the ancient national church has nearly reached the point of extinction. This is surely to be deplored for other than antiquarian reasons. Other and perhaps more unfortunate results of this undue multiplication of missionary agencies have been sectarian spirit, degeneration in morals, the cultivation of an undue feeling of dependence, and the promotion of mercenary aims in religion. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the preservation of the old ecclesiastical allegiance without a revival of spiritual and intellectual life could not have stemmed the tide of demoralization due to social and industrial influences. From the Protestant point of view it may further be remarked that under very special difficulties a Christian body has been built up, which has taken firm hold of Evangelical truth, has its independent organization, exerts an influence out of proportion to its numbers, and proves its sincerity by its gifts. It is the only considerable body of native Christians animated by missionary purposes. The influence of missions on the Armenians has been much less. The ecclesiastical bonds have been merged into the bonds of nationality, of which the Armenians are unusually tenacious. A small number of Armenians have left the Gregorian for the Protestant and Roman Catholic communions. The Roman Catholics have done something and the Presbyterians and the Church Missionary Society have done more for the education of Armenians, both directly and by stimulating the Armenians to raise the grade of their national schools. Evangelical views have also made progress among the clergy and laity of the Gregorian church. The Jews and Parsis have benefited to some extent from the missionary educational work; and in Hamadan a small church is made up of Jewish Christians.

Lord Curzon, while he acknowledges in his monumental work on Persia (G. N. Curzon, *Persia and the Persian Question*, 2 vols., London, 1892), the benefits of the humanitarian work done by missions, denies both the fact and the possibility of converts from Islam to Christianity. One can not but suspect that his disbelief in the possibility of conversion affects his judgment of the fact. Of course the reality of conversion must ultimately be a question of opinion, and opinions will differ; but there is probably no Protestant missionary long resident in the country who has not in his own experience and to his best judgment known more than the half-dozen genuine converts allowed by Lord Curzon as the utmost limit of such converts from the days of Henry Martyn. Still converts are few, and are nowhere numerous enough to be collectively of any influence. There is no open movement toward Christianity. Nevertheless real and important advantages have been gained. Christianity was very imperfectly known and that only as the despised faith of the ignorant fragments of conquered peoples. The political changes of the past century have brought Christianity to notice as the religion of powerful and civilized nations. Increase of commercial intercourse has been another powerful influence for change. This impact of civilizations and religions was inevitable and necessarily changed the conception of Christianity. Political power and commercial enterprise could at best most inadequately represent Christianity, and it is due to missions that the humanitarian and benevolent side of Christianity has been presented. It is still more true that missions alone have presented the doctrinal and spiritual elements of Christianity, or, in other words, Christianity itself. The Gospel as a message of salvation has been preached to multitudes and the Bible has been put in the hands of very many of the educated. Through these agencies Christian truth is entering the current of religious speculation, which is never stagnant in the Persian mind. The medical work has made many personally grateful to the followers of the merciful Jesus. Missionary schools lead the educational movement in the country. The special representatives of Christianity are recognized as men of the highest character. Christian missions have gained a place not merely of tolerated existence but of real honor in the land.

Much might be said as to the conditions of work in Persia. Perhaps in no other country does Islam present so interesting a history as in Persia. Here the history is one of dissent, of schism, of heresy,

6. Conditions of Work.

of new doctrines and strange survivals, of bold speculation and poetical mysticism. Within the last century Babism, developing into Behaism (qq.v.), has been offered by Persia to the world as a universal religion. The claims made for it are extravagant, and it is making little progress, but it testifies to the fertility of the Persian mind, to its discontent with Islam as a social system, and in some of its teachings to the influence of Christianity. The Sufi teachings finding their expression in the *Masnavi* of Jalal ud Din and the cosmopolitan morality of Sheikh Saadi have not lost their influence. The yearning after a closer communion with the divine than that offered in orthodox Islam finds expression in many ways. All of these influences make many restive under the intolerance of Islam; and while there is little prospect of the proclamation of religious freedom at present, many forces are working in that direction and are already increasing the amount of freedom realized. A majority of the Persians are adherents of the mutasshari scholastic Shiite Islam, which makes life center in the fulfilment of the law; although even with them the greatest religious season is the Muharram, the time of mourning for the propitiatory sufferings of the Imam Hussein. Less numerous and yet wide-spread are the more liberal Sheikhis, as are the many branches of *'Arifs* (or Sufis). Then one must mention the growing class of the modern type of free-thinkers. These have some European education and are apt to be theists with little definite theological belief. The Sunnis, mainly Kurds, though numerous (probably a million), are outside the current of national life and are mostly very ignorant. The Ali Illahis are a numerous sect of obscure but ancient origin, having secret rites and a merely nominal attachment to Islam. This complex of sects and beliefs is made more intricate by race and language divisions and by tribal and dialect subdivisions. Finally to all these influences and counter-influences must be added the new movement in Islam with its new patriotism and its new attachment to European civilization and liberty. Unless this force is very quickly spent, religious change must result from it; for it is marked by two anti-Islamic ideals, national patriotism and the regulation of society by legislation originating in society itself and not enforced by religious sanctions. The disintegrating effect of modern science must also be taken into account. Meantime the variety of belief, the heritage of heresy, and the speculative tendency of the Persian mind, which have leavened even the Turkish population of northern Persia, all give openings to Christian truth. The need for missionary activity is great; and the missionaries must be strong in character, wise and alert in action, and full of intellectual and spiritual power in order to make the inevitable change a movement Christward. W. A. Shedd.

Bibliography: Beside the literature named in the text consult: W. A. Shedd, *Islam and the Oriental Churches*, Philadelphia, 1904; B. Brisson, *De regio Persarum principatio*, Strasburg, 1710 (best ed.); J. Perkins, *Residence of Eight Years in Persia Among the Nestorian Christians*, Andover, 1843; idem, *Missionary Life in Persia; Glimpses of a Quarter of a Century's Labor among the Nestorian Christians*, Boston, 1861; T. Laurie, *Woman and her Saviour in Persia*, Boston, 1863; D. T. Fiske, *Faith Working by Love*, Boston, 1868; D. W. Marsh, *Tennessean in Persia and Koordistan: Scenes and Incidents in the Life of S. A. Rhea*, Philadelphia, 1869; W. Guest, *Story of a Consecrated Life* (Fidelia Fiske), London, 1870; R. Anderson, *Hist. of the Missions of the A. B. C. F. M., Oriental Missions*, Boston, 1874; Berthold-Ignace, *Hist. de la mission de Perse . . . 1604–12*, Brussels, 1887; A. Riley, *Progress and Prospects of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission*, London, 1889; J. Bassett, *Persia; Eastern Mission*, Philadelphia, 1890; A. J. Maclean and W. H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and his People*, London, 1892; E. A. Lawrence, *Modern Missions in the East*, New York, 1895; S. G. Wilson, *Persian Life and Customs*, London, 1896; V. V. Barthold, *Zur Geschichte des Christenthums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung*, Tübingen, 1901; J. B. Piolet, *Les Missions catholiques françaises aux xix. siècle*, 6 vols., Paris, 1901; C. H. Stileman, *The Subjects of the Shah*, London, 1902; Hamd Allah, *Mesopotamia and Persia under the Mongols in the 14th Century*, London, 1903; J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse . . . 224–632*, Paris, 1904; W. A. Essery, *The Ascending Cross. Some Results of Missions in Bible Lands*, London, 1905; E. R. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, London, 1906; F. H. Davis, *The Persian Mystics, Jalalu'd-din Rumi*, London, 1907; E. Aubin, *La Perse d'aujourd'hui. Iran. Mesopotamie*, Colin, 1908; J. G. Wishard, *Twenty Years in Persia*, New York, 1908; Mrs. M. E. and A. Hume-Griffith, *Behind the Veil in Persia and Turkish Arabia*, Philadelphia, 1909; M. Jewett, *Reminiscences of my Life in Persia*, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909; V. Berard, *Révolutions de la Perse. Les Provinces, les peuples, et le gouvernement du roi des rois*, Paris, 1910; the literature under Grant, Asabel; Martyn, Henry; and Stoddard, David Tappan.

PERSONA, GOBELINUS: Canon and dean at Bielefeld; b. probably at Paderborn in 1358; d. at the monastery of Böddeken, near Paderborn, c. 1421. After a prolonged sojourn in Italy, especially at the court of Urban VI.; he received an appointment at the cathedral of Paderborn and later became pastor of the Market Church. As dean at Bielefeld under Bishop Wilhelm von Berg of Paderborn (1400–14) he contributed greatly to the reform of the Paderborn monasteries. He is to be mentioned chiefly for his work *Cosmodromium, hoc est chronicon universale complectens res ecclesiæ et reipublicæ ab urbe condita usque ad annum Christi 1418* (ed. H. Meibom, Frankfort, 1599; ed. the younger H. Meibom in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, i. 53 sqq., Helmstadt, 1688). Although a worthless compilation for the earlier times, it is a valuable source of information for the conditions and opinions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: E. A. Bayer, *Gobelinus Persona*, Leipsic, 1873; A. Hogemann, *Ueber die Quellen des Gobelinus Persona*, Halle, 1874; *ADB*, ix. 300–301.

PERSONNE, JOHN WILHELM: Swedish theologian; b. in Stockholm 1849. He studied at Upsala (Ph.D., 1875; Th.D., 1897), and at Tübingen (1877); he was appointed reader at the North Latin School in Stockholm (1881); was inspector at the catechist schools (1883–97); since 1885 he has been member of the committee revising the Swedish translation of the Bible; and since 1897 he has been provost of the cathedral in Linköping. Among his works may be mentioned *De mosaiska altaroffren* (1874); *V. Rydbergs Bibelns lära om Kristus granskad* (1880); *Grunddragen till Gamla testamentets sedelära* (1881); *Bibelkritikens nyasta hypoteser om*

Gamla testamentet (1886); *Skolungdomens sedliga uppfostran* (1888). John O. Evjen.

PERSONS, ROBERT. See Parsons.

PERTH, FIVE ARTICLES OF: Five articles agreed upon in the General Assembly of the Scottish Church at Perth Aug. 25, 1618. They enjoined kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Pentecost, and confirmation, and sanctioned the private administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper. They were obnoxious to the Presbyterians of Scotland and were adopted only at the command of King James VI. (James I. of England), being a part of his plan to unify the ecclesiastical policy of England and Scotland (see Presbyterians). They were ratified by parliament, Aug. 4, 1621. The General Assembly at Glasgow in 1638 declared the action at Perth "unfree, unlawful, and null," and condemned the five articles.

Bibliography: P. H. Brown, *Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 265–271, Cambridge, 1902; W. M. Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, p. 125, New York, 1881; C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 49, 50, 56, ib. 1885; G. P. Hays, *Presbyterians*, p. 54, ib. 1892.

PERU: A republic of South America, bounded by Ecuador on the north, Brazil and Bolivia on the east, Bolivia and the Pacific Ocean on the south, and the Pacific Ocean on the west; area, 695,730 square miles; population about 3,000,000. Of this, the natives comprise at least one-half, those of mixed blood about one-third. According to article four of the constitution of 1860, the Roman Catholic is the established religion, and no other worship is legally tolerated. Though all the territory is included in the diocesan distribution, some of the Indians in the eastern part are now in the process of being Christianized. The national church is administered by the eight bishops of Iquitos, Chachopoyas, Huanaco, Truxillo, Ayacucho, Cuzco, Puno, and Arequipa; and by the incumbent of the archbishopric of Lima, which was erected in 1546. The government maintains an extensive control of the clergy. Thus, when an episcopal vacancy occurs, the government proposes three ecclesiastics to the joint national legislature, which selects one, subject to the confirmation of the pope. The chapters are supplied by appointees of the State, and the archbishop can not hinder any such from assuming his office. While the State's allowance for the archbishop amounts to $20,000, the remaining dignitaries are ill-supported. The entire parochial clergy receives no state contribution; but its labors are in a great measure supplemented by those of the orders and congregations which have many establishments. Lima alone has thirteen nunneries and eight cloisters for men. The orders represented are mainly the Dominicans, and next, the Franciscans, Barefoot Friars (see Barefooted Monks and Nuns), Augustinians, and Jesuits. There are many lay fraternities in honor of Mary. Congregations of sisters still chiefly attend to the diffusion of elementary instruction, universal compulsory education not being enforced. Excepting the four at Lima, there are few intermediate schools. The University of San Marcos at Lima has a theological department which provides a six-years' course, after the custom of the orders. Owing to the meager immigration of Europeans and North Americans, there are but few Protestants in Peru. However, there are a German union congregation at Callao, a smaller Anglican congregation at Lima, and one of Presbyterians from the United States at Callao. [Missionary enterprises are carried on by the Regions Beyond Missionary Union, "the Brethren," and the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, U. S. The last-named reports 2 stations, 5 missionaries, 39 native workers, 231 communicants, and in all 400 professing Evangelical Christians. There are in Peru a total of 5,000 Evangelical Christians and 500 Jews.] Wilhelm Goetz.

Bibliography: C. R. Markham, *Hist. of Peru*, Chicago, 1892; E. W. Middendorf, *Peru*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1895; W. G. Mortimer, *Peru*, New York, 1901; J. Lee, *Religious Liberty in South America; with special Reference to recent Legislation in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia*, Cincinnati, 1907; C. R. Enock, *Peru; its former and present Civilization*, New York, 1908; G. Guinness, *Peru, its Story, People and Religion*, London, 1908; Marie R. Wright, *The Old and New Peru, A Story of the Ancient Inheritance and the Modern Growth and Enterprise of a Great Nation*, Philadelphia, 1909.

PESHITO. See Bible Versions, A, III., 1.

PESSIMISM: A word employed as the antonym of Optimism (q.v.). The term came into use in the first half of the last century. The dissatisfaction with life which the philosophcial theory aims to embody is, however, of long standing. The feeling was voiced in India by Guatama, the founder of Buddhism (d. about 475 B.C.), among the Hebrews in a modified form in the book of Ecclesiastes in the third century B.C., among the Persians in the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam (about 1120 A.D.). Arthur Schopenhauer (1860) was the first representative of modern pessimism. According to him the world is as bad as it can possibly be, if it is to continue to exist at all. The ultimate reality of the universe appears only in will—in any blind force of nature and in all organic existence—an endless striving without intelligence or aim. The radical evil of life—the will to live—is to be eradicated by denial of the "principle of individuation" and by the perfect denial of the will to live by means of asceticism, by destroying illusions of pleasure, by charity, by absolute refusal of the sexual impulse, and by total abstinence from food. Eduard von Hartmann (d. 1906) sought 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. 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 will 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 possible: but he holds decidedly that it is worse than would have been no world at all. He believes himself able to prove, by an appeal to the experience both of individuals and of society, that pain preponderates in a high degree over pleasure, evil over good. He does not deny that there is a kind of progress and plan in history; and yet he regards history as, on the whole, an irrational process, the successive epochs of which are so many stages of illusion. The progress of history is, in his view, not the growth of any positive good in history, but the growth of man's consciousness of the nothingness and vanity of human life. The most thorough and uncompromising of the advocates of pessimism is Julius Friedrich August Bahnsen (d. 1881). He maintains that the world and life are not only essentially irrational and wretched, 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 be based only on blind faith (*Der Widerspruch im Wissen und Wesen der Welt*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1880–82).

(Robert Flint.) C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: A. Schopenhauer, *Studies in Pessimism*, London, 1891, another transl., ib., 1896; Agnes Taubert, *Der Pessimismus und seine Gegner*, Berlin, 1873; J. Tulloch, *Modern Theories in Philosophy and Religion*, Edinburgh, 1874; E. Pfleiderer, *Der moderne Pessimismus*, Berlin, 1875; K. Frantz, *Der Pessimismus; seine Begründung in der modernen Philosophie*, Carlsruhe, 1876; J. Hüber, *Der Pessimismus*, Munich, 1876; J. Rehmke, *Die Philosophie des Weltschmerzes*, St. Gallen, 1876; idem, *Der Pessimismus und die Sittenlehre*, Leipsic, 1882; J. F. A. Bahnsen, *Das Tragische als Weltgesetz*, ib. 1877; idem, *Pessimiste-Brevier*, Berlin, 1879; idem, *Der Widerspruch im Wissen und Wesen der Welt*, 2 vols., ib. 1880–82; G. Borries, *Ueber den Pessimismus*, Leipsic, 1880; A. Bacmeister, *Der Pessimismus und die Sittenlehre*, Gütersloh, 1882; J. W. Barlow, *The Ultimatum of Pessimism*, London, 1882; P. Christ, *Der Pessimismus und die Sittenlehre*, Leipsic, 1882; H. Sommer, *Der Pessimismus und die Sittenlehre*, Berlin, 1883; idem, *Die Religion des Pessimismus*, ib. 1884; C. Williams, *Modern Pessimism; its Cause and Cure*, Bodmin, 1885; J. Hinton, *The Mystery of Pain*, Boston, 1886; G. Küssner, *Kritik des Pessimismus*, Halle, 1888; O. Plümacher, *Der Pessimismus*, Heidelberg, 1888; E. von Hartmann, *Philosophie des Unbewusstseins*, Leipsic, 1890, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., *Philosophy of the Unconscious*, 3 vols., London, 1884; idem, *Zur Geschichte und Begründung des Pessimismus*, Leipsic, 1892; J. Sully, *Pessimism: a History and Criticism*, London, 1891; P. Cadène, *Le Pessimisme légitime*, Paris, 1894; K. Hollensteiner, *Das Weltelend und die Welterlösung*, Gütersloh, 1894; R. M. Wenley, *Aspects of Pessimism*, London, 1894; S. Faure, *La Douleur universelle*, Paris, 1895; J. P. Hopps, *Pessimism, Science, and God*, London, 1895; H. Fierens-Gevært, *La Tristesse contemporaine*, Paris, 1899; A. Kowalewski, *Studien zur Psychologie des Pessimismus*, Wiesbaden, 1904; G. Salkinowitz, *Pessimistische Strömungen im Judentum*, Bern, 1908; and the literature under Optimism.

PESTALOZZI, JOHANN HEINRICH: Philanthropist and founder of the modern educational system; b. at Zurich Jan. 12, 1746; d. at Brugg (18 m. n.w. of Zurich) Feb. 17, 1827. He was brought up by his mother, his father, a surgeon, having died in 1751; he began the study of theology and of law, but gave up both to become a reformer in education, the stimulus having come in part from Rousseau's *Émile*, in part from the death of a friend. His earliest effort was an attempt to show the advantage of combining agriculture with manufactures and the education of children. To carry this out, he bought a tract of waste land in the canton of Aargau. This venture proved a failure, partly through Pestalozzi's inexperience in business, and with it went (1780) also his educational institute for poor children, which he had opened in the farmhouse with fifty scholars. At this time, which was one of great privation and dire poverty, he began to write, the earliest results being *Abendstunde eines Einsiedlers* (1780; aphorisms which contain his educational program); his celebrated *Lienhard und Gertrud* (4 vols., Frankfort, 1781–89; Eng. transl., *Leonard and Gertrude*, 2 vols., London, 1825), which achieved instant and universal success, being translated into practically all European languages; and the sequel *Christoph und Else* (Zurich, 1782). The *Lienhard und Gertrud* pictures the reformation of a household and then of a village by the efforts of a good woman. The next important contribution was his *Nachforschungen über den Gang der Natur in der Entwickelung des Menschengeschlechts* (1797), which reflects the influence of Fichte, whom he had come to know in 1792. When the French invaded Switzerland in 1798, Pestalozzi was given honorary citizenship. In consequence of the devastation of Unterwalden, many children were left orphans and destitute. Pestalozzi collected eighty of these in an old nunnery and took sole care of them, sharing their want and teaching them at the same time. This work was stopped and the children dispersed in 1799 when the French took the building as a hospital. He failed to interest Napoleon in his educational schemes, but published in 1801 *Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt* (Eng. transl., *How Gertrude Teaches her Children*, London, 1894) and in 1803 *Buch der Mütter, oder Anleitung für Mütter, ihre Kinder bemerken und reden zu lehren.* His ideas were now influential, and the government of Bern gave him a cloister for his school (1804), and the next year he removed to Yverdun on Lake Neuchâtel, where the rest of his active life (till 1825) was spent, the institution being for the instruction of both children and teachers. After his retirement in 1825, Pestalozzi wrote *Schwanengesang* and *Lebensschicksale.*

The revolution in teaching brought about by Pestalozzi consisted in beginning the education of a child by training the observation, passing then to the realization in consciousness of the facts thus gained, and next to the formulation of them in language. From measuring he passed to drawing, then to writing, counting, and reckoning. The entire aim was thus to evoke the child's native abilities instead of following the earlier method of pouring information into the mind. The centenary of his birth was celebrated in many places on the continent, occasion being taken to found institutions to carry out his ideas, especially his philanthropic plans for the poorer classes. The most noted of these is the Deutsche Pestalozzi-Stiftung at Berlin.

His works were collected as *Sämtliche Schriften* (15 vols., Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1819–26), and *Sämtliche Werke* (20 vols., Berlin and Liegnitz, 1881–96; ed. Seyffarth, 12 vols., Liegnitz, 1899–1902) and by P. Natorp in 3 vols. (ib. 1905). A work appearing in English was *Letters on Early Education* (London, 1827).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For list of writings of and on Pestalozzi consult A. Israel, *Versuch einen Zusammenstellung der Schriften von und über Pestalozzi*, Zschopau, 1894; *Monumenta Germaniæ pædagogicæ*, vols. xxv., xxix., xxxi., Berlin, 1901–05. Biographies are by: E. Biber, St. Gall, 1827, Eng. transl., London, 1831; C. J. Blochmann, Leipsic, 1846; R. Christoffel, Zurich, 1846; H. Morf, 4 vols., Winterthur, 1864–89; P. Krusi, New York, 1875; P. P. Pompée, 2d ed., Paris, 1882; R. de Guimps, 2d ed., Lausanne, 1888, Eng. transl., London, 1890; J. G. Guillaume; Paris, 1890; W. Kayser, Zurich, 1895; L. W. Seyferth, 8th ed., Leipsic, 1904; P. Natorp, Langensalza, 1905, A. Heubaum, Berlin, 1910. Consult further: C. von Raumer, *The Life and System of Pestalozzi*, London, 1855; J. Payne, *Pestalozzi; the Influence of his Principles and Practice*, London, 1875; A. Vogel, *Systematische Darstellung der Pädagogik Pestalozzis*, Hanover, 1886; H. Scherer, *Die pestalozzische Pädagogik*, Leipsic, 1896; C. Rothenberger, *Pestalozzi als Philosoph*, Bern, 1898; A. Pinloche, *Pestalozzi et l'éducation populaire moderne*, Paris, 1902; H. Barnard, *Pestalozzi and his Educational System*, New York, 1906; J. G. Compayré, *Pestalozzi and Elementary Education*, Boston, 1907; W. S. Monroe, *Hist. of the Pestalozzian Movement in the United States*, Syracuse, N. Y., 1907; R. Seidel, *Der unbekannte Pestalozzi der Sozial-Politiker und Sozial-Pädagoge*, Zürich, 1910.

PETAVIUS, DIONYSIUS (DENIS PÉTAU): French Jesuit; b. at Orléans Aug. 21, 1583; d. at Paris Dec. 11,. 1652. Educated at Orléans and Paris, he began to teach at Bourges in 1602, but three years later resigned both his professorship and a canonry of Orléans to enter the Society of Jesus. He then studied at the college in Pont-à-Mousson, taught at Reims, La Flèche, and Paris, was professed in 1618, and from 1621 to 1644 was professor of positive theology at Paris.

Petavius' range of learning was vast, extending over classical philology, chronology and history, polemics, patristics, and the history of dogma. He began with classical philology, where his learning was evinced by his editions of Synesius (Paris, 1611), sixteen orations of Themistius (1613), three orations of Julian (1614) and the same author's complete works (1630),. Nicephorus with fragments of other Byzantine historians (1616), and, the most important of all his contributions to this sphere of learning, an edition and translation of the complete works of Epiphanius (1622). He likewise composed *Orationes* (Paris, 1620), *Opera poetica* (Latin; 1620), and *Carmina Græca* (1641).

From classical philology and patristics Petavius was led to the studies in chronology which occupied him for many years. In his *De doctrina temporum* (2 vols., Paris, 1627)—written largely in criticism of the *De emendatione temporum* (Paris, 1583) of Joseph Justus Scaliger (q.v.)—Petavius sought to reestablish universal chronology; and this work was supplemented by him in his *Tabulæ chronologicæ regum, dynastarum . . . a mundo condito* (1628), *Uranologion sive systema variorum authorum qui de sphæra et sideribus eorumque motibus Græce commentati sunt* (1630), *Rationarium temporum* (2 parts, 1633–34; last ed., 3 vols., Venice, 1849; Eng. transl. by R. P., *The History of the World: or, An Account of Time*, 2 parts, London, 1659), and *La Pierre de touche chronologique* (1636).

Among the polemic writings of Petavius, aimed at those who would impair the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, mention may be made of the following: against the Calvinistic Claudius Salmasius (q.v.), *Dissertationum ecclesiasticarum libri duo* (Paris, 1641) and *De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri tres* (1643); against Maturin Simon, dean of Orléans, *De pænitentiæ ritu in veteri ecclesia* (Paris, 1624); against Hugo Grotius (q.v.), *De potestate consecrandi et sacrificandi sacerdotibus a Deo concessa* (Paris, 1639); and against the Jansenists, *De libero arbitrio* (Paris, 1643), *De la pénitence publique et de la préparation à la communion* (1643), *De lege et gratia* (1648), *De Tridentini concilii interpretatione et Sancti Augustini doctrina* (1649), and *De adjutorio sine quo et adjutorio quo* (1651).

Though Petavius' Greek *Paraphrasis Psalmorum et canticorum* (Paris, 1637) was highly esteemed for its exegetical value, his greatest service to theology was rendered by his avowedly anti-scholastic, *De theologicis dogmaticis* (5 vols., Paris, 1644–50), which he did not live to complete. The first volume discusses the doctrine of God and the divine qualities in eight books, and predestination in two; the second, the doctrine of the Trinity in eight books; the third, the doctrine of angels' creation, and the hierarchy in twelve books; and the fourth and fifth, the incarnation and the person and work of Christ in sixteen books. The sixth volume, which none but Petavius himself could have written, was to have set forth the doctrines of the sacraments, the law, faith, love, hope, virtues, and vices. After the merits of the work became fully recognized, repeated editions appeared, of which the best is that by J. B. Fournials (8 vols., Paris, 1865–67).

Petavius' correspondence with scholars in France, Italy, Holland, etc., is of value both for the history of learning in the seventeenth century and for his own biography. Only a comparatively small portion, however, has been preserved, this appearing posthumously in his *Epistolarum libri tres* (Paris, 1652), reprinted in the editions of the *De doctrina temporum* at Amsterdam (1705), Verona (1734), and Venice (1757). The sum total of his works is reckoned at forty-nine. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal sources are his own letters, ut sup.; the funeral oration by H. Valesius, Paris, 1653; and Niceron, *Mémoires*, xxxvii. 81–234. Consult further: F. Stanonik, *Dionysius Petavius*, Graz, 1876; J. C. V. Chatellain, *Le Père Denis Petau*, Paris, 1884; Bayle, *Dictionary*, iv. 600–602 (worth consulting); *KL*, ix. 1841–43; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, x. 507–508.

PETER OF ALCANTARA: Spanish Franciscan and reformer of his order; b. at Alcantara (110 m. s.w. of Salamanca) 1499; d. at Arnas (near Alcantara) Oct. 18, 1562. He entered the order at the age of sixteen, became guardian of a new monastery at Badajoz in 1519, and was ordained priest in 1524. He later lived as a hermit near Soriana, where he wrote his *De oratione et meditatione* (Eng. transl., by G. Willoughby, *A Golden Treatise of Mentall Praier*, Brussels, 1632; reprinted Liverpool, 1843). In 1538 he was made provincial of Estremadura,, and at once began measures to reform his order.. In 1554 he commenced the establishment of a Franciscan congregation of strict observance, and secured the sanction of Julius III. No monastery of these rigidly ascetic "Minorites of the Strictest Observance" (as they were officially known) might contain more than eight monks, and their rule formed a partial prototype for the discalced Carmelite nuns of St. Theresa (q.v.). Peter of Alcantara was beatified in 1622, and canonized in 1669. The treatise *De animi pace seu tranquillitate* (Eng. transl., by T. W., *Pax animæ: a short Treatise declaring how necessary the Tranquillity . . . of the Soul Is*, London, 1665; reprinted London, 1876) seems to have been the second part of the *De oratione* rather than an independent composition.

The congregation founded by Peter of Alcantara numbered some twenty provinces in the seventeenth century, and had monasteries in Spain, southern Italy, Rome, the Tyrol, South America, the Philippines, and Japan. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Laurentius a Divo Paulo, *Portentum pœnitentiæ, seu vita S. Petri de Alcantara*, Rome, 1669 (also in *ASB*, Oct., viii. 700–809; this is based upon the earlier works of Johannes a S. Maria and the Oratorian Francesco Marchese, Rome, 1667); *Acta canonizationis S. Petri de Alcantara et S. Magdalenæ de Pazzis*, Rome, 1669; F. Hueber, *Leben, Tugend und Wunderwerke des heiligen Petrus von Alcantara*, Munich, 1670; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, vii. 137 sqq.; O. Zöckler, in *Zeitschrift für die gesamte lutherische Theologie*, 1864, pp. 39–78; *KL*, ix. 1880–84.

PETER OF ALEXANDRIA: Bishop and martyr; d. at Alexandria 311. He seems to have been the second successor of Theognostus as the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria; and though only scanty fragments of his writings have survived, it is known that he was an opponent of Origen, criticizing his opinions on the relation of the body to the soul and on the resurrection of the dead, but at the same time agreeing with him that Christianity must supply an inerrant knowledge as a condition of attainment to the perfect life.

From Peter's treatise "On penitence" are drawn fourteen "penitential canons" which have been incorporated in canon law. These canons were evidently composed by Peter himself in an epistle written in 306 to the Egyptian churches; and in them he pleaded for greater leniency toward the Lapsed (q.v.). Those who had denied the faith under torture might be received after forty days of penance; those who had lapsed during imprisonment, after a year; those who had denied the faith without compulsion should be judged according to Luke xiii. 6 sqq.; and the impenitent should be excommunicated. Those who had pretended to abandon Christianity might be restored after penance of half a year; masters who had caused their slaves to offer sacrifice for them were required to do penance for three years, and their slaves for one year; but those who had suffered imprisonment for the faith were to enjoy the rights of Christian fellowship. Such of the clergy as had needlessly exposed themselves to persecution and had lapsed during the trial of their faith could never be restored to more than lay communion with the Church. On the other hand, those who had paid for immunity were deemed the reverse of blameworthy, and flight was also considered justifiable, even if others were taken instead of the fugitive.

The attitude taken by Peter toward the lapsed has been assigned as the cause of the schism of Meletius of Lycopolis (q.v.), though the real reason was more probably the rivalry between the two bishops. Meletius having unwarrantedly consecrated bishops and ordained priests in place of those who were imprisoned or had fled, he was excommunicated by Peter. According to another, but more dubious, tradition, the two bishops became estranged while fellow prisoners, in consequence of their conflicting views regarding the treatment of the lapsed. The acts of Peter's martyrdom also record that he ordained Arius to the diaconate, but afterward excluded him from the fellowship of the Church because of his adherence to the excommunicated Meletius. The imprisonment and execution of Peter of Alexandria seem to have been quite unexpected. His day is Nov. 26.

An interesting document on the observance of the Sabbath, which has been edited by C. Schmidt (*TU*, xx., 1901, pp. 4 sqq.), is ascribed to Peter, though its authenticity is still a matter of doubt. A number of other fragments obviously referring to Peter of Alexandria have also been discovered, but these, like the treatise on the Sabbath, seem to show many interpolations. Equally doubtful is a fragment of a "Teaching of Peter," and the same statement holds good of the fragments "On Blasphemy" and "On the Passover" which have been ascribed to him. Finally, if the acts of the martyrdom of Peter may be believed, he fled from persecution from place to place through Mesopotamia, Syria, and the islands of the Mediterranean, so that he must have left Egypt and interrupted his immediate supervision of his diocese.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

A second of the name (d. Feb. 14, 380) was bishop of Alexandria in succession to Athanasius, who nominated him just before his own death in 373. He suffered persecution from the Arians, who called in the pagan prefect, and was compelled to flee. He lived five years in Rome, and returned in 378. He was highly honored by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil.

Bibliography: Remains of Peter's writings are edited in M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, iv. 19 sqq., Oxford, 1846; P. de Lagarde, *Reliquiæ juris ecclesiæ antiquiæ*, pp. 63–73, 99–117, cf. pp. xlvi.–liv., Leipsic, 1856; *MPG*, xvi. 449–522; J. B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, iv. 187–195, 425–430, 8 vols., Paris, 1876 sqq.; Schulthess, in *ZDMG*, 1902, pp. 257–258; W. E. Crum, in *JTS*, 1903, pp. 387–397; C. Heer, in *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 2, pp. 344 sqq. An Eng. transl. of some fragments is in *ANF*, vi. 269–283. The Acts of his martyrdom are in F. Combefis, *Illustrium Christi martyrum lecti triumphi*, pp. 189 sqq., Paris, 1660; and J. Viteau, *Passions des saints Ecaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie, Barbara, et Anysia*, Paris, 1897, and in *MPG*, xviii. 453 sqq. (all these, the Greek Acts); the Latin Acts are in A. Mai, *Specilegium Romanum*, iii. 673 sqq., Rome, 1840, and thence reprinted in *MPL*, cxxix. 691 sqq.; the Syriac are in P. Bedjan's *Acta martyrum*, v. 543 sqq., Paris, 1895; the Coptic are in H. Hyvernat, *Les Actes des martyres*, i. 263 sqq., ib. 1886–87.

Further sources are: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VII., xxxii. 31, VIII., xiii. 7, IX., vi. 2; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxviii.; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, I., vi.; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, I., xv. Consult (for a list of works, principally old) *ANF*, Bibliography, p. 74. For discussions: C. Schmidt, in *TU*, xx. 4 (1901); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchliche Litteratur*, ii. 203 sqq., Freiburg, 1903; L. B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria*, Cambridge and New York, 1908; Krüger, *History*, pp. 219–222; idem, in *ZWT*, xxxi (1888), 434–448; *Analecta Bollandiana*, vols., xix.–xx., Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 443 sqq., ii. 2, pp. 71 sqq.; idem, *Dogma*, vols. iii.–iv., passim; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ii. 615–616, iii. 56–61; *KL*, ix. 1884–85; *DCB*, iv. 331–336.

PETER THE APOSTLE.

I. Life.
  Name and Early Career (§ 1).
  Position among the Apostles (§ 2).
  Character and Temperament (§ 3).
  Activity and Position in Palestine (§ 4).
  His Teachings as Recorded in Acts (§ 5).
  Attitude toward Gentile Christians (§ 6).
  The Closing Years (§ 7).
  Confused and False Traditions Concerning Peter (§ 8).
II. Writings.
  Occasion and Circumstances of I Peter (§ 1).
  Relation to Other N. T. Writings (§ 2).
  Its Theology (§ 3).
  Place and Date of Composition; Authenticity (§ 4).
  II Peter (§ 5).
III. Apocryphal Petrine Literature.
  1. The Gospel.
    Early Mention (§ 1).
    Rediscovery (§ 2).
    Contents (§ 3).
    Date, Sources, Character (§ 4).
  2. The Apocalypse.
    Early Mention (§ 1).
    Contents (§ 2).
    Literary Influence; Date (§ 3).
  3. The Preaching.
  4. The Acts.

1. Name and Early Career.

I. Life: The sole source for the biography of the Apostle Peter during the earthly ministry of Christ is the canonical Gospels. He originally bore the very common Jewish name of Shimeon, Simeon, or Simon (cf. Acts xv. 14; II Pet. i. 1), the first of these forms being the earliest, and the last the latest. He likewise had the Aramaic honorary surname of *Kepha* (Gk. *Kephas*), or "Rock," which was translated into its Greek equivalent *Petros*, "Peter." Christ himself, however, termed his apostle Peter only thrice (John i. 42; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 34), elsewhere using either the name Simon (Matt. xvii. 25; Mark xiv. 37; Luke xxii. 31) or, in more solemn moments, Simon son of John (Matt. xvi. 17; John i. 42, xxi. 15–17). The phraseology of the Evangelists varies. Mark terms the apostle Simon until he receives the surname of Peter (Mark iii. 16), after which he is called Peter; and a similar, though less consistent, course is followed by the other two synoptists (cf. Matt. iv. 18, viii. 14, xvi. 16; Luke v. 8). In Acts he is invariably called Peter, even when addressed (Acts x. 13, xi. 7). In the Fourth Gospel he is called Simon only when first mentioned, elsewhere being usually termed Simon Peter, Peter alone being used only when the double name either precedes or follows. Paul almost invariably terms him Cephas (I Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11, 14), the use of Peter here being extremely rare (Gal. ii. 7–8). The father of the Apostle Peter was named John (John i. 42, xxi. 15 sqq.) or, in abbreviated form, Jona (Matt. xvi. 17). He was probably from Bethsaida (John i. 44), although Mark i. 21, 29 makes him a resident of Capernaum, the apparent contradiction being explicable by the fact that at marriage (cf. I Cor. ix. 5) he had removed to the latter town, making his living by fishing, together with his younger brother Andrew, in the Sea of Galilee (Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16; Luke v. 3). Andrew had early become one of the disciples of John the Baptist (John i. 40), and it was this younger brother who brought Peter into contact with Jesus (John i. 42). There is, however, no reason to suppose that he then became a member of the Messiah's circle, or that he was present among the disciples at Cana (John ii. 2), at Jerusalem (ii. 17), in Judea (iv. 2), and in Samaria (iv. 8). It would rather seem that, after returning with Jesus to Galilee, Peter there resumed his trade, so that there is no real discrepancy between the account in the Gospel of John and the synoptic records of the calling of Peter (John ii. 41 sqq.; Matt. iv. 18 sqq.; Mark i. 16 sqq.), but, on the contrary, the synoptic account presupposes the Johannine, which alone renders it intelligible as the documents now read. With the second calling, however, Peter seems to have become the constant follower of Jesus throughout all his wanderings, so that his incorporation among the twelve apostles (Matt. x. 1 sqq.; Mark iii. 13 sqq.) evidently makes little real change in his relation to Christ.

2. Position among the Apostles.

While Matthew and Luke ascribe a slightly more marked preeminence to Peter among the apostles than does Mark, which is based largely on Petrine sources, there is no real discrepancy between them. Matthew and Luke have included certain passages, omitted by Mark, which emphasize the leadership of Peter (Matt. xiv. 28–31, xvi. 17–19, xvii. 24–27, xviii. 21; Luke v. 3, xii. 41, xxii. 32, xxiv. 12, 34); words ascribed by Mark to the apostles in general are attributed by Matthew and Luke to Peter (cf. Matt. xv. 15 and Luke viii. 45 with Mark vii. 17, v. 31); Peter is expressly mentioned where Mark gives no name (cf. Luke xxii. 8 with Mark xiv. 13); Matthew explicitly stresses the priority of Peter among the apostles (cf. Matt. x. 2 with Mark iii. 16 sqq.; Luke vi. 14 sqq.; Acts i. 13 sqq.); and the position which he held according to Mark (v. 37, xiii. 3, xiv. 33) was little less than that ascribed to him in Matthew and Luke. Nor is this position altered by the relation of Peter to John in the Fourth Gospel. Here John has a certain preeminence because of his greater sympathy with the mind of Jesus, whereas Peter owed his position to his quick decision and action, a position which the Fourth Gospel not only does not minimize, but, on the contrary, brings into full prominence.

3. Character and Temperament.

Generally speaking, the character of Peter is described with essential harmony in all the Gospels. He appears as an admirable type of the Galilean, well-meaning, confiding, freedom-loving, and courageous, yet changeable, capricious, and eager for novelty (Josephus, *War*, III., iii. 2; *Life*, 16–17; Matt. xi. 7 sqq., 16 sqq.). At first blush it seems strange that Jesus should have given the epithet of "Rock" to one of such character, yet he saw far beneath the surface and grasped the inherent strength and stability that underlay the changing and inconstant exterior. Nor did Peter prove unworthy of this confidence;

his trust became ardent devotion; and his quick resolution was strengthened and steadied. Yet in the account of his walking on the water (Matt. xiv. 28–31) his natural instability of character, even after being long under the influence of Jesus, comes clearly to the fore; while his denial of Christ still more strongly marks his wavering and his weakness. Nevertheless, he had already shown himself worthy of his title, as when at Cæsarea Philippi he boldly declared Jesus to be the Christ, not a mere precursor of the Messiah (Matt. xvi. 13 sqq.; Mark viii. 27 sqq.; Luke ix. 18 sqq.; John vi. 66 sqq.), especially as this was the very time when many, disappointed in Jesus, were abandoning him. Yet even the faith of Peter was not uncommingled with hopes of the earthly power and glory of Christ, and from the first foreshadowing of the sufferings of Christ, made at Cæsarea Philippi, until their close the alternate strength and weakness of Peter appear in ever-increasing clearness. He incurred the severe rebuke of his master by deprecating the necessity of such sufferings (Matt. xvi. 23–24; Mark viii. 33), yet on the mount of transfiguration he again wished to make permanent the glory there apocalyptically revealed (Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 33). Equally typical was his desire to extend forgiveness as far as possible, though he still fell far short of the Christian ideal (Matt. xviii. 21–22); and the same statement holds true of the words in which he reminds Christ how both he and the other disciples had left all to follow him (Matt. xix. 27; Mark x. 28; Luke xviii. 28). As the time of the passion approached, the moral perils of Peter thickened. In the scene recorded in John xiii. 6 sqq. his impetuosity is revealed, as well as a certain lack of understanding of the love of Jesus which was to reach its culmination in the passion. Immediately afterward he vowed, despite the prophecy of the denial, to remain faithful to Jesus even unto death (Matt. xxvi. 33 sqq.; Mark xiv. 29 sqq.; Luke xxii. 33–34; John xiii. 37–38). But he had overestimated his strength, nor could he even keep awake for his master's sake in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 40; Luke xxii. 45). It is true that he drew his sword when Jesus was seized (Matt. xxvi. 51; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; John xviii. 10–11), but when he saw that this was useless, he fled with the other disciples (Matt. xxvi. 56 and parallels). Nevertheless, he made his way into the palace of the high priest, where he was put to the real test, only to deny Jesus with the utmost vehemence (Matt. xxvi. 69 sqq.; Mark xiv. 66 sqq.; Luke xxii. 56 sqq.; John xviii. 15 sqq.). This last fall receives only a partial explanation from the vacillating character of Peter; the real reason seems to lie in the fact that inaction undermined his resolution, which activity would have kept consistent. Yet in all this he never really lost faith in Christ for an instant, and when he became aware of what he had almost unconsciously done, his remorse and shame, while finally purifying his character, kept him away from Christ until after the resurrection. Then, however, his old energy reappeared, and though at the tomb he was outstripped in running by the younger disciple John, he was still the first to find that the grave was empty (John xx. 3 sqq.), and in the account of the appearance of the risen Christ at the Sea of Tiberias, the old character of Peter once more becomes manifest (John xxi. 7 sqq.). The temperament of Peter, as here outlined, was inseparably connected with his position of preeminence among the apostles. Not only was he closely associated with the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, and once with his own brother, Andrew, as one of the favorite and most trusted disciples of Jesus (Mark v. 37, ix. 2, xiii. 3 sqq., xiv. 33 sqq.; Luke viii. 51, ix. 28), and not only were he and John commissioned to make preparations for the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 8 sqq.), but the entire content of the Gospels mark him as preeminent over the other disciples. This position seems to have been due essentially to his quick resolution and to his energy, and it was confirmed by Jesus both for the present and for the future; for the present by addressing to him questions and answers which concerned the other disciples as well (Matt. xvii. 25 sqq., xviii. 22, xxvi. 40; John xiii. 36); and for the future by the remarkable words recorded in Matt. xvi. 18–19, a prerogative which even temporary wavering and recreancy could not annul (cf. Luke xxii. 31–32).

4. Activity and Position in Palestine.

The apostolic activity of Peter in Judea and the neighboring districts after the resurrection of Jesus is recorded chiefly in Acts, although the Pauline epistles contain a few valuable allusions. It must be borne in mind that a certain amount of editorial change may be traced in the speeches ascribed to Peter in Acts, but there is no reason to doubt the essential authenticity of the facts there recorded. After the ascension, Peter, undismayed by the threats of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, preached and worked in Samaria and along the Syro-Phenician coast, especially in Lydda, Joppa, and Cæsarea (Acts viii. 14 sqq., ix. 32–x. 48), performing many miracles (Acts iii. 4 sqq., v. 15, ix. 34, 40). Returning to Jerusalem, he was imprisoned under Herod Agrippa after the death of James, the brother of John (Acts xii. 1 sqq.), but escaping, he left the city, though he seems again to have taken up his residence there after Herod's death. Paul visited him there three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), and he was there at the time of the council of the apostles recorded in Gal. ii. 1-9. With Jerusalem as a base, he visited other churches (Gal. ii. 11), accompanied by his wife (I Cor. ix. 5). Despite the existence of a Petrine faction in Corinth (I Cor. i. 12; cf. ix. 5), there is no reason to suppose that Peter ever labored there (cf. also I Cor. iv. 15), and the tradition, preserved by Eusebius, that Peter founded the church in the Syrian city of Antioch is refuted by Acts xi. 19 sqq. As to the position of Peter as the leader of the apostolic church, Acts and the Pauline epistles are in full accord. He took first place in the meeting which chose Matthias to succeed Judas Iscariot (Acts i. 15 sqq.), he was the spokesman of the whole company of apostles both in winning a large body of Jewish converts (Acts ii. 14 sqq.) and in defending the Gospel against the Jewish hierarchy (Acts iv. 8 sqq., 19 sqq., v. 29 sqq.), he reformed conditions within the mother church at Jerusalem (Acts v. 1 sqq.), he watched over relations with other Christian communities (Acts viii. 14 sqq., ix. 32 sqq.), and he was the first to receive a pagan into the new church (Acts x. 1 sqq.). On the other hand, he enjoyed no absolute preeminence. He labored in Samaria together with John (Acts viii. 14), and he was called to account for associating with gentiles (Acts xi. 3 sqq.). At the council of the apostles, moreover, he was not only not the leader, but was even subordinate, in a sense, to James (Acts xv. 6 sqq.). In like manner Paul at first describes Peter as the leader of the church at Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18), but by the time of the apostolic council he was, although still the virtual representative of the mission to the Jews, only one of the three pillars of the church, the other two being James and John (Gal. ii. 8–9).

5. His Teachings as Recorded in Acts.

The teaching of Peter, as recorded in Acts, was essentially apologetic, hortatory, and practical. Special stress was laid by him on the sufferings of Christ, which could allege no obstacle to full acceptance of his Messianic mission, since his death was an undeserved and unrighteous act of murder on the part of the Jews through pagan hands (Acts ii. 23, iii. 13 sqq.; cf. iv. 10–11, v. 30, x. 39). Christ was a true prophet (Acts iii. 22), anointed by the Holy Ghost (x. 38), and attested by miracles, wonders, and signs (ii. 22); and his death was due not to chance, but to the divine plan (Acts ii. 23) as foretold by the prophets (iii. 18), the purpose being the first of all the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, including the forgiveness of sins (cf. iii. 18–19). The proof of the Messianic kingship of Jesus, even during his human life and suffering, was sought in the fact that, in harmony with prophecy, he had been raised by God from the dead on the third day (Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, 26, iv. 10, x. 40), had been manifested to chosen witnesses (x. 40–41), and had been exalted to the right hand of God (ii. 31 sqq.). This resurrection, of which it was an essential duty of the apostles to be witnesses (Acts i. 22, ii. 32, iii. 13 sqq., v. 30 sqq., x. 40–41), had made Jesus the Messianic king (ii. 36, v. 31), the cornerstone of the divine kingdom (iv. 11), lord of all (x. 36, cf. ii. 36), the perfection of the divine kingdom established since the days of the patriarchs (iii. 13), and the consummation of the Messianic days foretold by the prophets (iii. 24). His mediation, therefore, conditions all the promised blessings of the perfect kingdom of God, forgiveness of sins (Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, v. 31, x. 43), peace (x. 36), the gift of the Holy Ghost (ii. 38, xi. 17), salvation from a perverse generation (ii. 40), physical health (iii. 6, 16, iv. 10), all salvation (iv. 12), and every divine blessing (iii. 26). The condition on which man shares in these blessings is repentance (Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, viii. 22), which first becomes fully possible through the death and resurrection of Christ (v. 31, xi. 18, cf. iii. 26), as well as obedience to God (v. 32) and acceptance of the divine revelation that Jesus is the Christ, the pledge and the expression of acceptance on both sides being baptism in the name of Christ (ii. 38). The full realization of the divine kingdom, however, will be impossible until the last judgment, when God will send Jesus as the judge of the quick and the dead (Acts x. 42), and to bring to the faithful of all ages rest from the affliction of the present wo (iii. 19 sqq.).

6. Attitude toward Gentile Christians.

While Peter realized that, in accordance with his divine promises, God would extend the blessings established in Christ to all the world and would call all the gentiles (Acts ii. 39, iii. 25–26), he also knew that these boons were primarily for the children of the old dispensation (iii. 25, x. 36), and he hoped that, despite their unbelief and rejection of Jesus, they might still be won for Christ (ii. 39). He was, moreover, certain that he and the other apostles were ordained to preach solely to the Jews (x. 42), and so strong was his aversion to the gentiles that only special divine commands could make him enter the house of the Roman centurion Cornelius in Cæsarea and preach the Gospel to him and his family, concluding by baptizing them (Acts x.). The growth of the Church in non-Jewish territory, however, forced Peter and other Judeo-Christians to modify their views, and at the council convened at Jerusalem to decide on the requirements to be laid upon gentile converts to Christianity, Peter deprecated excessive ritual exactions of the converts, though agreeing with James that the gentile Christians should refrain from all things forbidden in the Noachian laws binding on every gentile (Acts xv. 7 sqq.). Further light is cast upon this council by the account given by Paul (Gal. ii. 1 sqq.), according to which the final conclusion was complete harmony, and it was decided that James, Peter, and John should preach to the Jews, and Paul and Barnabas to the gentiles. Neither does the disagreement between Paul and Peter recorded by the former as taking place at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 sqq.) point to any opposition of principle between the two, particularly as they both agreed that true righteousness was to be sought, not in works of the law, but solely in faith in Christ (Gal. ii. 16). There can be little doubt that Peter's sudden change of attitude at Antioch was hypocritical, although at the same time it must be remembered that some uncertainty as to the proper course to be pursued may have existed in Peter's own mind.

7. The Closing Years.

Except for the prophecy in John xxi. 18 sqq. and the Petrine epistles (see below), the New Testament gives no information regarding the closing years of Peter. The sole remaining source is tradition, which, though constantly receiving unhistoric accretions, seems to preserve a kernel of truth in the legend that the apostle went to Rome toward the close of his life and there suffered martyrdom under Nero. Thus Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, written in 95–97, records: "Peter, through unrighteous envy, endured not one or two, but numerous labors; and, when he had at length suffered martyrdom, departed to the place of glory due to him" (*ANF*, i. 6). It is also noteworthy that no source describes the place of Peter's martyrdom as other than Rome, the place evidently implied by Clement, as the context shows. It would also seem that Papias of Hierapolis knew of Peter's residence at Rome (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 15). There are, however, a number of direct statements that Peter lived at Rome. Dionysius of Corinth (about 170) states that Peter and Paul founded the church at Corinth and then taught in Italy, both suffering martyrdom at Rome (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II., xxv. 8); and like declarations are made by Irenæus (*Hær.*, iii. 1, cf. iii. 3), Tertullian (*De præscriptione*, xxxvi.; cf. *Scorpiace*, xv.; *Adv. Marcionem*, iv. 5), Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VI., xiv., II., xv.), and the Roman presbyter Caius (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II., xxv. 7). A similar story is told both by the late second-century Acts of Peter (perhaps Gnostic in origin) and by the almost contemporary Acts of Peter and Paul. Reference must also be made to a tradition, evolved in the small pseudo-Clementine circle and devoid of historicity, that Peter carried on a conflict at Rome with Paul, here represented as a false apostle masked as Simon Magus. There is no evidence that Simon Magus was ever at Rome, the alleged proof being an erroneous interpretation of an inscription to the Sabine deity Semo Sancus as being in honor of the sorcerer (*NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 114, note 11). The residence of Peter in Rome is first brought into connection with the alleged presence of Simon Magus there by the Acts of Peter (chap. cxc.). The attempt has also been made to prove that Peter really suffered martyrdom by crucifixion at Jerusalem as a result of the Neronian persecution, evidence being drawn from a combination of the Romans Albinus and Agrippa, mentioned by the Acts of Peter as the persecutor and judge of the apostle, with Albinus, the successor of Festus as procurator of Judea, and Agrippa II., tetrarch of Galilee; but the argument is inadequate, as is another theory that Peter suffered at some unknown place in the East.

8. Confused and False Traditions Concerning Peter.

Of the other patristic traditions concerning Peter's residence at Rome probably the only one which may be regarded as certain is that which makes Mark his companion at Rome, where the second Gospel was written after Peter's death on the basis of his oral communications. When, however, Jerome declares (*De vir. ill.*, i.) that Peter, after being bishop at Antioch and laboring in Pontus, Galacia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, and Bithynia, went to Rome in the second year of Claudius to oppose Simon Magus, and was bishop of the church there for twenty-five years, finally being crucified head downward in the last year of Nero's reign and buried on the Vatican, his statements rest on a combination of fugitive allusions. The Antiochian episcopate is based on Gal. ii. 11 sqq., his activity in Asia Minor on I Pet. i. 1, his crucifixion is perhaps drawn from a literal interpretation of John xxi. 18, while the manner of it (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., i.) savors of post-apostolic rather than of apostolic taste, and his burial on the Vatican is deduced from the statement of Caius (see above) that there was a monument on that hill to commemorate the martyrdom of the apostle. The twenty-five years' episcopate of Peter at Rome is evidently due to the statement of Justin Martyr regarding the labors of Simon Magus at Rome (see above), combined with the tradition of Peter's residence in the same city, especially as it would seem that the Roman Church had actually been formed early in the reign of Claudius through the indirect influence of the Petrine Christianity of Palestine. All this giving rise to the belief that Peter himself came to Rome early in the reign of Claudius, the combination of it with the tradition of his martyrdom toward the close of Nero's reign evidently gave rise to the legend of his twenty-five years' residence in Rome. A further element of confusion was added by the increasing parallelism of Peter and Paul, leading not only to the unhistoric tradition of their joint founding of the church at Corinth, but also to their simultaneous labors in Rome; and a similar idea may have given rise to the belief that the death of Peter, almost coincident with that of Paul, took place in 64, the year of the general persecution of the Christians instigated by the burning of Rome. Still later the death of both apostles was put on the same day, June 29, although the persecution actually took place in July or August. Moreover, Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, III., ii., xxi.), like Irenæus, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Rufinus, seems to have regarded Linus, not Peter, as the first bishop of Rome; and it was not until the middle of the third century that Peter was definitely claimed as bishop of Rome (Cyprian, *Epist.*, lv. 8, lix. 14). The reckoning of the twenty-five years in Rome varies irreconcilably in different sources, and the whole is rendered impossible by the data of the New Testament, which shows that he was living in Jerusalem at the time of the council of the apostles in 53 (Acts xv.), whence he later visited Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 sqq.), while Paul's failure to mention him either in his epistle to the Romans (written in 59) or in his letters from Rome (in the seventh decade of the first century) would imply that Peter was not in the city even then. It seems most probable, on the whole, that Peter died a martyr's death in Rome toward the close of Nero's reign, some time after the cessation of the general persecution. Absolute certainty is, however, unattainable.

II. Writings: The authenticity of the two epistles canonically ascribed to the Apostle Peter has been severely attacked by modern criticism, although the problems connected with each are essentially different in character. The first epistle purports (I Pet. i. 1) to be addressed to readers in Pontus, Galatia (doubtless including, as in official Roman parlance, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and part of Lycaonia), Cappadocia, Asia (Caria, Lydia, Mysia, and probably Phrygia), and Bithynia. There is no reason to suppose, as has long been maintained, that the Petrine epistles were intended solely, or even primarily, for Jewish Christians, especially as the only known churches in Asia Minor were the gentile congregations established by Paul and his associates (cf. Gal. iv. 8, 19;

1. Occasion and Circumstances of I Peter.

Eph. ii. 11–iii. 13; I Cor. iv. 15, xv. 1–3; Acts xv. 3, 12, 19, xxi. 19), as well as in view of Peter's own attitude toward gentile Christians (Gal. ii. 12). The fact that the epistle was addressed to recent converts from paganism, not to Jewish Christians, is clear, moreover, from repeated allusions, such as i. 14, 21, ii. 10, iii. 6, and iv. 3. A similar meaning is plainly contained in ii. 25, while " the strangers " of i. 1 (R. V., " sojourners of the Dispersion ") clearly denote, not the Jewish Diaspora, but gentile Christians regarded as the true Israel scattered among the heathen (cf. ii. 9–10), even though Peter plainly considered these gentile churches as daughters of the mother church at Jerusalem. The epistle implies that the gentile Christians of Asia Minor had already been assailed by their pagan compatriots (iv. 4). Although the apostle evidently regarded acts of violence as a very possible eventuality (iv. 15–16; cf. i. 6, iii. 14, 17), at the time the only dangers were taunts and insults (iv. 4, 14) and the charge that the Christians were evil-doers (ii. 12, iii. 16), based on their rejection of heathen vices (iv. 3), an attitude attributed by their enemies to a hatred of the human race which might lead even to theft or murder (iv. 15). Such accusations were, generally speaking, unjust, but it is clear, from Peter's earnest admonitions to uprightness of life (I Pet. ii. 13–iii. 22), that he feared that the charges might prove real ones, and was also apprehensive that the Christians would relapse into pagan abominations to gain the friendship of the world (ii. 11, iv. 2). The general situation described in the epistle points to the period of the Neronian persecution, not, as some maintain, to the persecution under Trajan, for Christianity had not yet been made a crime against the State (cf. ii. 12, iii. 6, 13, 16, iv. 15), and obedience to temporal superiors could still be urged, a thing impossible after the faith was officially proscribed. Apart from these sufferings of the Christians of Asia Minor, and their consequent perils, nothing is known regarding their condition. It was these distresses and these dangers which had evoked the letter and had formed its purpose (cf. v. 12).

2. Relation to Other N. T. Writings.

The contents of I Peter can scarcely be systematized. The introduction, with its hopeful outlook beyond the evils of the present (i. 1–12), is followed by general admonitions to upright life (i. 13–21), brotherly love (i. 22–25), and the building of a spiritual temple (ii. 1–10). Then come admonitions bearing more directly on present conditions of earthly pilgrimage (ii. 11–12), obedience to earthly superiors, even though they be oppressive (ii. 13–25), mutual respect between husbands and wives (iii. 1–8), abstinence from revenge (iii. 8–12), and patient endurance of suffering (iii. 13–17), herein imitating Christ (iii. 18–22). The Christian must not relapse into pagan licentiousness (iv. 1–6), but must show sobriety, service, and affection (iv. 7–11), as well as endurance of undeserved affliction (iv. 12–19). Both old and young are admonished to perform their several duties (v. 1–5), and all must trust in God and be ever watchful (v. 6–9); while the epistle concludes with a benediction (v. 10–11), notes on the apostle's purpose in writing (v. 12), and salutations (v. 13–14). The epistle shows unmistakable dependence on Romans, Ephesians, and James (cf. I Pet. i. 14–15 with Rom. xii. 2; iv. 10 with xii. 3–8; iv. 8, i. 22 with xii. 9; iii. 9 with xii. 17; ii. 13–14 with xiii. 1; ii. 19 with xiii. 5; ii. 1, iv. 13 with xiii. 12–13; ii. 24 with vi. 2; i. 5, iv. 13 with viii. 17–18). There is, on the other hand, no reason to assume that I Peter is dependent on Hebrews, Colossians, or any other Pauline epistles, and what dependence there is must be considered rather as general reminiscences than as mechanical borrowing.

3. Its Theology.

There is, moreover, a marked individuality both in style and in dogmatic content, so that, despite a certain adoption of Pauline material (cf. I Pet. iv. 1–2, ii. 24, iii. 22 with Rom. vi. 7, 18, viii. 34), the type of doctrine represented is primitively apostolic, and is essentially a further development of the Petrine passages recorded in Acts. In both there is the same basal concept of Christianity as the realization of the Old-Testament kingdom of God, harmonizing with prophecy and brought into being by the crucified but risen Christ. There is, however, no such antithesis between the law and the Gospel as in the Pauline writings, nor is there the Pauline stress on the atonement or on justification by faith; but soteriology is more prominent in Peter than in James. Faith is not so much an acceptance of the forgiveness of sins based on the death of Christ upon the cross (as in Paul's teaching) as a trust in God grounded on the recognition of Jesus as the glorified Messiah who shall be revealed in the fulness of time. The moral life, consequently, is regarded as connected with faith from the first, rather than as a mere fruit of faith. The close union of prophecy and the entire theocracy of the Old Testament leads Peter to the conclusion that the salvation sought by the prophets is become the possession of the Christian, while the spirit which worked in the prophets was essentially the same as the spirit of Christ (I Pet. i. 10 sqq.). The ideal of the Old-Testament people of God is realized in the Christian Church (I Pet. ii. 9), which is to include all gentiles called of God (Acts ii. 39). The sufferings of Christ are not only the model for the Christian's patience under outward affliction (I Pet. ii. 21, iii. 18, iv. 1), but, since they most clearly reveal his moral greatness (ii. 22 sqq.), they inspire the Christian to all self-denial and to all struggle with sin (iv. 1 sqq.). Redemption from the power of sin is founded on the redemptive wor of the death of Christ (I Pet. i. 18–19), which has crushed the might of sin forever (iii. 18, iv. 1). From this it follows that Christ is the great shepherd of his flock (v. 4), that the salvation of the risen Lord extends even to the dead (iii. 19, iv. 6), that the moral effect of baptism, as " the answer of a good conscience toward God," is given through the resurrection of Christ (iii. 21), and that the sufferings of the Christians mark the beginning of the judgment (iv. 12). The result of all this is a lively hope (i. 3, 13, 21, iii. 15) in the Christian, who is but a pilgrim and a stranger in this world (i. 17, ii. 11), a situation which should only inspire him to still greater moral earnestness.

4. Place and Date of Composition; Authenticity.

According to I Pet. v. 13, the epistle was written at "Babylon." The ruined condition of the great Babylon at the time, however, as well as the fact that in the reign of Caligula the Jews had been driven from it by pestilence and persecution, render it certain that Peter did not compose his epistle there. It is equally improbable that "Babylon" here means Mesopotamia in general or the Egyptian town of Babylon in the Nile delta. Neither is there any tradition during the first five centuries of any activity of Peter in either Babylonia or Egypt. So it is indubitable that here, as elsewhere, "Babylon" means Rome (cf. Rev. xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 2, 10, 21; *Oracula Sibyllina*, v. 153; II Esdras, iii. 1; cf. also I Pet. v. 14; Col. iv. 10). The letter can not have been written before 64, both because of its dependence on James and Romans, and because of the designation of Rome as Babylon, which did not come into vogue until the Neronian persecution had begun. It may be concluded, then, that it was written either soon after the outbreak of the persecution, shortly before the return of Paul from Spain and the martyrdom of both Peter and Paul, or, if the death of the former be placed shortly before the fall of Nero, in the closing years of this reign. The testimony of the early Church favors the authenticity of the epistle. Besides the allusion to it in II Pet. iii. 1, it is mentioned by Hermas, Papias, Polycarp, is cited by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, and is placed in the canon by Eusebius. On the other hand, it was rejected, for dogmatic reasons, by the Paulicians, and in the nineteenth century its authenticity was denied by many critics; while others supposed either that it was translated from the Aramaic of Peter into Greek by Mark or Silvanus, or that one of these two developed the outline given by Peter. It has also been maintained that it was written later and then ascribed to Peter, although no credible motive can be assigned for such a proceeding. The optimism which pervades the epistle, like the theological attitude midway between James and Paul, is in entire accord with the temperament and position of Peter as revealed throughout the New Testament. Hence there is, in short, no good reason to doubt the authenticity of I Peter.

5. II Peter.

With the second Petrine epistle the case is different. The occasion of its writing was the rise of false teachers, some of them libertines like those described by Jude, and others mockers and deniers of the second advent (II Pet. ii.–iii.), although it seems probable, on the whole, that only one class of false teachers is really meant. The epistle is composed of an introduction reminding the readers of the boon of salvation and urging them to remain faithful (i. 1–10), and three parts: an assurance of the certainty of the second coming of Christ (i. 11–21); a characterization of the libertinism of the false teachers and their sure punishment (ii. 1–22); and prediction of the destruction of the world by fire, the delay of the day of judgment through the mercy of God, and an admonition to righteousness and patience (iii. 1–13); the whole concluding with an allusion to the writings of Paul, warning, admonition, and glorification of God (iii. 14–18). The epistle is clearly influenced profoundly by Jude (cf. ii. 4, 11, 13 with Jude 6, 9, 12); but, on the other hand, a comparison of the second Petrine epistle with the first shows a marked difference in style, as well as in dogmatic position. The concepts of "knowledge" and "godliness," unmentioned in I Pet., are prominent in II Pet., while the characteristic optimism of I Pet. here disappears. The center of expectation is the end of the world rather than the perfection of salvation; but, on the other hand, the second advent is thought of as more remote than in I Pet. Christ appears in II Pet. especially as the Savior, but the pattern of his life and passion, so stressed in I Pet., is as little mentioned in II Pet. as are his death and resurrection. The difference between the two epistles can not be explained from their divergent purposes; and a considerable time must have elapsed between the composition of the two, since II Pet. is later than Jude, which was probably written after the fall of Jerusalem (see Jude, Epistle of). Certain points in II Pet., moreover, imply a date subsequent to the apostolic age (cf. II Pet. iii. 3 sqq., 15–16), and the tradition of the Church is unfavorable to the authenticity of the epistle. There is no clear evidence that it was known to the apostolic Fathers or to the church writers of the second century. In the time of Origen only I Peter was considered canonical, and Eusebius reckoned II Peter among the antilegomena (*Hist. eccl.*, III., xxv. 3), although Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia seems to have considered it authentic (Cyprian, *Epist.*, lxxv.). Despite certain doubts of Gregory Nazianzen (*Carmina*, xxxiii. 35), Jerome, who himself recognized the fact that the epistle was rejected by most critics on the basis of its stylistic deviation from I Peter, was largely responsible for securing general acceptance of the epistle. At the Reformation period its authenticity was again doubted by Calvin and Erasmus, and since the time of J. S. Semler (q.v.) it has generally been deemed spurious by adherents of the critical school. (F. Sieffert.)

III. Apocryphal Petrine Literature: Of writings of this class four claim mention here, the Gospel, the Apocalypse, the Preaching, and the Acts.

1. Early Mention.

1. The Gospel: That such a gospel existed has been known since the end of the second century. The most explicit account of it is found in several passages in Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., xii.—the longest reference—, III., iii. and xxv., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser. vol. i.) and it is mentioned by Origen ("Commentary on Matthew," x. 17), Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, i., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., iii. 361), Theodoret (*Hæreticarum Fabularum*, ii. 2), and in *Decretum Gelasianum* (*De libris recipiendis*). The principal notice by Eusebius includes a letter by Serapion, bishop of Antioch 190–191—211–212, to the church at Rhossos in Cilicia, on the Mediterranean coast on the bay of Issus in Asia Minor. This church had been using the Gospel of Peter in its services, and when Serapion visited them he had granted permission to continue this use, though he did not himself examine the document closely. But he later read the book and found it tinged with Docetic heresy, though "most of it belonged to the right-teaching of the Savior, but some things were additions." The clear implication is that Serapion wished the reading suspended till a second visit, when he would probably give directions to cease using it. The other references to the gospel add little information beyond the fact that these documents attributed to Peter were not accepted or generally used as testimony by ecclesiastical authorities.

2. Rediscovery.

Being heretical, or at least being regarded as heretical, the Gospel was lost for centuries. Finally a Frenchman, Urbain Bouriant, discovered in the winter of 1886–87 at Akhmim in Upper Egypt a vellum manuscript in Greek containing on thirty-three pages parts of three Christian works, the Book of Enoch (pp. 21–56), the Gospel of Peter (pages 2–10), and the Apocalypse of Peter (reversed pages 19–13). The pages measure about six by four and three-quarters inches, and the manuscript itself is not earlier than the eighth century. The identification of the fragments as parts of the works named is granted by all critics. The documents were not published, however, till 1892, when they were issued under the auspices of the French Archeological Mission at Cairo as vol. ix. of a series devoted to Egyptology (pp. 137 sqq., Paris, 1892). The reason for the delay was probably that French scholars did not at first realize the importance of the documents. Immediately on the publication intense interest was manifested in the discovery, and discussions by leading scholars in the New Testament and in patristics issued in great numbers, as a result of which the principal questions which were raised may be regarded as settled.

3. Contents.

The fragment of the gospel is about 150 lines in length, and deals with the passion and resurrection of Jesus. It begins abruptly in the midst of the account of the trial, and closes as abruptly in the middle of a sentence which in complete form possibly recorded the first appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection. Evidently what preceded was the account of Pilate's washing of his hands (Matt. xxvii. 24). The document then proceeds to state that none of the Jews washed their hands, not even Herod, who gives Jesus up to the Jews to do as they would with him. Then Joseph, a friend of Pilate and of Jesus, begs of Pilate the body (in anticipation of the crucifixion), and Pilate refers the request to Herod, who accedes. Then follows the account of the mocking, scourging, and crucifixion, Jesus ("the Lord") being silent "as if in no wise feeling pain" while the Jews would not have his legs broken in order to prolong his agony. The document tells of the midday darkness, and the administration of gall and vinegar. "The Lord" thereupon cried out: "My Power, my Power, hast thou forsaken me" (or, "thou hast forsaken me"), and then died. The veil of the temple is rent, and the Jews draw the nails "from the hands of the Lord" and remove him from the cross. To Joseph is given the body, and he performs the last rites and lays it in his tomb. Then the Jews come to a consciousness of their sin and a fear of the coming judgment. The murmurings and dread anticipations of the people lead the scribes and Pharisees to ask of Pilate a guard for the tomb lest the body be stolen and resurrection be fictitiously claimed. The tomb is then sealed. Early in the morning the guard hear a great voice, see two men descend from the open heavens, and the stone of the tomb-door roll away of itself; the men enter the tomb, and emerge supporting a third, while a cross follows them. The two men's heads reach to heaven, the head of the third is still higher. A voice asks: "Hast thou preached to them that are asleep?" and the cross answers yea. The soldiers deliberate whether they shall tell Pilate, and from the open heavens a man descends and enters the tomb. The soldiers relate all to Pilate, who asserts innocence in the matter, but enjoins silence through fear of the Jews. At dawn "of the Lord's day" Mary Magdalen and her friends come to mourn Jesus, find the tomb open and a young man sitting there who tells them Jesus is risen. In the closing paragraph, on the last day of unleavened bread "the twelve disciples" after weeping and grieving withdrew to their homes. Simon Peter (the narrator) and Andrew took their nets and went to the sea with "Levi . . . whom the Lord . . ."

4. Date, Sources, and Character.

The date of composition of this gospel must be placed in the second century. This is proved by the fact that it was in use at Rhossus in the early part of the episcopate of Serapion; and it must have been some time in circulation to have gained the favorable reception which the Church there accorded it. It is evident, also, from a remark of Serapion that it was in quite extensive use among Docetic Christians. How far back into the second century it can be carried is doubtful. Harnack and McGiffert find traces of its use by Justin Martyr in his First Apology, therefore before 161 at the latest. But the majority of scholars, probably with good reason, reject this hypothesis, explaining the parallelism by a common use of sources, so that the *terminus a quo* can with assurance not be placed very high. There is no clue to the authorship, the one mark being a very evident and somewhat extreme antagonism to the Jews. Thus there is brought out in bold relief at the very beginning of the fragment the assumption by the Jews, including Herod, of responsibility for the death of Jesus. It is probable that the author was not a Palestinian (he speaks of the temple "at Jerusalem"). The relation of this gospel to the four canonical Gospels is clear, as it uses them all (this is perhaps best exhibited to the eye in H. von Schubert's *Das Petrusevangelium, synoptische Tabelle*, Berlin, 1893, Eng. transl., *Gospel of St. Peter. Synoptical Tables*, Edinburgh, 1893), noteworthy here being the employment of the Fourth Gospel. But the material is used with freedom, and with a view to the author's purpose. Joseph, e.g., is made to ask the body of Jesus as soon as the condemnation of Jesus is assured. The character of the gospel is by nearly all the commentators called docetic, following the classification of its users by Serapion as cited by Eusebius (ut sup.). That it is Gnostic is clear, that it is docetic is vigorously denied by McGiffert, who is not, however, strongly supported by other scholars. Docetism is on the surface of the document: to deny that quality requires strenuous argumentation. The docetism is of an early type. The reports referred to above (§ 1) all indicate that this book was outside the circle of ecclesiastically permitted writings. That it should be lost is therefore less strange than that it lingered so long as to become the object of copyist's care in the eighth century. Its recovery, however, showed it in pseudepigraphic company, and this company was in high favor in Egypt at a late date.

1. Early Notices.

2. The Apocalypse: This work is one of those which received frequent and to some extent favorable mention in early Christian literature, and left their impress of ideas and even of expression upon it, and yet vanished under the stress of authority acquired by the canonical New Testament. The Muratorian Canon (q.v.) mentions it as a book which " some of our number will not have read in the churches "; Clement of Alexandria commented on it (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VI., xiv. 1), and three passages from it are quoted in fragments of his " Miscellanies," in one of which it is " Scripture "; Methodius (q.v.) cited it as inspired; Eusebius (ut sup., III., iii. 2, xxv. 4) pronounced against it, as against the gospel and the Preaching, though not as being heretical in tendency; Macarius Magnes (see MACARIUS, 3) used it, possibly citing from Porphyry of the third century, and speaks of it as in agreement with prophecy and the Gospel. The Nicephoran list of apocryphal books (c. 850) says that it contained 300 lines (about equal in size to Galatians, which has 311) and this agrees approximately with the length as given in Codex Claromontanus (D_2) of the fourth century and with other evidence. After having been used with more or less reserve, sometimes being absolutely rejected, in Rome, Egypt, and Asia Minor, it survived in Palestine and Egypt till the eighth or ninth century. Certain fragments were known through the citations indicated above before the rediscovery (given in J. E. Grabe, *Spicilegium*, i. 74, Oxford, 1698; and in J. A. Robinson and M. R. James, *The Gospel . . . and . . . Revelation of Peter*, pp. 94–96, London, 1892). The knowledge of this book was greatly extended by the discovery, on the same manuscript as that which contained the fragment of the gospel, of a considerable part of the Apocalypse also.

2. Contents.

The newly recovered fragment of about 140 lines (nearly half the reported length of the book) consists of three parts: (1) the conclusion of an eschatological discourse, (2) a vision of paradise, and (3) part of a vision of hell. The eschatological part predicts false prophets, and the coming of God for the relief of the saints and the judgment of the lawless. The vision of paradise comes after the Lord had taken the twelve disciples into a mountain to pray, and is given them for encouragement in their preaching. While they are at prayer two of the righteous appear as glorious forms, and then a view of paradise with its inhabitants is granted. The vision of hell is more extended, and shows the punishment of blasphemers of various sorts, of adulterers, murderers and abortionists, persecutors of the saints, false witnesses, the wealthy and uncharitable, usurers, lewd persons, idolaters, and apostates from Christianity. The situation in which the book is placed is apparently a period after the resurrection of Christ and before the ascension, during which he instructs his disciples in order to their encouragement and equipment for the world-mission which (impliedly, according to the fourth complete sentence) they have already received.

3. Literary Influence; Date.

The literary influence of this Apocalypse is very far-reaching and important. Its general ideas affiliate with those of such books as Enoch and the Apocalypse of Baruch. But it has a much closer connection with (1) The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, (2) the Sibylline Oracles (ii. 6–30, 154–213), the vision of Josaphat in " History of Barlaam and Josaphat " and (4) II Peter. It appears to be very probable that the Testament is an expanded paraphrase of the first part of the Apocalypse, and that from it a fair idea can be gained of the content of the lost first part of the original. The Sibylline lines show close relationship with both the Testament and the Apocalypse, following the latter in the part where the Testament fails, and so making tenable the conclusion that the Sibyl employed as its source the Apocalypse. The description of paradise in the vision of Josaphat so reproduces not only the ideas but the language of the Apocalypse that identity of theme does not suffice to explain the close resemblances in expression. Finally, the connection between the verbal statements of II Peter and the Apocalypse (conveniently exhibited in *DB*, iii. 814–815) has made it clear either (1) that the writer of II Peter borrowed from the Apocalypse, (2) that both are by the same writer, or (3) that the authors were of the same school. Other Christian books which were influenced by the Apocalypse of Peter are the Apocalypse of Paul and the Apocalypse of Esdras, the Acts of Thomas, and the Passion of Perpetua. The notes of citation show that the document was composed in the second century, and the place of composition may have been either Palestine or Egypt.

3. The Preaching (Gk. *Kerugma Petrou*, Lat. *Prædicatio Petri et Pauli*): This book is cited by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, III., iii.) as one of the four spurious works attributed to Peter; Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, i. 29, ii. 15, vi. 5–7, 15; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, vol. ii.) uses it as a genuine writing of Peter; Origen (*In Johannem*, xiii. 17) quotes Heracleon as employing one of the passages used by Clement, but is generally unfavorable in his attitude to the book; still earlier use seems assured on the part of Justin Martyr, Aristides, and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, and later use by Apollonius of Asia Minor. It is possibly the same as the " Preaching of Peter and Paul " quoted by Lactantius (" Divine Institutes," iv. 21; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, vii. 123). The extant fragments have been collected by A. Hilgenfeld in *Novum Testamentum extra canonem* (iv. 51 sqq., Leipsic, 1884); by E. von Dobschütz, in *TU*, xi. 1 (1894); and by E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (pp. 52–54, 143–145, Giessen, 1901). Its date is placed by Harnack (and Von Dobschütz) as between 110 and 130, and by Zahn between 90 and 100 (too early!); Harnack and Von Dobschütz agree upon Egypt as the place of composition, the latter more definitely settles upon Alexandria. The fragments preserved indicate that the work was given as the substance of discourses by a spokesman for the apostles, the first person plural being used. It seems to have inculcated particularly a Christian monotheism, and to have been a polemic against Judaistic error and paganism, and an apology for Christianity. The faithful or saints are "a third race" (Gk. *triton genos*) among heathens and Jews.

4. The Acts: Brief mention should be made of the fact that about Peter's name there grew up a considerable literature, much of it having the character of "tendency writings." Of "Acts" there are two series quite distinct, the "Gnostic Acts" and the "Catholic Acts," which cover practically the same ground but with a marked difference in form of statement. For references and description of these see APOCRYPHA, B, II., and for part of the literature which developed on the same basis as these series of "Acts" see CLEMENTINA.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The life and development of Peter is treated with more or less completeness in the works on the life of Christ (see under JESUS CHRIST); sketches usually appear also in the introductions to the commentaries on the epistles. For further treatment of his life and activities consult: T. W. H. Griffith, *The Apostle Peter*, New York, 1905; M. Marquardt, *Simon Petrus als Mittel- und Ausgangspunkt der christlichen Urkirche*, Kempten, 1906; G. V. Lechler, *Das apostolische und das nach-apostolische Zeitalter*, Gotha, 1857, Eng. transl., *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, Edinburgh, 1886; E. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, Paris, 1866, Eng. transl., *The Apostles*, London, n.d.; A. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Munich, 1879, Eng. transl., particularly *Times of the Apostles*, London, 1895; J. Schmid, *Petrus in Rom*, Lucerne, 1879; F. W. Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, London, 1882; J. S. Howson, *Studies in the Life of St.* Peter, ib. 1883; C. von Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, Freiburg, 1886, Eng. transl., *Apostolic Age*, London, 1894; H. A. Birks, *Life and Character of St. Peter*, London, 1887; J. B. Lightfoot, in his *Apostolic Fathers, S. Clement of Rome*, ii. 481 sqq., London, 1890; C. Fouard, *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity*, London, 1892; F. W. Puller, *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, London, 1893; W. M. Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, London, 1893; idem, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, ib. 1895; A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, New York, 1897; J. V. Bartlett, *Apostolic Age*, Edinburgh, 1900; J. G. Greenhough, *Apostles of our Lord*, London, 1904 (devotional); W. H. G. Thomas, *The Apostle Peter*, London, 1904; J. Ninck, *Simon Petrus, der Fischer aus Galiläa*, Leipsic, 1903; G. Matheson, *Representative Men of the N. T.*, London, 1905; A. Brun, *Essai sur l'apôtre Pierre*, Montauban, 1905; L. C. Fillion, *Saint Pierre*, Paris, 1906; A. J. Southouse, *The Making of Simon Peter*, New York, 1906; A. Drews, *Die Petruslegende. Ein Beitrag zur Mythologie des Christentums*, Frankfort, 1910. The discussions in the dictionaries usually cover both the life and the epistles: *DB*, iii. 756–818 (elaborate); *EB*, iv. 4599–4627 (life), iii. 3677–85 (epistles); *JE*, xi. 366–368; *DCG*, ii. 349–351; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxi., cols. 356–379 (valuable citation of literature).

On the theology of Peter consult the pertinent sections in the works on N. T. theology mentioned in and under BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; also C. A. Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 21–41, New York, 1895; R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*, pp. 97–148, London, 1875.

On questions of introduction to the epistles the reader should consult the relevant sections in the works on N. T. introduction and on the Canon (see BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION; and CANON OF SCRIPTURE). Consult further: Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 450–475; D. Völter, *Der erste Petrusbrief, seine Entstehung und Stellung in der Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, Strasburg, 1906; B. Weiss, *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik*, Gross-Lichterfelde, 1906; E. T. Mayerhoff, *Einleitung in die petrinischen Schriften*, Hamburg, 1835; B. Weiss, in *TSK*, 1866, pp. 256 sqq.; Grimm, in *TSK*, 1872, pp. 657–694; B. B. Warfield, in *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Jan., 1882, Apr., 1883; F. Spitta, *Der Zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, Halle, 1885; P. J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1887; H. Grosch, *Die Echtheit des zweiten Briefes Petri*, Berlin, 1889; E. Scharfe, *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur*, Berlin, 1893; G. A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 244–245, 277 sqq., Marburg, 1895; L. Monnier, *La Première Epître de l'apôtre Pierre*, Paris, 1902; L. Gontard, *Essai critique et historique sur la première épître de S. Pierre*, Lyon, 1905; Link, in *TSK*, 1896, pp. 405–436; E. A. Abbot, in *Expositor*, 2 ser., iii. 49 sqq.; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fascs. xxxi.–xxxii., cols. 380–413.

Commentaries are: C. Bigg, in *International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh and New York, 1901; J. B. Mayor (on II Peter and Jude), London, 1907; W. Steiger, Berlin, 1832 (I Peter); J. Brown, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1848–56; T. Demarest, 2 vols., New York, 1851–65; A. Barnes, New York, 1859; T. Schott, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1861–83; T. Adams, Edinburgh, 1862 (II Peter); F. Steinfass, Rostock, 1863 (II Peter); R. Leighton, republished Philadelphia, 1864; J. Lillie, New York, 1869; T. Harms, Hermannsburg, 1873 (II Peter); G. F. C. Fronmüller, in Lange's commentary, Eng. transl., New York, 1874; J. C. K. Hofmann, Nördlingen, 1875; in C. J. Ellicott's *Handy Commentary*, New York, 1883; E. H. Plumptre, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1883; G. D. F. Salmond, in P. Schaff's *Popular Commentary*, New York, 1883; F. C. Cook and J. R. Lumby, in the *Bible Commentary*, London, 1881; J. E. Huther, in Meyer's commentary, Eng. transl., 1881; in the *Pulpit Commentary*, London and New York, 1887; J. M. Usteri, Zurich, 1887; R. Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1888; F. B. Meyer, London, 1890; M. F. Sadler, London, 1891; H. von Soden, in *Hand-Kommentar*, Freiburg, 1892; S. Goebel, Gotha, 1893; J. K. Lumby, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1894; K. Burger, Munich, 1895; H. Couard, Potsdam, 1895; J. T. Beck, Gütersloh, 1895; E. Kühl, Göttingen, 1896; W. F. Besser, Halle, 1899; J. Monnier, Paris, 1900 (I Peter); E. Hopp, Gütersloh, 1901; B. Weiss, Leipsic, 1902; K. Henkel, Freiburg, 1904 (II Peter); J. H. Jowett, London, 1905; H. Gunkel, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testament übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt*, ii. 25 sqq., Göttingen, 1906 (I Peter), and G. Hollmann, in the same, ii. 61 sqq. (II Peter).

On the Apocryphal literature: The principal works on the Gospel are named under APOCRYPHA. Of the books named there (vol. i., p. 229, col. 1, bottom), those by Harris, Robinson and James, Von Gebhardt, Harnack, and Lods deal also with the Apocalypse. Further literature covering either Gospel or Apocalypse, and sometimes both, is: Funk, in *TQS*, lxxv (1893), 255–288; A. Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, i (1893), 439–454; J. Kunze, *Das neu aufgefundene Bruchstück des . . . Petrusevangeliums*, Leipsic, 1893; H. von Soden, in *ZTK*, iii (1893), 52–92; H. B. Swete, *The Akmim Fragments of the Apocryphal Gospel o Peter*, London, 1893; W. C. Van Manen, *Het Evangelie van Petrus*, Leyden, 1893; E. Klostermann, *Reste des Petrus-Evangelium, der Petrus Apokalypse und des Kerygma Petri*, Bonn, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, in *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, vi. 101–130, New York, 1894 (contains a very full bibliography, including contributions to periodicals, which may be supplemented from Richardson, *Encyclopædia*, pp. 37, 412–413); E. Koch, in *Kirchliche Monatsschrift*, xv (1896) 311–388; G. Salmon, *Introduction to the Study of the . . . New Testament*, pp. 581–591, new ed., London, 1897; V. H. Stanton, in *JTS* ii (1901), 1–25; idem, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Cambridge, 1903; L. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, pp. 27–32, Tübingen, 1904; Harnack, *Lit-*

teratur, ii. 1, pp. 470–475, 622 sqq., 696–697, 716; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, pp. 392–399, 471–475.

On the " Preaching " consult, besides the works named in the text: *TS*, i. 1, pp. 86 sqq., Cambridge, 1891; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 2, pp. 820–832, Leipsic, 1892; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 472–474; E. Hennecke, *Die Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, pp. 168–171, Tübingen, 1904; *DCB*, iv. 329–331; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxii., 414–415; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 472 sqq.

The " Acts " are collected by R. A. Lipsius in *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, part I., Leipsic, 1891, and are discussed very thoroughly in the same scholar's *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 3 vols., Brunswick, 1883–90. Consult further: A. Bell, *Lives and Legends of the Evangelists, Apostles, and other Saints*, London, 1901; E. W. Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 2 vols., ib. 1901; A. Baumstark, *Die Petrus- und Paulusacten in der litterarischen Ueberlieferung der syrischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1902; C. Schmidt, in *TU*, xxiv. 1 (1903); G. Ficker, *Die Petrusacten*, Leipsic, 1903; A. S. Lewis, in *Horæ Semiticæ*, iv. 175–216, London, 1904; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 549 sqq., and ii. 2, passim; *DB*, iii. 773–776.

PETER THE APOSTLE, FESTIVALS OF: The calendar of the Western Church from the close of the early period indicates four feasts in honor of Peter.

I. The Feast of Saint Peter and Saint Paul: This festival on June 29 commemorating the interment of the remains of Peter and Paul, said to have taken place under consuls Tuscus and Bassus in 258, is already noted in the *Kalendarium Liberianus* prepared in 354. Ambrose and Prudentius both testify to it in the fourth century and no Western list of martyrs from the sixth century fails to notice it. In the Eastern Church the ecclesiastical history of Theodorus Lector states that this festival was already celebrated in Constantinople toward the end of the reign of Anastasius I. (518). It also appears in the calendars of the Copts, Ethiopians, and Armenians, the last of these naming Dec. 27 as well as June 29 as a memorial day of the martyrdom of Peter. The Roman Catholic Church regards this, together with Saint Paul's day on June 30, as one of the leading annual festivals. Benedict authorized a celebration of eight days in 1743, and Pius IX. lent new glory to this feast by the pompous celebration of the eighteenth centennial anniversary in 1867.

II. Feast of the Antiochian Accession of St. Peter: This festival, assigned to Feb. 22, in honor of the assumption of Peter of the bishopric is mentioned in the *Calendarium Liberianum* in 354. This oldest source as well as the calendar of Polemius Silvius of 448 leaves the seat of the bishopric to which the celebration pertains undetermined. The Ambrosian liturgy and the sacramentary of Gelasius I. do not mention this festival; after the Gregorian sacramentary mention is made in all the liturgies of the West but with a variation as to the seat. One recension of the Gregorian sacramentary refers the installation festival to Antioch and another to Rome.

III. Feast of Saint Peter's Accession at Rome: This festival, celebrated on Jan. 18, was not clearly distinguished from the last preceding before the eighth century. For example, some old liturgies of the Gallican Church knew of but one feast of installation, that of Jan. 18. Only from the Carolingian epoch were both feasts firmly established as well as the tradition of a double installation of Peter.

IV. Feast of the Chains of Saint Peter: This feast, celebrated on Aug. 1, mention of which is lacking in the older sources, is sometimes referred after the ninth century to the imprisonment and miraculous deliverance of Peter under Herod Agrippa and by some older sources like the martyria of Jerome and Bede rather to that under Nero. In the Western Church the feast assumed the character of a thanksgiving for the harvest, since bread made of the first-fruits was offered in the churches. In the Eastern Church this feast is celebrated on Jan. 16; in the Armenian Church on Feb. 22.

V. Feast of the Finger of the Apostle Peter: Nothing is known with reference to the origin and meaning, except that it took place among the Armenians on May 24.

VI. A Memorial Day of Saint Peter: This was celebrated on July 31 among the Abyssinians. There is no further record. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortologie*, pp. 163–166, 173–178, Freiburg, 1901; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iii. 175 sqq., Leipsic, 1820; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Altertümer*, i. 496–498, Freiburg, 1882; N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiæ*, vol. ii., Innsbruck, 1885; F. Probst, *Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines*, pp. 102, 272, 359, Münster, 1892; *DCA*, ii. 1623–28; *KL*, 1879–80.

PETER OF ASPELT. See Aichspalt.

PETER OF BLOIS: Ecclesiastical author; b. at Blois (100 m. s.w. of Paris) about 1130; d. between 1204 and 1212. While he was not among the foremost in rank and station, he was in positions which make his productions worthy sources for the church history of his times. His education was begun young and was extended by wide reading before he went to Bologna for the study of law and medicine; he afterward took up the study of theology, but that he did so under John of Salisbury (q.v.) is not proved. In 1167 he accompanied Stephen, archbishop of Palermo, to Sicily, where he became keeper of the seal during the minority of King William II., but the disfavor of the Sicilians for Stephen compelled Peter to leave in 1169. Later he was called by Henry II. to England, where he served several persons of distinction as secretary or chancellor, among them Baldwin of Canterbury, Queen Eleanor, widow of Henry II., and possibly Archbishop Hubert Walter. He had also relations with the bishop of Bath, whose archdeacon he was 1175–91; he spent a joyless service also as dean at Wolverhampton, where his attempts at reform were opposed by the chapter.

The personality of Peter does not make a pleasant impression upon one. He seems to have suffered from discontent because he did not meet the recognition his abilities seemed to demand. He did not lack philosophical talent or practical skill; but he was not creative, nor did he seem to grasp opportunities to put himself in a commanding position. He possessed sincerity and an earnest ethical spirit, was a partizan of Pope Alexander III. and a foe to heretics, and also upheld his episcopal superiors against their unruly subordinates. His letters are among the most interesting and important of his literary remains, containing much relating to the political, ecclesiastical, and social affairs of the period; though whether they are as completely the results of personal observation as they purport to be has been questioned. He had a double, a Peter of Blois who was chancellor of Chartres.

(S. M. Deutsch†.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* were edited by J. Merlin, Paris, 1519; more completely by P. de Goussainville, Paris, 1667; J. Busaeus, Mainz, 1600; J. A. Giles, in *PEA*, 4 vols., Oxford, 1846–47; and in *MPG*, ccvii. There is an ample sketch in *DNB*, xlv. 46–52 (contains a critical list of the works, genuine, doubtful, and false, and a list of scattering notices of value to the student of sources). Consult further: L. E. Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, ix. 167–175, 35 vols., Paris, 1689–1711; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, xv. 341–413; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, Anglo-Norman Period, pp. 366–379, London, 1846; and Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 764–784.

PETER OF BRUYS: Leader of a radical opposition to the ecclesiasticism of the Church in the twelfth century [1104–25]. Knowledge of him comes mainly from his opponent, Peter the Venerable of Cluny (*Adversus Petrobrusianos hæreticos*, *MPL*, clxxxix. 719–850) and from a short notice in Abelard's *Introductio ad theologiam* (*MPL*, clxxviii. 1056). The former writing had as a purpose the controverting of the most dangerous heretics of the times and the strengthening of the faithful, and the knowledge it gives is incidental to this aim. Of the early life of Peter of Bruys nothing is imparted; only that for twenty years he disseminated his doctrines, and that through burning the cross he enraged the people and was burned at St. Gilles. It seems that, after the death of Peter, his doctrines were changed, but not bettered, and diffused by Henry of Lausanne (q.v.). The doctrines of Peter and the Petrobrusians appear to have been about as follows: his chief authority he found in the Gospels taken literally, and next in the epistles; his position on the Old Testament is doubtful; baptism he regarded as for adults, since it presupposed faith—impossible in infants; he therefore rebaptized those who had received this ordinance in infancy; he rejected transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, and the Lord's Supper—Christ had given once his flesh and blood to his disciples, and repetition was impossible; he rejected the ceremonies and forms of worship, even church buildings; he discarded singing as worship, and especially the veneration of the cross because it was a means of crucifying Christ afresh. There is no decided clue to the source from which Peter derived these doctrines, suspicion points, however, to the Cathari (see New Manicheans, II.).

(S. M. Deutsch†.)

For knowledge of the specific teachings of Peter of Bruys dependence has to be placed upon Peter the Venerable. These are antipedobaptism, believers' baptism, denial of the sanctity of church buildings in the interest of spiritual religion, an iconoclastic attitude toward crosses, rejection of the Roman Catholic mass as idolatrous, with possible neglect of the Lord's Supper because of its idolatrous associations ("That the Church has not the body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, and that what is done by the priests in this matter is utterly vain and destitute of any true effect; since Christ gave his body not for those who were to be Christians in all times, but only for all his disciples who were present"), rejection of prayers for the dead and, on account of purgatorial sufferings, rejection of ecclesiastical chantings, a predilection for the Gospels and especially the words of Christ without rejection of the epistles and the Old Testament. Döllinger's effort to identify the Petrobrusians and Henricians with the Cathari was shown by the present writer (*Papers of the American Society of Church History*, iv. 183–189, New York, 1892) to be futile. Neither Peter the Venerable nor Bernard of Clairvaux charges them with dualistic teaching or with Manichean abstinence from animal food; Cathari rejected marriage, while Peter and Henry are charged with compelling monks and others who were living unchastely to marry and with taking up collections for dowries. The Petrobrusians and Henricians seem to have been absorbed by the more wide-spread and better organized Waldenses to whom they may have imparted the more radically Evangelical spirit of the later as compared with the earliest representatives of the party.

A. H. Newman.

Bibliography: C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, i. 408 sqq., Stuttgart, 1845; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, . . . ,* pp. 422–423, Philadelphia, 1874; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, i. 75 sqq., Munich, 1890; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 595–598, 602, 604.

PETER OF CELLE (PETRUS CELLENSIS): Abbot of St. Remy at Reims and bishop of Chartres; d. at Chartres in 1183. He was born of a noble family in Champagne, became abbot of La Celle at Troyes in 1150, hence his surname; abbot of St. Remy in 1162; and in 1181 bishop of Chartres. He is interesting as a representative of the practical type of monasticism introduced with Bernard's reforms. His voluminous correspondence with monks, dignitaries, popes, and princes has a distinct historical value, showing him to be an earnest representative of the ascetic high-churchly ideals which prevailed at that time; as, for instance, in his support of Alexander III. and Thomas à Becket. The new dogma of the Immaculate Conception he declined on the ground, besides the authority of Bernard, that the Roman Catholic Church had not yet spoken. He was not the first to use *transubstantiatio*, as has been claimed; the word was not new but only as yet unusual.

(R. Schmid†.)

Bibliography: The letters and sermons are most easily consulted in *MPL*, ccii., while some of the letters are found in the collections of those of Alexander III. and Thomas of Canterbury. Consult: The dissertation of Gillet, *De Petro Cellensi*, Paris, 1881; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 236 sqq.; H. Reuter, *Geschichte Alexanders III.*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1860–64; *KL*, ix. 1897–98; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés* xiv. 680 sqq.

PETER OF CHELĆIC. See Bohemian Brethren, I., § 1.

PETER COMESTOR: Biblical scholar of the twelfth century; d. at Paris in 1179 or 1198. He is known first as deacon of the Church of St. Peter in Troyes; became chancellor at the cathedral in Paris in 1164; and until 1169 was professor of theology there. Afterward he resigned all his offices and entered the Augustinian monastery of St. Victor at Paris where he remained until his death. He left eighty sermons (*MPL*, cxcviii.) and the *Historia scholastica* (Strasburg, 1470?; Augsburg, 1473; *MPL*, cxcviii., after the edition, Madrid, 1690; French transl., Paris, 1510?). This work treats of Biblical history in the Old and New Testaments as far as the second year of Paul's sojourn in Rome and abounds in references to the Hebrew text and ancient versions, giving now a literal and now an allegorical interpretation and employing also secular writings in its philosophical and theological explanations. The work was for a long time very famous and seems to have been a main source for medieval writers. See Bible Versions, B, III., and VI., § 2.

Bibliography: Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 744 sqq.; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 12 sqq.; L. G. Michaud, *Biographie Universelle*, viii. 679, 45 vols., Paris, 1843–65; *KL*, ix. 1903–04.

PETER DAMIAN (PIETRO DAMIANI), SAINT.

- I. Early Career.
  - Education and Training (§ 1).
  - Monk and Reformer of Monastic Life (§ 2).
  - Church Reformer (§ 3).
- II. Official Activities.
  - Cardinal, and Bishop of Ostia (§ 1).
  - In the Time of Hildebrand (§ 2).
  - In the Time of Alexander II. (§ 3).
  - Mission to Henry IV. of Germany (§ 4).
- III. Influence.
- IV. Characterization.

I. Early Career: St. Peter Damian, cardinal and reformer, was born at Ravenna in 1006 or 1007; d. at Faenza (31 m. s.w. of Ravenna) Feb. 22, 1072.

1. Education and Training.

A joyless youth was his lot; he was neglected by his parents, and after their early deaths by his elder brother. Another brother, named Damianus, took him up—in grateful recollection of whom, perhaps, he assumed his second name Damianus—and made it possible for him to study in Faenza and Parma. When he began to lecture on grammar and rhetoric he was much appreciated, but the ideal of the ascetic life gained power over him and he fled, perhaps in the year 1035, to the settlement of hermits at Fontavellana near Gubbio in the Apennines, founded possibly by a disciple of Romuald. See Camaldolites.

2. Monk and Reformer of Monastic Life.

Peter was allowed to omit the novitiate and take the vows at once. Soon he had so distinguished himself that he was called to other monasteries to revive the discipline. In 1043 he succeeded to the position of prior of Fontavellana. Under his leadership the monastery flourished, and the number of those who came from outside to escape the world increased; and from the new settlements was formed the Congregation of Fontavellana. In this circle Peter found his favorite form of activity, to cultivate and to advance himself and others in the monastic virtues. Rigorous fasting and self-scourging were fostered, the latter especially by Dominicus Loricatus (see Flagellation, I., § 2); but the reading of Holy Scripture and the Church Fathers, and manual labor were not neglected.

3. Church Reformer.

But even if the charm of this cloister life completely satisfied him, Peter was far too actively constituted not to turn his attention to church life outside his cloister. Crying needs called for reforms; above all, the two fundamental evils of the eleventh century, Simony (q.v.) and Nicolaitanism (see Nicolaitans). Peter entered the lists against them. When the priest Johannes Gratianus ascended the papal throne in 1045 as Gregory VI. (q.v.), Peter hailed him with acclaim, but he turned out to be incapable and, moreover, was polluted with simony; hence Damian's hopes turned toward the German King Henry III., and without mistake. This morally strict and energetic monarch, convinced of the necessity of thoroughgoing reforms of ecclesiastical life, brought aid to the Church. In 1046 he appeared in Italy, had the three popes Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and Gregory VI. deposed by synods at Sutri and Rome, and took care that the Church obtained a worthy supreme head. Clement II. towered above his predecessors; but his was not a vigorous personality, and Peter, who had already been brought into contact with the German king by their common interest in the reform of the Church, and had been instructed by him to support the pope, was impatient with the weakness of the latter. The sudden death of Clement II. brought a second German bishop, Poppo of Brixen, as Damasus II. to the Holy See, but he also had only a brief reign. It was all the more important then that in his successor Leo IX. a man was found who took up reform systematically and with great energy. Peter placed great confidence in him, and this was reciprocated by the pope. His relation to Victor II. was not so close.

II. Official Activities: Hitherto the activity of Peter in the cause of the elevation of church life had been entirely free of any official attitude. This state of affairs ceased under Pope Stephen IX. In the hope of increasing thereby the efficiency of Peter for the Church, he appointed him, in 1057, cardinal and bishop of Ostia. This promotion was no joy to the man thus distinguished; he shrank from reentering the world from which he had fled; but his sense of duty compelled him to accept the position. From the moment of his appointment he dedicated himself with great devotion to the new tasks, and supported the reform policy of Stephen with all his might. But this pope, too, reigned but a short time. When after Stephen's death the Roman nobility elevated Bishop John of Velletri as Benedict X., Peter with other cardinals fled from Rome, and went to Fontavellana. When he had returned to the old conditions, he became fully aware of what he had given up in leaving the monastery. He therefore addressed to Nicholas II., who had been elected by the cardinals successor of Stephen, the most pressing petition for release from his offices in the government of the Church. Whatever he could adduce in favor of this request he brought forward; but he was not mistaken when he thought that Hildebrand (see Gregory VII.), who had procured

1. Cardinal and Bishop of Ostia.

his appointment as cardinal, would oppose his desire.

2. In the Time of Hildebrand.

The relationship between him and Hildebrand was a remarkable one. At one as to their great aims, the two differed fundamentally both in regard to the means to be employed and in their own characters. Hildebrand had by far the stronger will; Peter therefore yielded to him, although not without resistance. He calls him "the flattering tyrant, who showed pity with the love of a Nero, caressed by boxing the ears, stroked with eagle's talons"; in bold paradox he called him "holy Satan." Nicholas II. refused Peter permission to resign; the times were far too serious to let a power like his expend itself in the service of a single monastery. Not merely did Peter remain a cardinal; he had also to assume the administration of the bishopric of Velletri. When through the movement of the Patarenes (q.v.) in Milan intolerable conditions had arisen, and the moment seemed to have come for Rome to intervene, Peter was sent thither as legate, together with Anselm of Lucca (Alexander II.). He justified to the full the confidence which had been placed in him. He succeeded in inducing the clergy of Milan to abjure simony and the marriage of priests, and in bringing the church of St. Ambrose into subjection to the see of Peter.

3. In the Time of Alexander II.

The schism which, after the death of Nicholas II., broke out between Alexander II. and Honorius II. found Peter on the side of the former. For him he labored with glowing zeal, by means of letters to the antipope as well as by composing the *Disceptatio synodalis* in view of the assemblage summoned to Augsburg for Oct., 1062, which was to decide between the rivals. When Alexander II. had actually attained recognition, Peter exerted himself anew for permission to return to his monastery. The answer was that the pope sent him as a legate to France, to settle a quarrel between the cloister of Cluny and the bishop of Macon. This journey, too, was a success. But Peter could also become disagreeable. That on his own responsibility he asked Archbishop Anno of Cologne to work for the calling of a general council for the purpose of doing away with the schism, did not correspond with the wishes of Alexander II. When the synod met at Mantua, Whitsuntide, 1084, it ended indeed in a triumph for Alexander. The papal court was also dissatisfied when Peter, without being instructed to that effect, sent in 1065 an earnest exhortation to King Henry IV. of Germany to come to Italy, annihilate Cadalus and get himself the imperial crown; this journey to Rome might easily have led to a strengthening of the royal influence in Italy, to undermine which had been one of the chief aims of papal policy since the days of Stephen IX.

4. Mission to Henry IV. of Germany.

In the year 1067 Peter finally brought about his release from his episcopal duties; yet, not only did he continue to have the titles of cardinal and bishop, but was also occasionally further employed by Alexander II. in difficult cases. Thus he was sent to Germany as legate in 1069, when Henry IV. wished to be divorced from his consort Bertha. In this case, too, the persuasive power of his oratory was brilliantly exercised; at the diet at Worms he succeeded in making Henry yield. He was also successful in reconciling Ravenna—which had allowed itself to be drawn by Archbishop Henry over to the side of Cadalus—with Rome after the archbishop's death.

III. Influence: The greatest merits of Peter Damian lie in the reform of life within the Church. In the struggle against the "incontinence" of the clergy, under which concept were included not merely immoral acts (cf. the *Liber Gomorrhianus*, *MPL*, cxlv. 159–190) but also the marriages of priests, he was the most important and most persistent of those in the front rank of the fight; he was second to none in preparing the way for the legislative measures of the papacy intended to enforce the compulsory celibacy of priests. His second great life-task was the conflict with simony. This evil had taken on vast dimensions and forms so various that its fundamental character, the purchase of an ecclesiastical position, was often disguised. Of especial difficulty was the question of what corollaries are to be drawn from the simoniacal transfer of an office, whether the office of priest or bishop could be obtained at all in this way. On this problem views within the Gregorian party were very divergent. Peter stood for the view (*Liber gratissimus*, *MPL*, cxlv. 99–154) that, since the quality of a consecrating priest can never affect the consecration performed by him, even a simoniac can impart real ordination, and that the orders are valid even in case the person ordained had knowledge of the simoniacal taint of the ordainer. Therefore, he rejects the repetition of an ordination which had been performed by a simoniac, and wishes to leave in office those who have, free of charge, received orders from a simoniac. In his time the question of Investiture (q.v.) by laymen was not yet in the foreground, but from numerous passages in his writings it is plain that he considered Church and State to be two coordinated powers with different spheres of duty; that he wished their harmonious cooperation; and that, though he disapproved of investiture by secular princes, he did not reject it in principle. In these maxims of ecclesiastical politics is seen an after-effect of the time of Henry III. The controversy between Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc about the doctrine of the Eucharist did not much concern him; neither did the outbreak of the great schism between Rome and Byzantium in 1054.

IV. Characterization: Peter Damian was through and through a monastic; he remained so even when he entered involuntarily the college of cardinals. But he possessed great gifts which procured him signal successes when he was compelled to come out into the world. Not with injustice did a contemporary name him "old Jerome," whom indeed he resembled in many respects. His greatest achievements pertained to the religious and moral elevation of the Italian monks and secular clergy. In the Roman Catholic Church he was soon reverenced as a saint, even though he was not canonized. In

1828 Leo XII. admitted him to the list of the *doctores ecclesiæ*. Carl Mirbt.

Bibliography: The *Opera* of Peter, ed. C. Cajetan, were published 3 vols., Rome, 1606–15, 4 vols., Paris, 1663, with two lives, also 1743, and Venice, 1783, and are in *MPL*, cxliv.–cxlv. His "Glory of Paradise" appeared in English, London, 1857. Of his life, besides the accounts in the *Opera*, ut sup., and in *ASB*, Feb., iii. 406 sqq., there are sketches by: J. Laderchi, Rome, 1702; A. Vogel, Jena, 1856; A. Capecelatro, Florence, 1862; F. Neukirch, Göttingen, 1875; A. Wambera, Breslau, 1875; and J. Kleinermanns, Steyl, 1882. Consult further: J. Fehr, in *Oesterreichische Vierteljahrschrift für katholische Theologie*, vii (1868), 189–240; E. Steindorff, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III.*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1874–81; H. C. Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, chap. xii., Boston, 1884; F. W. E. Roth, in *Studien und Mittheilen aus dem Benediktinerorden*, vii.–viii., 1886–87; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, vol. iii., Bonn, 1892; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, Leipsic, 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, vol. iv. passim, London, 1896; W. F. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy 590–1303*, New York, 1902; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iii., passim (valuable); Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. v., part 1, passim; *KL*, ix. 1904–08; the literature under the articles on the popes named in the text and under Flagellation.

PETER THE DEACON: The name of several men of considerable note in ecclesiastical history or literature.

1. One of the Scythian monks who was sent to Rome in connection with the theopaschite controversy under Pope Hormisdas (q.v.). He wrote *De incarnatione et gratia domini nostri Jesu Christi* (*MPL*, lxii. 83 sqq.), addressing it to Fulgentius of Ruspe (q.v.), and aimed in it to oppose the Scythian monks and especially the doctrine of Faustus of Riez concerning grace. Fulgentius replied in his *Epist.*, xvii. (*MPL*, lxv. 451 sqq.). The *De incarnatione* is often printed among the works of Augustine or Fulgentius.

2. Saint, and pupil and friend of Gregory the Great; d. at Rome c. 605. He was one of the stimuli which operated in the production of the works of Gregory, being especially influential in urging that Father to produce his *Dialogorum libri iv.* He was the sponsor for the story that the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove often hovered over Gregory (cf. *ASB*, March, ii. 211).

3. Peter of Monte Cassino, often known as Peter the subdeacon of St. Januarius at Naples. He lived in the tenth century, and was active in the compilation of hagiologies, among other works being part author of the *Vita et translatio Athanasii episcopi Neapoleos*. He had a namesake at Naples about 1100 who translated legends of the saints from the Greek.

4. The most important of the name is another Peter of Monte Cassino, often called "the Librarian" (Bibliothecarius). He was of high birth, and in 1115 entered the abbey at Monte Cassino to receive his education; he left there about 1127, and did not return till 1136, and then as the chief partizan of Reinald, who had just been chosen abbot, opposing in this Innocent II. He became chaplain and then secretary of Emperor Lothair II., and was satisfied with this place; but he was desired at Monte Cassino, and returned thither to take charge of the archives, to which he furnished an index which became celebrated. Alexander III. named him abbot of Venosa. He continued the "Chronicle" of Leo Marsicanus; wrote *De viris illustribus Casinensibus; De locis sanctis;* the rhythm *De novissimis;* and is regarded as the author of *Anastasii Chronicon Casinense* (in Muratori, *Scriptores*, ii. 351 sqq.). His other works are in *MPL*, clxxiii. 439 sqq.

Bibliography: A list of the editions of the works of the last-named is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 919–920. Consult further: U. Balzano, *Le Cronache Italiane nel medio evo*, Milan, 1884; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1893), 86, ii. 236, 237, 492, 498; and E. Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen*, Berlin, 1909.

PETER OF DRESDEN: Reputed refugee in Bohemia; d. about 1440. Æneas Silvius in his history of Bohemia relates that the distribution of the communion in both kinds by the pastor of the Church of S. Michael in Prague, Jacob of Mies (q.v.), was at the suggestion of a certain Peter of Dresden, a German by birth who had once studied in Prague and had left the university in 1409, but having been afterward driven from his native land on account of the Waldensian heresy had returned to Prague. Not only are good historical sources silent on Peter of Dresden; but the monk Nicolaus von Lacu (d. 1380) had already demanded both kinds of the communion. It is evident that the report that Peter of Dresden was the originator of this practise in Bohemia was an invention intended to make it unpopular among the Bohemians. Another story about Peter appearing in the seventeenth century was that he was the author of the macaronic church hymns, and, more particularly, of the hymn "In dulci jubilo." Hoffman von Fallersleben suggests that as Jacob of Mies wrote hymns in the popular dialect and sought to introduce them into the Roman liturgy, Æneas Silvius secured also this reputation for Peter of Dresden. It may be doubted if there was such a person, yet F. Palacky properly suggests that those who were responsible for naming the originator of communion in both kinds would hardly have referred to any one not known to contemporaries. It seems to be certain that Peter of Dresden was school-master at Prague for a time and was driven out. (Ferdinand Cohrs.)

Bibliography: J. G. Schreiber, *De Petro Dresdensi*, Leipsic, 1678; J. Thomasius, *Curiöse Gedancken vom Dressdnischen Peter*, Leipsic, 1702; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, III., i. 333, Prague, 1845; K. Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der hussitischen Bewegung*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–1866; E. H. Gillet, *Life and Times of John Huss*, i. 38, 483, 519, Philadelphia, 1861.

PETER THE FULLER. See Monophysites, §§ 4 sqq.

PETER THE HERMIT: B. at Amiens in the middle of the eleventh century; d. in the monastery of Neumoustier, at Huy (25 m. s.s.w. of Liège), Belgium, July 7, 1115. In 1093 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and brought back a letter from Simeon, patriarch of Jerusalem, to Pope Urban II. in which an appeal was made to deliver the Christians from the indignities they suffered at the hands of the Mohammedans. In delivering this letter Peter confirmed it by his own experiences and recited the sufferings of other pilgrims. His address made a great impression upon the pope. He also awakened interest as he told his story on his way back to Amiens. He was present at Clermont in Nov., 1095, when the first crusade was determined on (see Crusades) and afterward traversed southern France, and along the Rhine preaching to great crowds the duty of going on the crusade. The time set for the start was Aug. 15, 1096, but his converts insisted upon his leading them to Palestine as soon as possible, and in the spring 40,000, among them many knights, the archbishop of Salzburg, the bishops of Chur and Strasburg, and other ecclesiastics, made their way through Hungary. Only 7,000 reached Constantinople, many having been killed by the Bulgarians, and most of those who ultimately reached Asia were massacred by the Turks. Peter himself joined the regular crusading army and entered Jerusalem with it (1099). He returned to Europe and founded the monastery in which he died. On June 29, 1854, a bronze statue of him was unveiled in Amiens. It stands back of the cathedral, in the Place Pierre d'Amiens.

Bibliography: The principal literature is that dealing with the first crusade (see under Crusades). Consult further: William of Tyre, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, i. 11–17. The biography by D. A. Goodsell, Cincinnati, 1906; P. d'Oultreman, 2 parts, Valenciennes, 1632; J. F. Schachert, *Peter von Amiens und Gottfried von Bouillon*, Berlin, 1819; M. Vion, *Pierre l'Hermite et les croisades*, Amiens, 1853; L. Paulet, *Dissertation sur la naissance de Pierre l'Hermite*, Namur, 1854; A. Ingerslef, *Peter fra Amiens og det förste Korstog*, Copenhagen, 1859; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxxiii.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 25 sqq.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 230 sqq.

PETER THE IBERIAN. See Monophysites, §§ 2 sqq.

PETER LOMBARD.

Life (§ 1).
Theological Position (§ 2).
Method (§ 3).
Analysis of the "Sentences" (§ 4).
Attacks on the "Sentences"; Other Works (§ 5).

1. Life.

Peter, commonly known as "the Lombard" from his birthplace, and distinguished as "the Master of the Sentences" from his principal work, was one of the most important scholastic theologians of the twelfth century. He was born probably at Novara, then in Lombardy, scarcely earlier than 1105–10; d. in Paris c. 1160 (1164). His family was poor, but he early found powerful patrons, so that he was able to gain a good education, first at Bologna, then in France, at Reims, to which he came with a letter of recommendation from St. Bernard, and in Paris, at that time the headquarters of learning. Here he remained, in close relations with the school of St. Victor, to whose head Gilduin St. Bernard had again commended him in a letter still extant. He taught theology in the cathedral school of Notre-Dame, and found time to produce the works discussed below. Their dates can be only approximately fixed. The most famous of them, the *Libri quatuor sententiarum*, was probably composed between 1147 and 1150, although it may be placed as late as 1155. Nothing is certainly known of his later life except that he became bishop of Paris in 1159. According to Walter of St. Victor, a hostile witness, he obtained the office by simony; the more usual story is that Philip, younger brother of Louis VII. and archdeacon of Paris, was elected but declined in favor of Peter, his teacher. The date of his death can not be determined with certainty. The ancient epitaph in the church of St. Marcel at Paris assigns it to 1164, but the figures seem to be a later addition; and the demonstrable fact that Maurice of Sully was bishop before the end of 1160 seems conclusive against it, although it is possible that in that year he resigned his see and lived three or four years longer. His personal character, as far as it can be determined from the scanty indications, seems to have been deserving of respect, and even the opponent just mentioned, a former pupil of his, speaks of him with personal affection.

2. Theological Position.

The historic importance of Peter Lombard rests on his "Sentences" and the position taken by them in medieval theology (see Scholasticism). The earlier dogmatic theologians, such as Isidore of Seville, Alcuin, and Paschasius Radbert, had attempted to establish the doctrine of the Church from Bible texts and quotations from the Fathers. In the eleventh century this method gave place to dialectical and speculative working over of the traditional dogmas. Peter Lombard came into the field at a time when the new methods and their dialectical artifices were still exposed to wide-spread objection, but when the thirst for knowledge was exceedingly keen. One text-book after another was being published, the majority of them either issuing from the school of Abelard, or in some degree inspired by him. Of these works the greatest influence was attained by that of Peter, which was, for the time, an admirable compendium of theological knowledge. It is written under the influence preeminently of Abelard, Hugo of St. Victor, and the *Decretum* of Gratian. Whether Peter had himself seen the early writers whom he cites is frequently uncertain; he was a man of wide reading, but the works of the Fathers had been used again and again in long catenæ of "sentences" which rendered it unnecessary to go to the original treatises. As to his contemporaries, whom he knew thoroughly, he shows the influence of Abelard in his whole method and in countless details, while preserving a critical attitude toward his most pronounced peculiarities. On the other hand, he follows Hugo very closely and often textually, though here also with a tendency to avoid the purely speculative elements. For his sacramental doctrine, Gratian is very useful, especially through the quotations adduced by him and his legal attitude toward these questions.

3. Method.

The most marked characteristic of Peter's method is the cautious and reserved discretion of his treatment of dogmatic problems. He shows a strong disinclination to launch out into speculation, attempting simply to set forth clearly the Church's received doctrine. He does not touch disputes between Scripture and reason, authority and philosophy. He was unable to keep clear altogether of the technical terms of the philosophical schools; the authorities, both earlier and later, whom he followed had worked with these terms. But his explanations of them are rather non-committal and eclectic, thus rendering his work of the broadest utility. Assuming as the grounds of his decisions the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the ancient councils with their creeds, he proceeds first of all to propound a question, offering next a solution by means of one or more patristic passages. Authorities which seem to contradict this conclusion are next adduced; and the opposition is met by one of two methods, both Abelard's—either by the hypothesis that the words may be taken in two different senses in the two authorities, or by the weighing of authorities, in which case the Bible is assumed to be infallible, and Augustine has the greatest weight among the Fathers. Another way of posing the question is to cite some contemporary statement and confirm or refute it. Reason takes a secondary place. The natural reason is indeed a reflection of the presence of God, yet it needs to be helped and completed by revelation. He admits that the creation of the world by God was known to the heathen "by a course of philosophical reasoning," as well as the law of nature "by which man understands and is conscious what is meant by good and evil"; and he here anticipates the later scholastic attitude. Theology is bound to set forth the positive doctrine of the Church, but in its fundamentals it agrees with the natural and rational results arrived at by the human mind. The Lombard, however, does not reach the scientific clearness of his successors in relation to these questions, while, on the other hand, he usually resists the tendency to hair-splitting so characteristic of many of them.

4. Analysis of the "Sentences."

The first book of the "Sentences" deals, principally from a cosmological standpoint, with the evidences for the existence of God. For the doctrine of the Trinity he appeals to the analogies used since Augustine, while denying that a real knowledge of the doctrine can be obtained from them without positive revelation and faith, and emphasizing the fact that no human speech can give a satisfactory account of the nature of God. Joachim of Flore asserted that Peter changed the Trinity into a quaternity, and the charge was investigated at the Lateran Council of 1215. The basis of this charge was the manner in which he distinguished the divine substance from the three persons, asserting, as a realist, the substantive reality of this common substance. Joachim accused him of adding this substance to the three persons; but Innocent III. and the council decided that he was perfectly orthodox. The relation between the prescience of God and events is conceived in such a way that neither that which happens is the actual ground of the foreknowledge nor the latter of the former, but each is to the other a *causa sine qua non*. Predestination is thus, as a divine election, the preparation of grace, the foreknowledge and preparation of the blessings of God, through which man is justified. There is no such thing as merit antecedent to grace, not even in the sense that man can merit not to be cast away. The omnipotence of God consists in this, that he does what he wills and suffers nothing. A distinction is made between the absolute uncaused will of God, which is always accomplished, and what may be called his will in a loose sense. To the *signa beneplaciti*, the signs of the latter, including commands, prohibitions, counsels, operations, permissions, results do not always correspond—"for God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, yet did not will it to be done." The second book deals with creation and the doctrine of the angels, usually following Hugo. Peter considers the "image" and "likeness" of God as distinct, but does not decide for any of the three explanations of this distinction which he quotes. He rejects the traducianist theory of the origin of the human soul. He calls the will free, inasmuch as it "has power to desire and choose, without coercion or necessity, what it has decreed on grounds of reason," but he denies Abelard's theory that the moral character of an act depends on the will of the doer. Of some importance is the strong emphasis laid upon the actually sinful character of the nature derived from Adam, in conjunction with the condemnation of Abelard's proposition that "we inherit from Adam not guilt but penalty." In regard to grace he shows some independent thought, which had its influence on later teaching. Grace (*gratia operans*) is a power (*virtus*) which frees and heals the will, enabling it to perform good and meritorious works; of the two coefficients to the production of these, grace and the will, grace is the more important. The third book deals with Christology, reproducing the traditional orthodox conceptions, but showing some influence from Abelard. One portion of this discussion brought him into suspicion of Nihilianism, of which he was accused by John of Cornwall and Walter of St. Victor, and more than one council took up the question, though without deciding it. The charge of Nestorianism, which Gerhoh of Reichersberg brought against the Christology of his time, was made also against the Lombard. In regard to the atonement, he endeavored both to follow out the accepted system of his day and to make use of suggestions from Abelard. Christ merited glorification by his life, and by his death man's entrance into Paradise, his liberation from sin and its penalty and from the power of the devil. Christ as man is a perfect and sufficient sacrifice to achieve reconciliation, through the revelation of God's love made in his death; "the death of Christ then justifies us, when by it love is awakened in our hearts." Further, Christ sets man free from eternal punishment *relaxando debitum;* but to set man free from the temporal punishment, which is remitted in baptism and mitigated by penance, "the penances laid upon those who repent by the Church would not suffice unless the penalty borne by Christ were added to release us." There is a lack of clearness about this whole subject; the ideas of Abelard (Anselm is not noticed) show themselves now and again through all the effort to preserve the objective notion of the work of redemption. The fourth book deals with the sacraments. Here Peter follows Hugo and the *Decretum* of Gratian; and his teaching was of great significance for the later development. He was probably the first to make a distinct classification of seven and only seven sacraments; he laid down the dogmatic questions to be discussed under the head of each, and he introduced matter from church law into his discussion of the sacramental dogma. In regard to the Eucharist, he speaks of the "conversion" of one substance into the other, without defining any further, and denies both the symbolic view and the consubstantiation taught by some followers of Berengar. In his doctrine of penance he follows Abelard in seeking theoretical justification for the change which by this time had taken place in the practise.

5. Attacks on the "Sentences"; Other Works.

In spite of the cautious objectivity of the whole treatment, some of the propositions laid down in the "Sentences" were considered erroneous in after years. Mention has been made above of the attacks on Peter's doctrine of the Trinity and his Christology. Walter of St. Victor asserts that at the Lateran Council of 1179 it was proposed to condemn the "Sentences," but other matters prevented a discussion of the proposal. From the middle of the thirteenth century the University of Paris refused its assent to eight propositions, of a highly technical character, it is true, and Bonaventura declined to press them. Others were afterward added; but these objections did not interfere with the general popularity of the work, which had increased to such an extent by Roger Bacon's time that he could complain (c. 1267) that lectures on it had forced those on Scriptural subjects into the background. Besides the "Sentences," other extant works of Peter Lombard are *Commentarius in psalmos Davidicos* (first printed Nuremberg, 1478; in *MPL*, cxci. 31–1296) and *Collectanea in omnes D. Pauli epistolas* (first printed Paris, 1535; in *MPL*, cxci., cxcii.)—both collections, in the manner of medieval Catenæ (q.v.), of quotations from patristic and early medieval theologians, with occasional independent remarks. A few unpublished manuscripts, some of them of doubtful authenticity, remain in various places. Of these the most important for a complete knowledge of the author are two manuscripts, one early thirteenth century, the other fourteenth, in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, containing twenty-five festival sermons representing a moderate type of medieval mystical theology, dominated by allegorical exegesis, but making some excellent practical points. Extracts from them are given by F. Protois (*P. Lombard, son époque, sa vie, ses écrits et son influence*, pp. 126–147, Paris, 1881).

(R. Seeberg.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* are collected in *MPL*, cxci.–cxcii. The "Sentences" were issued in the original in many editions in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. On Peter Lombard consult, besides the work of Protois, ut sup.; P. J. Hauréau, *De la philosophie scolastique*, i. 332 sqq., Paris, 1850; I. A. Dorner, *Lehre von der Person Christi*, ii. 374 sqq., Stuttgart, 1853, Eng. transl., 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1861–63; J. Bresch, *Essai sur les "Sentences" de Pierre Lombard*, Strasburg, 1857; A. Stöckl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, i. 390–411, Mainz, 1861; H. Denifle, *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. i., Paris, 1889; J. Kögel, *Petrus Lombardus in seiner Stellung zur Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Leipsic, 1897; J. N. Espenberger, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, iii. 5 (1901); O. Baltzer, in *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche*, vol. viii., 1902; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 631–636; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 409–411 et passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, vol. vi. passim; and the works on the history of philosophy and of dogma.

PETER MARTYR (PETER OF VERONA): Italian Dominican; b. at Verona 1205 or 1206; assassinated near Barlassina (14 m. n. of Milan) Apr. 6, 1252. Though his parents were probably Cathari, he seems to have become a Roman Catholic while a student at Bologna. In 1221, the year of Dominic's death, he entered the Dominican order, and soon gained wide reputation as an inquisitor and converter of Italian heretics. For twenty years he worked in the service of the Inquisition at Florence, Cremona, Como, etc., and especially at Milan. It was here that he finally fell a victim to a conspiracy originated by the Cathari, who had him assassinated while returning from Como. The next year he was canonized by Innocent IV., and by the close of the fifteenth century had become a chief patron saint of the Holy Office. His martyrdom is frequently depicted in the art of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The whole scene of his death was represented by Titian in a painting in the Venetian church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo; and he also frequently appears with a sword in his back, a knife thrust into his neck, or with a palm and sword. His day is Apr. 29.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: The *Vita*, by Thoma Agni (Agnello de Lentino), with commentary, is in *ASB*, Apr., iii. 678–719. The proceedings of the inquiry into his death are printed in *Archivio storico Lombardico*, iv (1877), 791–794, and ed. G. Waitz, in *MGH*, *Script.*, xxv (1880), 320 sqq.; cf. H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, i. 383, 417, 479, 511, ii. 276, New York, 1906. Consult further: R. de Visiani, *Vita e martirio del S. Pietro*, Verona, 1862; G. Mira, *Bibliografia Siciliana*, i., ii., Palermo, 1875; F. T. Perrens, in *Revue historique*, ii (1876), 337–366; *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina*, ii. 977 sqq., Brussels, 1901; *KL*, ix. 1925.

PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI. See Vermigli.

PETER NOLASCO, SAINT. See Nolasco.

PETER OF POITIERS: Scholastic theologian; d. 1205. He seems to have followed Peter Comestor at Paris as a teacher of theology about 1160 and became in 1192 his second successor as chancellor of the University of Paris. While he left as minor writings the unprinted *Distinctiones psalterii* and *Allegoriæ super Vetus et Novum Testamentum*, he is known for his *Sententiarum libri quinque*, completed at the latest in 1175 (ed. H. Mathoud, Paris, 1655, reprinted in *MPL*, ccxi. 789 sqq.). The work is closely related to that of Peter the Lombard (q.v.), though it has its own peculiarities. Book i. deals with the Trinity; ii. with rational creatures, among which the sins figure; iii.–v. are concerned with the restoration which comes (1) with the reestablishment of the virtues, (2) through the incarnation, and (3) through participation in the sacraments. The first subject, the Trinity, is handled in dialectic manner and at length; the second book is a treatment of cosmology, angelology, and anthropology; of the three theological virtues faith and hope are briefly discussed, charity more exhaustively; the sacraments are naturally seven, among which special attention is given to baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, and marriage. As distinguished from the Lombard, Peter cites fewer authorities and is more dialectic; as a consequence of the latter, he is addicted to minute subdivision of his subject. Thus he distinguishes between four kinds of fear: worldly fear, fear of divine punishment, fear which comes from love of God, and filial fear, which divides into reverence and fear of separation, from the last of which Christ was free. The unison between this Peter and the Lombard was so great that the latter overshadowed the former, in spite of his numerous illustrations.

Besides the foregoing, two other men bore the name of Peter of Poitiers: a monk of Cluny, secretary to Peter the Venerable, who left a couple of writings which are in *MPL*, clxxxix. 52 sqq., 56 sqq., 661; and a canonist of St. Victor, who left an unpublished work *De poenitentia seu confessione*.

(S. M. Deutsch†.)

Bibliography: C. Oudin, *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiæ*, ii. 1499 sqq., Leipsic, 1722, reproduced in *MPL*, ccxi. 779 sqq.; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xvi. 484 sqq., xii. 349 sqq.; H. Denifle, *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, i. 8, no. 8, note 1, and p. 61, Paris, 1890; *KL*, ix. 1934–35.

PETER OF SEBASTE: Youngest brother of Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Macrina the Younger (qq.v.); b. before 349; d. between 391 and 394. He was brought up and educated by his sister Macrina, who early instilled in him the desire for the ascetic life and was accompanied by him when she and their mother retired to their retreat on the Iris. He was skilful in handicrafts, by which he contributed to the support of his mother and sister and to their charities. He succeeded Basil in the presidency of the latter's monastery on the Iris, and in 370 was made presbyter by Basil, whose messenger he was on missions which required diplomacy and delicate handling. In 380 he was made bishop of Sebaste in Lesser Armenia, in succession to Eustathius (q.v.), and took part in the First Council of Constantinople, 381. He served as almoner for Olympia the deaconess in the distribution of funds to the poor.

The only extant literary work of Peter is a letter to his brother Gregory (in the latter's *Opera*, ii. 268), beseeching him to refute Eunomius and defend Basil from charges brought against the latter. Yet all accounts, as well as his own letter, seem to make him the intellectual equal of his more renowned brothers, give him a character for a lovely modesty and for talents which sought a practical not a literary outlet, and show that his was really the stimulus which resulted in several of Gregory's works, notably the *Explicatio apologetica* and the *De hominis opificio*.

Bibliography: Sources are his brother Gregory's "Life of the Holy Macrina"; Nicephorus, *Hist. eccl.*, xi. 19; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, v. 8. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ix. 572–580; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iv. 349, 618; *DNB*, iv. 345–346.

PETER THE VENERABLE (MAURICE DE MONTBOISSIER): Abbot of Cluny; b. in 1092 or 1094; d. at Cluny (11 m. n.w. of Mâcon) Dec. 25, 1155. Of noble lineage, he was devoted by his mother to the religious life before his birth, and was educated in the abbey of Soucilanges in the diocese of Clermont. His ability led the abbot, Hugo I. of Cluny, to make him prior of Vezelay and Domne at an early age; and on Aug. 27, 1122, he was elected abbot of Cluny to succeed Hugo II. Aided by his loyal friend Mathieu, prior of St. Martin-des-Champs, later cardinal bishop of Albano, he reformed the mother house at Cluny; and by his tours of inspection secured discipline in the cloisters of the Cluniac congregation. While he was absent on a tour of inspection in Aquitaine, the former Abbot Pontius, who had resigned his office, returned to Cluny and seized the abbey, only to be deprived of it by Pope Honorius II., and to die at Rome in 1126. Peter succeeded, by his wise financial course, in gradually repairing the damages which the monastery had suffered from the extravagance of Pontius.

The next task of Peter was to check the dissension between the monks of Cluny and the Cistercians. In this he was at least partially successful, largely through his profound and sincere regard for Bernard of Clairvaux; and the schism which threatened the Church at the papal election of 1130 was averted chiefly through the combined efforts of the two abbots, both of whom supported the cause of Innocent II. Yet on the other hand, when Abelard, who had been condemned as a heretic by the Synod of Sens under Innocent II. at the instance of Bernard, sought refuge at Cluny, he was welcomed by Peter (see Abelard).

In 1146 Peter submitted to the chapter general of Cluny his *Consuetudines Cluniacenses* (see Cluny, Abbey and Congregation of, § 5), a series of seventy-six statutes providing stricter discipline and abolishing the chief abuses censured by the Cistercians; and in 1148 he supplemented these statutes by an ordinance governing the domestic economy of the monastery, adding a report of the conditions which he had found at Cluny when he became abbot.

With advancing years Peter again felt the longing of his youth to pass the close of his life in complete solitude as a hermit; but though he besought this privilege personally of Eugenius III. at Rome, the pope refused.

Among the extant writings of Peter the Venerable, his six books of collected letters, though not in chronological order, belong to the most important historical documents of the twelfth century. They include letters to popes Innocent II., Celestine II., Lucius II., and Eugenius III.; to kings Sigward of Norway, Roger of Sicily, Louis VII. of France, and his minister Suger of St. Denis; to the Greek Emperor John Comnenus; to the king and patriarch of Jerusalem; to Bernard of Clairvaux, the Carthusian Prior Guigo, Cardinal Mathieu of Albano, Bishop Henry of Winchester, and many others. Since, however, he lacked the gift of popular preaching, he strove to refute the foes of the Church by means of his pen. The earliest of his treatises is probably the *Contra dicentes Christum nunquam se Deum dixisse*, in which, while conceding that Christ nowhere in the Bible calls himself simply and unmistakably God, he declares doubt as to Christ's divinity to be a Mohammedan error and that the reserve in Christ's own expressions concerning his person was due to his deference to the Jews. An important source in connection with the sect of the Petrobrusians (see Peter of Bruys) is found in Peter's treatise *Contra Petrobrusianos*, in which he defends the doctrines of the sacrifice of the mass and transubstantiation. In his treatise *Adversus Judæorum inveteratam duritiam*, Peter sharply attacks the Jews, who are said to be worse than the Saracens, since the latter deny only the divinity and resurrection of Christ, whereas the former do not believe in Christ at all.

In 1141 Peter visited Spain, and there commissioned Peter of Toledo to translate the Koran. This version, though really only an excerpt from the original, was sent by Peter to Bernard with the request that he refute it. When Bernard declined, Peter himself wrote five books *Contra nefandam sectam Sarracenorum*, of which only two books have been preserved, though a table of contents of the remainder by his secretary, Peter of Poitiers, is still extant (the two books are published, ed. J. Thomä, Leipsic, 1896). Peter sought to prove, in this work, that Mohammed's alleged prophetic office was void, since he lacked both the gift of prediction and that of miracles, the two signs of the true prophet. Peter's last literary task was his *De miraculis* (see Bibliography, J. d'Avenal), in which he related the marvels which he had experienced, as well as those of which he had heard in his travels. Four of his sermons and some of his Latin poems and hymns have been preserved. Two of the hymns have been translated into English: the Christmas hymn " Coelum gaude, terra plaude " in O. Shipley, *Lyra Messianica* (London, 1864); and the Easter hymn " Mortis portis fractis fortis " in the same collection and in E. Charles, *The Voice of the Christian Life in Song* (London, 1858). G. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Opera* are in M. de la Bigne, *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum*, xxii. 826–1142, 28 vols., Genoa, 1677–1707, and in *MPL*, clxxxix.; his two books against the Saracens are in E. Martène and U. Durand, *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, ix. 1120–80, 9 vols., Paris, 1724–33; sermons, letters, etc., are in Martène and Durand's *Thesaurus novus anecdotum*, i. 407 sqq., v. 1419–1450, 5 vols., Paris, 1717; J. Mabillon, *Vetera analecta*, pp. 159 sqq., ib. 1723; L. d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ii. 332, 13 vols., ib. 1655–77; and E. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, v. 443, vi. 550, 4 vols., ib. 1761–64. His *Epistolæ historicæ* are in A. Du Chesne, *Historiæ Francorum scriptores*, vol. iv., 5 vols., Paris, 1636–49; and in Bouquet, *Recueil*, vol. xv. Sources are: The *Vita*, by a monastic pupil Rodulfus, in Martène and Durand's *Amplissima collectio*, ut sup., vi. 1187–1202; a panegyric by Peter of Poitiers is in Bigne's work, ut sup., xxii. 820; and the *Chronicon Cluniacense*, in Bigne's work, ut sup., xxii., 813 sqq. Consult further: *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiii. 263 sqq., xxii. 241–267, P. Lorain, *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny*, Dijon, 1839 (includes part of Peter's correspondence), C. A. Wilkens, *Petrus der Ehrwürdige*, Leipsic, 1857; B. Duparay, *Pierre-le-Vénérable, . . . sa vie, ses œuvres, et la société monastique au xii. siècle*, Chalons, 1862; J. d'Avenal, *Vie de Pierre le Vénérable*, Paris, 1874 (with transl. of *De miraculis*), M. Demimuid, *Pierre-le-Vénérable, ou la vie et l'influence monastiques au douzième siècle*, Paris, 1876; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. v., part 1, passim; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iv. passim; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 500–525; and the literature under CLUNY, ABBEY AND CONGREGATION OF.

PETER, MARGARETA. See WILDENSPUCH CRUCIFIXION.

PETERBOROUGH: The seat of a bishopric in Northamptonshire, Eng., situated on the left bank of the Nene, seventy-six miles north of London 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 in 1528.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. A. Poole, *Peterborough*, in *Diocesan Histories*, London, 1881; W. C. Ingram, *Peterborough Cathedral*, ib. 1898; W. D. Sweeting, *The Cathedral of Peterborough*, ib. 1898; A. Percival, *Notes on Old Peterborough*, Peterborough, 1905.

PETERKIN, GEORGE WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopal bishop of West Virginia; b. at Clear Spring, Md., Mar. 21, 1841. He was educated at the University of Virginia (1858–59), and, after serving in the Confederate Army throughout the Civil War, studied at the Theological Seminary of Virginia, near Alexandria (graduated 1868). He was ordered deacon in the same year and was advanced to the priesthood in 1869. After being curate to his father at St. James', Richmond, Va. (1868–69), he was rector of St. Stephen's, Culpepper, Va. (1869–73), and of the Memorial Church, Baltimore, Md. (1873–78). In 1878 he was consecrated first bishop of West Virginia. Since 1886 he has been a member of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in this capacity was in charge of the Protestant Episcopal missions in Brazil (1893–99) and in Porto Rico (1901–02). In theology he is a Low-churchman. He has edited *History and Record of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of West Virginia* (Charleston, W. Va., 1902).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 255, New York, 1895.

PETERS, GEORGE NATHANIEL HENRY: Lutheran (Wittenberg Synod); b. at New Berlin, Union County, Pa., Nov. 30, 1825; graduated at Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., 1850; was pastor at Woodbury, Springfield, Xenia, and Plymouth, O., but long since retired. He is a conservative premillenarian; and has published *The Theocratic Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ* (3 vols., New York, 1884).

PETERS (PETER), HUGH: English Independent; b. at Fowey (22 m. w. of Plymouth), Cornwall, in 1598; hanged at Charing Cross, London, Oct. 16, 1660. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1617–18), and studied theology and preached in London in 1624–29. Not being able to conform wholly, he traveled abroad and about 1632 became pastor of a congregation at Rotterdam, where he adopted Independent views. In 1635 he emigrated to America and became pastor at Salem, and it was he who excommunicated Roger Williams (q.v.). He was also one of the opponents of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson in the New England controversy over antinomianism (see ANTINOMIANISM AND ANTINOMIAN CONTROVERSIES, II., 2). In 1641 he was one of three agents sent by the Massachusetts colony to England on a commission on commercial and religious affairs and took part as chaplain with the expedition against Ireland in 1642. He was prominently identified with the Puritan movement throughout, and with affairs under the protectorate, and gained great unpopularity by his speech and actions. At the Restoration he was tried and executed as a regicide.

He published a considerable number of small tracts, reports, and sermons (the *British Museum Catalogue* devotes over two pages to him), and wrote *A Dying Father's Last Legacy to an Only Child* (London, 1660).

Bibliography: Sources are: His *Last Legacy*, ut sup., pp. 97–115; the materials indicated in G. C. Boase and W. P. Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis*, i. 465, iii. 1310, 3 vols., London, 1874–82; and thirty-five letters by him in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 4 ser., vi. 91–117, vii. 199–204. Consult further: J. B. Felt, *Memoir and Defence of Hugh Peters*, Boston, 1851. Other accounts are: W. Yonge, *England's Shame, or the Unmasking of a Political Atheist*, London, 1863 (" a scurrilous collection of fabrications"); [W. Harris], *An Historical Critical Account of H. Peters*, ib. 1751; S. Peters, *Life of H. Peters*, New York, 1807; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 70–75, ib. 1859; *DNB*, xlv. 69–77 (detailed).

PETERS, JOHN PUNNETT: Protestant Episcopal; b. in New York City Dec. 16, 1852. He was educated at Yale College (A.B., 1873; Ph.D., 1876), Yale Divinity School (1879), and the universities of Berlin (1879–81) and Leipsic (1882–83). He was ordered deacon in 1876 and ordained priest in the following year, and was a tutor in Yale (1876–79) and minister in charge of St. John's, Dresden (1881–1882). He was professor of Old-Testament languages and literature in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, from 1884 to 1891, as well as professor of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania (1885–93), while in 1888–95 he was director of the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania to Babylonia, and in this capacity conducted important excavations at Nippur. From 1883 to 1893 he was curate of St. Michael's, New York City, has been rector of the same church since 1893, and since 1904 he has been canon residentiary of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. In theology he terms himself " a conservative-radical Churchman." He has edited *The Diary of David McClure* (New York, 1899), translated W. Müller's *Political History of Recent Times* (1882), and contributed extensively to *The Bible as Literature* (1896) and *Lauda Zion* (1896). He has written: *Scriptures Hebrew and Christian* (2 vols., New York 1886–89); *Nippur: or, Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates* (2 vols., 1897); *The Old Testament and the New Testament Scholarship* (London, 1901); *Early Hebrew Story* (New York, 1904); *Some Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa* (in collaboration with H. Thiersch; London, 1905); *Annals of St. Michael's, New York, for One Hundred Years, 1807–1907* (New York, 1907); and *Modern Christianity; or, the Plain Gospel expounded* (1910).

PETERS, MADISON CLINTON: Baptist; b. in Lehigh County, Pa., Nov. 6, 1859. He was educated at Muhlenberg and Franklin and Marshall Colleges, and at Heidelberg Theological Seminary, Tiffin, O., from which he was graduated in 1881. After preaching in the Reformed Church at Mulberry, Ind., acting as stated supply at Terre Haute, Ind., and being pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Ottawa, Ill., he was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia (1884–89), of Bloomingdale Reformed Church, New York City (1889–1900), of the Sumner Avenue Baptist Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1900–02), and of Immanuel Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md. (1902–04). In 1904–1905 he preached in Park Theater, Philadelphia, but then returned to New York City as pastor of Epiphany Baptist Church. This charge he resigned in 1906 to conduct non-denominational services in the Majestic Theater, New York City. He has written *Justice to the Jew* (New York, 1899; new ed., 1908); *The Wit and Wisdom of the Talmud* (1900); *The Jew as a Patriot* (1901); *The Birds of the Bible* (1901); *Why I became a Baptist* (Philadelphia, 1901); *The Man who Wins* (Boston, 1905); *The Jews in America* (Philadelphia, 1905); *Will the Coming Man Marry?* (1906); *Sermons that have Won the Masses* (1908); and *Abraham Lincoln's Religion* (1909).

PETERS, NORBERT: Roman Catholic; b. at Allendorf (50 m. n.e. of Cologne) Aug. 5, 1863. He was educated at the gymnasia of Coesfeld and Paderborn, the universities of Münster, Bonn, Tübingen, and Würzburg, and the seminaries of Eichstädt and Paderborn; became licentiate in 1883; and priest in 1887; taught at the high school at Geseke, 1887–1889; continued his studies at Bonn and Tübingen, 1889–92; became professor of theology at Paderborn, 1892, where he was dean 1898–99 and 1904–1905; he was also prosynodal examiner 1896–1904. He has issued a commentary on Obadiah (Paderborn, 1892); *Die sahidisch-koptische Uebersetzung des Buches Ecclesiasticus auf ihren wahren Werth für die Textkritik* (Freiburg, 1898); *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (1899); an edition with notes of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes (1902); *Die grundsätzliche Stellung der katholischen Kirche zur Bibelforschung, oder die Grenzen der Bibelkritik nach katholischer Lehre* (Paderborn, 1905); *Bibel und Naturwissenschaft nach den Grundsätzen der katholischen Theologie* (1906); *Papst Pius X. und das Bibelstudium* (1906); *Glauben und Wissen im ersten biblischen Schöpfungsbericht* (1907); and *Kirche und Bibellesen, oder die grundsätzliche Stellung der katholischen Kirche zum Bibellesen in der Landessprache* (1908). He has served also on the editorial boards of such publications as *Biblische Studien; Biblische Zeitschrift; Theologische Quartalschrift;* and *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.*

PETER'S PENCE (*Denarius Sancti Petri; census Beati Petri*): A sum of money annually sent to the Holy See from several northern nations. It is first found in England, where later chronicles state that King Ina of Wessex paid it in 725, although this tradition may be apocryphal. The first certain mention of Peter's pence occurs in a letter of Leo III. to Cenwulf of Mercia, in which the pope states that King Offa had bound himself and his successors to pay to the Apostle Peter 365 *mancusæ* annually for the care of the poor and for lighting the church. Ethelwulf, in 855, is the first king known to have sent this amount, and after his reign the " Rome-fee " (*Romfeot*) is frequently mentioned in the laws. After the middle of the tenth century a penny was required to be given by each household in England before St. Peter's day under severe penalties, and various minor regulations were later introduced.

At first a free gift, Peter's pence later became a legal duty, so that Gregory VII. could use it as a basis for his claim to the full dependence of England as a vassal of the Holy See. The bishops were required to attend to the collection of Peter's pence, but delegated their task to the archdeacons; and Alexander III. expressly forbade the use of stern measures in raising the money. The clergy, however, frequently tried to free themselves from their duty, and the archdeacons often sent an insufficient amount to Rome. The whole tribute, from the middle of the twelfth century on, seems to have been fixed at 299 marks in silver. The later English kings, however, refused payment of this tax, and finally it was annulled by an act of Parliament on July 9, 1533.

Attempts were made with varying success to introduce this custom into other countries. It is found in Denmark as early as the eleventh century (though it seems to have been paid only irregularly after the fifteenth century), and about the same time in Poland. The connection between Poland and Prussia through the supremacy of the Teutonic Knights gave John XXII. an excuse to demand Peter's pence from Prussia, but the payment was resisted and never became general. It was introduced into Sweden in 1152 by Nicholas Breakspear, afterward Hadrian IV., and from there the custom spread to Norway, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands. Gregory VII. tried to introduce it into France in 1081, basing his appeal on ancient customs, but he was as unsuccessful here as in his similar attempt in Spain. With the sixteenth century the payment of Peter's pence was abandoned. It did not, however, end altogether with the Reformation, for a Lutheranizing bishop in Iceland, Gissurus of Skaholt, continued to collect it in 1539–48, apparently without sending it to Rome.

The modern Peter's pence has nothing in common with the ancient system except the name. It originated in 1860 as a free-will offering to the pope, a kind of compensation for the loss of his territories. It was introduced first in Vienna, whence it spread to Ireland, Germany, and other parts of the Roman Catholic world. The amount is so considerable that it enabled Pius IX. to reject the offer of the Italian government of a yearly pension of 3,500,000 francs. In 1861–68 it is supposed to have amounted to 71,000,000 francs, and during the later years of the pontificate of Pius it was estimated at from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 francs. No exact records are kept, or at least published. During the pontificate of Leo XIII. the sum produced by this contribution fell considerably, so that in 1901 it was said to have amounted only to about 2,300,000 francs.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Fabre, *Recherches sur le denier de Saint Pierre en Angleterre au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1892; L. Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, III., l. 1, chap. xxxii., 3 vols., Paris, 1728; L. A. Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ*, v. 851 sqq., 6 vols., Milan, 1723–51; L. T. Spittler, *Von der ehemaligen Zinsbarkeit der nordischen Reiche an den päpstlichen Stuhl*, Hanover, 1797; F. Hurter, *Geschichte Innocenz III.*, iii. 121–122, 134–135, Hamburg, 1836–42; William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum Anglicorum*, book ii., ed. T. D. Hardy, p. 152, London, 1840; R. W. Thompson, *Papacy and the Civil Power*, New York, 1877; P. Woker, *Das kirchliche Finanzwesen der Päpste*, Nördlingen, 1878; C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediæ et infinæ latinitatis*, ed. C. A. L. Henschel, iii. 62–63, Niort, 1883; A. M. von Steinle, *Der Peterspfennig*, Frankfort, 1893; O. Jensen, *Der englische Peterspfennig und die Lehenssteuer aus England und Irland an den Papststuhl im Mittelalter*, Heidelberg, 1903; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 11, 26; *DCA*, ii. 1628–29; the article of the French Assembly suppressing Peter's Pence is in Reich, *Documents*, p. 414.

PETERSEN, FREDRIK: Norwegian theologian; b. at Stavanger (190 m. w.s.w. of Christiania), Norway, Apr. 23, 1839; d. at Christiania Jan. 9, 1903. He studied theology at the University of Christiania (candidate in theology, 1863) and Berlin, and pursued postgraduate studies in Germany, Sweden, and Denmark (1866–68); was university stipendiary in Christiania (1868–72); ordained (1873); and professor of theology at the University of Christiania (1873–1902). He was very popular with the students, knowing how to enlist their sympathies for the researches of a modern-conservative theology, though he was unjustly blamed for the liberal thinking now existing in the University of Christiania. He was neither a disciple of any school, nor did he create a school. His position was that of a progressive conservative eclectic, combining scientific method with Christian piety. His efforts at reconstructing the doctrine of inspiration, of the atonement, and of the theory of restitution are notable. As a youth he had been attracted to the writings of the Danish philosopher S. Kierkegaard, and his first theological production was a study of Kierkegaard, *Dr. Sören Kierkegaards Christendomsforkyndelse* (1877). Though he protested against Kierkegaard's dualism respecting faith and thought, he agreed with him in holding that faith is independent, and regarded the objects of faith as mysteries which, independent of anything else, possess the ability of creating certainty. Petersen became a circumspect but enthusiastic apologist, on the basis of positive Christianity. His two leading apologetic works are *Om Skabelsen, Opholdelsen og Styrelsen*, vol. i., *Forskningen* (1883), vol. ii., *Theologien* (1885), revised ed., *Forskningen og den Kristelige Tro* (1886); and *Fritänkerne og Kristentroens moralske Värd* (1891). Of his lesser works may be mentioned *Hvorfor jeg tror paa Jesus Kristus*, indicating a development from a hearsay belief passing through doubt over to independent faith in Christ. Of the larger works, just mentioned, the first deals with materialism in its opposition to the Christian conception of creation and preservation; the second treats of the attitude of evolution to revelation and the atonement. Petersen's knowledge of the various schools of thought, combined with his effort to harmonize faith and belief, arrested the attention of a wide circle of readers. He did not escape the criticism of the old-orthodox party, nor of liberal theology and infidelity. JOHN O. EVJEN.

PETERSEN, JOHANN WILHELM: German Lutheran, mystic, and chiliast; b. at Osnabrück (74 m. w.s.w. of Hanover) June 1, 1649; d. near Zerbst (22 m. s.e. of Magdeburg) Jan. 31, 1727. He was educated at the universities of Giessen (1669–1671) and Rostock (1671–72), and was then adjunct in the philosophical faculty at the latter institution in 1672–74. Receiving a stipend from the Lübeck council in recognition of his attainments, he was enabled to visit the universities of Leipsic, Jena, and Wittenberg. On his return to Giessen he lectured in the philosophical faculty, a controversy between the theologians of Giessen and Marburg leading him to write his two treatises: *De prædestinatione reformatorum non divina* (Giessen, 1675), and *De osculo juris naturæ cum primo præcepto decalogi* (1675).

About this same time Petersen became associated with Spener and his circle, and renouncing an academic career, retired to Lübeck in obedience to his father's wish. Here he hoped to become a preacher, but ruined his chances by a malicious poem on the Roman Catholic clergy. To escape prosecution for his action, he accepted a call to Rostock as professor of poetry; but the enmity which he had excited followed him there, and early in 1677 he accepted a call to the Church of St. Ægidius at Hanover, where he found a defender in Duke John Frederick until, in 1678, he became superintendent of the diocese of Lübeck and court chaplain at Eutin.

Petersen's next ten years were the happiest of his life. His preaching was so popular that he issued a collection of his sermons, and he also advanced the cause of popular religious training by his *Spruch-Catechismus* (Plön, 1680). In 1688 he became superintendent at Lüneburg. His predecessor, Caspar Hermann Sandhagen, had first decided to take another position, but had changed his mind after Petersen had accepted the call. The ducal government and many of the people wished Sandhagen to remain, so that Petersen, by insisting on holding them to their call, had to contend with their opposition from the very first. This antagonism was intensified by a number of other factors, especially by the chiliastic views which Petersen put forth more and more, until all preaching on the subject was forbidden by the consistory of Celle. In 1691, however, his defense of the visions of Rosamunde Juliane von Asseburg (q.v.) in his *Sendschreiben an einige Theologos* (Eng. transl., *A Letter to Some Divines Concerning the Question whether God, since Christ's Ascension, doth any more Reveal Himself to Mankind by the Means of Divine Apparitions? With an Exact Account of what God hath Bestowed upon a Noble Maid*, by Francis Lee, London, 1695), combined with his increasing promulgation of chiliasm, again brought him before the consistory, which, after receiving a formal expression of opinion from the theological faculty of Helmstädt, on Jan. 28, 1692, deposed him and expelled him from the principality of Lüneburg.

After a brief residence in Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, and Magdeburg, Petersen purchased an estate at Nieder-Dodeleben, near the latter city, through the assistance of his sympathizers, and settled down to a life of quiet study and literary activity. He now proceeded to defend his chiliasm, particularly in his *Die Wahrheit des herrlichen Reiches Jesu Christi, welches in der siebenten Posaunen noch zu erwarten ist* (2 parts, Magdeburg, 1692) and *Mysterion apokatastaseos panton, das ist Geheimniss der Wiederbringung aller Dinge* (3 vols., Frankfort, 1700–10). He likewise wrote commentaries on the Psalms (1719), Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel (1719), Daniel (1720), the Minor Prophets (1723), etc., his mystical views appearing in these as well as in other writings. The last three years of his life were spent on his estate of Thymer, near Zerbst, whither he had removed from Nieder-Dodeleben, and his literary activity was such that he could record the writing of nearly seventy printed books and pamphlets and of over a hundred more that remained in manuscript.

Despite his eccentricities, Petersen was one of the foremost theologians of his period of transition from orthodoxy to the conflicting extremes of pietism and rationalism. He is also known as a poet in both Latin and German, he himself mentioning 700 hymns in manuscript. His epic *Uranias sive opera Dei magna carmine heroico celebrata* was edited by Leibnitz (Halle, 1720), while his collections of hymns include the 300 prose *Stimmen aus Zion zum Lob des Allmächtigen im Geist gesungen* (2 parts, Halle, 1696–98) and *Neue Stimmen aus Zion* (1701), as well as the poetic *Dreihundert Stimmen aus Zion* (1721). Seven of his Latin hymns and eight of his prose German hymns were included by Johann Anastasius Freylinghausen in his *Geistreiches Gesang-Buch* (Halle, 1704). Three of Petersen's hymns have also been translated into English: the "Cerne lapsum servulum," thrice rendered with the first lines "Look on me Thy servant fall'n," "Jesus cometh to fulfil," and "Lamb of God, all praise to Thee"; "Salve crux beata, salve," of which the chief renderings begin "Welcome Cross and tribulation," "Cross, reproach, and tribulation," and "O Cross, we hail thy bitter reign"; and "Liebster Jesu, liebstes Leben," translated as "Jesus, Lord of life and glory."

The doctrines in which Petersen departed from orthodox Lutheran principles were his theories of the millennial kingdom; the restoration of all things; the heavenly God-man, the first-born of all creatures; and direct miraculous revelations of God at the present time. (Carl Bertheau.)

Bibliography: The chief sources are his autobiography, Frankfort, 1717, and his *Leben Frauen Johannä Eleonorä Petersen* (his wife), ib. 1718. Consult further: Kürschner, *J. W. Petersen, ein theologisches Lebensbild*, Eutin, 1862; J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten*, ii. 586 sqq., v. 937 sqq., Jena, 1735–36; I. Moller, *Cimbria literata*, ii. 639 sqq., Copenhagen, 1744; C. G. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, iii. 1421 sqq., Leipsic, 1751; H. Schmid, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, pp. 186 sqq., Nördlingen, 1863; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, ii. 225 sqq., Bonn, 1884; *ADB*, xxv 508 sqq.; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 216, 892, 988.

END OF VOLUME VIII.