THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Divine Right - Dysentery

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Divine Right

(1) in politics, the claim of sovereigns to unlimited obedience, on the ground that the sovereign power is derived directly from God.

(2) In ecclesiastical polity, the divine right (jus divinum) has been claimed for certain forms of Church government, and for certain classes of persons as administering it; e.g. bishops in the Roman Church long claimed divine right to exercise authority in their dioceses, while the Pope claims that their right is not directly divine, but mediately through him. This controversy has never been authoritatively settled. It was largely discussed in the Council of Trent (q.v.).

(3) In the Protestant churches generally, the claim of divine light on the part of the clergy to govern is generally abandoned, and where it is held the right is maintained as a mediate one, derived through the Scriptures, so far as they give principles and laws for Church government. *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY*.

Divinity

a term sometimes used to designate the science of theology. *SEE THEOLOGY*.

Divinity Of Christ

SEE CHRISTOLOGY; *SEE INCARNATION*; *SEE TRINITY*.

Divisions, Church.

SEE SCHISM.

Division

the rendering of the following words:

1. hQ;lu} *chalukkah'*, <1455>2 Chronicles 35:5, or tq,lÒjmi *machalo'keth*, <0612>Joshua 11:23; 12:7; 18:10; <1301>1 Chronicles 24:1; 26:1, 12, 19; <1611>Nehemiah 11:36; a regular distribution (e.g. the sacerdotal "courses" or sections).

2. hG;l Bl;P] *peluggah'*, 2Ch 35:5, or Chald. aG;l Bl;P] *pelugga'*, Ezr 6:18, a partition (likewise applied to the priestly ranks), but, tWdP] *pelaggah'*, Jdg 5:15, 16, *streamlets* ("*rivers*," Job 20:17).

3. tWdP, *peduth'*, a distinction, Ex 8:23 (elsewhere "*redemption*").

4. διαμερισμός, *disunion*, Lu 12:21; διχοστασία, *variance*, Ro 16:17; 1Co 3:3; Ga 5:20; σχίσμα, a split, Joh 7:43; 9:16; 10:19 ("*rent*," Mt 9:16; Mr 2:21).

Divisions In The Church At Corinth

(σχίσματα, 1Co 1:10; 11:18, *schisms*, as rendered 1Co 12:25), i.e., parties or factions leading to altercation (ἔρις, "contention" 1Co 1:11). The existence in many of the early churches of a strong tendency towards the ingrafting of Judaism upon Christianity is a fact well known to every reader of the N.T.; and though the Church at Corinth was founded by Paul and afterwards .instructed by Apollos, yet it is extremely probable that, as in the churches of Galatia, so in those of Achaiai, this tendency may have been strongly manifested, and that a party may have arisen in the Church at Corinth opposed to the liberal and spiritual system of Paul, and more inclined to one which aimed at fettering, Christianity with the restrictions and outward ritual of the Mosaic dispensation. The leaders of this party probably came with letters of commendation (2Co 3:1) to the Corinthian Church, and it is possible that they may have had these from Peter; but that the party itself received any countenance from that apostle cannot for a moment be supposed. Rather must we believe that they took the name of the apostle of "the circumcision" as the designation of their party for the sake of gaining greater authority to their position; at any rate, they seem to have used Peter's acknowledged place among the apostles to the disparagement of Paul, and hence his retort (2Co 11:5). The vehement opposition of this party to Paul, and their pointed attack upon his claims to the apostolic office, would naturally lead those who had been Paul's converts, and who probably formed the major part of the Church, to rally round his pretensions, and the doctrines of a pure and spiritual Christianity which he taught. Closely allied with this party, and in some respects only a subdivision of it, was that of Apollos. This distinguished teacher was not only the friend of Paul, but had followed up Paul's teaching at Corinth in a congenial spirit and to a harmonious result (2Co 3:5, etc.).

Between the party, therefore, assuming his name, and that ranking itself under the name of the apostle, there could be no substantial ground of difference. Perhaps, as Apollos had the advantage of Paul in some respects, especially in facility in public speaking (<44>Acts 18:24; conmp. <47>2 Corinthians 10:10), the sole ground on which his party may have preferred him was the higher gratification he afforded by his addresses to their educated taste than was derived from the "simple statenments of the apostle concerning" Christ "and him crucified." Thus far all, though almost purely conjectural, is easy and probable; but in relation to the fourth party — that which said "I am of Christ" — it has been found extremely difficult to determine by what peculiar sentiments they we're distinguished. (See the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, 1.) The simplest hypothesis is that of Augustine ("alii qui nolebant aedificari super Petrum, sed super petram. [dicebant] Ego autem, sum Christi," *De verb. Dom. Serm.* 13), whom Eichhorn (*Einleit.* 3:107), Schott (*Isagoge in N.T.* page 233), Pott (*N.T. Koppian.* volume 5, part 1, page 25), Bleek (*Einl.* page 397), and others follow, viz. that this party was composed of the better sort in the Church, who stood neutral, and, declining to follow any mere human leader, declared themselves to belong only to Christ, the common Lord and the Leader of all. This opinion is chiefly based on <46>1 Corinthians 3:22, 23, where it is supposed the four parties are alluded to, and that of Christ alone commended. But this seems a forced and improbable interpretation of that passage of the words ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, "and ye are Christ's, being much more naturally understood as applying to all the Corinthians, than as describing only a part of them. This opinion, moreover, hardly tallies with the language of the apostle concerning the Christ-party, in <46>1 Corinthians 1:7, 12, and <47>2 Corinthians 10:7, where he evidently speaks of them in terms of censure, and as guilty of dividing Christ. Another hypothesis is that suggested by Storr (*Notitiae Historicae epistoll. ad Cor. interpretationi servientes. Acad.* 2:242), and which has been followed, among others, by Hug (*Introd.* page 524, Fosdick's tranls., Bertholdt (*Einleit.* page 3320), and Krause (*Pauli ad Cor. Epistolae Graece. etc. Proleg.* page 35), viz. that the Christ-party was one which, professing to follow James and the other brethren of the Lord as its heads, claimed to itself, in consequence of this relationship, the title οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, those of Christ, by way of eminence. To this it has been objected that, had the party in question designed, by the name they assumed, to express the relationship of their leader to Jesus Christ, they would have employed the words οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου, those of the Lord, not οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the former being more

correctly descriptive of a personal, and the latter of an official, relationship. Besides, as Olshausen remarks, "the party of James could not be precisely distinguished from that of Peter; both must have been composed of strenuous Jew-Christians. In fine, there is a total absence of all positive grounds for this hypothesis. . . . The mere naming of 'the brethren of the Lord' in 1 Corinthians 9:5, and of James in 1 Corinthians 15:7, can prove nothing, as this is not in connection with any strictures on the Christ-party, or indeed on any party, but entirely incidental; and the expression γινώσκειν Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα, 'know Christ after the flesh,' (2 Corinthians 5:16), refers to something quite different from the family-relations of the Savior: it is designed to contrast the purely human aspect of his existence with his eternal heavenly essence" (*Biblische Comment.* III, 1:457; comp. *Bilroth Commentary on the Corinthians*, 1:11). In an able treatise which appeared in the Tubingen *Zeitschrift für Theelogie* for 1831 (part 4, page 61), Baur has suggested that, properly speaking, there were only two parties in the Corinthian Church — the Pauline and the Petrine; and that, as that, of Apollos was a subdivision of the former, that of Christ was a subdivision of the latter. This. subdivision, he supposes, arose from the opposition offered by the Petrine party to Paul, which led some of them to call in question the right of the latter to the apostleship, and to claim for themselves, as followers of Peter, a closer spiritual relationship to the Savior, the honor of being the alone genuine and apostolically-designated disciples of Christ. This opinion is followed by Billroth, and has much in its favor; but the remark of Neander, that "according to it the Christ-party would be discriminated from the Petrine only in name, which is not in keeping with the relation of this party-appellation to the preceding party-names," has considerable weight as an objection to it. Neander himself, followed by Olshausen, supposes that the Christ-party was composed of persons "who repudiated the authority of all these teachers, and, independently of the apostles, sought to construct for themselves a pure Christianity, out of which probably they cast everything that too strongly opposed their philosophical ideas as a mere foreign addition. From the opposition of Hellenism and Judaism, and from the Hellene-philosophical tendency at Corinth, such a party might easily have arisen . . . To such the apostles would seem to have mixed too much that was Jewish with their system, and not to have presented the doctrines of Christ sufficiently pure. To Christ alone, therefore, would they professedly appeal, and out of the materials furnished them by tradition, they sought, by means of their philosophic criticism, to extract what should be the pure

doctrine of Christ" (*Apoestel. Zeitalt.* page 205; 1:273 of Eng. tr.). The reasoning of the apostle in the 1st, 2d, 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th chapters of the 1st Epistle seems clearly to indicate that some such notions as these bad crept into the Church at Corinth; and, upon the whole, this hypothesis of Neander commends itself to our minds as the one which is best maintained and most probable. At the same time, we have serious doubts, of the soundness of the assumption on which all these hypotheses proceed, viz. that there really were in the Corinthian Church sects or parties specifically distinguished from each other by peculiarities of doctrinal sentiment. That erroneous doctrines were entertained by individuals in the Church, and that a schismatical spirit pervaded it, cannot be questioned; but that these two stood formally connected with each other may fairly admit of doubt. Schisms often arise in churches from causes which have little or nothing to do with diversities of doctrinal sentiment among the members; and that such were the schisms which disturbed the Church at Corinth appears to us probable, from the circumstance that the existence of these is condemned by the apostle, without reference to any doctrinal errors out of which they might arise, while, on the other hand, the doctrinal errors condemned by him are denounced without reference to their having led to party strifes. For farther information, besides that contained in the writings of Neander, Davidson (*Introd. to N.T.* 2:222 sq.), Conybeare and Howson, and others, the student may be referred to the special treatises of Schenkel, *De Eccl. Cor.* (Basel, 1838), Kniewel, *Eccl. Cor. Dissensiones* (Gedan. 1841), Becker, *Partheiungen in die Gemeinde z. Kor.* (Altona, 1841), Rabiger, *Ent. Untersuch.* (Bresl. 1847); Hilgenfeld, in *Zeitschr. fur wiss. Theol.* 1865, page 241 sq.; Beyschlag, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, page 217 sq.; but he cannot be too emphatically warned against that tendency to construct a definite history out of the fewest possible facts, that marks most of these discussions. *SEE CORINTHIANS (EPISTLES TO THE)*.

Division Of The Earth.

That all mankind were originally of one family spoke but one language, that, in consequence of their being united in a design which accorded not with the views of Providence, the Almighty confounded their speech, and introduced among them a variety of tongues, which produced a general dispersion, are facts declared by the sacred writers. In 44726Acts 17:26, we are told, "God made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the

face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." In Genesis 10:25, it is said, in the days of Peleg the earth was divided. The idea was, that each nation received its allotted portion of territory from God. The same view is probably taken in Deuteronomy 32:8, 9. When the Most High assigned an inheritance to nations When He divided the sons of Adam; He fixed the bounds of peoples, according to the number of the sons of Israel. For the portion of Jehovah is his people Jacob the lot (cord) of his inheritance. The object of the sacred historian, in the tenth chapter of Genesis, is to furnish a brief, but authentic record of the origin of the principal nation of the earth. In the form of a genealogical table, or roll, of the descendants of Noah, it contains a view of the pedigree of nations in the then known world. As such, it is a record of inestimable value, being the most ancient ethnographic document which we possess. It does not, indeed, afford to us, at this late period of the world, that degree of definite information which it doubtless conveyed in the time of Moses. A proper name is apt to assume a new form every time it is translated into a different language, and often in the same dialect at different periods. It is not, therefore, to he wondered at that many nations and peoples should have lost the names by which they were originally called, or that these names should have become so altered by time, or so distorted in being transferred into other tongues, as to make it difficult to trace their relation to those here given. But, notwithstanding the uncertainty arising from this source, far more successful results have attended the researches of learned men in this department than could have been anticipated, so that nearly all the leading nations of ancient and modern times can be distinctly traced up to their patriarchial progenitors, recited in the present catalogue. Indeed, the subject of this chapter has been so nearly exhausted by the labors of Bochart, Le Clerc, Wells, Michaelis, Sir William Jones, Hales, Faber, Rosenmüller, and others, that little is left for future gleaners, until a more minute acquaintance shall be formed with the Asiatic regions by some one who shall be master of the various dialects spoken from the Indus to the Nile, and from the Arabic Gulf to the Caspian Sea. In considering this record, it is important to remark,

1. That the names of individuals are for the most part names of the nations descended from them, just as Judah and Israel, though names of single persons, are also names of whole nations. This is evident, not only from the fact that many of them are in the plural number, as all those ending in im,

but also from the termination of many of them, especially those ending in ite, being descriptive of tribes, and not of individuals.

2. Although this chapter is placed before the eleventh, yet in the order of time it properly belongs after it; for the confusion of tongues at Babel, which was the principal occasion of the dispersion of mankind, must of course have preceded that dispersion. This is still further evident for in the expression, "after their tongues," implying a diversity of languages, which we know did not exist prior to the confusion of tongues mentioned in the eleventh chapter. But such transpositions are common with the sacred writers.

3. Speaking in general terms, it may be said that the three sons of Noah — Shem, Ham, and Japheth — are exhibited in this genealogical chart as the representatives of the three grand divisions of the earth, Asia, Africa, and Europe, although not precisely according to the boundaries of modern times. The descendants of Japheth peopled Europe and the north-west of Asia; those of Ham, the southern quarter of the globe, particularly Africa; and the Shemites, the countries of Central Asia, particularly those around the Euphrates. In accordance with this, a tradition has long and extensively prevailed throughout the East, particularly amongst the Arabs and Persians, that Noah divided the earth among his three sons. But as this tradition rests upon no express authority of Scripture, the presumption is that it arose from some confused recollection or interpretation of Noah's prophecy mentioned in Genesis 9:25-27. "It has often been asserted," says Hengstenberg, "that the genealogical table in Genesis 10 cannot be from Moses, since so extended a knowledge of nations lies far beyond the geographical horizon of the Mosaic age. This hypothesis must now be considered as exploded. The new discoveries and investigations in Egypt have shown that they maintained even from the most ancient times a vigorous commerce with other nations, and sometimes with very distant nations. But not merely in general do the investigations in Egyptian antiquities favor the belief that Moses was the author of the account in this tenth chapter of Genesis. On the Egyptian monuments, those especially which represent the conquests of the ancient Pharaohs over foreign nations, not a few names have been found which correspond with those contained in the chapter before us. It must be allowed that far more still could be effected if our knowledge of hieroglyphics were not so very imperfect." Admitting Moses to have been the writer of the book of Genesis (as is established by well known internal and external evidences),

still there is no improbability in supposing that, in drawing up this genealogical table, he may have had access to the archives kept by the priests among the Egyptians, Phoenicians, and other surrounding nations. He was, we are informed, "learned in all the learning of the Egyptians;" and that this included historical and ethnographic knowledge appears from the fragmentary remains of Manetho, Sanchoniathon, and Berosus, and the testimony of Herodotus. For the sake of conciseness and perspicuity, this ancient ethnographic chart may be thrown into the following tabular form, along with the most probable explanations which the labors of the learned have enabled us to offer.

1. JAPHETITES.

I. GOMER — the Cimmerians on the north coast of the Black Sea. Their descendants were,

1. *Ashkenaz* — an unknown people, perhaps between Armenia and the Black Sea.

2. *Riphath* — the inhabitants of the Riphaean Mountains.

3. *Togarmahe*. — Armenia.

II. MAGOG — the inhabitants of the Caucasus and adjacent countries — Scythians.

III. MADAI — the Medes.

IV. JAVAN — the Ionians or Greeks. Their descendants were,

1. *Elisha* — the Hellenes, strictly so called.

2. *Tarshish* — Tartessus, in the south of Spain.

3. *Kittim* — the inhabitants of Cyprus and other Greek islands, with the Macedonians.

4. *Dodanim* — the Dodonaei, in Epirus, or perhaps the Rhodians.

V. TUBAL — the Tibareni, in Pontus.

VI. MESHECH — the Moschi (Muscovites?), in the Moschian Mountains, between Iberia, Armenia, and Colchis.

VII. TIRAS — the Thracians, or perhaps the dwellers on the River Tiras, the Dniester.

2. HAMITES.

I. CUSH — the Ethiopians. Gesenius thinks that all the nations enumerated in Genesis 10:7, as sprung from Cush, are to be sought in Africa. Their descendants were,

1. *Nimrod* — the first king of Shinar, i.e., Babylon and Meaopotamia, where he founded Babel, Erech, Calneh, and Accad.

2.*Seba* — Meroe.

3. *Havilah* — the Avalitae, dwelling on the Sinus Avalites, now Zeila, southward of the straits of Babel-Mandeb.

4. *Sabtah* — Sabata, situated on the coast of the Arabian Gulf, not far from the present Arkiko.

5. *Raamah* — Rhegma, in the south-east of Arabia, on the Persian Gulf. Descendants or colonies were,

A. *Sheba* — probably a tribe in the northern Arabian desert, near the Persian Gulf.

B. *Dedan* — Daden, an island in the Persian Gulf.

6. *Sabtechah* — the Zingitani, in the eastern parts of Ethiopia.

II. MISRAIM — the Egyptians. Their descendants were,

1. *Ludim*

2. *Anamim*, probably African tribes.

3. *Lehabin* or *Lubim* — the Libyans.

4. *Naphtuhi* — the inhabitants of the province of Nepltys, on the Lake of Sirbo, on the borders of Egypt and Asia.

5. *Pathrusim* — the inhabitants of the Egyptian canton of Pathures (Pathros).

6. *Casluhim* — the Colchians. Their descendants or colonies were,

A. *Philistim* — the Philistines.

B. *Caphtorim* — the Cretans.

III. PHUT — the Mauretanians.

IV. CANAAN — the inhabitants of the country so called, from Sidon to the south end of the Dead Sea. Their descendants were,

1. *Sidonians* — on the northern borders of Canaan or Phoenicia.

2. *Hethites* or *Hittites* — in the country of Hebron, south of Jerusalem.

3. *Jebusites* — in and around Jerusalem.

4. *Amorites* — on the east and west side of the Dead Sea.

5. *Girgasites* — south-east of the Sea of Galilee.

6. *Hivites* — at the foot of Helmon and Antilibanus.

7. *Arkites* — in the city of Area, in Phosnicia.

8. *Sinites* — in the country of Lebanon.

9. *Arvadites* — on the Phoenician island of Aradus, and the opposite coast.

10. *Zemarites* — the inhabitants of the Phoenician town of Simyra.

11. *Hamathites* — the inhabitants of the Syrian town of Epiphania, on the Orontes.

3. SHEMITES.

I. ELAM — the Persians, particularly of the province of Elymais.

II. ASSHUER — the Assyrians, founders of Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calneh, and Resen.

III. ARPHAXAD — the inhabitants of the northern point of Assyria (Arrapachitis). A descendant was

Salah; from whom came

Eber, progenitor of the Hebrews; and from him,

A. *Peleg*, and

B. *Joktan*, called by the Arabians *Kachtan*, ancestor of the following Arab tribes:

1. *Almodad* — in Southern Arabia.

2. *Sheleph* — the Selapenes, in Nejd or Tellama, in Southern Arabia.

3. *Hazarmaveth* — the inhabitants of the Arabian province of Hhadramaumt.

4. *Jerah* — the inhabitants of the Mountain of the Moon (Jebel or Gobb el-Kamar), near Hhadramaut.

5. *Hadoram* — probably the Atramitse, on the southern coast of Arabia.

6. *Uzal* — the inhabitants of the country of Sanaa, in South ern Arabia.

7. *Diklah* — probably the district of the MinEei, in Arabia.

8. *Obal* — unknown.

9. *Abimael* — the Mali, in the vicinity of Mecca.

10. *Sheba* — the Sabeans, in Southern Arabia.

11. *Ophir* — the inhabitants of El-Ophir, in the Arabian province of Oman.

12. *Havilal* — the Chaulotai, dwelling on the Persian Gulf.

13. *Jobab* — the Jobabites, on the Gulf of Salachitis, between Hadramaut and Oman.

IV. LUD — probably the Lydians in Asia Minor.

V. ARAM — the inhabitants of Syria and Mesopotamia. Their descendants were,

1. *Uz* — the inhabitants of a district in the north of Arabia Deserta.

2. *Huel* — perhaps the inhabitants of Caelo-Syria.

3. *Gether* — unknown.

4. *Mash* — the inhabitants of a part of the Gordiaean Mountains (Mons Masius), north of Nisibis.

SEE ETHNOLOGY.

Divorce, Jewish

(tWtyrK] *kerithuth'*, a cutting apart, <2488>Jeremiah 3:8; ἀποστάσιον, desertion or separation; both usually rendered "*divorcement*;" the verb is vrG; *garash'*, to expel, <0214>Leviticus 21:14; 22:13; <0409>Numbers 30:9; ἀπολύω, to dissolve or dismiss, <4052>Matthew 5:32), or repudiation (comp. *repudium*, *Sueton. Calig.* 36) of a wife or betrothed woman (see the tract Kiddushin, in the Mishna, 3:17; and the *Gemara Hieros.* Hebrews and Lat. in Ugolino, 30). There is great probability that divorces were used among the Hebrews before the law, since Christ says that Moses permitted them by reason only of the hardness of their hearts; that is to say, because they were accustomed to this abuse, and to prevent greater evils. Abraham dismissed Hagar, on account of her insolence, at the request of Sarah. We find no instance of a divorce in the books of the Old Testament written since Moses, though it is certain that the Hebrews separated from their wives on trifling occasions. Samson's father-in-law understood that, by his absence from her, his daughter was divorced, since he gave her to another (<0702>Judges 15:2). The Levite's wife, who was dishonored at Gibeah, had forsaken her husband, and would not have returned had he not gone in pursuit of her (<0702>Judges 19:2, 3). Solomon speaks of a libertine woman who had quitted her husband, the director of her youth, and had forgotten the covenant of her God (<2002>Proverbs 2:16, 17). The prophet Malachi (<3002>Malachi 2:15) commends Abraham for not divorcing Sarah, though barren; and inveighs against the Jews, who had abandoned "the wives of their youth." Micah also (<3002>Micah 2:9) reproaches them with having "cast out their wives from their pleasant houses, and taken away the glory of God from their children forever." As the Hebrews paid a stipulated price for the privilege of marrying (in the shape of dower presents), they seemed to consider it the natural consequence of making a payment of that kind that they should be at liberty to exercise a very arbitrary power over their wives, and to renounce or divorce them whenever they chose. This state of things was not equitable as regarded the women, and was very often injurious to both parties. Finding himself unable, however, to overrule

feelings and practices of very ancient standing, Moses, in his declaration of the law, merely annexed to the original institution of marriage a very serious admonition to this effect: that it would be less criminal for a man to desert his father and mother than, without adequate cause, to desert his wife (<01224>Genesis 2:24). He also laid a restriction upon the power of the husband so far as this, that he would not permit him to repudiate his wife without giving her a bill of divorce, in which were set forth the date, place, and cause of her repudiation, and a permission was given by it to marry whom she pleased. He further enacted that the husband might receive the repudiated wife back in case she had not in the mean while been married to another person; but if she had been thus married, she could never afterwards become the wife of her first husband — a law which the faith due to the second husband clearly required (<05240>Deuteronomy 24:1-4; <24301>Jeremiah 3:1; <40119>Matthew 1:19; 19:8). Ezra and Nehemiah obliged a great number of the Jews to dismiss the foreign women, whom they had married contrary to the law (<15011>Ezra 10:11; 12:19). As Christ has limited the permission of divorce to the single case of adultery, he denied the equity of the Mosaic statute; and in justification of Moses maintained that he permitted divorces for causes below adultery only for prudential reasons for the time being. Nor was this limitation by Christ unnecessary, for at that time it was common for the Jews to dissolve the union upon very slight and trivial pretences (<40531>Matthew 5:317 32; 19:1-9; <41002>Mark 10:2-12; <42168>Luke 16:18). As wives were considered the property of their husbands, they did not possess by the Mosaic statutes a reciprocal right, and were not at liberty to dissolve the matrimonial alliance by giving a bill of divorce to that effect. Josephus was of opinion (Ant. 15:11) that the law did not permit women to divorce themselves from their husbands He believes Salome, sister of Herod the Great, to he the first who put away her husband; though Herodias afterwards dismissed her, (*Ant*. 18:7). as did also the three sisters of the younger Agrippa, and others theirs. The following are largely Rabbinical regulations. *SEE ADULTERY*.

The Mosaic law regulating this subject is found in <05240>Deuteronomy 24:1-4, and the cases in which the right of a husband to divorce his wife was lost are stated 22:19, 29. The ground of divorce was what the text calls rb;D; tw ir][, (lit. *nudity of a word or thing*, i.e., anything filthy, some shameful act or circumstance, as in <05234>Deuteronomy 23:14), "some uncleanness" (<05240>Deuteronomy 24:1), on the meaning of which the Jewish doctors of the period of the N.T. widely differed, the school of Shammal seeming to

limit it to a moral delinquency in the woman, while that of Hillel extended it to trifling causes ("for every cause," Matthew 19:3; as among the Druses, Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1:329), e.g. if the wife burnt the food she was cooking for her husband or merely over-salted it (Mishna, *Gittin*, 9:16). Rabbi Akibah allows divorce if the husband merely saw a wife whose appearance pleased him better (see Otho, *Lex. Rabb*. page 502 sq.). The Pharisees wished, perhaps, to embroil our Savior with these rival schools by their question (Matthew 19:3); by his answer to which as well as by his previous maxim (verse 31), he declares that, but for their hardened state of heart, such questions would have no place. Yet, from the distinction made, "But I say unto you" (verses 31, 32), it seems to follow that he regarded all the lesser causes than "I fornication" as standing on too weak ground, and declined the question as to the interpretation of the words of Moses (see Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*, page 220 sq.). We may conjecture that the Mosaic statute had reference to doubts of his bride's virginity, or of his wife a modesty and fidelity, on the part of the husband, although he might not be able to bring a definite charge of unchastity. It would be unreasonable to suppose that by rbD; twir][, to which he limited the remedy of divorce, Moses meant "fornication," i.e., adultery, for that would have been to stultify the law "that such should be stoned" (John 8:5; Leviticus 20:10). The practical difficulty, however, which attends on the doubt which is now found in interpreting Moses's words will be lessened if we consider that the mere giving "a bill" (or, rather, "book," rpse, βιβλίον, Talm. fGe or hfyGe) "of divorcement" (comp. Isaiah 1, 1; Jeremiah 3:8), would in ancient times require the intervention of a Levite, not only to secure the formal correctness of the instrument, but because the art of writing was then generally unknown. This would bring the matter under the cognizance of legal authority, and tend to check the rash exercise of the right by the husband. Traditional opinion and prescriptive practice would probably fix the standard of the hwr][, and doubtless, with the lax general morality which marks the decline of the Jewish polity, that standard would be lowered (Malachi 2:14-16). Thus the Gemar. Babyl. *Gittin*, 9 (ap. Selden, *De ux. Heb.* 3:17) allows divorce for a wife's spinning in public, or going out with head uncovered, or clothes so torn as not properly to conceal her person from sight. But the absence of any case in point in the period which lay nearest to the lawgiver himself, or in any, savae a much more recent one, makes the whole question one of great uncertainty. The case of Phalti and Michal is not in

point, being merely an example of one arbitrary act redressed by another (<01534>1 Samuel 25:44; comp. <10314>2 Samuel 3:14-16). Selden, quoting (*De ux. Flab.* 3:19) Zohar, *Praef.* page 8, b, etc. speaks of an alleged custom of the husband, when going to war, giving the wife the *libellus divortii*; but the authority is of slight value, and the fact improbable. It is contrary to all known Oriental usage to suppose that the right of quitting their husband and/choosing another was allowed to women (Josephus, *Ant*. 15:7, 10). Salome is noted (ibid.) as the first example of it — one, no doubt, derived from the growing prevalence of heathen laxity (see Wachsmuth, Hellek. Alterthum. iii, 208). Hence also, prob. ably, the caution given <46710>1 Corinthians 7:10. Those are surely mistaken who suppose that a man might take back a remarried wife whom he had divoiced, except in the cases when her second husband had died, or had divorced her. Such resumption is contemplated by the lawgiver as only possible in those two cases, and therefore is in them only expressly forbidden (<24301>Jeremiah 3:1). The divorces of Gentile wives ordered by Nehemiah (<15101>Ezra 10:11; 12:19) rested on entirely different grounds. For the view taken among later Jews on this subject, see Joseph. *Ant.* 4:8, 23; 16:7, 3; *Life*, 76, a writer whose practice seems to have been in accordance with the views of Hillel. On the general subject, Buxtorf, *de Spionsal. et Dicort.* p. 82-85; Selden, *Uxor. Hebr.* 3:17 sq.; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, 2:336; and Danz, in Menschen's *N.T. Talm.* Page 677 sq., may be consulted. For the Greek and Roman usages on the subject, see Smith's *Dictitonary of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Divortium, Apodeipseos Dike. Monographs have been written on the passage in Deuteronomy by Winkler (*Unters. schwerer Schriftstellen*, 2:26 sq.); also on the passage in Matthew by Venema (in his *Dissertt. sacr.* ed. 2, append.); Wolff, *De divortio Judeorum* (Lips. 1739); Schindler, *Quaedam de matrimonio* (Liegn. 1795); Hommelhosius, *Utrum divortium jure* (Jen. n.d.). *SEE MARRIAGE*.

Divorce, Christian Law Of.

Under the term divorce are included several separations of married persons which are quite unlike one another. First, they may have been joined in unlawful wedlock, as when near relationship, was a bar to their union, and the law, on ascertaining this fact, declares that they never were legally married. Such was the case where Henry VIII of England was separated from his first wife by an ecclesiastical court, and was permitted to marry again; or, as it would be more proper to say, was declared never to have

been married at all. Cases of this kind are properly not divorces, but annulments of marriage; or declarations of the nullity of the marriage. They occur in all societies, and against them the precepts of Christ are not directed. Only it is a sin of legislation, and a snare to men, if the obstacles to marriage are, as they are in Catholic countries, made too numerous. Secondly, there are separations of persons lawfully married which involve the impossibility for either of them to marry again during the life of the other. These are often called divorces or separations as mensa et thoro, and sometimes separations merely. Finally, there are divorces proper, or separations *a vinsculo matrimonii,* dissolutions of a marriage originally lawful, with liberty given to one or both parties to contract a new marriage. It is these two last kinds of divorce to which we shall confine ourselves in the present article.

At the time when Christ appeared in the world a very great laxity of divorce prevailed in the nations which have had the greatest influence on the progress of mankind. Among the Jews, as has been seen above, the husband could repudiate his wife for any reason which rendered her society distasteful to him, and was only required by the law to give her a formal notice to withdraw from his house. The wife, it is true, had no such liberty, and yet ladies of the higher classes among the Jews were beginning to act as if they had. Among the Greeks and Romans, both husband and wife had almost unrestricted power of divorce in their hands; not only could they separate by mutual agreement, but either party could loose the marriage bond with little or no formality. Among the Romans, originally severe in observing the laws of family morality, there had been a gradual declension through several centuries until the days of Christ. At that time the emperor Augustus attempted by a system of laws to put a stop to the alarming neglect of marriage, to the freedom of divorce in certain respects, and to the frequency of adultery. Loss of more or less dower, or obligation to pay it back, fell on the culpable author of the divorce, and severe penalties were inflicted on an adulterous wife and her paramour. But Roman manners were too corrupt to be made better by the leges Julice relating to these points. The higher classes practiced divorce and committed adultery almost ad libitum, and the lower lived to a considerable extent in concubinage. The evil remained uncured. The emperor Septimius Severus, as Dion Cassius says (lib. 66, § 16), who had the records in his hands, and was consul under this sovereign, instituted three thousand prosecutions for

adultery at the beginning of his reign; but manners were too strong for law, and it all went for nothing.

Meanwhile the commands of Christ in relation to divorce were a slowly-working leaven, thrown into his Church to keep it pure, and, through the Church, destined, more or less, to influence legislation, and to aid those other influences by which the Gospel sought to ennoble family life. These precepts of the Master are contained in <4005>Matthew 5:31, 32; 19:3-10; <4102>Mark 10:2-12, and <4268>Luke 16:18, to which the teaching of Paul in <4607>1 Corinthians 7:10-15, is to be united as an important supplement. We propose to give the substance of the instructions in the New Testament concerning divorce under several heads, but have not space to defend our positions as fully as we could wish.

1. The liberty given to a man by the Mosaic law to put away his wife "because he found some uncleanness" or something offensive in her (<5524>Deuteronomy 24:1) was an accommodation to the hardness of the Jewish heart, and did not harmonize with the original declarations concerning the nature of marriage.

2. He, therefore, who puts away his wife, except on the ground of her fornication, and marries another, commits adultery (<4009>Matthew 19:9), and he who thus puts her away leads her to commit the same crime (<4005>Matthew 5:32).

3. He who marries a woman that has been divorced commits adultery, and the woman who puts away her husband and marries another man (<4102>Mark 10:12) incurs the same kind of guilt, which is a precept that seems to look beyond the Mosaic code, under which no liberty of initiating divorce was conceded to Jewish women, to the practices of heathen lands. We may observe in regard to these passages, first, that Mark and Luke do not record the exception preserved in Matthew, "excepting for the cause of fornication," but the plain reconciliation of the passages must be found in the principle that an exception in a fuller document must explain a briefer one, if this can be done without force. Now, as divorce for that one reason was admitted by all, Mark land Luke might naturally take this for granted without expressing it. Secondly, by fornication is intended a sexual crime since the beginning of the marriage state committed by either of the parties with a third person, i.e., adultery begun or completed. And the exceedingly rare crime of sodomy, or bestiality, as the greater, may be fairly included in

the less, adultery. Again, thirdly, the exception is the sole exception. It cannot be said with any honesty that Christ, in saying "except it be for fornication," gives a sample of the causes which may dissolve the marriage union, as one of many which put an end to the state beautifully called one flesh. Plainly but one cause of separation with remarriage is in his thoughts, and that is one in its outward nature and grossness distinct from all others. Nor again, fourthly, can it be said that these precepts were intended to govern individual action, but that, where the law of the state permitted, the individual, acting under public law, might exercise the right of divorce for other reasons. For Christ set aside Jewish law. He says, let not man put asunder, i.e., not the individual man, but man as opposed to God, who established the primeval law of marriage. He gives a rule to his followers, who must follow it, whether the State allows larger liberty or not. Christians may live in a State which feels no obligation to conform its law to Christ's views in this respect, but they will, if they have influence, necessarily change legislation regarded by them as injuring society like that which opens a wide path for divorce.

We come now to the supplemental precepts of Paul, who had to guide churches gathered amid the heathen, infected by heathenish views of marriage, some of whose members, by their conversion, were brought into the trying condition of having heathen partners. The apostle contemplates two cases: the first where both partners are believers, the other where one is not (1 Corinthians 7). In the former case he repeats the Lord's rule against separation, with the additional injunction that if a woman should be separated from her husband, she must remain unmarried, or be reconciled to him. Here, then, the possibility of separation *a mensa et thoro* alone, without liberty of remarriage, is contemplated; and this passage has had a vast influence on ecclesiastical legislation. Most interpreters suppose that the apostle here is thinking of withdrawal from the marriage union for comparatively slight grounds, such as do not involve unfaithfulness — and this view alone seems to reconcile what Christ says with the supplementary precepts of Paul — but Augustine strives, with great pains and ingenuity (de conjugiis adulteriis), to show that divorce for adultery is intended, and applies the interpretation to our Lord's words. Hence adultery can be condoned by the innocent partner, and can only involve separation, without liberty to either party to enter into second nuptials. This view became prevalent, and had a great effect on subsequent opinion. In the other case, where one of the partners is an unbeliever, the apostle enjoins on the

believer to be passive, to take no active steps for the purpose of dissolving the marriage because it is a union with a heathen, for it is a marriage after all. If the unbeliever wishes to retain the tie, the believer must not leave him or her. But if the unbeliever depart, "let him depart." A Christian "is not in bondage" in circumstances like these. Here the question arises, What does "not in bondage" mean? The fathers, at least to some extent, the Catholic and older Protestant interpreters, understood it to mean not in bondage to keep up the marriage connection, and hence at liberty to contract a new one. This interpretation has had wide effects. In the canonical law a believing partner was allowed, if thrust away by an infidel one, to marry again; and as the early Protestant theologians extended the rule, by analogy, to malicious desertion in Christian lands, an entrance-wedge was here driven into the older ecclesiastical laws, and much of the shocking facility of divorce in some Protestant countries has flowed from this source. But we reject the interpretation. We hold with Tholuck (Bergpred. ed. 4, page 253), with Neander, De Wette, Meyer, and Stanley (commentaries on 1 Corinthians), that the apostle means "not in bondage" to keep company with the unbeliever at all events, without having the thought of remarriage in his mind. This must be regarded, we think, as settled by the soundest modern exegesis.

Roman law adhered, on the whole, to its fatal facility of granting divorces for very slight reasons so long as the Western empire lasted; and even the Eastern empire, after it became Christian, did not move wholly in a new track. Meanwhile, opinion within the Church, and ecclesiastical law, took an opposite course. Owing to the interpretations of Scripture mentioned above, to new views of the sanctity of marriage, and at length to the developed doctrine of the sacrament of marriage, divorce with remarriage was excluded from Christian practice, with the single very rare exception of the case where an infidel or a Jew had deserted a believer; and separation *a mensa et thoro* remained as the only kind of divorce permissible. The law of all Christian states in the West until the Reformation, and of Roman Catholic states since, has been shaped by canon law, which knows no divorce with remarriage even for the cause of adultery. After the Reformation, when the Protestants had abandoned the doctrine of the sacramental character of marriage, and the Protestant interpreters generally held that malicious desertion, according to the apostle Paul, released the innocent party from the marriage bond altogether, many ecclesiastical ordinances in Protestant Germany permitted

divorce with remarriage on this account, as well as in cases of adultery. Thus the Geneva "*ordonnances ecclusiastiques*" of 1541 declare that "if any one maketh a business of abandoning his wife to stroll through the country, and continueth unamended, it be provided that the wife be no longer bound to such a man, who will keep neither faith with her nor company." And in the ordinance of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen for 1581 it is said that divorce shall be granted only for the two reasons which Christ and Paul in the Gospel declare to be sufficient, of which the second is "malicious desertion, running away, and abandonment, whereof St. Paul speaketh, 1 Corinthians 7." Still another ordinance, that of Lower Saxony of 1585, says that "whatever other grounds besides these two (adultery and desertion) are alleged by certain emperors, as Theodosius, Valentinian, Leo, Justinian, cannot be sufficient for divorce." Some few, it is true, of the earlier Church regulations limit divorce to cases of adultery, but a few others extend its operation beyond the two grounds already mentioned. The Prussian consistorial ordinance of 1584 permits it in cases of plotting to take the life of a consort. A Zurich ordinance of 1525 goes further still, so much so as to desert the principles of Scripture entirely. Not only does it allow divorce in cases of adultery, desertion, and attempt on life, but considers these as examples, and leaves it to the judge to decide what other grounds he will add to them, among which it mentions as possible cases not only cruelty, but insanity and eruptive disease, as leprosy. For the most part only adultery and desertion were, through the 17th and into the 18th century; held to be valid grounds for divorce. But in more recent times the civil law of some German states goes far beyond these limits. We confine ourselves to the Prussian code, where plotting against the life of a consort, grave transgressions against third persons, cruelty, refusal of connubial duties, insanity, impotence, or other incurable bodily disease commencing after marriage, incompatibility of temper and permanent variance, mutual consent without discord when the marriage is childless, are allowed to put an end to the marriage tie. The laws in Baden, and for non-Romanists in Austria, come near to these. It is impossible not to see in such legislation a disregard of the religious character of marriage, a tendency to look at it on the outside and as a civil contract, to consider it as a means to gain certain earthly ends. It has forgotten the religious side of life, and thus falls under the influence of Roman law, and looks at purely secular results.

An important chapter in the modern history of divorce would treat of French legislation on that subject. A law passed September 20, 1792, at the

opening of the National Convention, overthrew the ancient law which followed the Roman Catholic doctrine of marriage, and opened the way for divorce on three grounds. These are, 1, mutual consent; 2, incompatibility of temper on complaint of either consort; 3, certain determinate causes or motives derived from the condition or conduct of either of the married parties, viz. derangement of reason, condemnation to an infamous crime, crimes, cruelties, or grave injuries committed by either party against the other, notorious licentiousness of morals, desertion for at least two years, absence for at least five without sending news, and emigration from France in certain cases, which was naturally a temporary provision. Separation of body, or *a mensa et thoro*, was thereafter to be abolished. The divorced parties could marry one another *de novo*, and could marry other persons after certain short intervals. To a good degree, these enactments follow the Roman law, but one peculiarity of this statute was that the family relatives were to act in the first instance as a kind of court of conciliation, when the parties, or one of them, desired divorce without allegation of crime. Divorces were now exceedingly frequent in France, but became much more easy after the acts of 1793 and 1794, permitting a man to marry at once, and a woman ten months after divorce was granted; and, what was far worse, making separation in fact of a married pair for six months cause for pronouncing them divorced without delay, if one of them demanded it. These laws belong to the worst times of the Revolution, and were suspended in August, 1795. The original law of 1792 gave place in 1803 to the new divorce law of the Code Civil, or Code Napoleon, which continued in force until the restoration of the Bourbons. The divorce law of the Code, although, in the main, agreeing with the law of 1792 on the causes of divorce, does away with its family council, restores for the sake of Catholics the separation *a mensa et thor* — which, however, may afterward be converted into a full divorce on the demand of the innocent married partner — provides for the punishment of the unfaithful wife, and in its minute, tedious processes in the preparatory steps, seems intended to make the obtaining of divorces by mutual consent, and on the ground of incompatibility of temper, very difficult, as well as to leave room for change of mind. Moreover, the limits within which divorce by mutual consent are confined is an observable step in the right direction. The courts, and several distinguished lawyers who were consulted on the articles of the Code, were against granting divorce for incompatibility of temper, i.e., on the ground of mutual consent in any cases, but they could not carry their point. After the restoration of the Bourbons, this title of the

Code was abrogated, and France returned to the old system, to which it has adhered, if we are not mistaken, until the present time.

In England, until after the Reformation, divorce on sentence of nullity, and divorce a mensa et thoro on the ground of adultery, were within the cognizance of the ecclesiastical court, and no divorce a vinculo was known to the law. Henry VIII was separated from Catharine by the ecclesiastical court on the plea that a marriage with a brother's wife was *void ab initio*, and therefore no marriage; Anna Boleyn and Catharine Howard were convicted of adultery, and executed on attainder of treason; and Anne of Cleves was only nominally married. There was a project under Edward VI to allow the innocent party, after sentence of divorce, to marry again, but it was never sanctioned. Still, since many, especially among the more puritanical clergy and laity, held such marriage to be lawful, it was more or less practiced. Men divorced on sentence of a court from adulterous wives sometimes married again (although the marriage was null and void), because there was no civil law to forbid it. In the first year of James I a statute made remarriage in the lifetime of a former husband or wife a felony, yet with the provision that the act should not extend to persons divorced or to be divorced by sentence of an ecclesiastical court. The matter was still at loose ends, but several canons were passed in the same year with the intention of putting a stop to the practice, by one of which it was ordained that a sentence of divorce should not be pronounced until the parties should have given sufficient security to the court that they would not, each during the other's life, contract matrimony with any other person. This canon was violated in a most scandalous way in 1605, soon after its enactment, when lady Rich, after being divorced from her husband on the ground of her adultery, was, married to her paramour, baron Mountjoy, afterwards duke of Devonshire, by his chaplain, Laud, who afterwards professed to repent of it. From the time of James, and, indeed, since the Reformation, only a special act of Parliament could authorize divorce a vinculo until the passage of a new general act in 1857. By this act a new court is established, having exclusive jurisdiction in cases of marriage, with the power of issuing sentences of separation — equivalent to divorce *a mensa et thoro* — which may be obtained either by the husband or the wife on the ground of adultery, or cruelty or desertion without cause for two years and upwards; and with the power of dissolving marriage in cases of adultery. But the two parties are not exactly on a level with respect to their crime. On the wife's part, simple adultery can have this effect, or the

husband's "incestuous adultery, bigamy with adultery, rape, sodomy, or bestiality, or adultery coupled with such cruelty as, without adultery, would have entitled her to a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, or adultery coupled with desertion for two years and upwards." In the case of separation, the court can restore the parties, on their consent and petition, to the exercise of conjugal rights. In the case of dissolution, after final decision on appeal to the House of Lords, if such appeal should be made, the parties are allowed to marry again, both the innocent and the guilty party, the latter, so far as appears, to the partner in crime — a provision, in our judgment, much to be condemned. Nor is there any civil penalty for adultery. The innocent husband may, as before this act, get damages from the offenders, but the former action for criminal conversation is to cease. We forbear to go further into the act, only adding that collusion, condonation of adultery, adultery, cruelty, or desertion, on the part of the petitioning party, and unreasonable delay in presenting the petition for dissolution of marriage, free the-court from the obligation to pronounce a decree of dissolution.

In the United States, the divorce laws, in different states, run along from the strictness of English law almost to the looseness of that of Rome and revolutionary France. The tendency is towards increased looseness, as is shown by the revised laws of the older states, and the laws of some of the new states. Of looser legislation, Connecticut and Indiana furnish examples. We confine ourselves to the legislation of the former state. The colonial laws allowed the court to grant divorce for adultery, fraudulent contract, willful desertion for three years, or seven years providential absence without being heard of after due inquiry made and certified, and in all these cases the aggrieved party might marry again. This legislation remained almost unchanged for nearly two hundred years, yet not without strong remonstrances on the part of some of the clergy, who complained more especially of the loose administration of the law by the courts. In 1843 two new causes of divorce were added to the old, namely, "habitual intemperance" and "intolerable cruelty;" and five or six years afterwards the legislation on this subject reached its climax by the further addition to the causes of divorce of "imprisonment for life," "infamous crime," and any such "misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner, and defeats the purposes of the marriage relation." Now first a vague subjective indeterminate cause was added to the determinate causes of former legislation, and the looseness in hearing and determining cases of divorce is so great that the worst legislation of the French Revolution

could not be much more opposed to the true interests of society. The law knows no separation *a mensa et thoro*, allows immediate remarriage, does not forbid an adulterer or adulteress to be united after divorce to a partner in guilt, nor divorced persons to be remarried to one another. Divorces have, as might be expected, greatly increased with the new legislation, especially since the omnibus clause. as it is called, was annexed to the law. In one year, according to a recent report, they bore to marriages the ratio of one to eleven. Now, as nearly one seventh of the population are Roman Catholics, who rarely apply for divorces, and as in a certain grade of society, embracing perhaps half the people, divorces are almost unknown, it may, we think, be safely said that one quarter or one fifth of the marriages of each year, in the lower stratum of Protestant society, if we may so call it, are dissolved by act of the courts. Without question, the family life and morals of a community once most religious, and even now retaining much of steady habit, must be gradually undermined and poisoned by such a social evil (see H. Loomis, "*Divorce Legislation in Connecticut*," New Englander, July, 1866).

Our limits preclude us from adding more than a word or two in regard to the right legislation on this subject, and the duty of the Church when cases of divorce come before those to whom its discipline is intrusted.

1. A Christian legislator will strive to realize in law what he conceives to be the true conception of marriage, and the law of Christ in the Gospel. Only on this subject does Christ legislate; here he sets aside the law of Moses, and this he does in regard to an institution of life concerning which the law must speak. If the Christian legislator does not carry out Christ's principles in regard to divorce, it will be not because they are moral rather than jural, but because "the hardness of men's hearts" prevents the introduction of a perfect rule. He will consent with a good conscience to a less perfect law, for the law of divorce *permits*, and does not require, so that it need bring no Christian man into disobedience to the Gospel.

2. Among the outlines of good legislation in regard to divorce, we suggest the following: the recognition of the two kinds of divorce, mere separation and that *a vinculo*, with the reservation of the latter for graver crimes of one party against the other; punishment of the offending party by imprisonment, or deprivation of alimony, or both; prohibition of speedy marriage when it is allowed, of all marriage between one of the parties and a partner in guilt, of all remarriage after full divorce on the ground of

adultery; a careful, deliberate process, perhaps before a special court, leaving room for reconciliation, preventing collusion as far as possible, and making it no slight matter to dissolve the relation.

3. When the state law is not accordant with the law of Christ as commonly received in the churches, what is their duty? One thing is clear, that a clergyman ought not to be compelled to unite in marriage to a new wife or husband a person whom he considers to be unlawfully divorced. The English law expressly relieves the ministers of the Established Church from this necessity; the Prussian, if we are not misinformed, is harsh and intolerant in this respect; the French law requires a civil marriage, and leaves it to the consciences of parties and of clergymen to go through with the religious ceremonies or not, as they see fit. On the other hand, no clergyman can with a good conscience join in marriage those whom Christ's law, according to his interpretation of it, keeps apart, as, for instance, a woman, separated from her husband for incompatibility of temper, and another man. They are not those whom God has joined together, and the woman man has unlawfully parted from her husband, so that she commits adultery in her new marriage. Again, there are questions of discipline growing out of divorces, as when a member of the Church contracts a marriage not forbidden by state law, but forbidden by Christ. Here the rule is tolerably clear. Christ's law must be maintained, whatever the state requires or allows, and maintained in this case by discipline. Only thus can the Church be a witness on the side of Christian morality. Only thus can it guard the sanctities of family life. There is no more reason for omitting discipline for unlawful divorce permitted by the state than for drunkenness, if no state law exists against this sin. But there are cases of another sort which present serious difficulty, as when a person, having violated Christ's rule of divorce in contracting marriage, becomes a sincere Christian years afterwards, and desires to unite with the Church. Shall such a person be required to separate from his or her consort before being received into communion? The act would not have been committed with the present disposition, and state law tempted to its performance. We think that in such a case as this, at least in extreme cases of this kind, the communion may be opened to a penitent without conditions.

Diz'ahab

(Hebrews Di-Zahab', bhz;yD][see below]), a place in the desert of Sinai, one of the boundary points of the "Arabah," or region where the Israelites

wandered (Deuteronomy 1:1). It is probably the same cape now called Dahab (Robinson, *Res.* 1:217; 2:600), on the western shore of the Elanitic Gulf (Schwarz, *Palest.* page 212), about opposite Sinai; it abounds in palms, and has traces of ruins (Burckhardt, *Syria*, page 523). Wilson, however, doubts the identification (*Lands of Bible*, 1:235 n.). *SEE WILDERNESS*. The name is indicative of the presence of gold there, as that is the meaning of the latter half of the word (so Sept. Καταχρύσεα, Vulg. ubi auri est plurimum); but the former part of the name is foreign, either with the Aramaean expletive = of (literally "that which is"), or from the Arabic = l [Bj "lord," i.e., possessor of (Gesenius, *Thes.* page 334). With this import also agrees the description of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Κατὰ τὰ χρύσεα, Cata Ta Chrysea), that the mountains in that region (in *Phaeno*, according to the true reading; see Le Clere in Bonfrere's ed.) are full of gold veins; also the modern name, which is in full Minah el-Dahab, "the porch of gold" (Büsching, *Erdbeschr.* XI, 1:621).

Doane, George Washington, D.D., Ll.D.,

Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of New Jersey, was born in Trenton, N.J., in 1799. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, at nineteen years old, and then commenced the study of theology. He was ordained deacon by bishop Hobart in 1821, and priest in 1823. He served in Trinity church, New York, three years, and in 1824 was appointed professor of belles-lettres and oratory in Washington College, Connecticut. He resigned that office in 1828, and soon after was elected rector of Trinity church, in Boston. He was consecrated bishop of the diocese of New Jersey on October 31, 1832. He founded St. Mary's Hall in 1827, and Burlington College in 1846, both of which institutions remain flourishing. His career as a bishop was one of indefatigable industry and devotion. "I look back," says the bishop of Missouri, "upon the work he accomplished during his episcopate with amazement. The work of three lives was crowded into a bishopric of twenty years." The clergy of his diocese increased in that time from 18 to 99; its parishes from 30 to 84; 58 churches were consecrated, and the number of communicants increased from 657 to 5000. His energy, however, was greater than his judgment, and his career was not without acts of imprudence, which caused him great trouble. His literary industry was very great, and he had a genuine vein of poetry. His writings, in prose and verse, are gathered in *The Life and Writings of G.W. Doane, D.D.*, edited by his son (New York, 1860, 4

volumes, 8vo), of which volume 1 contains a memoir and his poetical writings; volumes 2 and 3 consist of sermons and episcopal charges; volume 4 of educational writings and orations. Bishop Doane died at Riverside, N.J., April 27, 1859. — *American Quart. Church Review*, October, 1859, and April, 1861.

Dob

SEE BEAR.

Dober, Leonhard Johann,

a Moravian missionary, was born in 1706 at Münchsroth. He went to Herrnhut in 1725, and in 1732 was sent as first Moravian missionary to the negroes of St. Thomas. He returned in 1735; became general elder of the congregation; labored for some time for the conversion of the Jews in Amsterdam; and in 1741 resigned his office as general elder, which at the London Conference of September 16,1741, was transferred to Christ himself. In 1747 he became bishop of the Moravians. He died in 1766. He is the author of many hymns in the Moravian Hymn-book.

Dobmayer, Marian

a German Jesuit and theologian, was born at Schwandorf, Oberpfalz, October 24, 1753, entered the Jesuit order, and on its suppression in 1773 became a Benedictine. In 1778 he was ordained priest, and in 1781 he became professor at the Lyceum of Neuberg; in 1794 professor of theology at Ingolstadt. In 1799 he returned to the Benedictine monastery at Weissenohe, and thence went to Amberg as professor of theology, in which office he died, December 21, 1803. His chief works are his Conspectus Theologice Dogmatica (Amberg, 1789): — Systema Theologice Catholicce (posthumous; 1807-1819, 8 volumes, 8vo), of which an abridgment was published in 1823, edited by Professor Salomon of Regensburg. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:186.

Dobritzhoffer, Martin,

a Jesuit missionary, was born at Gratz, in Styria, in 1717. He was admitted to the Society of Jesus in 1736, and was sent in 1749 as missionary to Paraguay, where he spent eighteen years among the Abipones and Guaranas, when, on the expulsion of the Jesuit missionaries from Spanish South America in 1767, he was compelled to return to Europe. In 1784 he

published *Historia de Abiponibus, equestri bellicosaque Paraguariae Natione* (Vienna, 3 volumes, 8vo, 1783-84). It is very ample and minute, but, though it contains many curious and interesting facts, abounds in extravagant statements. Dobritzhoffer's book was a favorite with Southey, and at his suggestion Sara Coleridge translated it into English — *An Account of the Abipones, an equestrian People of Paraguay* (1822, 3 volumes, 8vo). It has also been translated into German. Dobritzhoffer died at Vienna in 1791. — *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 14:403.

Docetae

Docetism, which in the latter half of the second century took form in the sect of the Valentinians — so named after Valentinus — is, in fact, only a form of Gnosticism — a form, moreover, which played a most important part in the general movement of Gnosticism. Its prominent teachers, as Valentinus — a man of great depth, ingenuity, and power of imagination Cassianus, and Bardesanes, are reckoned among the Gnostics. How Docetism is to be distinguished from general Gnosticism is not easy to be stated in a brief article; the Church histories must be consulted on this point. The dualism of the Oriental philosophy, the elements of which were extensively embraced in all forms of Gnosticism, especially the view which held to the inherent evil of matter, rendered it impossible for the Gnostics to come to any right view of the union of the divine and human in Christ's person. In order to remove the author of all good from all contact with matter, which they conceived to be the same as evil, they called in the aid of Oriental philosophy in order to people the space between God and matter with a vast succession of superhuman beings as mediators between God and the world. These, emanating from the Deity, were called aeons; among these the highest rank was assigned to Christ. Here, however, they seem to have split. "Many imagined that Jesus was a mere man, and maintained that the aeon Christ descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism, and left him immediately before his crucifixion, so that Christ was not, in fact, subjected to pain and death; while others held that the body, with which Christ appeared to be invested, was not really human and passable, but unsubstantial or etherial, or, at least, immaterial: these last were called Docetae" (Waddington's *Hist. of the Church*, pages 74, 75). They denied the whole humanity of Christ, regarding it only as a deceptive show, a mere vision. This the sense of the Church could not bear. "They

who would make nothing but a spectre are themselves spectres — spectral men," is an expression ascribed to Ignatius. Tertullian says to the Docetae, "How is it that you make the half of Christ a lie? He was all truth." And again, "You are offended when the child is nourished and fondled in its swaddling-clothes. This reverence shown to nature you despise; and how were you born yourself? Christ, at least, loved man in this condition. For his sake he came down from above; for his sake he submitted to every sort of degradation-to death itself. In loving man he loved even his birth, even his flesh" (Neander, *Church Hist.* 2:369). Neander says: "One consequence of the disruption of the divine and the human by Gnosticism was Docetism, which altogether denied the real, humanly-sensuous side of Christ's life, and only acknowledged as real the revelation of the divine Being. Preparation for this view had been made among the Jewish theologians by the representation that it was one of the privileges of a superior spirit to appear in a variety of forms. Philo's explanation of the Angelophanies, and the Christology of the Clementine homilies, furnish evidence of this. According to that Docetic conception, the heavenly Being, whose nature is pure light, suddenly came forth as a sensuous apparition. All sensuousness is only an illusion practiced by the divine Genius. Hence the latter by no means attached himself to the Demiurgos; only an appearance of him descended into this world" (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, 1:194).

Docetism was a most subtle element, which wrought variously before it had any discernible concentration in any leading men or sects, and it infused its unreal and fantastic leaven into various Gnostic sects, and other later ones which grew out of Gnosticism. It was a deep, natural, rationalistic, pseudo-spiritualistic, anti-incarnation element. It was firmly set against the real union of the divine and human in Christ, and against all dogmas which depend upon the reality of the incarnation. Hagenbach says: "The Docete, whom Ignatius (*ad Eph. 7, 8, ad Smyrn*., c. 1-8) already opposed, and probably even the apostle John (1 John 1:1-3; 4:2 sq.; 2 John, 7) (on the question whether he alludes to them in his prologue to his gospel, see Licke, *in loc.*) may be considered as the forerunners of the Gnostics (Burton, *Bampton Lect.* page 158 sq.). They form the most decided contrast with the Ebionites, inasmuch as they not only maintain (in opposition to them) the divinity of Christ, but also merge his human nature, to which the Ebionites exclusively confined themselves, in a mere phantom (by denying that he possessed a real body). Ebionitism (Nazaritism) and Docetism form, according to Schleiermacher (*Glaubenslehre*, 1:124),

natural heresies, and complete each other, as far as this can be the case with one-sided opinions; but they quite as easily pass over from the one to the other (comp. Dorner, *Geschichte der Christologie*, page 349 sq.)" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1:48). The fathers were compelled to war with this subtle Docetism constantly, as it ever broke out in new places, and attacked the true Christian faith at most unexpected points. Even some of them, as Clement and Hilary, were temporarily ensnared by some of its subtleties. Docetism (the speculative view of Christ's person) reappears in modern times in the mythical and spiritualistic theories which "attempt to reduce Christianity to an aesthetic religion, in which no realities are necessary but such as the human mind can supply as ideas" (Martensen, *Dognmatics*, § 128). See Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, 1, § 71; Neander, Church History (Torrey's edit.), 1:386; 2:717; Hase, Church History, § 37; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. 1, volume 1.

Doch

SEE DOCUS.

Dochan

SEE MILLET.

Doctor

(διδάσκαλος), a teacher, as the terms both signify (<4Lu 2:46; 5:17; <4Ac 5:34). Anciently learned men among the Jews were denominated μk;j; chakam', sage, as among the Greeks they were called σόφος, wise. In the time of our Savior the common appellative for men of that description was νομοδιδάσκαλος, "teacher of the law," or νομικός, "lawyer," less exactly γραμματεύς; in the Hebrew rpes, *sopher'*, meaning "scribe." They were addressed by the honorary title of br; *Rab*, yBaæ; Rabbi, great, or master. The Jews, in imitation of the Greeks, had their seven wise men, who were called Rabboni (q.v.), of which number Gamaliel was one. They called themselves the children of wisdom, an expression which corresponds very nearly to the Greek φιλόσοφος, "philosopher" (<4Mt 11:19; <4Lu 7:35). The heads of sects were called fathers (<4Mt 12:27; Matthew 23:1-9), and the disciples, µydmeæT; *talmidim'*, were denominated sons or children. The Jewish teachers, at least

some of them, had private lecture-rooms, but they also taught and disputed in synagogues, in temples, and, in fact, wherever they could find an audience. The method of these teachers was the same with that which prevailed among the Greeks. Any disciple who chose might propose questions, upon which it was the duty of the teachers to remark and give their opinions (<4046>Luke 2:46). *SEE DISCIPLE*.

There is a difference of opinion as to what part of the Temple it was in which our Savior was found sitting with the doctors. There was no school in the Temple; but there was a synagogue, and several courts of council and judicature, including at this time the great Sanhedrim itself. It is very probable our Lord was offered a seat among them, from their being struck with admiration at the searching power of his questions, and the depth of knowledge which they displayed. But it is also possible that he might have sat on the floor with other young persons, while the doctors sat on raised benches, according to their custom. This was called sitting at their feet; and as the benches were often raised in a semicircle, those who sat or stood in the area might well be said to be "among" the doctors. *SEE JESUS*; *SEE TEMPLE*.

Teachers were not invested by any formal act of the Church or of the civil authority; they were self-constituted. They received no other salary than some voluntary present from the disciples, which was called τιμή, rendered "honor" (<5057>1 Timothy 5:17), and they acquired a subsistence chiefly by the exercise of some art or handicraft. *SEE TEACHER*. According to the Talmudists, they were bound to hold no conversation with women, and to refuse to sit at table with the lower class of people (<4011>Matthew 9:11; <4027>John 4:27). The subjects on which they taught were numerous and of no great interest, of which there are abundant proofs in the Talmud. *SEE SCHOOL*.

Doctors of the law, frequently mentioned in the New Testament, were chiefly of the sect of the Pharisees; but they are sometimes distinguished from that sect (<4057>Luke 5:17). *SEE LAWYER*.

In the schools that were established after the destruction of Jerusalem at Babylon and Tiberias, a sort of academical degree was conferred, the circumstances attending the conferring of which are thus stated by Maimonides.

(1.) The candidate for the degree was examined both in reference to his moral character and his literary acquirements.

(2.) Having undergone this examination with approbation, the disciple then ascended an elevated seat (see <42312>Matthew 23:2).

(3.) A writing tablet was presented to him, to signify that he should write down his acquisitions, since they might escape from hi memory, and, without being written down, be lost.

(4.) A key was presented to him, to signify that he might now open to others the treasures of knowledge (see <42152>Luke 11:52).

(5.) Hands were laid upon him; a custom derived from <042718>Numbers 27:18.

(6.) A certain power or authority was conferred upon him, probably to be exercised over his own disciples.

(7.) Finally, he was saluted in the school of Tiberias with the title of Rabbi, and in the school of Babylon with that of Master. *SEE RABBI*.

Doctor,

primarily a teacher.

1. The title Doctor of Theology (Doctor Theologiae) is the highest academical degree in theology. In England and America it is generally given under the title Doctor of Divinity (Doctor Divinitatis, abridged D.D.), or Doctor of Sacred Theology (S.T.D.).

2. The word was used at an early period as a general expression for a teacher of Christian doctrine, and later it was applied (before it became a special academical title) to men eminent for their knowledge in theology, and for their skill in teaching it. Pre-eminently the title Doctors of the Church (*doctores ecclesiae*), was given to four of the Greek fathers, viz. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom; and to three of the Latin, viz. Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. To a few great men among the scholastics it was given with an additional epithet to designate some special intellectual quality in gift; thus, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the following doctors of the Church were thus honored: Thomas Aquinas, Angelicus; Johannes Bonaventura, Seraphicus; Johannes Duns Scotus, Subtilis; Raimundus Lullus, Illuminatus; Alanus de Insulis (de l'Isle), Universalis; Durandus de S. Pourgain, Resolutissimus; Gregorius de

Rimini, Authenticus; Johannes Taulerus, Illuminatus; Johannes Gersonus, Christianissimus; Alexander Hales, Irrefragabilis; Roger Bacon, Admirabilis; William Occam, Singularis.

3. The academical degree of doctor seems to have arisen in the 12th century, *SEE DEGREE*, when Irnerius of Bologna has the credit of originating the ceremonial of investiture for the doctorate of laws. The University of Paris almost immediately followed in the footsteps of Bologna, the first reception of doctors having taken place in the year 1145, in favor of Peter Lombard and Gilbert de la Porree, the greatest theologians of the day. Subsequently to this period the emperors were accustomed to confer upon the universities the right of appointing doctors of laws by their authority and in their name. The example of the emperors was speedily followed by the popes, who conferred corresponding rights with reference to the canon law. From the 11th to the 13th century there seems reason to believe that, both in Italy and France, the terms master and doctor were pretty nearly synonymous. According to Spelman, the degree of doctor was not given in England until the time of king John, A.D. 1207.

4. In modern times, the title Doctor of Theology is conferred by universities and colleges, and also by the Pope. In France it is bestowed, after suitable examination, on any ecclesiastic who has taken the degree of doctor in a faculty of theology and in some university. In the faculty of theology in Paris, the time of necessary studies is seven years: two of philosophy; after which they commonly receive the cap of master of arts; three of theology, which lead to the degree of bachelor in theology; and two of licentiate, during which the bachelors are continually exercised in theses and argumentations upon the sacred Scriptures, the scholastic theology, and ecclesiastical history. After further examinations, the doctorate in full is conferred. In Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, the degree is now generally conferred as an honorary one (*honoris causa*), without examination, upon men having distinguished themselves as teachers of Christianity by writing or speech. In the universities of Oxford and Cambridge (England) the academical degree of doctor is still, however, given upon examination (formal, if not real) to masters of arts of eleven years' standing; in Cambridge, to masters of twelve years' standing, or to bachelors in divinity of five.

Doctors Commons

formerly the college of the doctors of civil law in London, wherein the Court of Admiralty and the principal ecclesiastical courts were held. It was founded by Dr. Henry Harvey, dean of the Arches, previous to which time the doctors had lived in Paternoster Row. The original building was burned in the great fire in 1666, when the doctors removed for a time to Exeter House. After some time the Commons was rebuilt, and the doctors returned to their former quarters. The courts which have been wont to hold their sittings at Doctors Commons are the Court of Arches, the Archdeacon's Court, the Prerogative Court, the Faculty Court, the Court of Delegates, and the Court of Admiralty. The Prerogative Court is now amalgamated in the Probate Court (q.v.), and the Court of Delegates (q.v.) is transferred to the judicial committee of the privy council. At the time when these courts were all in full operation, their times of session were regulated by terms, as in the courts of equity and common law, a certain day in the week being assigned to each court for hearing its causes. The Court of Arches, the Archdeacon's Court, the Faculty Court, and the Court of Admiralty, are now the only courts which continue to exercise their functions in this once famous spot. The Court of Arches (so called from having sat in Arcubus, or under the arches or bows of Bow Church, Cheapside) is the court of-appeal belonging to the archbishop of Canterbury. The judge in this court is styled Dean of the Arches, and he has jurisdiction, as the archbishop's principal official, in all ecclesiastical causes within the province of Canterbury.

Doctrinal Theology

SEE DOGMATIC THEOLOGY; *SEE THEOLOGY*.

Doctrine

SEE DOGMA.

Doctrine, Christian

Picture for Doctrine, Christian

MONASTIC CONGREGATIONS OF (Doctrinaires, Doctrinarians).

1. Priests of the Christian Doctrine, a congregation of secular priests, the chief object of which was to instruct the poor and the ignorant. Their

founder, Caesar de Bus, was born February 3, 1544, at Cavaillon, in France. He took orders for the purpose of obtaining a rich benefice, and for some time led a dissolute life in Paris; but on his return to the quiet Cavaillon he changed his mode of life, and devoted himself with great zeal to the care of the poor and the sick. In order to extend his philanthropic activity, he united with four other priests of Cavaillon, and now added to his former labors that of catechizing poor people and the children. In 1593 the association obtained a special authorization from the Pope. When the number of members had increased to twelve, they elected Caesar de Bus as their superior. The new superior wished to consolidate the association by introducing the simple vows. This induced a number of members to quit; but in 1597 pope Clement VIII sanctioned the association as a society of secular priests. The founder soon after became blind, but continued to preach and work for the extension of his society until his death in 1607. The successor of De Bus, Vigier, caused new trouble within the society by an attempt to convert the society into a regular "monastic congregation" (q.v.) by the introduction of solemn vows. This led pope Paul V to subject the society to the general of the Somaskians. This measure, however, increased the disturbance, and pope Innocent X on that account repealed the union, and subjected the priests of the Christian Doctrine to the diocesan bishops. These were henceforth again a society of secular priests, who only took simple vows. On the outbreak of the French Revolution, the society had in France 3 provinces, 15 houses, and 25 colleges. The society was abolished by the French Revolution; their last superior, M. de Bonnefour, died in 1806.

2. A Congregation of Sisters of the Christian Doctrine was likewise founded by Caesar de Bus. They were more commonly called Ursulines of Toulouse.

3. A Congregation of Doctrinarians was founded in Italy about the middle of the 16th century by Marco de Sadis Cusani. The object of this society was likewise to give instruction. Benedict XIII and Benedict XIV gave to this society the direction of several elementary schools in the city of Rome. The society did not extend much beyond Rome, where they still give elementary instruction in a few schools.

Doctrines, History of

(Germ. Dogmengeschichte), a special branch of Historical Theology.

1. The conception and the definition of History of Christian doctrines depend upon the conception and definition of what constitutes a Christian doctrine (dogma). For evangelical Christians, who believe that nothing should be received as Christian doctrine but what is clearly taught in the Word of God, the history of doctrine is a history of the efforts made by theologians and religious denominations to develop and shape the substance of the Christian faith into doctrinal statements; of deviations from the pure teachings of the Bible; and of the efforts to restore and defend the theology of the Bible. Roman Catholics, who believe in the sole infallibility of their Church, and deny that she has ever added anything to the teachings of Jesus, define history of doctrine as a scientific statement of the manner in which the several doctrines of the Church have been discussed, developed, and, at last, authoritatively defined. To the Rationalist, who does not believe in the immutability of the word of the Bible, the history of doctrines is nothing but a history of the doctrinal controversies in the Christian denominations. From the stand-point of evangelical theologians, the history of doctrines has an apologetic character with regard to Bible theology; the Roman Catholic theologians make it an apology of all the doctrines defined by the Church while in the treatment by a Rationalistic author it will lose the character of a branch of Christian theology, and appear as simply historical. But, though conception and definition, and, consequently, mode of treatment and division of matter vary, all works on the history of doctrines embrace a history of the controversies which have been carried on in the Christian Church on doctrinal questions.

2. As regards the relation of the History of Doctrines to other branches of theological science, it is evidently a subdivision of Church history, separately treated on account of its special importance for theologians, and on account of its wide ramifications. It presupposes Biblical theology as its basis (or as its first period). As it recounts the formation and contents of public confessions of faith, and the distinguishing principles set forth in them, it forms itself the basis of symbolics, or comparative dogmatic theology, which stands to it in the same relation as Church statistics of any particular period stand to the advancing history of the Church. As the opinions of the prominent, especially the earliest, fathers of the Church are of considerable importance in the history of any Christian doctrine, it has frequently occasion to refer to the results of Patristics (q.v.). Of the "history of Heresies," the beginning will always have to be noticed in a

comprehensive history of doctrine; its further progress only in so far as the heresies remain of importance for the Christian world at large. To a "general history of religion" it may have occasionally to refer; and with the, history of philosophy and the history of Christian ethics it may sometimes have to travel over the same ground, though in the latter case it will treat the same subjects from a different point of view. Archaeology, and the sciences auxiliary to Church history, such as universal history, ecclesiastical philology, ecclesiastical chronology, diplomatics, etc., also aid in furnishing materials.

3. The value of the History of Doctrines, in a scientific point of view, is evident. Though the history of no doctrine can have a decisive influence in determining the faith of an evangelical theologian, who to this end searches the Bible exclusively, it is for him the most important portion of the history of the Christian Church, leads him into a more minute contemplation, and frequently into a deeper insight of Biblical doctrines, and furnishes him with powerful weapons, both apologetic and polemic, against the various forms of error.

4. The periods of the history of doctrines have been differently determined by the writers on the subject. Hagenbach assumes the following five periods:

> **1.** The Age of Apologetics, from the close of the apostolic age to the death of Origen (A.D. 80-254).
>
> **2.** The Age of Polemics, from the death of Origen to John Damascenus (254-730).
>
> **3.** The Age of Systems, from John Damascenus to the Reformation (Scholasticism in its widest sense) (730-1517).
>
> **4.** The Age of Polemico-ecclesiastical Symbolism (the conflict of confessions), from the Reformation to the rise of the Philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolf in Germany (1517-1720).
>
> **5.** The Age of Criticism, of Speculation, and of the antagonism between Faith and Knowledge, Philosophy and Christianity, Reason and Revelation, including the attempts to reconcile them, from the year 1720 to the present day.

Neander's division is:

1. To Gregory the Great.

2. To the Reformation.

3. From the Reformation to the present time.

Minscher, Engelhardt, and Meier adopt the division into Ancient, Mediaeval, and Modern times. Klee (Romans Cath.) coincides almost With Hagenbach.

Baumgarten-Crusius (Rationalist) adopts in his Compendium six periods:

1. To the Council of Nice; Formation of the System of Doctrines by reflection and opinion.

2. To the Council of Chalcedon; Formation by the Church.

3. To Gregory VII; Confirmation of the System by the Hierarchy.

4. To the end of the 15th century; Confirmation by the Philosophy of the Church.

5. To the beginning of the-18th century; Purification by Parties.

6. To the present time; Purification by Science. Kliefoth (High-Church Lutheran) divides as follows:

1. Age of Formation of Doctrines	Greek	Analytic	Theology
2. Age of Symbolical Unity	Rom. Cath.	Synthetic	Anthropology
3. Age of Completion	Protestant.	Systymatic	Soteriology
4. Age of Dissolution	?	?	Church

Rosenkranz (in his *Encyklop.* 2d edit. Page 259) makes, according to the philosophico-dialectic categories, the following division:

1. Period of Analytic Knowledge, of substantial feeling (Greek Church).

2. Period of Synthetic Knowledge, of pure objectivity (Roman Cath. Church).

3. Period of Systematic Knowledge, which combines the analysis and synthesis in their unity, and manifests itself in the stages of symbolical

orthodoxy, of subjective belief and unbelief, and in the idea of speculative theology (Protestant Church).

5. The ideal of a history of doctrines is given as follows by Dr. H.B. Smith (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 4:560 sq.): "It should be the object of a history of doctrines to give in the truest possible manner the order in which divine truth has been unfolded in the history of the Church. It must trace down the whole course of doctrinal discussion, give the leading characteristics of each epoch, as distinguished from all others, and at last show just where the world now stands in the discussion of the problems which Christianity has presented to it. It should be a faithful mirror to the whole doctrinal history of the Church. It must interpret each writer according to the sense of the age in which he lived, and not bring in subsequent views and modern notions to explain the meaning Which an ancient writer gave to a phrase or dogma. It must show what are the points of difference in the reiterated controversies about the same doctrine. It must carefully distinguish the theological and systematic spirit of the different ages of the Church, and not force a subsequent development upon an antecedent aera. It must bring out into clear relief the influential personages of each age, and, in exhibiting their systems, distinguish between the peculiar notions of the individual and the general spirit of his times. It must show how controversies about one series of doctrines have modified the views held respecting other doctrines; how each doctrine has acquired a new aspect, according to its position in the mind or system of an author, or in its relation to the leading controversies of the age. It must show when a dogma was held strictly and when loosely; when disconnected from a system and when embraced in a system. It must carefully guard against the error of supposing that when a doctrine was not carefully discussed by the inquisitive and discriminating intellect, it was not really cherished as a matter of faith. This is an error into which many have fallen. But we might as well suppose that men did not believe they had understanding until they discussed the operations of this faculty, or did not trust to their senses until they invented a theory of sensation. Such a history must show the influence which councils, confessions; and systems have had upon their respective aeras; how preceding times led to such expositions of the faith, and subsequent times were affected by them. It must exhibit clearly the ruling ideas, the shaping notions in each system, and how each predominant idea has modified the component parts of the whole system. It will not neglect to notice the influence which national habits and modes of thought, which

great civil and political changes, which the different philosophical schools have had upon the formation of dogmas; nor, on the other hand, will it fail to notice how the Christian faith has itself acted upon and influenced these in its turn, if indeed the latter be not the point of view which should have the precedency. Such a history must finally present before our eyes a picture of a real historical process just as it has been going on, and the more faithful it is to all the leading facts of the case, the more philosophical and complete will it be as a history. By such an exhibition, the whole doctrinal progress of the Christian Church being set before our eyes, we shall, in comparing its results with our own systems, be able to see wherein we are defective, one-sided, and partial; wherein our systems need to be reformed, filled up, or chastened; how they may be animated by a new life, and gather better nurture; and by comparing the results with the Scripture, we shall be able to see what parts of its sacred truths have been least discussed, what problems yet remain to be solved, what is still to be done in order that our divine system of faith be wholly reproduced in the life of the Church, in order that all its truths and doctrines stand out as distinctly and majestically in the history of the race as they do in that revelation which was given to control and determine this history."

6. The history of doctrines has been treated as an independent branch of theological science only in modern times, yet some of the earlier writers of Church history, as well as the theologians, prepared the way for it. Thus the works of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, and Tertullian against the heretics furnish much valuable material. Much, too, is found scattered in the apologetical and polemical literature of the earlier and mediaeval periods of the Church. A more definite preparation for a history of doctrines is found in the works of the Roman Catholic theologians Petavius (*Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*, 1644-50), Thomassin (*Dogmata Theologica*, 1684-89), and Dumesnil (*Doctrina et Disciplina Ecclesiae*, 1730), and of the Protestant theologian Forbesius a Corse (*Instructiones Historico-theologicae de Doctrina Christiana*, 1703), who undertook to prove, especially in opposition to cardinal Bellarmin, the agreement between the doctrines of the Reformers and the opinions of the earlier fathers. A direct transition to the treatment of the history of doctrines as a separate science may be found in the preface by Semler to the Evangelische Glaubenslehre of J.S. Baumgarten (Halle, 1759-60). The literature of special compendiums and manuals of the history of doctrines begins at the close of the last century, and has more recently become quite copious. The

large majority of these works belong to German literature, only a few original works having arisen by writers of other countries. The most important works on the subject are the following: S.G. Lange, *Ausfuhrliche Geschichte der Dogmen* (Leipzig, 1796, incomplete); J. Ch. Wundemann, *Geschichte der christlichen Glaubenslehren*, etc. (from Athanasius to Gregory the Great, 2 volumes, Leipz. 1798-99); W. Miinscher, *Handbuch der christl. Dogmengeschichte* (4 volumes, Marburg, 1797-1809; only to the year 604; the first treatment in the pragmatic method), and *Lehrbuch der christl. Dogmengeschichte* (Marburg, 1812; 3d edit. revised and continued by D. von Colln, Hupfeld, and Neudecker, Cassel,1832-1838, 3 volumes, 8vo; Eng. transl. (Compendium) by Murdock, New Haven, 1830, 12mo); F. Munter (Danish bishop), *Handb. of earlier Hist. of Christ. Doct.* (1801 sq.; Germ. transl. by Evers, Gott. 1802, 2 volumes, incomplete); J. Ch.W. Augusti, *Lehrb. der christl. Dogmengesch.* (edited by J.G.V. Engelhardt, Erlang. 1822-23, 2 volumes); F.G. Ruperti, *Gesch. der Dogmen* (Berlin, 1831); L.F.O. Baumgarten-Crusius, *Lehrbuch der christl. Dogmengesch.* (Leipz. 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo) and *Compendium der Dogmengesch.* (ed. by Hase, Leipz.1840-46, 2 volumes); C.G.H. Lentz, *Geschichte der christl. Dogmen* (Helmst. 1834-35, 2 volumes); J.G.V. Engelhardt, *Dogmengesch.* (Neustadt, 1839, 2 volumes); F.C. Meyer, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengesch.* (Giessen, 1840, 2d edit. by Gust. Baur, 1854); K.R. Hagenbach, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Leipz. 1840, 5th edit. 1867; Engl. transl. by C.W.Buch, Edinburgh, 1846, 3d edit. 1858; the English transl. revised, with large additions from the 4th German edit. and other sources, by H.B. Smith, 2 volumes, New York, 1861); F.C. Baur, *Lehrb. der christl. Dogmengesch.* (Stuttg. 1849, 3d ed. Tubing. 1867), and *Vorlesungen uber die christl. Dogmengesch.* (edit. by his son, F.F. Baur, 3 volumes, Leipz. 1866-1867); Karl Beck, *Lehrb. der christl. Dogmengesch.* (Weimar, 1848, 2d edit. 1864); Marheineke, *Christl. Dogmengesch.* (edited by Matthies and Vatke, being the 4th volume of the complete works of Marheineke, Berlin, 1849); L. Noack, *Die christl. Dogmengesch.* (Erlangen, 1852, 2d edit. 1856); J.C.L. Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte* (ed. by Redepenning, Bonn, 1855, 8vo); Neander, *Christl. Dogmengesch.* (ed. by Dr. J.L. Jacobi. 2 volumes, 8vo, Berl. 1857-8; Eng. transl. by Ryland, in Bohn's library, 2 volumes, 12mo, Lond. 1858); H. Schmid, *Lehr. der Dogmengesch.* (Noirdlingen, 1860, 2d ed. 1868). The only recent works on the subject by Roman Catholic authors are those by Klee, *Lehrbuck der Dogmengeschichte* (Mainz, 1837-38, 2 volumes); and Schwane,

Dogmengesch. der patrist. Zeit (of the period from 325-787, Munster, 2 parts, 1866-67).

No copious or complete history of doctrines has been produced in England; but the great writers of the English Church, in treating special topics, have largely illustrated them from history. "Though comprising no continuous and entire history of Christian doctrine, and even when investigating a particular subject, often doing it incidentally, the labors of Hooker and Bull, of Pearson and Waterland, are every way worthy to be placed beside those of Baur and Dorner. The learning is as ample and accurate, the logical grasp is as powerful, and the judgment more than equal" (Shedd, *Pref.* 7). The writer just cited has the honor of having produced one of the first books of the class in English literature (*A History of Christian Doctrines*, by William G.T. Shedd, D.D., New York, C. Scribner, 3d ed. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo). This work is candid, luminous; and able throughout, though it does not aim at a full treatment of all topics in Christian theology. "It gives the results of extensive reading, and the analogies of a patient and devout thinker. Holding firmly to the great Puritan theology, Dr. Shedd shows a mastery of modern German speculation; and while his pages are not burdened with copious notes, or enriched with the laboriously collated extracts with which Hagenbach or Gieseler favor us, the gist of all the controversies is well indicated" (*British Quarterly*, April, 1865, page 326). The only other work of the class in English literature is Historical Theology, a Review of the principal doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age, by William Cunningham, D.D., principal of New College, Edinburgh (2d ed. 1864, 2 volumes, 8vo). This is a posthumous work, edited from Dr. Cunningham's college lectures by his literary executors. Of course it has not the compactness or the finish which it might have had if prepared for the press by the author himself; but it is, nevertheless, a very valuable contribution to historical theology.

The history of creeds and confessions of faith, so far as relates to the doctrinal principles set forth in them, belongs to history of doctrine; but it is now generally treated as a separate branch of historical theology, under the name of Symbolics. *SEE CONFESSIONS*; *SEE CREEDS*; *SEE SYMBOLICS*.

Tables exhibiting the history of doctrines have been published by Hagenbach, Tabellarische Uebersicht der Dogmengeschichte bis

aufdie.Reformation (Basel, 1828); Vorlander, *Tabell.-übersichtliche Darstellung der Dogmengesch.* (Hamburg, 1835-1855, 3 parts); Lange, *Tab. der Kirch.-u. Dogmengesch.* (Jena, 1831).

In addition to the general works on the history of doctrines, there are a number on special periods (as the theology of the apostolic fathers), and also monographs on special doctrines (as the doctrine of the Person of Christ, the Trinity, etc.), all of which are noticed in the articles devoted to these special subjects. Outlines of the history of the principal doctrines are also more or less given in the general "Church histories," and in the works on dogmatic theology and symbolics. We refer to the special articles in this Cyclopaedia on these branches of scientific theology for the literature.

Do'cus

(Δώκ v.r. Δωήκ; Vulg. Doch; Syr. Doak), a "little hold" (τὸ ὀχυρωμάτιον; Vulg. *munitiunculum*), near Jericho (1 Macc. 16:15; compare verse 14), built by Ptolemaeus, the son of Abubus, and in which he entertained and murdered his father-in-law, Simon Maccabaeus, with his two sons. By Josephus (*Ant.* 13:8,1; *War*, 1:2, 3) it is called Dagon (Δαγών), and is said to have been "one of the fortresses (ἐρυμάτων) above Jericho." The word is probably the Aramaean Dakeka, a watch-tower (Grimm, *Exeg. Handb.* in loc.). The name still remains in the neighborhood, attached to the copious and excellent springs of Ain-Dûk, which burst forth in the Wady Nawa'imeh, at the foot of the mountain of Quarantania (Kuruntul), about four miles N.W. of Jericho (Robinson, *Res.* 2:309). Above the springs are traces of ancient foundations, which may be those of Ptolemy's castle, but more probably of that of the Templars, one of whose stations this was (see Münter, *Statutenb. der Ord. des Tempelh.* 1:419). It stood as late as the latter end of the 13th century, when it was visited by Brocardus, who calls it Dooch (*Descr. Terrce Sanctae*, chapter 7, page 178, ed. Bonfrere in *Onomast.*).

Dod, Albert Baldwin

D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister and mathematician, was born in Mendham, N.J., March 24, 1805, and graduated A.B. at Princeton in 1822. In 1826 he became tutor, was licensed to preach in 1829, and in 1830 was appointed professor of mathematics in Princeton College. He filled the office with signal ability and success for fifteen years, and died, after a short illness, November 20, 1845. To a remarkable aptitude for

mathematics he added an acute metaphysical turn and a taste for general literature, so that his mental culture was broad and catholic. He wrote several articles of great value in the Princeton Review, and among them one on Transcendentalism (volumes 11, 12), which was afterwards reprinted as a separate pamphlet on account of its masterly treatment of the subject. — Sprague, *Annals*, 4:737.

Dod, John

an eminent Puritan divine, was born at Shotledge, Cheshire, England, in 1547, and was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he became fellow, and resided for sixteen years. At college he acquired great reputation both as a disputant and a preacher. His first settlement was at Hanwell, Oxfordshire, in 1581, where he remained twenty years, and was very popular and useful. He was suspended for non-conformity by Dr. Bridges, bishop of Oxford, and went to Cannons' Ashby, in Northamptonshire, where he was again silenced on a complaint to king James by bishop Neale. After the death of king James he gained liberty to resume his public labors, which he did with unremitted faithfulness and success till his death in August, 1645, at Fawesley, Northamptonshire, a living to which he was presented in 1624. Mr. Dod was an excellent scholar, especially in Hebrew. He published An Exposition of the Proverbs (London, 1608, 4to): — Sermons on Lamentations in (London, 1608, 4to): — A Remedy against Contentions (Lond. 1609, 4to); and, together with Robert Cleaver, An Exposition of the Ten Commandments, with a Catechism (Lond. 1632, 4to).

Do'dai

(Hebrews *Doday'*, ydwD, prob. another form for *Dodo*; Sept. Δωδία v.r. Δωδαΐ and Δωδαΐα, Vulg. *Dudia*), an Ahohite, the chief officer of the contingent for the second month under David (1 Chronicles 27:4); probably the same as DODO *SEE DODO* (q.v.), whose son Eleazar was one of David's three chief braves (2 Samuel 23:9; 1 Chronicles 11:12). By some the words rz[la ^b, "Eleazar the son of," are supposed to have accidentally escaped in transcription from the text in 1 Chronicles 27:4 making this person the father of the military character there spoken of.

Do'danim

(Hebrews Dodanim', µynædoD, deriv. unknown; Sept. Ῥόδιοι, Vulg. Dodanim), a family or race descended from (the fourth son of) Javan, the son of Japheth (<01004>Genesis 10:4). The authorities vary as to the form of the name: the Hebrew text has Dodanim in Genesis, but RODANIM (µynædor) in the text of the parallel passage (<130107>1 Chronicles 1:7, margin µynædoD, Sept. again Ῥόδιοι [v.r. Δωδανάμ], and Vulg. Dodanim, A.V. "*Dodanim*"); Dodanim appears in the Syriac, Chaldee, Vulgate, Persian, and Arabic versions, and in the Targum of Onkelos; Rodanima is supported by the Sept., the Samaritan version, and some early writers, as Eusebius and Cosmas. The weight of authority is in favor of Dodanim; the substitution of Ῥόδιοι, Rhodians, in the Sept. may have arisen from familiarity with that name (compare <261715>Ezekiel 27:15, where it is again substituted for Dedan). Dodanim is regarded as identical with Dardani (Gesenius, *Thesaur*. page 1266), the latter, which is the original form, having been modified by the change of the liquid *r* into *o*, as in Barmilcar and Bomilcar, Hamilcar and Hamlilco (Hall. *Lit. Zeit.* 1841, No. 4). Thus the Targum of Jonathan, that on Chronicles, and the Jerusalem Talmud, give Dardania for Dodanim. The Dardani were found in historical times in Illyricum and Troy: the former district was regarded as their original seat. They were probably a semi-Pelasgic race, and are grouped with the Chittim in the genealogical table, as more closely related to them than to the other branches of the Pelasgic race (Knobel, *Volkertafel*, page 104 sq.). The similarity of the name Dodona in Epirus (*Strabo*, 7:327 sq.) has led to the identification of Dodanim with that place (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1:120); but a mere local designation appears too restricted for the general tenor of Genesis 10. *SEE ETHNOLOGY*. Kalisch (*Comm. on Gen.*) identifies Dodanim with the Daunians, who occupied the coast of Apulia: he regards the name as referring to Italy generally. The wide and unexplained difference of the names, and the comparative unimportance of the Daunians, form objections to this view. Those who prefer the reading Rodanim refer it to the Greek inhabitants along the river Rhone (Bochar *Phaleg*, 3:6), from the original Rhodus (Tuch, *Genesis* page 216).

Do'davah

(Hebrews only in the prolonged form *Dodava'hu*, Whwdoæ v.r. Whwdoæ beloved of Jehovah; Sept. Δωδία v.r. Ὠδία, Vulg. *Dodan*), an inhabitant

of Mareshah, and father of the Eliezer who predicted the wreck of Jehoshaphat's fleet auxiliary to Ahaziah (1407 2 Chronicles 20:37). B.C. ante 895. In the Jewish traditions Dodavah is the putative son of Jehoshaphat, who was (in reality) his uncle (Jerome, *Qu. Heb.* ad loc.).

Dodd, Charles

an English Romanist divine, whose real name is said to have been Richard Tootle. He resided at Harvington, Worcestershire, where he died about 1745. He published a Church History of England from 500 to 1688, chiefly with regard to Catholicks (Brussels, 1737, eight parts, in 3 volumes, fol.). It was printed in England, though dated at Brussels. It was sharply criticized by Constable, a Jesuit, in 1740, and Dodd replied as sharply (1742). Berington, in his Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani, speaks of Dodd as the author of other works "against the insidious conduct, as he deemed it, of the Jesuits, in their transactions with the secular clergy." His Church History was for a long time very scarce and dear, but a new edition was undertaken in 1839 by the Reverend M.A. Tierney, of which 5 volumes, 8vo have appeared (1839-1843).

Dodd, William

LL.D., an unworthy clergyman of the Church of England, was born in 1729, at Bourn, Lincolnshire, and was admitted a sizar of Clare Hall, Cambridge, in 1745. In 1753 he was ordained, and settled in London; and from this time he continued to obtain a succession of small preferments in the Church, holding, in the latter part of his life, two chapels in London, with a rectory and vicarage in the country, and possessing an ecclesiastical income of £800 a year. He was one of the most popular preachers of the day; was one of the king's chaplains; and in 1763 was entrusted with the education of Philip Stanhope, afterwards earl of Chesterfield. In 1775 he was deprived of his king's chaplaincy for having offered to the wife of chancellor Apsley a bribe of £3000 if she would secure him the living of St. George's, Hanover Square. He preached his last sermon February 2, 1777; two days after he forged a bond for £4200 on Lord Chesterfield, was arrested, tried, and convicted February 24, and executed June 27. Strenuous efforts were made by men of the highest rank to save him, but without effect. He was a man of superficial learning, but of great literary industry. Besides minor pieces in prose and verse, he published *An Elegy on the Death of the Prince of Wales* (1751, 4to): — *Thoughts on the*

glorious Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ, a poetical essay (1758, 4to): — *Sermons on the Parables and Miracles* (1758, 4 volumes, 8vo): — *Account of the Rise, Progress, etc., of the Magdalen Charity* (1759, 8vo): — *A familiar Explanation of the poetical Works of Milton* (1762, 12mo): — *Reflections on Death* (1763, 12mo): — *Comfort for the Afflicted* (1764, 8vo): — *The Visitor* (1764, 2 volumes, 12mo): — a new edition of Locke's *Commonplace-book to the Bible* (1766, 4to): — *Sermons on the Duties of the Great*, transl. from Massillon (1769, 8vo): — *A Commentary on the Bible*, 3 volumes, fol. (published in numbers, commenced in 1765, and completed in 1770. "In order to give greater éclat to this undertaking, it was announced that lord Masham had presented him with the MSS. of Mr. Locke, and that he had help also from the MSS. of lord Clarendon, Dr. Waterland, and other celebrated men. The ability and sound judgment with which, in the compilation of this work, Dodd availed himself of the labors of preceding commentators, foreign as well as British, have rendered this a very valuable work." It was made the basis of Dr. Coke's Commentary, without adequate acknowledgment):Sermons to young Men (1771, 3 volumes, 12mo): — The Frequency of capital Punishments inconsistent with Justice, sound Policy, and Religion (1772, 8vo): — *Thoughts in Prison, etc., with Memoirs of his Life* (posthumous). See some interesting notices of Dodd's attack on Wesley, and of Wesley's visits to him, in Wesley's *Works*, N.Y. ed., 4:245, 466; 6:537.

Doddridge, Philip, D.D.

was born in London June 26, 1702. His parents were pious Dissenters, and took pains to educate their children religiously. Philip was introduced by his mother to a knowledge of the characters and scenes of the O. and N.T. history by means of some Dutch tiles that lined a corner of their sitting-room. In his childhood he was taught the rudiments of Greek and Latin, and from his tenth to his thirteenth year he attended the grammar-school at Kingston-on-Thames. In 1715 he entered a private school at St. Albans, kept by Mr. Nathanael Wood, and here he gained the friendship of Samuel Clarke, who aided him in many ways after the death of his father (1715). Doddridge repaid his benefactor by his devotion to study and to personal religion. In 1718 he received an offer from the duchess of Bedford, who lived in the neighborhood, and had heard of his character and circumstances, to send him to either of the two universities on condition of his becoming a clergyman in the Church of England. He declined the

proposal. Mr. Clarke now undertook to bear the expense of his education, and Doddridge gladly embraced the offer by entering, in 1719, the academy of Kibworth, in Leicestershire, where he studied under Dr. Jennings. In 1722 he was licensed to preach, and was settled over the congregation at Kibworth as successor to Dr. Jennings. In 1729 he removed to Harborough, to be assistant to the venerable Mr. Some.

In the same year, Dr. Doddridge, in conjunction with Dr. Watts, Reverend Mr. Saunders, Reverend Mr. Some, and others, established an academy for preparing young men for the work of the ministry among Dissenters; and to that institution he was appointed tutor. No man was better qualified than Dr. Doddridge for that situation, and the institution soon acquired a wide celebrity. A pressing invitation from the Independent congregation in Northampton, enforced by the advice of Dr. Watts and other friends to accept it, led him to a new sphere of labor; and from December 24, 1729, he discharged in that town the double duty of pastor of a large congregation and tutor to the theological seminary. "Seldom has there been a more laborious or conscientious life than that of Doddridge. To serve his divine Master was the ruling principle of his heart; and to the advancement of the sacred cause he brought all the energies of an active mind, and all the stores of an almost boundless knowledge, daily to bear. Many students resorted to him from all parts of the kingdom, and amongst these not a few who afterwards rose to distinction, not among the Dissenters only, but in the established churches of England and Scotland, in America, and even in Holland. The University of Aberdeen conferred on him, in 1736, the degree of D.D. He was a voluminous author. His most important works are *Sermons on Regeneration*; *Sermons to Young People*; *Life of Colonel Gardner; Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*; *Family Expositor, or Paraphrase and Version of the N.T.* Dr. Doddridge's frame, never robust at any time, was enfeebled by his incessant labors, and severe cold having settled on his lungs, and been followed by symptoms of consumption, he was advised to try the effects of a sea voyage. On the 30th of September, 1751, he sailed from Falmouth in a vessel bound for Lisbon, where he landed on the 13th of October, and, being completely exhausted, he died on the 26th, expressing to Mrs. Doddridge, who accompanied him, his firm faith and joyful hope in Christ" (Rich, *Cyclopaedia of Biography*, s.v.). The best edition of Doddridge's works is that of Leeds, 1802, 10 volumes, 8vo, the first volume containing his Life by Job Orton. His *Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity* are stereotyped in one volume, imp.

8vo (Lond., Bohn). The *Family Expos*itor has passed through many editions; a convenient one is that of Amherst (1844, royal 8vo), with memoir by Prof. N.W. Fiske.

As commentator and theologian Dr. Doddridge deserves the praise of industry and purity of aim, but in no field, except in that of practical religion, did he rise to the first rank. In the Commentary "Doddridge always writes in a good spirit. The love of Christ reigns in his heart, and pours itself out in all that he says. This is the charm of his 'Observations.' His 'Notes,' though often valuable, could not be expected to possess the highest philological merit. Dr. Doddridge had not the time, the training, nor the means to furnish a thorough critical commentary on the N.T. The paraphrase is diffuse, often needlessly so; circuitous in expression, when the straightforward, simplicity and terseness of the original would be far better. It is proof enough of the comparative and absolute worth of the Observations that they are more and more read, at family devotion and in private reading, to the exclusion of other parts, and in preference to other commentators. Good sense, warm piety, flowing ease of expression, and a happy exhibition and improvement of his text, mark the Observations, and recommend them to the Christian reader" (*Comprehensive Commentary*, Philadelphia Supplement). As a divine, "with all his manifold excellencies, Doddridge had neither a deep theological interest nor a strenuous theological mind. He did not always conceive of nice distinctions clearly; he did not value them highly when conceived. Hence he flees to authorities, recites catalogues, and balances opinions, and continually slides from the scientific to the historical. From one end of the lectures to the other we look in vain for a thorough, masterly, and exhaustive treatment of any one theological point. The method of the work scarcely allows such a result. Continual perusal; if, indeed, such a thing were endurable, would, we think, engender vacillation and skepticism. Such seems to have been the effect upon his students, who heard him announce every variety of opinion, without decided and weighty assertion on his own part. Great liberality and mildness are beautiful in their time; but this is not when the enemy is assaulting the citadel, which was true of Nonconformist-theology a hundred years ago. His sermons are remarkable for soundness in doctrine, for rigid method and cleal statement, and for earnest application to the heart and conscience of the hearer... His hymns are, in number, three hundred and seventy-four. A few of these are likely to be preserved, such, for example, as 'Let Zion's Watchmen all Awake;' 'God of my Life, through

all its Days;' 'Ye Hearts with youthful Vigor warm;' 'See Israel's gentle Shepherd stand;' 'What if Death my Sleep invade?' and 'Remark, my Soul, the narrow Bound;' but, in general, they are measured prose" (Princeton Review, 1857, p. 257). See also Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, volume 2; Orton, *Life of Doddridge*; Stoughton, *Life of Doddridge* (Boston, 1853, 12mo); Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, volume 5; *North British Review*, 14:190.

Do'do

(Hebrews *Dodo'*, /d/D, *amatory*; but, according to Fürst, an abbreviation of *Dodavah*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. πατράδελφος αὐτοῦ v.r. πατὴρ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ; Vulg. *patruus Ahimelech*, both apparently as a rendering of "Ahohite" inserted.) A descendant of Issachar, father of Phuah, and grandfather of the judge Tola (<07001>Judges 10:1). B.C. considerably ante 1319.

2. (Sept. Δουδί, Δωδαΐ; Vulg. *patruus ejus*.) An Ahohite (q.v.), father of Eleazar, who was one of David's three special heroes (<10239>2 Samuel 23:9, margin; <13112>1 Chronicles 11:12). B.C. ante 1046. He seems to be the same with the DODAI mentioned in <13704>1 Chronicles 27:4, as commander of the fourth monthly division of the royal troops under David. This latter form of the name occurs in the Hebrew text of <10239>2 Samuel 23:9 (ydD), and is favored by the Sept. as well as by Josephus (*Ant*. 7:12, 4, Δώδειος); and is believed by Kennicott (*Dissertation*, page 134), who has examined these lists with great minuteness, to be the correct one. The Jewish tradition (Jerome, *Qu. Hebr.* on <13112>1 Chronicles 11:12) was that Dodo was the brother of Jesse.

3. (Sept. Δουσὶ πατράδελφος αὐτοῦ, and Δωδωαί v.r. Δωδωέ; Vulg. *patruus jus*.) A Bethlehemite, and father of the Elhanan who was one of David's thirty heroes (<10234>2 Samuel 23:24; <13126>1 Chronicles 11:26). B.C. ante 1046.

Dodwell, Henry

an eminent nonjuror, critic, and theologian, was born at Dublin in 1641, and was educated at the York Free School and at Trinity College, where he obtained a fellowship, which he relinquished in 1666. He was chosen Camden professor at Oxford in 1688; but, being a nonjuror, he lost his

office at the Revolution. Dodwell was a learned and a virtuous man, but addicted to paradoxes, and was so much an ascetic that during three days in the week he refrained almost wholly from food. He was a man of great obstinacy, unwearied industry, and prodigious learning. But his intellect was neither vigorous nor comprehensive. "Many of his publications were on the popish and nonconformist controversies: they have the reputation of showing, like everything else he wrote, extensive and minute learning, and great skill in the application of his scholarship, but little judgment of a larger kind. Few, if any, of the champions of the Church of England have strained the pretensions of that establishment so far as Dodwell seems to have done; but his whole life attested the perfect conscientiousness and disregard of personal consequences under which he wrote and acted" (*English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). On leaving Oxford he retired to Cookham, Berkshire, and soon after to Shottesbrooke, where he spent the rest of his days. He possessed an estate in Ireland, but allowed a relation to enjoy the principal part of the rent, only reserving a moderate maintenance for himself. His relative at length began to grumble at the subtraction even of this pittance, and on that Dodwell resumed his property, and married. He took this step in his fifty-second year, and lived to see himself the father of ten children. The works for which he is now chiefly remembered were also all produced in the latter part of his life. Among these are his Dissertationes Cyprianicae (n. d. fol.): — *Dissert. in Irenaeum* (Oxon. 1689): — *Scripture Account of Rewards and Punishments* (Lond. 1708, 8vo): — *Dissertations and Annotations on the Greek Geographers*, published in Hudson's *Geographix Veteris Scriptores Graeci Minores* (Oxon. 1698, 1703, and 1712): — Annales Thucydidei et Xenophontei (1696): — *Chronol. Graeco-Romano* (1692); and Annales Velleiani, Quintiliani, Statiani (1698). These several chronological essays, which are drawn up with great ability, have all been repeatedly reprinted. Dodwell's principal work is considered to be his *De Veteribus Graecorum Romanorumque Cyclis, Obiterque de Cyclo Judaeorum ac AEtate Christi Dissertationes* (Oxon. 1701, 4to). He also published in 8vo, in 1706, *An epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and the first Fathers that the Soul is a Principle naturally mortal*, but immortalized actually by the pleasure of God, to punishment or to reward, by its union with the divine baptismal spirit; where it is proved that none have the power of giving this divine immortalizing spirit since the apostles, but only the bishops. "This attempt to make out for the bishops the new power of conferring immortality raised no small outcry against the writer, and staggered many even of those who

had not seen any extravagance in his former polemical lucubrations. Of course it gave great offense to the Dissenters, all of whose souls it unceremoniously shut out from a future existence on any terms. Dodwell died at Shottesbrooke June 7, 1711" (*English Cyclopedia*). See Dodwell's *Works* abridged, with his *Life*, by Brokesby (Lond. 1723, 2 volumes, 8vo, 2d ed.); Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 5:320 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors* 1:511; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, volume 2, chapter 8.

Doederlein, Johann Christoph

a celebrated Lutheran theologian, was born at Windheim, in Franconia, January 20, 1745, and studied at the University of Altorf, where he was appointed professor of theology in 1772. In 1782 he became professor of theology at Jena, where he died December 2, 1792. His erudition was solid and various. His most important works are, *Esaias ex recensione text. hebr., cum notis* (1789, 8vo): — *Spriiche Salomons neu iubers.* etc. (1778, 8vo): — *Institutio theologiae christiane* (Altdorf, 1791, 8vo, 6th ed.). His miscellaneous writings and sermons are very numerous, and he edited the *Theologische Bibliothek* from 1780 to 1792. His Institutio Theologiae was a very successful book. In theology, Doederlein stood at the point of transition from the old German orthodoxy to modern Rationalism. — Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, book 2, chapter 4.

Do'ig

(Hebrews *Doeg'*, גָּאֹדֵג, *fearful*, 1 Samuel 21:7, Sept. Δωήγ v.r. Δωήκ; or גָּאֹדֵ, Psalm 52, title, Sept. Δωήκ; in 1 Samuel 22:18, 22, *Doyeg'*, גְּיֹדֵ, after the Syrian pronunciation, Sept. Δωήγ), an Edomite, and chief overseer of king Saul's flocks (Josephus, Δώηκος, "keeper of the king's mules," *Ant.* 6:12, 1), which is an important trust in Oriental courts. B.C. 1062. At Nob he was witness of the assistance which the high-priest Ahimelech seemed to afford to the fugitive David, by furnishing him with the sword of Goliath, and by supplying him with bread even from the sacred table (1 Samuel 21:7). Of this he failed not to inform the king, who, regardless of the explanation offered by Ahimelech, and finding that the chiefs censured him and hesitated to lay their hands upon a person so sacred, commanded Doeg to slay him and his priests (to the number of 85 persons), and to destroy all their families and property — a task which was executed with equal readiness and cruelty by the Edomite (1 Samuel 22:18 sq.). This truculent act called forth one of David's most severe

imprecative prayers (Psalm 52), of which divine and human justice seem alike to have required the fulfillment. *SEE DAVID*; *SEE PSALMS*. A question has arisen on the nature of the business by which he was ' detained before the Lord" (rx;[]n, Sept. συνεχόμενος Νεεσσαράν; Vulgate, *intus in tabernaculo Domini*). The difficulty which lies in the idea that Doeg was a foreigner, and so incapable of a Nazarite vow (*Mischn. de Votis*. 9:1, Surenh.), has been explained by the supposition that he was a proselyte, attending under some vow or some act of purification at the Tabernacle (compare 1 Samuel 20:18). Thenius (*Kurzg. exeg. handb*. in loc.) has corrected Gesenius's interpretation (*Thesaur.* page 1059) of the phrase as meaning "was assembled before Jehovah." Ephrem Syrus (*Opp*. 1:376) explains the term as merely indicating that Doeg had introduced himself there secretly, whether by right or otherwise. With this agrees Fürst's rendering (*Hebr. Handw.* page 175), that he had tarried behind (*zuruickbleiben*) as a spy.

Dog

Picture for Dog 1

Picture for Dog 2

(blK, *ke'leb*, so called from his barking; Arabic kelb; Greek κύων, whence Eng. hound; diminutive κυνάριον) occurs in numerous passages both of the Old and the New Testament (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:769 sq.). An animal so well known, whose numerous varieties come under daily observation, requires no detailed description (see the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). There is, however, in Asia still extant one, perhaps more than one, species, that never have been the companions of man, and there are races of uncertain origin, that may have been formerly domesticated, but which are now feral, and as fierce as wolves; while, in accordance with Oriental modes of speech, there are others, exceedingly numerous, neither wild nor domesticated, but existing in all the cities and towns of the Levant, without owners; feeding on carrion and offal, and still having the true instinct of protecting property, guarding the inhabitants of the district or quarter where they are tolerated; and so far cherished, that water and some food are not unusually placed within their reach (see Jardine's *Naturalists' Library*, 9, 10). The true wild species of Upper and Eastern Asia is a low, sharp-nosed, reddish car-dog, not unlike a fox. but with less tail. In Persia and Turkey there exists a larger dog resembling a wolf, exceedingly

savage. Both are gregarious, hunt in packs, but are occasionally seen alone. They are readily distinguished from a wolf by their shorter unfurnished tails. In the time of the sojourning of Israel in Egypt, there were already in existence domestic dogs of the principal races now extant — the curdog or fox-dog, the hound, the greyhound, and even a kind of low-legged turnspit (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egypt.* abridgm. 1:230). All the above, both wild and reclaimed, there is every reason to believe, were known to the Hebrews (see Mishna, *Baba Kamma*, 7:7), and although the Mosaic prohibition is presumed, yet anterior habits, and, in some measure, the necessity of their condition, must have caused cattle-dogs to be retained as property (052318Deuteronomy 23:18), for we find one of that race, or a house-dog, actually attending on travelers (Tobit 5:16; 11:4). It is to be presumed that practically the street-dogs alone were considered as absolutely unclean; though all, as is the case among Mohammedans, were excluded from familiarity. (See Berjeau, *Dogs on Old Sculptures*, etc. Lond. 1863.) In Egypt, anterior to the Christian aera, domestic dogs were venerated. *SEE NIBHAZ*. They continued to be cherished till the Arabian conquest, when they, like the unowned street-dogs, fell under the imprecation of Mohammed, who with reluctance, though with good policy, modified his denunciations and sentence of destruction in favor of hunting-dogs, and even permitted game killed by them to be eaten, provided they had not devoured any portion of it (comp. 022231Exodus 22:31). The words of the Lord Jesus to the Syrophoenician woman, and her answer (401526Matthew 15:26, 27), certainly imply a domestication and domiciliation of dogs; but simple toleration of their presence is all that can be gathered. They lived on what they could get. Among the Moors of North Africa a similar position of the dog is occasionally seen. They "grant him, indeed, a corner of their tent, but this is all; they never caress him, never throw him anything to eat" (Poiret's *Barbary*, 1:253). Besides the cattle-dog, the Egyptian hound, and one or two varieties of greyhound, were most likely used for hunting — a pastime, however, which the Hebrews mostly pursued on foot. On the Assyrian monuments they are depicted in hunting scenes. The street-dog, without master, apparently derived from the rufous-cur, and in Egypt partaking of the mongrel greyhound, often more or less bare, with a mangy, unctuous skin, fre quently with several teeth wanting, was, as it now is, considered a defiling animal. It is to animals of this class, which no doubt followed the camp of Israel, and hung on its skirts, that allusion is more particularly made in 022231Exodus 22:31, for the same custom exists at this day, and the race of streetdogs still retains their ancient habits (Prosp.

Alpin. *Rev. Egypt.* 4:8, page 230 sq.; Russel, *Aleppo*, 2:55; Rosenmüller, Morgen. 4:76). A portion of the Cairo packs annually become hajis, and go and return with the caravan to Mecca, while others come from Damascus, acting in the same manner; and it is known that the pilgrims from the banks of the Indus are similarly attended to Kerbela: indeed, every caravan is so, more or less, by these poor animals. But with regard to the dogs that devoured Jezebel, and licked up Ahab's blood (<1212>1 Kings 21:23), they may have been of the wild races, a species of which is reported to have particularly infested the banks of the Kishon and the district of Jezreel. In illustration of this shocking end of Jezebel, it may be remarked that the more than half-wild street-dogs of the East, living upon their own resources, and without owners, soon make rapid clearance of the flesh of dead bodies left exposed, whether of human creatures or beasts (Bruce, *Trav.* 4:81). Among other instances, it is recorded that a number of Indian pilgrims were drowned by the sinking of a ferry-boat in which they were crossing a river. Two days afterwards a spectator relates: "On my approaching several of these sad vestiges of mortality, I perceived that the flesh had been completely devoured from the bones by the Pariah dogs, vultures, and other obscene animals. The only portion of the several corpses I noticed that remained entire and untouched were the bottoms of the feet and insides of the hands, a circumstance that may afford a corroborative proof of the rooted antipathy the dog has to prey upon the human hands and feet. Why such should be the case remains a mystery" (*Kitto's Daily Illust.* in loc.). Stanley (*S. and P.* page 350) states that he saw on the very site of Jezreel the descendants of the dogs that devoured Jezebel, prowling on the mounds without the walls for offal and carrion thrown out to them to consume; and Wood, in his Journal to the source of the Oxus, complains that the dog has not yet arrived at his natural position in the social state (compare *Strabo*, 17:821; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2:870). The dog was employed, however, in sacrifice by some ancient nations (Pausan. 3:14, 9; Arnob. 4:25; Julian, *Orat.* 5, page 176; Pliny, 18:69; comp. Saubert, *De sacrific.* c. 23, page 518 sq.), and was even sometimes eaten (Plutarch, *De sollert. animal.* c. 2; Justin. 19:1). The cities of the East are still greatly disturbed in the night by the howlings of street-dogs, who, it seems, were similarly noisy in ancient times, the fact being noticed in <1916>Psalm 59:6, 14; and dumb or silent dogs are not unfrequently seen, such as Isaiah alludes to (56:10). The same passage has reference to the peculiarly fitful sleep of the dog, and his sudden start as if during a dream (see J.G. Michaelis, *Observ. Sacr.* 2:50 sq.).

The dog was used by the Hebrews as a watch for their houses (<236610>Isaiah 56:10; comp. *Iliad*, 23:173; *Odys*. 17:309), and for guarding their flocks (<183001>Job 30:1; comp. *Iliad*, 10:183; 12:302; Varro, *R.R.* 2:9; *Colum*. 7:12; see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:301). Then also, as now, troops of hungry and semi-wild dogs used to wander about the fields and streets of the cities, devouring dead bodies and other offal (<111411>1 Kings 14:11; 16:4; 21:19, 23; 22:38; <120910>2 Kings 9:10, 36; <241533>Jeremiah 15:3; <195906>Psalm 59:6, 14), and thus became such objects of dislike (comp. Harmar, 1:198 sq.; Host, *Nachr*. 5. Marokko; page 294; Joliffe, page 327) that fierce and cruel enemies are poetically styled dogs in <192216>Psalm 22:16, 20 (see <241533>Jeremiah 15:3; comp. Joseph. *Ant*. 15:8, 4; Homer, *Il*. 17:255; 22:335). Moreover, the dog, being an unclean animal (<236603>Isaiah 66:3; <400706>Matthew 7:6; comp. Horace, *Ep*. 1:2, 26), as still in the East (Arvieux, 3:189; Hasselquist, page 109), and proverbially filthy in its food (<202611>Proverbs 26:11; <610222>2 Peter 2:22), the terms *dog*, *dead dog*, *dog's head* were used as terms of reproach, or of humility in speaking of one's self (<092414>1 Samuel 24:14; <100308>2 Samuel 3:8; 9:8; 16:9; <120813>2 Kings 8:13). Knox relates a story of a nobleman of Ceylon, who, being asked by the king how many children he had, replied, "Your majesty's dog has three puppies." Throughout the whole East "dog" is a term of reproach for impure and profane persons, and in this sense is used by the Jews respecting the Gentiles (<662215>Revelation 22:15; compare Schöttgen, *Hor*. <583011>*Hebrews* 1:1145), and by Mohammedans respecting Christians (Wetstein, 1:424; 2:274). The wanton nature of the dog is another of its characteristics, and there can be no doubt that bl;K,in <052318>Deuteronomy 23:18 means a male prostitute (i.q. vdq); comp. Ecclus. 26:25, "A shameless woman shall be counted as a dog" (Hesych. κυνὲς ἀναιδεῖς). We still use the name of one of the noblest creatures in the world as a term of contempt (comp. *Athen.* 6:270). To ask an Uzbek to sell his wife would be no affront, but to ask him to sell his dog an unpardonable insult —*Suggeeferosh*, or dog-seller, being the most offensive epithet that one Uzbek can apply to another. The addition of the article (τοῖς κυναρίοις, <401526>Matthew 15:26; <410727>Mark 7:27) implies that the presence of dogs was an ordinary feature of Eastern life in our Savior's time. When Christ says in <401526>Matthew 15:26, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," by the children are meant the Jews; by the dogs, the Gentiles. In the Rabbinical writings the question is put, "What does a dog mean?" and the answer is, "One who is uncircumcised." The dog and the sow are mentioned together in <236603>Isaiah

66:3; <4107> Matthew 7:6; <6102> 2 Peter 2:22, as being alike impure and unacceptable. Paul calls the false apostles dogs on account of their impurity and love of gain (<5103> Philippians 3:2; see Simon, Κυνοβλεψία, a Paulo mandata, Smalcald, 1747). Those who are shut out of the kingdom of heaven are called dogs, sorcerers, etc. (<6215> Revelation 22:15), where the word is applied to all kinds of vile persons, as it is to a particular class in <5218> Deuteronomy 23:18.

Dogma

(Gr. δόγμα), a doctrine received as an article of faith. I. In the Scriptures the Greek word δόγμα has nowhere the meaning of doctrine. In <4215> Ephesians 2:15, and <5214> Colossians 2:14, it denotes Jewish ordinances. In other passages (<4201> Luke 2:1; <4401> Acts 16:1; 17:7) it designates the decrees of Roman emperors. II. This term is used by some of the earliest writers of the Christian Church, both Greek and Latin, to designate a doctrine of the Christian Church, or the whole of the Christian doctrines. Thus, by Ignatius, in the epistle to the Magnesians (chapter 13), the Christian doctrines are called δόγματα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, and by Origen (in *Matth.* tom. 12, § 23), δόγματα θεοῦ. In his work against Celsus (*contra Celsum*, 3, c. 39) he calls the whole of the Christian doctrines τὸ δόγμα, and the apostles διδάσκαλοι τοῦ δόγματος. The ecclesiastical writers of the 2d and 3d centuries also applied it to the tenets of philosophical schools. But the meaning Christian doctrine came to be the common use of the word in the theological and ecclesiastical language of the Greek and Latin writers, and from the Latin it has passed into most of the modern languages, especially those of Roman Catholic countries. In English, the word Dogma, in this theological sense, is only of late coming much in use, but Doctrine has generally been used instead of it.

Dogmatic Theology

(Lat. *Theologia Dogmatica; Germ. Dogmatische Theologie, Dogmatik*) is a special branch of theology, the object of which is to present a scientific and connected view of the accepted doctrines of the Christian faith. In English theology the name has not come into general use, but dogmatics are included in Systematic Theology. In Germany it became common, particularly after Danmus and Calixt, to separate systematic theology into dogmatics and ethics, and this arrangement is now generally adopted. In

the following article we speak of "Dogmatic Theology" with special reference to its cultivation in Germany, and to its place in the theological literature of Germany, reserving the English literature on the subject for the article "Theology."

I. Idea and Scope of Dogmatics. — The functions of dogmatic theology are twofold: first, to establish what constitutes a doctrine of the Christian faith, and to elucidate it in both its religious and its philosophical aspects; secondly, to connect the individual doctrines into a system. As regards the second function, all writers on dogmatic theology have more or less the same aim in view; but with regard to the former, there is between them the widest possible divergence. There are, in particular, three radically different views of what constitutes a doctrine, of the sources from which dogmatic theology has to derive its chief material, and of the value of the doctrines shown to be articles of the Christian faith. These views we may call the Evangelical, the Roman Catholic, and the Rationalistic.

1. From the stand-point of an Evangelical theologian the Bible alone is recognised as the rule of faith, and as the source from which we have to derive our religious beliefs. The Evangelical dogmatic theologian presupposes the divine inspiration of the Bible, which another special branch of systematic theology, Apologetics (in English literature commonly called Evidences), has to demonstrate. He does not enter into a minute interpretation of the true sense of the word of the Bible, which is the proper function of exegetical theology, but his aim is, by combining all which the Scriptures teach on one particular subject, to establish a doctrine of the Bible. Among those who accept the Bible as the inspired word of God and as the only rule of faith, there has been from the beginning of the Christian Church a wide difference of opinion as to the meaning of many passages of the Bibleword. Thus different theological parties have arisen in the Church, and different ecclesiastical organizations (churches, sects, heresies). The latter, in many instances, have adopted "symbolical books" setting forth their conception of the teaching of the Bible on the most important articles of faith, and have demanded from their members, and in particular from ministers, an acceptance of their distinctive views. Hence we have Lutheran dogmatics, Reformed dogmatics, etc. Julius Muller (in Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, s.v. Dogmatik) objects to denominational dogmatics, and asserts that Protestants should have only Christian dogmatics — not Reformed, Lutheran, etc. But in this respect we think

Schleiermacher is correct (*Darstellung d. theol. Studiums*, § 98) in stating that dogmatic theology must be written from the point of view of some Church Confession, while he is entirely wrong in making it a branch of Historical Theology. Protestant dogmatics treats, not of opinions, but of doctrines accepted as such by the Church.

2. The dogmatic theology of the Roman Catholic Church recognises, besides the Scriptures, the tradition of the Church as part of the rule of faith. The Scriptures are only to be understood in the sense which the Church declares to be the true one. The dogmatic theology of the Roman Catholic Church consequently contains only those doctrines which that Church has declared to be such. All other doctrines that have not received this formal definition by the Church, however clearly they may appear to be grounded in the Scriptures or demonstrated by theological science, have only the value of "theological opinion" (*theologumenon*). With regard to the Biblical proof for the doctrines, Roman Catholic writers distinguish between Biblical and ecclesiastical doctrines, the latter of which can only be proved by tradition. Other distinctions made by them are: Dogmata implicita and explicita (fully defined); pure (if they can only be known from divine revelation) and mixed (if they can also be demonstrated by reason), necessary (those a belief in which is declared to be necessary for salvation) and useful (which are not necessary for salvation).

3. The first Rationalistic writers on dogmatic theology did not refuse belief in any doctrine they found in the Bible; but, demanding that the conformity of every Biblical doctrine with reason should be demonstrated, they introduced a new interpretation of the Bible, explaining away a number of doctrines which thus far had been generally accepted both by Evangelical and Roman Catholic theologians. Subsequent schools of Rationalism denied the authenticity of most of the books of the Bible, and consequently rejected all doctrines as Biblical which could only be proved by the books rejected by them; and the authority of the Old Testament was denied in toto. In the New Testament a distinction was drawn between the opinions of the apostles and the words of Jesus, and infallibility claimed for the latter exclusively. Finally, schools arose which maintained the fallibility of Jesus himself, and which regarded the doctrines taught in the Bible as entitled to no more authority than any system of human opinions. *SEE RATIONALISM*.

II. History. — The beginnings of a systematic exhibition of Christian doctrine are seen in the Apostolic and the Nicene Creeds. Among the writers of the ancient Church, Origen, in his work περίἀρχῶν, presented the first outline of what may be called a system of (dogmatic) theology. Among the works of Augustine, the following were of a similar character: Enchiridion ad Laurentium (*de fide, spe et caritate*); *de doctrina christiana*; *de civitate Dei*; *de fide ac symbolo*; *de ecclesiae dogmatibus*. They were followed by Fulgentius of Ruspe, Gennadius, and Junilius. In the Greek Church, the Catecheses of Gregory of Nyssa (ὁ λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μέγας) and of Cyril of Jerusalem (Catecheses ad baptizandos et baptizatos) belong to this class of literature, though they have chiefly a practical object. The first scientific system of dogmatic theology was written by John of Damascus (ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως), whom, however, Isidor of Hispalis (died 636) had preceded as a compiler (in his *Sententiae*). Dogmatic theology in the Middle Ages finds its foremost expression in Scholasticism, which is supplemented by Mysticism. In the 9th century Scotus Erigena was distinguished as a thinker; but his principal work, De divisione naturae, is not a dogmatic theology in the strict sense of the word. At the close of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century, Anselm of Canterbury, Roscellin, and Abelard gave a new impulse to the treatment of dogmatic theology, and aimed at a reconciliation between philosophic speculation and faith. But a strictly scientific method was for the first time introduced by the Magister Sententiarumn (Peter Lombardus), whose followers (Robert Pulleyn, Peter of Poitiers, etc.) were called *Sententiarii*. The school of St. Victor (Victorines), on the other hand, tried to unite profound mysticism with dialectics. Scholasticism was further developed by the greater acquaintance of the theologians with the works of Aristotle, which dates from the Crusades. Alexander of Hales (*Doctor Irrefragibilis*, 1222-1245), Albertus Magnus (1222-1280), Thomas Aquinas (1221-1274, the head of a new theological school which embraces nearly all the theologians of the Dominican order), compiled works of immense extent, called Summae, in which every chapter was subdivided into questions, distinctions, etc. But, chiefly owing to the ascendency of Nominalism, scholastic theology soon degenerated into absurd subtleties. In opposition to the Thomistic school, the mystic school of Bonaventura (*Doctor Seraphicus*, died 1274) and the dialectic school of Duns Scotus (*Dr. Subtilis*, died 1308) arose, both from the Franciscan order. The conflict of

theological schools became a conflict of monastic orders. The *Summae* were succeeded by Quodlibets; the multiplicity of questions was infinitely increased. The liberal but sceptical Occam (died 1347) was followed by the "last of scholastic theologians," Gabriel Biel (died 1495), while Mysticism, which had taken a practical turn in the works of Master Eckart, Tauler, Ruysbroek, and Suso, was brought into a scientific shape by Gerson (*Dr. Christianissimus*, died 1429). *SEE SCHOLASTICISM*. The progress of humanistic studies secured for dogmatic theology a more complete and thorough treatment, but only externally. Its regeneration begins with the Reformation. Luther was a preacher rather than a dogmatic theologian. The foundation of evangelical dogmatics was laid by Melancthon, the *praeceptor Germanic*, in his *loci communes* (subsequently *loci theologici*). He was followed in the Lutheran theology by Chemnitz, Egidius and Nicolaus Hunnius, and the zealous Hutter (*Lutherus redivivus*), whose loci were particularly opposed to the moderate school of Melancthon. One of the greatest works of this period is the *Loci theogici* of J. Gerhard; and among other great writers were Quenstedt, Calov, Hollaz, Baier, etc. In these works a new school of Scholasticism arose, which again called forth an opposing school of Protestant mysticism (Jacob Bohme, Weigel, Arnd). In the Reformed churches there was from the beginning a less strict adherence to symbolic books, and a prevalence of the exegetical treatment of theology over the dogmatic. Zuingle wrote several dogmatical works of considerable value; but the standard work of the Reformed Church is Calvin's *Institutio Christianas religionis*. Other Reformed writers on dogmatic theology were Bullinger, Musculus, Peter Martyr, Hyperius, and, in the 17th century, Keckermann, Polanus of Polansdorf, Alsted, Alting, Wolleb, Burmann, Heidanus, F. Heidegger. New methods of treating dogmatic theology were attempted by Cocceins ("Federal Theology") and Leydecker (the "econominal" method, dividing the subject according to the persons of the Trinity). In the Lutheran Church, Calixtus endeavored to substitute the analytical way ("final method") for the synthetical, which had been followed since Melancthon. At the close of the 17th and in the earlier part of the 18th century, Pietism, and the philosophical systems of Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and Wolf, began to exercise a considerable influence upon dogmatic theology both in the Lutheran and in the Reformed Church. In the Reformed Church, Arminianism, represented by Limborch and the French school of Saumur, gained numerous adherents; while in the Lutheran Church new methods were attempted by Pfaff, Buddeus, Carpzov, Rambach, and J.S. Baumgarten, the last named being wholly

under the influence of the Wolfian philosophy. The new method was more fully developed by Semler, Michaelis, Teller, Tollner, Doderlein, Morus, and others, who prepared the way for Rationalism, among whose early representatives were Gruner, Eckermann, and Henke. A new epoch began with the philosophy of Kant, by which the works of Tieftrunk, Stiudlin, and Ammon were more or less influenced. The orthodox system was adhered to by Storr and Reinhard, more, however, with regard to its supranaturalistic character than to all its ecclesiastical definitions and developments. Augusti pleaded the authority of the old doctrinal system, and the same was done by De Wette, who distinguished himself for dialectical keenness, and by Daub and Marheineke, who tried a mediation between the old theology and Hegelian speculation. In opposition to these attempts, Wegscheider consistently developed the views of the former Rationalists, and gave to the Rationalistic system the last finish. Bretschneider also proceeded from a Rationalistic stand-point, but in many questions tried to mediate between Rationalism and the old Church doctrine. A powerful influence upon German theology was exercised by Schleiermacher, who undertook the bold task of not only mediating between Rationalism and Supranaturalism, but of merging the two into an entirely new system, which was to acknowledge the claims of both. He based his *Christliche Glaube* neither upon historical authorities nor upon philosophical speculation; but, regarding the Christian revelation solely as a new, divine, world-redeeming principle of life, he represented dogmatic theology as the exhibition of the Christian consciousness manifesting itself in the Church. Several theological schools sprung from Schleiermacher; and even the schools opposed to his system felt and acknowledged its importance and its influence. Some of the adherents of Schleiermacher defended from his stand-point all the essential doctrines of Biblical orthodoxy. Others attempted a middle course between the system of Schleiermacher and the symbolical books of the German Protestant Church, as Twesten (*Vorlesungen uber die Dogmatik der ev. luth. kirche*, 2 volumes, Hamburg, 1826-1829; 4th edit. 1837) and Nitzsch (*System der christlichen Lehre*, Bonn, 1829; 6th edit. 1851).

A third school rejected these two as deviations from the true spirit of Schleiermacher, and claimed the fullest independence of theological investigation with regard to both the doctrines of the Bible and the Church Confessions. To this school belong Schweizer (*Die Glaubenslehre der evang.-reform. Kirche*, 2 volumes, Zurich, 1844-1847) and Baumgarten-

Crusius (*Grundriss der ev.-kirchl. Dogmatik*, Jena, 1830). They were succeeded by Schenkel, who developed a system of dogmatics from the stand-point of conscience (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Wiesbaden, 2 volumes, 1858-59). While one school of Hegel, already referred to, claimed that the new speculative philosophy of the absolute was identical with the orthodox dogmas, another school, the Young Hegelians, proclaimed that religion, carried to its perfection by reason, is only a god worshipping himself; that a god-man, as an individual, had never an existence upon earth. From this school proceeded Dr. F. Strauss, who, after declaring in his "Life of Jesus" the Biblical account of the life of Jesus a myth, attacked in his "Christian Doctrine in its Historic Development" (*Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, Tubingen, 1840-41, 2 volumes) even the belief in the personality of God and the immortality of the soul and tried to undermine every fundamental doctrine of Christianity by tracing its history. L. Feuerbach, in his essence of Christianity (*Wesen des Christenthums*, 1841, Leipzig), went even beyond Strauss to the extreme limit of nihilism, rejecting religion itself as a dream and an illusion. Under the influence of both Schleiermacher and Hegel, the so-called Tubingen school, of which F.C. Baur was the founder, sought to comprehend the historic development of the dogma as the dialectic process of the idea itself, and as the development of the undeveloped doctrine of the Bible into a more adequate unity of contents and form. We have no complete system of dogmatics from any prominent writer of this school. Many German theologians sustain either an eclectic or an independent relation with regard to the philosophical schools just mentioned. Thus Liebner (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Gotting. 1849, volume 1) and Lange (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Heidelberg, 1849-1852) were called the Epigoni of speculative theology, and Hase, the Church historian, was a prominent representative of speculative rationalism (Lehrbuch der evangel. Dogmatik (*Stuttg*. 1826, 5th edit. 1860). In direct opposition to the rationalistic and speculative theology, as well as to the vague supranaturalism of the 18th century, there developed itself at the beginning of the present century a school which demanded a restoration of the original theological method of the Reformed churches, as it existed in the 16th century, especially of the old Lutheran dogmatics. Among the works of this class are H. Schmid (*Dogmatik der evluth.* K. Erlangen, 1843, 5th edtiion, 1863) and Philippi (*Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, Stuttgardt, 1854-63,4 volumes). Ebrard wrote a manual of dogmatics from the standpoint of the evangelical school in the United Evangelical Church, which is based upon the doctrines *common to the old Lutheran and old Reformed*

churches (Christliche Dogmatik, Konigsberg, 1851-52, 2 volumes, 2d edit. 1862-63). Previously Tob. Beck, abandoning the traditional method of theological schools, sought to bring the doctrines of the Bible, without regard to theological controversies and symbolical books, into a system, using many new terms (*Die christl. Lehrwissenschaft.* Stuttgardt, 1840).

In the Roman Catholic Church, the writers on dogmatics for a long time after the Reformation adhered to the scholastic method. Prominent among them were Bellarmin, Canisius, Maldonat, and Becanus. Noel (Alexander Natalis, died 1724) introduced a new dogmatic method, more simple, and in many respects emancipating itself from the clumsiness of scholasticism. In Germany a number of writers appeared (e.g. Schwarz, Zimmermann, Brenner, Dobmayer), leaning on the reigning philosophical schools. Among works aiming merely at a systematic exhibition of the doctrines of the Church, those by Liebermann and Perrone (a Roman Jesuit) have acquired permanent reputation. Klee (*Kathol. Dogmatik,* Mainz. 1835, 3d ed. 1845) paid prominent attention to Biblical and patristic arguments, but neglected the philosophical development of doctrines. This feature is more conspicuous in the manuals of dogmatics by Staudenmaier (*Christl. Dogmatik*, Freiburg, 1844-54, 4 volumes), Dieriger (*Lehrbuch der kath. Dogmatik*, 4th edition, 1858). and Kuhn. The establishment of a new theological school was attempted by Hermes (q.v.), who, conceiving doubt as the necessary condition of truth, sought through doubt to advance to the proof of the Roman Catholic doctrine; but his system was condemned by the Pope. The same fate happened to the system of Günther (q.v.), and to most of the works of Franz Baader (q.v.), who was largely under the influence of Schelling.

On the history of dogmatics, see Heinrich (*Versuch einer Geschichte der verschiedeene Lehrarten*, etc. Leipz. 1790); Schickedanz (*Versuch eiser Gesch. der christl. Glaubenslehre*, Brunsw. 1827); Hermann (*Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik von Melanchthon bis Schleiermacher*, Leipz. 1842); and Gass (*Geschichte derprotestantischen Dogmatik in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Theologie uberhaupt*, Berlin, 1854-1866, 4 volumes); Frank, *Geschichte d. prot. Theologie* (Leips. 1862-65, 2 volumes); Dorner, *Geschichte der protestant. Theologie, besond. in Deutschland* (1867, 8vo). See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 3:433; Hagenbach, *Encyklopadie*, page 321; German Theology (in New American Cyclopaedia, 8:192), and our art. *SEE DOCTRINES, HISTORY OF*.

Dolcino

SEE DULCINISTS.

Doleful creatures

(µyjæpo*chim'*, prop. shrieks, hence howling animals; Sept. ηχος, noise, Vulg. *dracones*, *dragons*) is thought by most to be a general name for howlers, or screech-owls, which the prophet predicts will occupy the desolate palaces of Babylon (<232121>Isaiah 13:21). *SEE OWL*. As the parallelism requires some animal inhabiting ruins and uttering a disconsolate cry to be understood, the Rabbins (with Abulwalid) understand the marten, or kind of weasel (comp. Hitzig, in loc.), which has a clear, short, plaintive voice (Bechstein, *Naturgesch.* 1:28). But the owl is more probable, as it is well known for this peculiarity (comp. *gemere*, Pliny, 10:16; *queri*, Virg. AEn. 4:462). *SEE OCHIM*.

Dolesus

(Δόλεσος), a citizen of Gadara of rank and wealth, whom the inhabitants slew out of spite towards the Romans on surrendering the city to Vespasian (Josephus, *War*, 4:7, 3).

Dome

(Latin domus, a house). In the early Middle Ages the word domus was applied to the house of God, and especially to the cathedral church. In this latter sense the derivatives of the word are still used in Italy and Germany. The word dome is used more generally in architecture to signify the roof to the whole or a part of a building, which roof has a circular or polygonal base, and whose perpendicular section is a curved line. Such domes, or curved roofs, are found very early in the history of architecture, especially in Etruria and Persia. The dome of modern architecture has its origin in the Roman adaptation of the Etruscan dome. The roof of the Pantheon at Rome is the finest example existing of the ancient Roman dome. In the Byzantine architecture, a flat dome over the center of church edifices, resting upon four arches, and supported below by half or quarter domes, is copied in the Turkish religious architecture. A modification of the Byzantine into the horse-shoe dome has been introduced largely into the Russian and some other Oriental branches of architecture. In the transition from the Byzantine to the Romanesque style of architecture, the dome

became more of a cupola. In the Gothic architecture the dome disappeared. The Baptistery at Pisa, founded in the 13th century, has a dome for a roof, though all the ornaments are Gothic. It was during the Renaissance, that the modern dome was developed. The first one built was in the church of Santo Spirito, in Florence. It had a semicircle for its section, and was single. The dome of the cathedral of Florence has a diameter of 139 feet, the same as that of St. Peter's in Rome, and only three feet less than that of the Pantheon at Rome. This dome is considered by some to be more elegant in outline than that of St. Peter's, which others consider the most graceful dome ever built. Both rest on a cylinder, or drum, and both are double; that is, they have each an interior dome, surmounted by an exterior one, rising from the same base, and being more pointed. This exterior one is only for its effect on the external architecture. They are both surmounted by a small cupola, called a lantern. All later Renaissance domes are built on this general type. Among the most famous domes are the following: Pantheon, Rome, 143 feet in diameter; Cathedral, Florence, 139; St. Peter's, Rome, 139; St. Sophia, Constantinople, 115; St. Paul's, London, 112; Mosque of Achmet, Constantinople, 92; Church of the Invalids, Paris, 80; St. Vitalis, Ravenna, 55; St. Mark's, Venice, 44. — Maigne, *Dictionnaire des origines dans les arts* (Paris, 1864); Lubke, *Geschichte der Baukunst; Viollet le Due, Dictionnaire de l'Architecture* (Paris).

Dominic

a saint of the Romish calendar, founder of the order of "Dominicans." His name was Domingo de Guzman, and he was born in 1170 at Calahorra, Spain. He completed his education at the University of Palentia, in 1193 was made canon of the cathedral of Osma, and in 1198 a priest and archdeacon. He subsequently became known as an eloquent preacher, and was sent on missions to various parts of Spain, and into France. Having had his zeal inflamed by the progress of the Albigenses, he bent all his energies to their conversion. Finding his own efforts insufficient, he appears to have conceived the idea of founding an order of preaching friars, whose special duty should be the conversion of heretics; and about the commencement of the 13th century he began to carry his purpose into effect. He soon found numerous volunteers to his new order, and, to disarm opposition, he and his followers adopted the rule of St. Augustine. As a distinct order, they did not, however, receive the formal verbal approval of the pope, Innocent III, till 1215. *SEE DOMINICANS*. Dominic

did not, however, trust for the uprooting of heresy simply to his own preaching and that of his followers. Finding that his eloquence failed to convert the Albigenses, he, with the papal legates, Peter of Castelnau and Rainier of Raoul, obtained permission of Innocent III to hold courts, before which they might summon by authority of the pope, and without reference to the local bishops, any individuals suspected of heresy, and inflict upon them, if obstinate, capital punishment, or otherwise any lesser penalty. Peter of Castelnau, who had made himself especially obnoxious by his severity, was killed at Toulouse in 1208; and then was proclaimed by the pope, at the instigation of Dominic, that fearful 'crusade,' as it was designated by Innocent, to which all the barons of France were summoned, and which, under the captaincy of De Montfort, led to the slaughter of so many thousands of these so-called heretics. *SEE ALBIGENSES*. Dominic himself, it has been said, was not personally cruel; but towards heretics he had no compassion, and it is certain that, so far from attempting to lessen the horrible slaughter, he did what he could to stimulate it. Dominic is very frequently said to have been the founder of the Inquisition, but this is an error. He and his companions in the commission to examine and punish the Albigenses were commonly called 'Inquisitors,' but their commission was merely local and temporary. The 'Holy Office' was not formally established till 1233, when Gregory IX laid down the rules and defined the jurisdiction of the courts, which he appointed for various countries under the name of 'Inquisitorial Missions.' It is, however, worthy of notice that the chief inquisitor was a Dominican monk, Pietro de Verona, and that the governance of the Inquisition was placed pretty much in the hands of the Dominicans. The Romish accounts make Dominic a miracle-worker even to the extent of raising the dead to life, as in the case of a young nobleman named Napoleon, at Rome, on the Ash-Wednesday of 1218, and by other miracles. Dominic died at Bologna in 1221. He was canonized by pope Gregory IX on July 3, 1234: the Church of Rome keeps his festival on August 4. Dominic is said to have written some commentaries upon St. Matthew, St. Paul, and the canonical epistles, but they have not come down to us." — *English Cyclopaedia*; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, August 4; Acta Sanctorum, Aug. 1:545 sq.; Lacordaire, *Vie de S. Dominique* (Bruxelles, 1848), and OEuvres (Paris, 1864), volume 1.

Dominica in Albis

(the Sunday of white garments), a title anciently given to the Sunday after Easter, because on this day those persons who had been baptized at Easter appeared for the last time in the chrysomes, or white robes, which they received at baptism. These were laid up in the church as evidences of their baptismal profession. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 20, chapter 5, § 12.

Dominica Palmarum

SEE PALM-SUNDAY.

Dominicale

a white veil anciently worn by women at the time of receiving the Eucharist. It has been disputed whether the dominicale was not a linen cloth which women, in the sixth century, were in some churches required to take to the Eucharist, and with which they covered the hand before the bread was laid upon it. Augustine may refer to this in one of the sermons usually ascribed to him, *De Tempore*, in which he says that it was customary for men to wash their hands when they communicate, and for women to bring their little linen cloths to receive the body of Christ. In the Council of Auxerre, A.D. 590, a rule was enacted that no woman should receive the Eucharist in her bare hand, but nothing further is prescribed. The best authorities, however, are of opinion that the dominicale was a veil for the head. — Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dictionary, s.v.; Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 15, chapter 5, § 7.

Dominical Letter

the letter in our almanacs which marks the Lord's Day (*Dies Domini*), usually printed in a capital form. In the calendar, the first seven letters of the alphabet are applied to the days of the week, the letter A being always given to the 1st of January, whatsoever that day may be, and the others in succession to the following days. If the year consisted of three hundred and sixty-four days, making an exact number of weeks, no change would ever take place in these letters. Thus, supposing the 1st of January in any given year to be Sunday, all the Sundays would be represented by A; not only in that year, but in all succeeding. There being, however, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, the first letter is again repeated on the 31st of

December, and, consequently, the Dominical, or Sunday letter for the following year will be G. The retrocession of the letters will, for the same reason, continue every year, so as to make F the Dominical letter of the third, etc. If every year were common, the process would continue regularly, and a cycle of seven years would be sufficient to restore the same letters to the same days as before. But the intercalation of a day every bissextile or leap year causes a variation. The leapyear, containing three hundred and sixty-six days, will throw the Dominical letter of the following year back two letters; so that, if the Dominical letter at the beginning of the year be C, the Dominical letter of the next year will be A. This alteration is not effected by dropping a letter altogether, but by changing the Dominical letter at the end of February, where the intercalation takes place. In consequence of this change every fourth year, twenty-eight years must elapse before a complete revolution of the Dominical letter can take place; and it is on this fact that the period of the solar cycle is founded. The rules for finding the Dominical letter for any year are given in the Book of Common Prayer. *SEE CYCLE*.

Dominicans

Picture for Dominicans

an order of mendicants founded by Dominic (q.v.) de Guzman about the year 1215. In England they were generally called Black Friars from their garments, in France Jacobins, from the fact that their first French house was in the Rue St. Jacques, at Paris. They called themselves commonly Preaching Friars (*Fratres Prcedicatores*), from their office of preaching.

I. *History.* — Dominic projected the order when he was preaching against the Albigenses (q.v.); but the Council of Lateran, in 1215, declared itself against any increase of the monastic orders. Nevertheless Innocent III was prevailed upon to approve of the order on condition that it should assimilate itself as closely as possible to one already in existence. The successor of Innocent, Honorius III, was less reluctant, and confirmed the Dominicans as a new and independent order. It spread rapidly over all Christian countries. In 1221 thirteen of the friars went to England for the purpose of establishing the order, and Stephen Langton, then archbishop of Canterbury, giving his approval, they fixed their first house at Oxford. Their second house was in London. At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII there were 58 houses in England and Wales.

When the second general chapter was held, in 1221, at Bologna, 60 convents, belonging to eight provinces, were represented, and a great many friars were sent out to establish new houses. In 1278 the number of their convents amounted to 417. In 1233 the Inquisition (q.v.) was transferred to them by the Pope. This gave them a powerful and pernicious influence in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and France. They showed so much eagerness in hunting up and prosecuting heretics that a popular pun changed the name Dominicans into Domini canes (the dogs of the Lord). Although endowed in 1272 with all the privileges of the mendicant orders, they soon gave up begging, and, after being allowed in 1425 to accept donations, they accumulated great wealth. Together with the Franciscans, they became the chief representatives of the theological science of the Middle Ages, occupied a large number of the theological chairs at the universities, and became in most controversies not only the rivals, but also the bitter opponents of the Franciscans. The greatest theologian among them in the Middle Ages was Thomas Aquinas (q.v.), whom they have ever since followed as a standard authority. Among their other celebrities are Albertus Magnus, Eccard, Tauler, Suso, Savonarola, Las Casas, Vincent Ferrier, and Vincent of Beauvais. As theologians, they were mostly Nominalists, Augustinians, and opponents of the Immaculate Conception. In literature in general they have had great influence, as the Magister sacri palatii at Rome, in whose hands is the censorship of books, has always been taken from their order. They secured great popular favor not only by their preaching, but by the establishment of an order of tertiarians, open to laymen. The people were also gained by them especially by the spreading of the use of the Rosary (q.v.), which was introduced by them, and which became, in consequence of the many indulgences attached to it by the popes, a very popular form of worship. The Dominicans also belonged to the most zealous laborers in the foreign missions of the Roman Church. Many of their members were sent to the East; and in Armenia, in particular, they succeeded in uniting a great many Armenians with the Roman Church. After the discovery and conquest of America by the Spaniards, the Dominicans protected the natives from being enslaved, but gave, on the other hand, the first impulse to the, importation of slaves from Africa. In America, and in the West and East Indies, they surpassed all other orders in power, numbers, and riches. In Europe, on the contrary, the reputation and influence of the order rapidly declined. The conduct of Tetzel (q.v.) in preaching the papal indulgences brought odium upon the whole order, and the development of the Inquisition in Spain, under the management of the

Dominicans, attached to their name a stain which will never be blotted out. In the countries which embraced Protestantism they lost over 400 convents, while in Roman Catholic countries they were generally superseded, as confessors at the court and as teachers at the universities, by the Jesuits. Several attempts to reform the order were made in the 15th and 16th centuries, but led only to the establishment of 12 reformed congregations. The whole order was never brought back to its original simplicity and vigor. Yet they still counted in the 18th century more than 1000 convents of monks and nuns in 45 provinces, 11 of which were outside of Europe. In consequence of the French Revolution, they lost all their convents in France and Belgium, nearly all in Germany, and many in Italy; and in the 19th century they were entirely suppressed in Spain, Portugal, and Sardinia. In 1832 the emperor of Russia suppressed in the sole province of Mohilew 55 Dominican convents. In Father Lacordaire the order received a member of great reputation and influence, and through him the order was re-established in France in 1845. In Austria the Dominicans reluctantly submitted, in 1858, to certain reforms which the Pope ordered to be introduced. According to the provisions made, all the novices are to be bound to the ancient rule, which will also be established in every convent as soon as it will have a majority of reformed monks. The order is on the increase in the United States of North America and in France, and established its first convent in Prussia in 1860. The Dominicans entered the United States in 1539, but their missions have been less extensive than those of the Franciscans and Jesuits. The first bishop of New York, Luke Concanen, had been assistant general of the order. A great activity in behalf of its spreading was at a later period displayed by father (later bishop) Fenwick, a native of Maryland, who entered the novitiate at Bornhem, Belgium. He established the convent of St. Rose, Springfield, Kentucky, which is now the novitiate of the order in the United States.

II. *Constitution*. — The constitution of the order was adopted at a general chapter in 1220, and is in all essential points like that of the other mendicant orders. At the head of the order is a general, who is elected by a general chapter for life, and is assisted in the exercise of his office by a number of definitores. The order is divided into provinces, at the head of which is a provincial, who is elected at a provincial chapter by the superiors of the houses, who are. called priors. Their habit consists of a

white garment and scapular, with a white mantle and hood ending in a point.

III. *Statistics*. — The Dominicans have still convents in Italy (4 in the city of Rone, with about 100 members), France (10 in 1862), Belgium, Holland, England, Ireland (about 50 members in 1843), Austria (37 convents with 202 members in 1843), Prussia (first convent established in 1860), Poland (in 1841, 16 houses with 160 members), Spain, Russia, Turkey, Mexico, Central and South America, and the United States, where they have houses in New York, Ohio, Kentucky, and Wisconsin. In 1862 the total number of convents was estimated at 360 houses, with 4000 members. See Fehr's *Geschichte der Miischsorden*; Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*; Malvendi, *Annales Ordinis Prcedicatorum* (Romae, 1746); Castillo and Lopez, *Historia general de S. Domingo y de su Orden de Predicatores* (Madrid, 1612 sq. 6 volumes, fol.); Antonius Senensis, *Chronic. Fratrum Praedicat*. (Paris, 1585, 8vo). A complete list of all the saints, martyrs, writers, etc., of the order is given in Annee Dominicaine (Paris, 1678 sq. 13 volumes, 4to). The complete statutes of the order may be found in Holstenii Codex Regularum (Augsburg, 1759, 6 volumes, fol.).

Dominican Nuns

Picture for Dominican Nuns

an order of nuns founded by Dominic (q.v.) de Guzman in 1206, at Prouille, near Toulouse. They were mostly converted Albigenses. At the time of their greatest prosperity they counted about 400 convents in Europe and America. They fell earlier into irregularities and disorders than the monks. They took part in all the reforms which were introduced among the monks, and split into similar congregations. The first convent of the order in the United States was organized by father Thomas Wilson, in Kentucky, in 1823, from which some other houses have sprung in the dioceses of Cincinnati, Nashville, and San Francisco. There are also congregations in the dioceses of Milwaukee and Brooklyn. They have also convents in most italian states, in France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, England, Russia. Their house in Rome is under the immediate direction of the Dominicans, while in most other countries they are under the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishops.

Dominicum

a term applied by ancient writers to the Lord's day, the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's house. Cyprian uses it in two meanings in the same paragraph: *Locuples et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare to credis, quae corbonam non respicis? quae in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis; quae artem de sacrifcio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis*?" — "Are you a rich and wealthy matron, and do you think that you rightly celebrate the Dominicum" (Lord's day or Lord's Supper), "who have no regard to the corban? who come into the Dominicum" (the Lord's house) "without any sacrifice, and eat part of the sacrifice which the poor have, offered?" The general application of the word was to the Lord's house. Jerome says that the famous church at Antioch, which was commenced by Constantine, and completed and dedicated by Constantius, had the name of Dominicum aureum, in consequence of its richness and beauty. — Ducange, Glossarium Med. et inf. Latinitatis, s.v.; Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary*, s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 1.

Dominis, de, Marco Antonio

a learned Italian theologian, was born in 1566, of an ancient family, at Arba, on the coast of Dalmatia, and studied at the Jesuits' college at Loretto, and at the University of Padua. The authorities of the university used their influence to induce him to enter the order of Jesuits: to this he appears to have consented at first; and, while passing his novitiate, he gave instruction in mathematics, physics, and eloquence. At the same time he employed his leisure in the study of theology. The routine of a college life not suiting his taste, De Dominis quitted Padua; and, on the recommendation of the emperor Rodolphus, he was appointed bishop of Segni, much to the anger of the Jesuits. Two years afterwards he was made archbishop of Spalatro; but, while holding this dignity, he became embroiled with the pope (Paul V) by taking a part in the disputes between that pontiff and the Venetians respecting the endowment of ecclesiastical establishments. On this occasion he threw out a censure on the conduct of the pope;, and he further gave offense by entering upon the important but personally dangerous subject of reforming the manners of the clergy. He resigned his archbishopric and retired to Venice in 1615, and in 1616 he came to England, where James I appointed him dean of Windsor. He now prepared his book, De Republica Ecclesiastica, the object of which is to show that the pope has no supremacy over other bishops (Lond. part 1,

1617; part 2, 1620; part 3, Hanov. 1622, fol.). He edited father Paul's *Hist. of the Council of Trent in English*. De Dominis appears to have been restless and inconstant, for after a few years he expressed a wish to return to the Roman Church, and having received from Gregory XV a promise of pardon, he set out for Rome. Soon after his arrival, some intercepted letters gave indications that his repentance was not sincere, and he was in consequence committed to the castle of St. Angelo, where, after an imprisonment of a few months, he died, September, 1624. Being convicted after his death of heresy, his body was disinterred and burnt. A pamphlet, called his *Reasons for renouncing the Protestant Religion*, appeared in London in 1827 (8vo). Dr. Newland, dean of Ferns, published in 1860 a *Life and Contemporaneous Church History of De Dominis*. — Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog*. 4:474; *English Cyclopaedia*; Collier, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 7:434 sq.

Dominus vobiscum

(the Lord be with you), a form of salutation used in the liturgies of several of the Christian churches. It is taken from the book of Ruth, together with the response *et cum spiritu tuo* — "and with thy spirit." It was introduced into Christian worship before the end of the second century. A canon of the first council of Braga, in 563, directed against a custom which the Priscillianists had adopted, of assigning one form of salutation to the bishops and another to the presbyters, enjoins all to use the same form, *Dominus sit vobiscum* — "the Lord be with you;" and the people to reply, *Et cum spiritu tuo — sicut ab ipsis apostolis traditionemn omnis retinet oriens* — "and with thy spirit," according to apostolic and Eastern custom. — Augusti, Christl. Archeologie, book 5, chapter 3, § 6.

Domitian

(TITUS FLAVIUS DOMITIANUS), Roman emperor, younger son of Vespasian and Domitilla was born October 24, A.D. 52, and succeeded his brother Titus as emperor September 13, A.D. 81. In the beginning of his reign he affected great zeal for the reformation of public morals, but his true character showed itself later in almost unexampled cruelties. In A.D. 95 a persecution of the Christians is recorded in the history of the Church, but it appears to have been directed particularly against the Jews, with whom the Christians were then confounded by the Romans. Suetonius (In Dornsitian. chapter 12) ascribes the proscriptions of the Jews, or those

who lived after the manner of the Jews, and whom he styles as "improfessi," to the rapacity of Domitian. Eusebius (3:17) says that Domitian "was the second that raised a persecution against us, and established himself as successor of Nero in his hatred and hostility to God." The same writer (3:19, 20), following Hegesippus, tells of a summons of the grandchildren of Jude the apostle to appear before Domitian. He questioned them as to their birth, claims, property, etc. and when they answered that the kingdom of Christ, for which they looked, was purely spiritual, he dismissed them. The tyrant was not so lenient with his own relatives, Flavius Clemens and Domitilla, who were charged with "Atheism and Jewish manners," charges often brought against the Christians. Flavius was executed and Domitilla banished, A.D. 95. Domitian himself was assassinated (A.D. 96). A tradition (not now believed) speaks of St. John as having been tried before Domitian, and that, having been condemned to be plunged into a caldron of boiling oil, he came forth unhurt. See Milman, *History of Christianity*, book 2, chapter 4; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chapter 16, and the article *SEE PERSECUTION*.

Domitilla

niece (or wife) of Flavius Clemens, who was put to death under Domitian (q.v.; Euseb. 3:18). It is not certain that they were Christians, but it is at least probable. Domitilla did not suffer martyrdom, but was banished; an unwarranted tradition says that she was afterwards burnt under Trajan. She is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Church, May 12. See Butler, *Lives of Saints*, May 12; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 2:124; Murdoch's Mosheim, *Church History*, N.Y. ed., 1:59.

Domus

(house), a designation of the church, or of appendages of the church, in ancient times, with distinguishing epithets attached; thus:

Domus Basilicae

(οἴκοι βασίλειοι) (in the plural), the houses of the clergy adjoining the church. — Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4:59; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 7, § 13.

Domus Columbe,

the house of the dove, used by Tertullian for a church. When writing against the Valentinians, who affected secrecy in their doctrines, he compares them to the Eleusinian mysteries. whose temple was so guarded with doors and curtains that a man must be five years a candidate before he could be admitted to the adytum of the deity, or secrets of the sanctuary. "Whereas," says he, "the house of our dove is plain and simple, delights in high and open places, affects the light, loves the figure of the Holy Ghost, and the orient or morning sun, which is the figure of Christ." "The house of the dove" seems here to be the same as " the house of Christ." Mede explains it, the house of the dove-like religion, or of the dove-like disciples of Christ (*Tertullianus contra Valentin.* c. 3, cited by Bingham. *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 1, § 2.

Domus Dei, Domus Divina, Domus Ecclesie

— the House of the Lord, the Divine House, the House of the Church.

(1.) The first of these, the Lord's House, was one of the earliest names of the church-building, and it is still in use. It answers to the Greek κυριακόν, which some suppose to be the origin of our word "Church." *SEE DOMINICUM*.

(2.) The second title, Divine House, was applied, among the pagan Romans, to the emperor's palace, and it was retained in this use by some Christian emperors. It was also applied to the Church; and from this double use some confusion has arisen in interpreting ancient writers.

(3.) The title House of the Church was applied not only to the church edilice, but also to the bishop's house, after the third century. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 1.

Donaldson, John William, D.D.,

a modern Latitudinarian divine and scholar, was born in London, June 10, 1812. He was educated first at the University of London, and afterwards at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as B.A. in 1834, and obtained the second place in the first class of the classical tripos. In 1835 he was elected fellow. His reputation rests upon his numerous and valuable writings in philosophy and classical literature, e.g. his Theatre of the Greeks (8vo, many editions): — New Cratylus (1839; 3d ed. 1859): —

Varronianus (1844). After his ordination he became head-master of Bury St. Edmunds, where he remained several years, and published Maskil le Sopher (a treatise on Hebrew grammar), and finally Jashar, or Fragmenta Archetypa Carminum Hebraicorum, etc. (Berlin, 1854; London, 1860, 8vo), the object of which was to reconstruct the lost book of Jashar from the fragments scattered through the O.T. The book is full of wild and extravagant conjectures. *SEE JASHER*. Soon after he resigned his place at Bury St. Edmunds, and returned to Cambridge, where he gave a course of lectures on Latin synonymes, and occupied himself with tuition. Here he wrote a volume entitled Christian Orthodoxy reconciled with the Conclusions of modern critical Learning (London 1857, 8vo), an attempt, according to the author, "to stay the plague of unbelief, which has for some time followed in the train of a dishonest Bibliolatry." In 1856 he was appointed one of the classical examiners in the University of London. He died in London February 10, 1861. Dr. Donaldson was a man of great industry, learning, and integrity, but his critical faculty was not equal to the tasks he ambitiously attempted. That his Jashar abounds in misapplied learning, uncritical criticism, and unsound exegesis, was amply shown on its appearance by Ewald and other German scholars, and by Perowne and others in England. See Journal of Sacred Literature, July, 1855, article 1, and October 1860, page 206; Christian. Remembrancer, October 1855, art. 5.

Donar

SEE THOR.

Donaria

(ἀναθήματα, comp. Luke 21:5), gifts and offerings to adorn the Church. The term was also applied in later times to gifts to the Church, which were hung on pillars, and set in public view as memorials of some great mercy which men had received from God. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 8, § 1.

Donation of Constantine

a forged imperial edict. published between A.D. 755 and 766, professing to contain a gift from Constantine, in the year 324, of Rome and Italy to Sylvester, then Pope. The document exists both in a Greek and Latin text, and was first produced in a letter of Pope Adrian I to Charlemagne.

Baronius defended its genuineness; but its spuriousness is now generally admitted. Its substance is as follows: "We give as a free gift to our most blessed father, Sylvester, the Pope, the city of Rome, and the cities of all Italy, as well as the cities of the other Western countries. To make room for him, we abdicate our sovereignty over all these provinces; and we withdraw from Rome, transferring the seat of our empire to Byzantium, since it is not just that a terrestrial emperor should retain any power where God has placed the head of religion." "According to the legend," says Gibbon, "the first of the Christian emperors was healed of the leprosy, and purified in the waters of baptism, by St. Sylvester, the Roman bishop; and never was physician more gloriously recompensed. His royal proselyte withdrew from his seat and patrimony of St. Peter; declared his resolution of founding a new capital in the East; and resigned to the popes the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West." The fraud was exposed by Laurentius Valla. For the "Donation" and its literary history, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, ed. Harles, 6:697; see also Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. xlix; Milman, Latin Christianity, book 1, chapter 2; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book 3, chapter 14; Munch, *Ueber die erdichtete Schenkung Constantin des Grossen* (Freiburg 1824); Biener, *De Collectionibus canonum ecclesiae Graecae* (Berl. 1827).

Donatists

(*Pars Donati* was the name they themselves assumed). During the last half of the third and the first half of the fourth centuries there was a combination of elements at work in the bosom of the Church, which, in consequence of and in connection with peculiar forces operative on the outside, produced a severe strain upon its stability and unity. During this period there were repeated and powerful centrifugal tendencies, which gave birth successively to the Novatian, Meletian, and the Donatist schisms. The outward history of these schisms is long, and its remote causes and outward details must be learned from Church histories.

Of these movements, that of the Donatists in North Africa was by far the most important and widest in its influence. Substantially it had the same ground and character as the Novatian. On this point Neander very clearly and judiciously says: "This schism (the Donatist) may be compared, in many respects, with that of Novatian in the preceding period. In his, too, we see the conflict, for example, of Separatism with Catholicism; and it is therefore important, in so far as it tended to settle and establish the notion

of the visible, outward unity of the Church, and of the objective element in things of religion and of the Church. That which distinguishes the present case is the reaction, proceeding out of the essence of the Christian Church, and called forth, in this instance, by a peculiar occasion, against the confounding of the ecclesiastical and political elements; on which occasion, for the first time, the ideas which Christianity, as opposed to the papal religion of the state, had first made men distinctly conscious of, became an object of contention within the Christian Church itself — the ideas concerning universal, inalienable human rights; concerning liberty of conscience; concerning the rights of free conviction. The more immediate and local occasion of these disputes lay in a certain spirit of fanaticism, which, ever since the spread of Montanism, had prevailed in North Africa, and also in various circumstances superinduced by the Diocletian persecution" (Neander, *Church Hist.* Bohn's ed. 3:250). The substance of what was at issue in this movement is given thus by Dr. Schaff: "The Donatist controversy was a conflict between Separatism and Catholicism; between ecclesiastical purism and ecclesiastical eclecticism; between the idea of the Church, as an exclusive community of regenerate saints, and the idea of the Church as the general Christendom of state and people. It revolved around the doctrine of the essence of the Christian Church, and in particular of the predicate of holiness [as in the Novatian controversy it revolved, ultimately at least, more round the predicate of unity]. It resulted in the completion by Augustine of the Catholic dogma of the Church, which had been partly developed by Cyprian in his conflict with a similar schism" [the Novatian] (Schaff's *Church Hist.* 2:365).

Donatism, starting thus in a time of persecution, when the question in regard to the restoration of the Lapsed brought up under various aspects the question of authority and freedom, and created, too, a severer and a milder theory of discipline, had its roots in the age preceding its actual rise. Embers previously scattered, but still full of latent fire, lay ready all around to create and feed a new fire. Already in the Diocletian persecution the old controversy between the rigoristic and the milder party in regard to discipline was revived. Secundus of Tigisis, the primate of Numidia, led on by one Donatus of Casse Nigre, wrought himself into fury on the subject of severe discipline, advocating prompt exclusion, once and forever, of all who had fled in danger, or delivered up the sacred books to the persecutors. Mensurius, with Cecilian, his archdeacon and successor, headed the milder party, advocating moderation and discretion, and casting

suspicion on the motives of the rigorists. This tension threatened schism as early as the year 305 in the matter of an episcopal election for the city of Cirta (Schaff's *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, 2:361). The actual outbreak was in 311. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, died in that year, whereupon the clergy and people of that district, in a hasty manner, elected the archdeacon Caecilianus in his place, and proceeded to consecrate him without summoning or consulting the bishops of Numidia, a contiguous and subordinate province. Perhaps courtesy or custom, perhaps some real or imaginary right, was here violated; at any rate, on this ground the disaffected party hastened to resent the slight by refusing to acknowledge the new bishop. In addition to the slight of the, Numidian bishops, they justified their opposition to him on the ground or pretext that Felix, one of the bishops who was prominent in the consecration, was a Traditor that is, one who had delivered up the sacred books to the persecutors. In Carthage, also, the elders of the congregation, besides many others, and among them a noble lady, Lucilla, a widow and very superstitious, were opposed to him. Secundus of Tigisis, with seventy Numidian bishops, assembled at Carthage, summoned Caecilian to appear, which he failing to do, they deposed and excommunicated him, and elected in his place Majorinus, the chaplain and favorite of the wealthy and influential widow, Lucilla. After his death in 315, DONATUS, a gifted man, of fiery energy and eloquence, revered by his admirers as a wonder-worker, and styled THE GREAT, was made his successor. From him the now developed party took their name.

Each party now labored to secure the conquest of churches, and thus the breach was extended, and the schism in the North African Church fully effected. The emperor Constantine, who had just secured the sovereignty in this part of the Roman empire, is supposed to have been prejudiced against the friends of Majorinus, for in his first edict he expressly excluded the party from the privileges which he bestowed on the Catholic Church. Thus condemned without a hearing, the Donatists presented a petition to the emperor, who was at the time in Gaul, asking him to name judges in that country before whom the questions which had arisen in the North African Church might be laid. He "directed that Melchiades (Miltiades), bishop of Rome, with five other Gallic bishops," should inquire into the affair; that Caecilian should appear before them, with ten bishops who were to present the charges against him, and ten other bishops who were to defend him" (Neander, *Church Hist.* Bohn's ed. 3:268). The trial took

place in 313. Melchiades brought fifteen other Italian bishops, and Donatus also appeared on the opposite side as chief accuser of Caecilian, and the soul of the new party. His charges were found to be unsustained, and "he himself was declared guilty of various acts contrary to the laws of the Church."

The Donatists were of course dissatisfied with this result. A second hearing was ordered in 314, at which the charges against Felix, the ordainer of Caecilian, were to be investigated. Felix was declared innocent. The Donatists now appealed from this ecclesiastical decision to the emperor himself. He accepted their appeal, though he answered it with violent expressions against them, and after listening to the delegates of the two parties at Milan, in 316, he also decided against the Donatists. The matter now took a severer turn. The emperor issued penal laws against the Donatists, deprived them of their churches, and confiscated their places of assembly. This exasperated them, and fully developed their enthusiasm. The strife went forward not without the use of carnal weapons on both sides. The Donatists were in spirit unsubdued and determined. Ursacius, who was empowered to carry the laws into effect against them, used forcible measures to compel them to unite with the Church. This produced a powerful ferment, and pushed them to the point of desperation. They declared that no power on earth could induce them to fellowship with the "rascal," as they called Caecilian. The cause of the Donatists was espoused by a band of idle, roving, fanatical ascetics, who wandered about the country among the huts of the peasants (whence they were called by their adversaries Circumcelliones [q.v.]). These half-crazy beggars and plunderers excited the peasants to all sorts of violence, and went forth with fire and sword as the "Christian champions" (*agonistici*). Their fury cost blood, and the military was required to suppress it. Some of the Donatists were executed, others banished, and their churches were closed or confiscated. Death, met in this way, they regarded as martyrdom, and, instead of avoiding, they coveted it. Many who did not attain to this honor at the hands of their enemies, in their fanatical zeal resorted to suicide, casting themselves from precipices or into the fire, and even hired others to kill them: The emperor saw the mistake of his violent measures, and in 321 granted to the Donatists full liberty to follow their convictions in faith and worship, at the same time exhorting the Catholics to patience and moderation. This somewhat subdued, but did not end the strife.

Under the successor of Constantine, Constans, they fared worse again. We read of a battle of Bagniae, in which the Donatists were defeated, and of thirteen years of tumult and bloodshed. In general they were subjected to severe measures.

When Julian the Apostate came into power as emperor, the Donatists were much pleased that Christianity should, under a pagan ruler, cease to be the dominant religion of the state. Thus, in 361, they obtained once more their full freedom in religious matters, and rose to the highest degree of eminence that at any time was attained by them. They took possession of their own churches again with joy; repainting the edifices, and generally cleansing the walls and altars. Towards the close of the 4th century Africa was covered with their churches, and had four hundred Donatist bishops.

To be thus placed on a level merely with heathen religions and all sects was, however, after all, only a negative comfort. It by no means adjusted the difficulties of the Donatists with the Church, and under succeeding emperors their case again became worse. Maximus, a deacon, and Primianus, a bishop of Carthage, coming into conflict with each other, created parties, out of which grew sects taking their names the Maximianists and the Prinzianists. Other divisions and difficulties followed, and there grew up among the more thoughtful and reflecting of the African bishops a desire to have the breach healed. Reason and calm disputation also now more and more took the place of violence. A powerful influence toward reconciliation began to be exerted about 396 by Augustine, first presbyter, and afterwards bishop of Hippo, in Numidia. He wrote, preached, and labored privately and publicly with varied, but still generally increasing success.

From this time forward the cause of the Donatists began gradually to. decline. After a three-days' arbitration at Carthage in 411, attended by 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist bishops, where the old issues were rediscussed, the Donatists again stood defeated. Stringent civil laws were also again passed against them, and in 415 they were forbidden, on pain of death, to hold religious assemblies. Even Augustine, who had depended on calm and earnest discussion before, now advocated force, appealing to [2143]Luke 14:23 — "compel them to come in" — and exhorted the hesitating officer of the law to proceed in the infliction of the appointed penalties, saying that it was "much better that some should perish by their own fires than that the whole body should burn in the everlasting flames of Gehenna, through the

desert of their impious dissension" (Waddington, *History of the Church*, page 153). A new flame of violent desperation broke out. A bishop, Gaudentius, even vindicated suicide, referring in justification to 2 Macc. 14; and threatened "that if an attempt were made to deprive him of his church by force, he would burn himself, with his congregation, in it." In 428, when Africa was conquered by the Arian Vandals, the Donatists suffered no persecution from them except as adherents to the Nicene Creed; and the great and long controversy was now virtually ended by ,the general destruction of the Church in Africa through that invasion. Yet the Donatists continued to survive as a distinct party down to the sixth century.

As may be seen from our sketch, the Donatists were not heretical in any essential articles of faith, nor were they immoral in life, except as their fanaticism led many into excesses, yet these were always disapproved by the better class. Many of the charges of immorality made against them are regarded as unfounded, or at least as highly exaggerated. The schism began in differences of view in regard to discipline, and was continued and widened continually more and more by hasty and severe action on the part of the Church and State, and growing fanaticism, separatistic pride, and passion on the part of the Donatists. A rich lesson for the Church through all ages lies in the history of this remarkable schism and the subsequent controversy.

To the above account of the Donatists, written by the late lamented Dr. Harbaugh, we append a few notices of views held with regard to them by writers who justify their position, more or less fully, from the nonprelatical point of view.

Schenkel, in *Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie* (art. *Kirche*, 7:568), speaks of Donatism as an attempt (similar to that of the Novatians) to break the hard shell of external ecclesiasticism, and to bring out again, from the dead mass of simply baptized Christians, the pure Church of the regenerate; to substitute, in a word, the Christian communion for an ecclesiastical corporation. "Augustine, in opposing the Donatists, went so far (Epist. 161:5) as to call separation from the Episcopal Church a crime, and to say that no separatist could be saved." The question turned (Schenkel proceeds), in fact, upon that of Church and State. The Donatists saw that the unity and freedom of the Church were imperilled by its union with the State, and they declared against the State-Church doctrine, then (under

Constantine and his successors) a new thing. Augustine not only adopted the State-Church theory, but pushed it to its legitimate consequence, that the State is bound to put down separatists by force. *SEE AUGUSTINE*. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system rests on Augustine's doctrine of the Church as set forth in his writings against the Donatists.

The Donatist doctrine was that the true Church is composed only of pure Christians; Augustine, on the other hand, held that the "Church consists of the sum total of all the baptized, and that the ideal sanctity of the Church is not impaired hr impure elements externally connected with it. He nevertheless advocated a rigorous exercise of Church discipline" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 135). Neander maintains that both the Donatists and their opponents confounded the visible with the invisible Church, and placed the predicates of purity and holiness in the former. The Donatists made catholicity to depend upon purity; Augustine made purity depend upon catholicity. The Donatists said, "Whoever is a true Christian is to us a Catholic;" Augustine said, "No man can have Christ for his head who is not a member of his body, the Church." Neander thinks, therefore, that, had the parties fully understood and recognized the "distinction in the idea of the Church as visible and invisible" (which Augustine came near to, but did not carry out), they might have come to an agreement with each other (*History of Dogmas*, Ryland's transl., ed. Bohn, 1:395). The subject is very well treated from this point of view, but with stronger Independent leanings, in Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*, N.Y. 1865, volume 1, chapter 2. Litton (an unprelatical Episcopalian) holds that Donatism "sprang from a principle true in itself, but pushed beyond the limits of sobriety" (Litton, The Church of Christ, London, 1851, page 518). See also Cooper, *The Free Church of Ancient Christendom* (Lond. 1853, page 360 sq.).

The sources for the history of Donatism are given by Dr. Schaff (*Hist. of the Christian Church*, 2:360. Augustine, works against the Donatists; *Optatus Milevitanus* (about 370), *De Schismate Donatistarum*; Du Pin, *Monumenta vet. ad Donatist. hist. pertinentia* (Par. 1700); *Excerpta et Scripta vetera ad Donatistarum Historiam pertinentia*, at the close of the 9th vol. of the Bened. ed. of Augustine's works. The literature — Valesius, *De Schismat. Donat.* (appended to his ed. of Eusebius); Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, etc., volume 4; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's, 2:282 sq.); Roux, *De Augustino adversario Donat.* (Lugd. Bat. 1838); Ribbeck,

Donatus u. Augustinus, oder der erste entscheidende Kampf zwischen Separatismus u. der Kirche (Elberf. 1858); Tillemont, *Memoires* (Bruxelles, 1732), 6:1-98; Arnold, *Kirchen.-u.-Ketzerhistorie*, book 1, chapter 8; and the other works cited above.

Donative

in English ecclesiastical law, is a benefice made by the king (or any subject by his license), who founds a church or chapel, and ordains that it shall be merely in the gift or disposal of the patron, and vested absolutely in the clerk by the patron's deed of donation, without presentation; institution, or induction. This is said to have been anciently the only way of conferring ecclesiastical benefices in England; the method of institution by the bishop not having been established before the time of archbishop Becike in the reign of Henry II. All bishoprics, being of royal foundation, were originally donatives.

Donato, Luigi,

an Italian cardinal, was a native of Venice, and entered the Franciscan order at an early age. He was one of the founders of the school of theology in the University of Bologna, which, in the papal schism of the; 14th century, declared for Urban VI. In 1379 Urban rewarded Donato for this service by causing him to be chosen general of the Franciscan orders. In 1380 he was created cardinal of St. Mark, and in the next year was sent by Urban on a mission to Charles' III, king of Naples, for his want of success in which mission the pope arrested him, January 13, 1385. He was charged with conspiracy, along with five other cardinals, and was put to the torture in presence of the pope himself. He was afterwards decapitated. — Sismondi, *Hist. des Republiques Italiennes*, 7:241; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 14:539.

Donatus of Case Nigrae

SEE DONATISTS.

Donatus the Great

SEE DONATISTS.

Donker Curtius, Hendrik Herman

was born at Hertogenbosch in 1778. At the age of sixteen he entered the University of Utrecht. He applied himself faithfully to his studies, and did not allow himself to be drawn aside by the political excitements of the time. In theology he enjoyed the privilege of listening to the instructions of the able and learned Heringa, who had but a short time before been inducted into the office of professor of theology in that institution. Highly prizing and faithfully improving this privilege, he reflected honor upon his able and faithful instructor. At the age of twenty-two he entered the ministry, and after spending a year or more in places of less note, he was called to Arnhem, where he continued to labor faithfully to the time of his death, which occurred July 25, 1839. The influence of Donker on the Reformed Church of Holland was very great. He was a popular and eloquent preacher. His style was perspicuous, flowing, and vigorous. For twenty years or more he conducted the Godgeleerde Bydragen, a theological journal of high character. In 1827 his essay on *Jesus leer als van God zelven geopenbaard en het gezag der rede in zaken van Godsdienst* received the gold medal from the Hague Society. For many years he was either president or vice-president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church. In regulating the government and discipline of the Church, in advancing theological science, and in elevating the standard of biblical scholarship in reference to candidates for the ministry, he labored zealously and successfully.

Donne, John, D.D.

dean of St. Paul's, was born in London in 1573. He received the instructions of a private tutor at home until 1584, when he entered Hart College, Oxford, from whence he went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1587. He took no degree at either university, as his parents had brought him up in the Roman Church, and were unwilling for him to take the necessary oaths. At the age of seventeen he commenced the study of law at Lincoln's Inn, advancing, at the same time, in liberal education under the care of able masters. After examining the question of religion thoroughly, he decided in favor of Protestantism. At this time, and for years after, he had no design of entering the ministry; he therefore sought civil employment, and upon several occasions accompanied expeditions and embassies abroad. From his youth ha exhibited powers of no ordinary character. Before he was twenty he wrote his satires, which, Hume admits,

"flashed with wit and ingenuity," though he speaks of "coarseness of expression." While yet a young man he wrote the most of his poems, some of which were of a licentious nature, leading us to infer that his life at this time was impure; this conclusion is strengthened by the utterances of deep penitence in many of his sermons. When about thirty years of age he was involved in a difficulty with his father-in-law, Sir George Moore, which resulted in his committal to prison for a short time. A lawsuit for the possession of his wife followed, and so impoverished him that he was compelled to depend upon his relatives. He now applied himself to the study of the civil and canon law, the fruit of which may be seen in some of his discourses. An invitation to enter the ministry, extended by Dr. Morton, afterwards bishop of Durham, was declined. He soon began to attract the notice of the chief men of the day, and, being frequently at court, that of the king, who regarded him as a man of wit and learning. In 1610 the king was so well pleased with his remarks on supremacy and allegiance, made one day at table, that he commanded him, to embody the arguments in a formal treatise. He complied, and in the same year published his Pseudo-martyr, in which he showed that Roman Catholics ought to take the oath of allegiance. On perusing it, the king insisted that he should enter into orders, which, after two or three years spent in the study of theology, he did. He was immediately appointed chaplain to James I, and soon after was admitted D.D. at Cambridge. For a while, in 1617, he suspended his clerical functions, from grief at the loss of his wife. Soon after resuming them he was appointed to the deanery of St. Paul's. Preferments now came, so that he was soon raised from a condition of anxious penury to one of comparative affluence, in which he forgot not his friends and the poor. He also helped his father-in-law. He died March 31, 1631. Donne's epistolary writings are models in their kind. Some of his poems are very fine. But his sermons constitute his great title to enduring reputation. With a style somewhat like that of Sir Thomas Browne, he combined a power of illustration, an artistic skill, and a "capability of administering to thought" equalled by but one or two of his great contemporaries. His sermons are remarkable for subtle trains of thought and of argument. His published works are,

1. Pseudo-martyr (1610, 4to): —

2. Essays in Divinity (1651, 12mo): —

3. Ignatius, his Conclave; a Satyr, with an Apology for the Jesuits (1653, 12mo): —

4. Paradoxes, Essays, Characters, to which is aided a Book of Epigrams, in Latin, translated by J. Maine, D.D. (1652, 12mo): —

5. The Works of John Donne, D.D. (1839, 6 volumes, 8vo).

This is the best edition of his sermons. It is compiled from the old folio of 1640, and contains, in addition to the sermons, Devotions, Letters, and Poems. Besides the above is an essay entitled Biathanatos, a declaration that suicide may not always be sin. This was published fourteen years after his death, and contrary to his wishes, expressed in a letter to the earl of Ankerum, in which he says, "It is a book written by Jack Donne, and not by Dr. Donne." See Walton, *Life of Donne*; Alford's *Life of Donne*, in Donne's *Works*, volume 6, and Preface to same, volume 1 (edit. of 1839); Hume, *History of England*, volume 4, 524; Coleridge, *Works* (New York edit.), 5:73 sq.

Donellan Lecture

a course of lectures founded by the provost and senior fellows of Trinitv College, Dublin, in fulfillment of a legacy of £1243, left by will, dated February 22, 1794, to that college, by Mrs. Anne Donellan, "for the encouragement of religion, learning, and good manners." The lecturer is elected annually on the 20th of November — the subject to be determined at the time of election by the board — and the course consists of six sermons, delivered in the college chapel after morning service. Among the lectures printed are Graves, Lectures on the Pentateuch (1807, 2 volumes, 8vo, London); Sadleir, *On the Dispensations* (Dublin, 1822, 2 volumes, 8vo); Kennedy-Baillie, *The Mosaic Record of Creation* (London, 1826, 8vo); Todd, *The Prophecies relating to Antichrist* (Dublin, 1840-46, 2 volumes, 8vo); McDonnell, *On the Atonement*.

Donoso Cortes, Juan

(FRANCISCO-MANUELMARIA-DE-LA-SALUD), marquis de Valdegamas, viscount del Valle, was a politician, statesman, publicist, diplomatist, historian, theologian, philosopher, and much the ablest and most eminent of recent Spanish authors. He was born May 9, 1809, at La Valle de Serena, a village of Est emadura. At sixteen he had completed his

preparatory studies, which were largely occupied with history, philosophy, and literature. His education in jurisprudence was prosecuted at the University of Seville. In 1830 he married and settled in Madrid. He received some public appointments, but devoted his talents chiefly to literature. In 1839 he entered the Cortes as representative of the province of Cadiz. He took the side of Maria Christina against the Carlists, rose to high favor in the court, and was appointed private secretary to queen Isabella II. This office he resigned in 1845 on becoming a member of the royal council. He was an earnest advocate of the French marriages. In acknowledgment of his support, he was created by his sovereign Marquis de Valdegamas, Viscount del Valle, and was decorated by Louis Philippe with the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor.

In 1848, the Revolution, long foretold by him, exploded. The reforming Pope was driven from Rome; all the nations of Europe were agitated and convulsed. On the 4th of January, 1849, he pronounced his speech in the Cortes renouncing all liberal doctrines, and demanding a dictatorship. This speech startled Europe, and was perhaps the beginning of the reaction. It was a defiant reassertion of the principles of Gregory VII and Innocent III.

Shortly after the delivery of this speech, Donoso-Cortes was. sent as ambassador extraordinary to Berlin. The earlier part of the next year was occupied with the rapid composition of his only formal work his Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism. It was published in 1851, in Spanish, at Madrid, and was speedily translated into French, Italian, and German. An English version, by Madelcine Goddard, appeared in 1862 (Phila. 12mo). Just before the appearance of this work he was sent as ambassador to France, a mission which he held till his death. His eminence and high position were, however, embittered by the imputations of heretical doctrine alleged against his brilliant essay by the abbe Gaduel and other opponents. He submitted his book without reserve to the papal judgment. He died at Paris May 3, 1853.

A collection of his works, in 2 volumes, had been published at Madrid in 1849 (Colleccion escogida de los escritos del Sefor Don Juan D.C.). A more complete edition of his works was published after his death (Madrid, 1854-55, 5 volumes) by Tejada, and was republished at Paris, in French, by M. Louis Veuillot. The Essay on Catholicism forms three volumes of the collection. The other two volumes contain Parliamentary Addresses; Letters on France in 1842, and in 1851-52; Observations on Prussia in

1849; a few contributions to political and literary journals; letters to distinguished correspondents; and some unfinished sketches on historical and political topics.

The single work on which his reputation will rest is his Essay named above. He is throughout a polemic, but a polemic after the order of Hooker, whose sonorous periods he alone of moderns rivals, with greater precision, correctness, and elegance. The book is a trenchant onslaught on Protestantism and Liberalism; an earnest, unquestioning advocacy and eulogy of Roman Catholicism, and all its ancient usages, doctrines, and policy. Yet it affords a bright exhibition of pure intellect and lofty sentiment. The writer is a logician by his intellect, and something of a mystic by his heart. God is ever present to his mind, and the redemption of man is ever on his lips. Life is no independent, uncertain, arbitrary human evolution. It is the dread tragedy acted on earth by responsible beings in the presence of heaven and of hell, with the certainty of the one as a recompense or of the other as a doom. Nations as well as individuals are on their trial in the awful arena, which is presided over by the Almighty, prepared to issue his eternal judgments. The course of thought in the Essay is about as follows: Man, created in the image of his Maker, falls by disobedience. Sin entered into the world, and death by sin. The curse is realized in the alienation of the sinner from God, and in the introduction of disorder and violence into all the phases of human life, and into the whole constitution of nature. "Discord on the music fell, and darkness on the glory." "The whole world groaneth until now." Helpless, apparently discarded, and turned over to the counsels and passions of his own depraved heart, man falls into all the corruptions and aberrations of heathenism. Redeemed at last by divine grace and a divine expiation, the work of regeneration and restoration commences. Christianity changes the spirit of the world, and recreates society. It changes the relation of man to his Creator and to his fellowman. The little leaven ferments, and leaveneth the whole lump, and civilization slowly becomes Christian throughout instead of pagan. The range of man's contemplation is enlarged and his sympathies expanded; his reason is strengthened, his knowledge augmented, his dominion over thought and matter is increased; but, in the pride of intellect, he claims again the knowledge of good and evil; he speculates about all things; he drags revelation and the ordinances of God before the tribunal of his own understanding; he maintains the sovereignty of his own caprices, phantasies, and passions; he inaugurates on earth — a

new revolt, similar to that which cast the rebellious angels out of heaven. The passionate vacillations or vagaries of the individual or of the mass are substituted for the decrees of the Almighty and beneficent Father of all. The furious appetencies of pride, greed, jealousy, and lust are taken to be canons of political and social wisdom, instead of the precepts of the moral law and of obedience to constituted authorities, "since the powers that be are ordained of God." Hence an age of revolutions and of social disturbances prepares the way for the long agony of a material and debasing despotism. All that is right, and wholesome, and enriched with promise is founded on voluntary submission to the will of God. All revolt from his ordinances is sin, and is followed by the consequences of sin — disorder, crime, war, wretchedness, impotency, ending in political and social dissolution. The law of the Gospel is the law of perfect liberty. The carnal mind is enmity with God; and the law of man is enslavement to the passions, provoking, inviting, necessitating, and maturing the tyranny of force on earth, and eternal torments hereafter.

Such, in general terms, and divested of its partisan coloring, is the substance of this splendid essay, which belongs to the same general type of speculation as the grand or graceful productions of Bossuet, De Maistre, Chateaubriand, and Montalembert. But the author's political absolutism was a bad inference from the sound theology of his Essay; and while the direct influence of his book is conservative, its ultimate effect doubtless was to increase the atheistic tendency in Europe by confounding Christianity with despotism. See a discriminating essay in The Catholic World, April, 1867, art. 1; also Bibliotheca Sacra, October 1866, page 679. A life of Donoso-Cortes was written by Tejada, and is embraced in the edition of his works.

Donum Superadditum, Or Supernaturalè

a designation of the scholastic doctrine of "superadded grace" given to Adam, in addition to his natural powers, and which grace he lost by the Fall. According to some of the scholastic divines (Scotus Erigena, Bonaventura, etc.), original righteousness (justitia originalis) was added to man's natural powers (pura naturalia) as a donum superadditum. Aquinas held (part 1, qu. 95. art. 9) that man was created in possession of original righteousness, still, however, as a grace superadded to his natural powers.

Mohler thus states the doctrine: "No finite body can exist in a living moral communion with the deity save by the communion of the Holy Spirit. This relation of Adam to God, as it exalted him above human nature, and made him participate in that of God, is hence termed a supernatural gift of grace, superadded to the endowments of nature. This is not merely a private opinion of theologians, but a dogma" (Symbolism, book 1, part 1, § 1, N.Y. 1844, 8vo; see also the Catechismus Romanus, 1:2, 19; Bellarmin, *Gratia primi hominis*, 2; citations in Winer, *Comparat. Darstellung*, 4). Dr. J.H. Newman, while yet in the Church of England, taught this doctrine: "What Adam lost in sinning was a supernatural endowment" (*Lectures on Justification*, 177); so also archdeacon Wilberforce: "The likeness of God must have been some divine presence superadded to primitive nature (*On Incarnation*, page 71, London edit.). The Roman Church further holds that this supernatural presence is restored by baptism, so that a baptized person stands in the condition of Adam before the Fall. If he goes astray, he is to be restored by confession, absolution, and the sacrament of penance. See Bird, Sacramental Systemn (London, 1854), § 4; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (Smith's edit.), § 175, 245; Jackson, *Works*, 9:8 (Oxford); Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Bohn's edit.), 2:654. *SEE IMAGE OF GOD*; *SEE SIN, ORIGINAL*.

Doolittel (Or Doolittle), Thomas, M.A.,

a Nonconformist divine, was born at Kidderminster, England, in 1630; was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and became minister of St. Alphage, London. Ejected in 1662, he taught school in Moorfields, and afterwards at Woodford Bridge. Returning to London after the plague, he had a meeting-house built in Monkwell Street, London, where he continued his ministry (with some interruptions from persecution) until his death, May 24, 1707. His writings became very popular; the principal are, *A Treatise concerning the Lord's Supper* (Lond. 9th edit. 1675,1 2mo): — *Love to Christ necessary to Escape the Curse at his coming* (London, 1830, 18mo): — *Captives bound in Chains made free by Christ* (on Isaiah 61:1): — *A Rebuke for Sin* (1673): — *A complete Body of Divinity* (1723, fol.), etc. — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1:945; Calamy, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, 1:80 (ed. of 1778).

Door

Picture for Door 1

Picture for Door 2

Picture for Door 3

(usually tl;D; *da'leth*, strictly the valve or part that swings on the hinges; while, jtP,*pe'thach*, designates the entrance or door-way; r[iv; *sha'ar*, is rather a gate; Gr. θύρα). From a comparison of various passages of Scripture, we learn that anciently doors were suspended and moved by means of pivots of wood, which projected from the ends of the two folds, both above and below. The upper pivots, which were the longest, were inserted in sockets sufficiently large to receive them in the lintel; the lower ones were secured in a corresponding manner in the threshold. The pivots or axles are called t/tPo,*pothoth'*; the sockets in which they are inserted, *tsarim'*, µyrøxa (Proverbs 26:14). Doors were fastened by a lock (Song of Solomon 5:5), or by a bar (Judges 16:3; Job 38:10). Those made of iron and brass were not used except as a security to the gates of fortified places or repositories of valuables (Isaiah 45:2, 3). The lock was nothing more than a wooden slide attached to one of the folds, which entered into a hole in the door-post, and was secured there by teeth cut into it, or catches. Two strings passed through an orifice leading to the external side of the door. A man going out, by the aid of one of these strings moved the slide into its place in the post, where it was so fastened among the teeth, or catches, as not to be drawn back. The one coming in, who wished to unlock, had a wooden key, sufficiently large, and crooked, like a sickle. It was called jTpjmaø*miphtach'* (Judges 3:25). He thrust the key through the orifice of the door, or key-hole, lifted up the slide so as to extricate it from the catches, and, taking hold of the other string, drew it back, and thus entered. Keys were not made of metal, except for the rich and powerful, and these were sometimes adorned with an ivory handle. A key of this kind, in the days of the Hebrew monarchs, was assigned to the steward of the royal palace as a mark of his office, and he carried it on his shoulder (Isaiah 22:22). The key-hole was sometimes so large as to admit a person's finger through it, and enable him to lift the slide; in that case he stood in no absolute need of a key to enter (Song of Solomon 5:4). *SEE KEY*. Among the ancient Egyptians doors

were frequently stained so as to-imitate foreign wood. They were either of one or two valves, turning on pins of metal, and were secured within by bars and bolts. Some of the bronze pins have been discovered in the tombs of Thebes and two of them, after Wilkinson, are figured below (2, 3). They were fastened to the wood with nails of the same metal. *SEE HINGE*. The stone lintels and floor behind the threshold of the tombs and temples still exhibit the holes in which the pins turned, as well as those of the bolts and bars, and the recess for receiving the opening valves. The folding doors had bolts in the center, sometimes above as well as below; a bar was placed across from one wall to the other, and in many cases they were secured by wooden locks passing over the center (above cut, fig. 4) at the junction of the two folds. "It is difficult (remarks Sir J.G. Wilkinson) to say if these last were opened by a key, or merely slided backward and forward like a bolt; but if they were really locks, they were probably upon the principle of those now used in Egypt, which are of wood, and opened by a key furnished with several pins answering to a smaller number that fall down into the hollow movable tongue, into which the key is introduced when they open or fasten the lock." *SEE LOCK*. For greater security, they are also occasionally sealed with a mass of clay. This was also a custom of the ancient Egyptians, as appears from Herodotus (ii. 121), from tombs actually so closed at Thebes, and from the sculptures, as in the first cut above, fig. 3, where the door is thus closed and sealed. To this custom there is an allusion in Job. *SEE CLAY*. At a later period, when iron came into general use, keys were made of that metal, of the shape shown in the above cut, fig. 4. Of the kind thus indicated were probably the lock and key which fastened the summer-parlor of king Eglon (Judges 3:23, 25). In this case Ehud locked the door and took away the key; but when the servants became alarmed they easily opened it with another key, which suggests that the lock, as in ancient Egypt or the modern East, was nothing more than a peculiarly constructed open bolt of wood, which the wooden or metal key was adapted to raise and thrust back. The forms of the Egyptian doors may be seen from the cuts. (See Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. 1:7-23.) The chief entrance to houses was through a pyramidal pylon on a projecting porch of columns, whose capitals were often ornamented with ribbons. Over the doorway was sometimes a brief hieroglyphical legend (Wathen, page 101). This last circumstance reminds one of the writing on their doors recommended to the Israelites, as noticed below. A comparison of the ancient Egyptian doors with those now used in the. East will probably suggest no incorrect notion of the provision among

the ancient Hebrews in this respect. A sort of intermediate idea arising from this comparison will be found to furnish very satisfactory illustrations of most of the passages of Scripture which relate to the subject. (See Lane's *Mod. Eg.* 1:9, 18.) Doors are generally unpainted throughout Western Asia and in Egypt. In the interior of houses it is not unusual to see curtains instead of doors, especially in summer. This helps to keep the apartment cool, and also enables servants to enter without noise. This custom originated in the use of tents. Accordingly we find that all the entrances of the tabernacle had curtains, although the framework was of wood (<02631>Exodus 26:31-33, 36, 37); and even in the Temple a curtain or "vail" formed the separation between the holy and the most holy place. *SEE HOUSE*. The word "door," in reference to a tent, expresses the opening made by dispensing with the cloths in front of the tent, which is then supported only by the hinder and middle poles (<01802>Genesis 18:2; Burchardt, *Notes on Bed.* 1:42).

Picture for Door 4

Picture for Door 5

Among the figurative allusions to doors, it may be mentioned that, in <28215>Hosea 2:15, the valley of Achor is called "a door of hope," because there, immediately after the execution of Achan, the Lord said to Joshua, "Fear not, neither be dismayed;" and from that time Joshua carried on his conquests with uninterrupted success. Paul, in <46609>1 Corinthians 16:9; <47012>2 Corinthians 2:12; <51403>Colossians 4:3, uses the symbol of a door opened, to signify the free exercise and propagation of the Gospel. Our Lord applies the term to himself, "I am the door" (<43009>John 10:9). The "door opened in heaven" signifies the beginning of a new kind of government (<66401>Revelation 4:1); and in general the opening of anything is said when it may act suitably to its quality; the shutting of anything is the stopping of its use. *SEE GATE*.

Door-Keeper

(רֹ֫שׁ, *shoer'*, <13523>1 Chronicles 15:23,24, a *gate-tender*, or "porter," as elsewhere rendered; but in <19841>Psalm 84:11, סָפַף; *saphaph'*, to sit at the threshold; Sept. παραρίπτεσθαι; Vulg. *abjectus esse*; Gr. θυρωρός, <43816>John 18:16, 17; elsewhere likewise "porter"), a person appointed to keep the street-door leading by an alley-way to the interior entrance of an

Oriental house (q.v.). This was originally doubtless a male, but in later times, in imitation perhaps of Greek and Roman usages (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible,* note on John 1.c.; no such custom, however, appears in classical writers; see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* pages 514 b, 527 b), a female janitress or portress often held this post (<43B16>John 18:16; <44C12>Acts 12:13). *SEE PORTER*. In <19C84>Psalm 84:10, the word "door-keeper" does not convey the proper meaning of the original, because the preference of the Psalmist was evidently given to a very humble situation, whereas that of a door-keeper, in Eastern estimation, is truly respectable and confidential. The gods are always represented as having door-keepers, who were of great dignity and power, as they also fought against other deities. In the heathen temples there are images near the entrance called kaval karan, guards, or door-keepers. *SEE ANUBIS*; *SEE ASP*. Kings and great men, also, have officers whose business it is to stand at the door or gate as keepers of the entrance. The most dignified native of Ceylon is the maha modeliar of the governor's gate, to whom all others must make obeisance. The word door-keeper, therefore, does not convey the idea of humility, but of honor. The marginal reading of our version, however, to "sit at the threshold," at once strikes an Eastern mind as a situation of deep humility. See the poor heathen devotee; he goes and sits near the threshold of his temple. Look at the beggar; he sits or prostrates himself at the threshold of the door or gate till he shall have gained his suit. "I am in great trouble; I will go and lie down at the door of the temple." "Friend, you appear to be very ill." "Yes." "Then go and prostrate yourself at the threshold of the temple." The Psalmist therefore probably refers to the attitude of a beggar or suppliant at the threshold of the house of the Lord as being preferable to the splendid dwellings of the wicked. *SEE BEGGAR*.

Door-Keepers

(*ostiarii*), in the ancient Church, a class of church officers forming the lowest clerical order. Their duties were to open and close the doors, not only at the termination of religious worship, but during the services, especially after the missa catechumenorum (q.v.). In later times, in the Roman Church, their duties became nearly those of the modern sexton, viz. to take care of the church ornaments and vessels, to ring the bell, to sweep the church, etc. The customary forms of ordination are prescribed in the fourth council of Carthage; and the keys were delivered to them by the bishop, with the injunction, "Behave thyself as one who must give account

to God of the things that are kept locked under these keys." Their ordinary name was πυλωροί, ostiarii, and sometimes mansionarii and janitores. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book 3, chapter 6.

Door-Post

Picture for Door-Post 1

Picture for Door-Post 2

(ãsi, *saph*, 4116Ezekiel 41:16, the *sill* or "threshold," as elsewhere usually rendered; ãqvimi, *mashkoph'*, 4617Ezekiel 12:7, the *lintel*, as elsewhere rendered). In 5609Deuteronomy 6:9, Moses enjoined upon the Israelites to write the divine commands upon the posts (tzWmi, *mezuzoth'*, invariably so rendered) of their doors, a practice which is understood literally by the modern Jews (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:141). It is at this day customary in Mohammedan Asia for extracts from the Koran, and moral sentences, to be wrought in stucco over doors and gates, and as ornamental scrolls to the interior of apartments. The elegant characters of the Arabian and Persian alphabets, and the good taste with which they are applied in running scrolls, the characters being usually white, raised on a blue ground, and intermixed with gilding, have a very pleasing effect, particularly in interior ornament. This custom must have been very ancient, for Moses here very evidently alludes to it. We understand the injunction not as imperative upon the Hebrews to write on their doors, but as enjoining them, if they did write at all, to write sentences of the law. He suggests this as a means of inculcating the law upon their children, whence it seems that he took it for granted that the children would be taught to read. "Among us," says Michaelis, "where, by the aid of printing, books are so abundantly multiplied, and may be put into the hands of every child, such measures would be quite superfluous; but if we would enter into the ideas of Moses, we must place ourselves in an age when the book of the law could only come into the hands of a few opulent people." The later Jews have exercised their usual ingenuity in misunderstanding this injunction. They conceive the observance to be imperative, and they act on it as follows: Their nezuzoth, or door-schedules, are slips of parchment, on which are written the passages 5604Deuteronomy 6:4-9, and 11:13-20; these slips are rolled up, and on the outside is written the Hebrew word ydç, *shaddai*, or "the Almighty," one of the names appropriated to God. This

roll they put into a reed or hollow cylinder of lead, in which a hole is cut for the word shaddai to appear, and the tube is then fastened to the door-post by a nail at each end. As the injunction is in the plural form, they conceive that a mezuzah should be placed on every door of a house. It is usually fixed to the right-hand door-post, and those Israelites who wish to be considered particularly devout usually touch or even kiss it as they pass. The Talmud ascribes great merit to having the mezuzah fixed on the door-post, and describes it as a preservative from sin. *SEE MEZUZOTH*.

Doors Of The Church.

To insure secrecy in worship, the ancient Christians constructed the doors of their churches with peculiar care. The early fathers, from this usage, derived abundant metaphors, relating to admission to the church, to heaven, etc. There were generally three principal entrances, in imitation of the Jewish Temple. Sometimes the terms πύλη, *porta*, and θύρα, *janua*, were interchanged; but, for the most part, the principal entrance, at the west, over against the altar, was called, by way of eminence, πύλη, and πύλη ὡραία, or βασιλικὴ. Men and women entered by different doors. The doors were constructed of the most durable wood, or of brass richly ornamented. The date of the building or dedication of the church was usually inscribed on the doors. Sometimes the doors bore inscriptions of various kinds, of which the following may be taken as a specimen. On the outside,

"Pax tibi sit, quicunque Dei penetralia Christi
Pectore pacifico candidus ingrederis."

On the inside,

"Quisquis ab aede Dei, perfectis ordine votis,
Egrederis, remea coore, corde mane."

It was customary, in early times, to place on the doors the names of all excommunicated persons; at a later period, the names of persons intending marriage were posted up in like manner. This was also the place for affixing all proclamations and decisions of the Church, as well as all public notices. — Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, book 6, chapter 5, § 6; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, chapter 9, § 10.

Doph'kah

(Hebrews *Dophkah'*, hqpD; according to Gesenius, a knocking; accord. to Fürst, cattle-driving; Sept. ̔Ραφακά, by error of r for d; Vulg. *Dapaca*), the eighth place of encampment of the Israelites in coming out of Egypt (<0332>Numbers 33:12). It was situated in the desert of Sin, on the eastern shore of the western arm of the Red Sea, probably at the mouth of Wady Feiran. *SEE EXODE*. Pococke (*East*, 1:235) thinks it lies east of Thor, in Wady Hibran; but this is apparently conjecture. Furst (*Hebrews Handw.* s.v.), after Seetzen (Zach's *Correspond.* 27:71), says it is the modern el-Tobbacha; which, if the el-Tubukah of Robinson (*Res.* 2:388, 648), is far away, and probably the ancient Tagoba (q.v.); but if in the valley Kineh (Keil, *Exodus* page76), would be precisely opposite our location (Robinson, 1:121, 122).

Dor

(Hebrews id., r/D, a dwelling, but raD in <0671>Joshua 17:11; <1104>1 Kings 4:11; Sept. Δώρ, but joins with preceding word tpn;or T/pn] in <0610>Joshua 11:2 Νεφεδδώρ, in <0612>Joshua 12:22 [second clause] Ναφαδδώρ, in <1104>1 Kings 4:11 Νεφθαδώρ; Vulg. *Dor*; the *Dora*, τύ Δῶρα, of the Apocrypha and Josephus, who, as well as Greek writers, also calls it *Dorus*, Δοῦρα), an ancient royal city of the Canaanites (<0612>Joshua 12:23), whose ruler was an ally of Jabin, king of Hazor, against Joshua (<0610>Joshua 11:1, 2). It was probably the most southern settlement of the Phoenicians (*Scylax*, page 42, ascribes it to the Sidonians) on the coast of Syria (Joseph. *Life*, p. 8; *Ant.* 15:9, 6). Josephus describes it as a maritime city (*War*, 1:21, 5) on the west border of Manasseh and the north border of Dan (*Ant.* 5:1, 22; 8:2, 3; *War*, 1:7, 7), near Mount Carmel (*Ap.* 2:10). One old author tells us that it was founded by Dorus, a son of Neptune, while another affirms that it was built by the Phoenicians, because the neighboring rocky shore abounded in the small shell-fish from which they. got the purple dye (Reland, *Palest.* page 739). It appears to have been within the territory of the tribe of Asher, though allotted to Manasseh (<0671>Joshua 17:11; <0701>Judges 1:27). The original inhabitants were never expelled, but during the prosperous reigns of David and Solomon they were made tributary (<0701>Judges 1:27, 28), and the latter monarch stationed at Dor one of his twelve purveyors (<1104>1 Kings 4:11). Reland (*Palest.* page 744) thinks it is the Dura (Aoeipa) mentioned by Polybius (5:409) as the scene of the victory of Antiochus

Epiphanes over Ptolemy Philometor. Tryphon, the murderer of Jonathan Maccabaeus and usurper of the throne of Syria,, having sought an asylum in Dor, the city was besieged and captured by Antiochus Si detes (1 Macc. 15:11, 13, 25; Joseph. *Ant*. 13:7, 2; *War*, 1:2, 2). It was granted the privilege of nominal independence by Pompey (Joseph. *Ant*. 14:4, 4; *War*, 1:7, 7), and was rebuilt by Gabinius, the Roman general, along with Samaria, Ashdod, and other cities of Palestine (Joseph. *Ant*. 14:5, 3), and it remained an important place during the early years of the Roman rule in Syria. Its coins are numerous, bearing the legend "Sacred Dora" (Vaillant, *Num. Impp*.). It became an episcopal city of the province of Palaestina Prima, but was already ruined and deserted in the fourth century (Jerome, in *Epitaph. Paulae*). According to Ptolemy (5:15, 5), it was situated in long. 66° 30', lat 32° 40'; according to the Peutinger Table, 20 miles from Ptolemais; and according to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Δὼρ τοῦ Ναφάθ, Dornaphet), it lay on the coast, "in the ninth mile from Caesarea, on the way to Ptolemais." Just at the point indicated is the small village of Tantura (or *Tortura*, Pococke, 2:84; Arvieux, 2:11: Gesenius thinks, *Thesaur.* page 331, either form equal to the Arabic for *hill of Dora*), consisting of about thirty houses, wholly constructed of ancient materials, and inhabited by Mohammedans (Mangles, *Trav.* page 190; Schwarz, *Palest.* pages 77, 91, 149; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:248). Three hundred yards north are low rocky mounds projecting into the sea, covered with heaps of rubbish, massive foundations, and fragments of columns. The most conspicuous ruin is a section of an old tower, 30 feet or more in height, which forms the landmark of the town. On the south side of the promontory, opposite the village, is a little harbor, partially sheltered by two or three small islands. A spur of Mount Carmel, steep and partially wooded, runs parallel to the coast-line, at the distance of about a mile and a half. Between its base and the sandy beach is a rich and beautiful plain — this is possibly the "border," "coast," or "region" (53, Symmachus παραλία) of Dor (<06102>Joshua 11:2; 12:23; <11041>1 Kings 4:11). The district is now almost wholly deserted, being exposed to the raids of the wild Bedouins who pasture their flocks on the rich plain of Sharon. *SEE HAMATH-DOR EN-DOR*.

Do'ra

(1 Macc. 15:11, 13, 25). *SEE DOR*.

Dor'cas

(Δορκάς, a female antelope; explained in the text as equivalent to Syr. atybæ, a gazelle), a charitable and pious Christian widow of Joppa, whom Peter restored to life (<40936>Acts 9:36-41). The sacred writer mentions her as "a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas," the reason of which probably is that she was a Hellenistic Jewess, and was called Dorcas by the Greeks, while to the Jews she was known by the name of TABITHA *SEE TABITHA* (q.v.). *SEE GAZELLE*.

Dorcas Society

"a name given to an association of ladies who collect and dispose of garments with the benevolent object of giving aid to necessitous families. Sometimes the ladies connected with a congregation unite to form a Dorcas society, in order to afford employment to poor needlewomen. Societies of this kind are so called from what is recorded in <40939>Acts 9:39: 'And all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made while she was with them.'"

Dorchester, Daniel

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Vernon, Connecticut, January 25, 1790. He was drafted for service in the war of 1812, and soon after his term of military duty expired he was licensed to preach. In 1816 he entered the traveling ministry in the New England Conference, and served as minister and presiding elder until his final superannuation in 1850. In 1853 he went to the West; in 1854 was made librarian of the public library and reading-room in Chicago, and died near that city August 6, 1854. Mr. Dorchester was a man of clear intellect and decided character. He ably defended Methodism in a time when it was "much spoken against." On many of his circuits there were extensive revivals. — Minutes of Conferences, 5:512.

Doris

(Δορίς), a Jewess of low descenit, the first wife of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:12,1), by whom she had Antipater (*War*, 1:28, 4); she was expelled from court on account of alleged complicity in the treason of Pheroras (*War*, 1:30, 4).

Doroa

(Δοροά), a town whose ancient name ant site was discovered by Seetzen from an inscription found by him in the modern village ed-Dur, in the region of the Hauran, south of the Lejah, and a little south of Wady Kanamat (Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:868).

Dorotheiis

(Δορόθεος, God-given), the deputy appointed by Nicanor, the royal steward of Ptolemy Philadelphus, to entertain the seventy learned persons sent from Jerusalem to translate the Old Testament into Greek (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:2, 12, 13). *SEE SEPTUAGINT*.

Dorotheus

a presbyter of Antioch, mentioned by Eusebius as "a man of fine taste in sacred literature, who was much devoted to the study of the Hebrew language, so that he read the Hebrew Scriptures with great facility. He also was of a very liberal mind, and not unacquainted with the preparatory studies pursued among the Greeks, but in other respects a eunuch by nature, having been such from his birth; so that the emperor, on this account, as if it were a great miracle, received him into his house and family, and honored him with an appointment over the purple dye establishment of Tyre. Him we have heard in the church expounding the Scriptures with great judgment." As Eusebius says that he flourished under Cyril, who is supposed to have been bishop of Antioch from A.D. 280 to 300, the date of Dorotheus may be given as about A.D. 290. — Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* book 7, c. 32; Lardner, *Works* (10 volumes, 8vo), volume 3, 159.

Dorotheus of Tyre

supposed to have been bishop of Tyre about A.D. 300. He is said (not by contemporary writers, but by later martyrologists) to have suffered greatly in the persecutions under Dioclesian, and to have suffered martyrdom under Julian, A.D. 363. There is extant under his name a Synopsis de vita et morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et Discipulorum Domini (given in Biblioth. *Max. Patrum,* 3:421). "It is now generally allowed to be fabulous, and of little or no value." — Lardner, *Works* (10 volumes, 8vo), 3:161;

Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca* (edition Harles), 7:452; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Geneva, 1720), 1:103; Oudin, *Script.* <21013>*Ecclesiastes* 1:1377.

Dorotheus

bishop of Marcianople, in Mcasia, in the fifth century, was a strong advocate of Nestorianism. He pronounced anathema against all who asserted that Mary was the mother of God. He attended, as a bishop, the Council of Ephesus (opened June 22, 431), which denounced the Nestorians as schismatics; and he was banished to Cappadocia by order of the emperor Theodosius. Four letters of his are preserved in the collection of P. Lupus, entitled *Ad Ephesianum Concilium variorum Patrum Epistolae* (Louv. 1682, 2 volumes, 4to). — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:269.

Dorotheus

archimandrite of Palestine, 7th century, a disciple of Joannes the Abbot, wrote Διδασκαλίαι διάφοροι, *Doctrinae Diversae*, given (Gr. and Lat.) in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 88, page 1611 sq., and in the other great collections of the fathers. See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (ed. Harles), 11:103 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:373.

Dorsche, Johann Georg,

a Lutheran theologian, was born at Strasburg, November 13, 1597; became professor of theology at Strasburg in 1627, and was called to the same chair at Rostock in 1654. He died January 25, 1659. Dorsche (Latin form *Dorscheus*) was a voluminous writer in theology and Biblical literature. Among his works are Dissertationes Theologicae (3d ed. Frankf. 1693, 4to): — Biblia Numerata (Frankf. 1674, fol.): — *Commentarius in quat. Evangelistas* (Hamburg, 1706, 4to): — *Comun. in Ep. Pauli ad Hebraeos* (Frankf. 1717, 4to): — Fragment. *Comm. in Ep. Judez*, with Gebhardi, *Comm. in Ep. Judoe* (Frankfort and Leips. 1700, 4to). — Winer, *Theol. Literatur*, 2:495; Kitto, *Cyclopoedia*, 1:696.

Dort, Synod of

(SYNODUS DORDRACENA), a national synod of the United Provinces, held at Dort (Dordrecht; Lat. Dordracum) in 1618-19.

I. *Origin of the Synod.* — The opposition of James Arminius to the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrines on predestination gave rise to a bitter controversy, for an account of which, *SEE ARMINIANISM*. After the death of Arminius (t 1609), the strife increased, and with added bitterness. The clergy and laity of Holland were arrayed in two hostile armies — Gomarists and Arminians, the former being the most numerous, but the latter including the leading scholars and statesmen. In 1610 the Arminians presented a petition to the States of Holland and West Friesland, which was called a "Remonstrance" (*Remonstrantia, libellus supplex adhibitus Hollandie et West Frisice ordinibus*). They were named REMONSTRANTS *SEE REMONSTRANTS* (q.v.) in consequence; and, as the Calvinists presented a "Counter-Remonstrance," they were called ContraRemonstrants. The "Remonstrance" sets forth the Arminian theory over against the Calvinistic in five articles (for which, *SEE ARMLNIANISM*). Attempts were made by the authorities to reconcile the two contending parties by a conference between them at the Hague in 1611, a discussion at Delft in 1613, and also by an edict in 1614, enjoining peace. The Remonstrants desired a provincial synod for the province of Holland, where the two parties were nearly equal in numbers and influence; or else a general synod of all Protestant Christendom, to which Lutherans as well as Reformed should be summoned. Grotius, especially (1617), argued in favor of a general Protestant council.

Unfortunately, political interests aided to increase the difficulty. The great patriots and statesmen, Grotius and Barneveldt, were advocates of toleration for all opinions, and the former was also one of the literary pillars of the Remonstrant party. The stadt-holder, Maurice of Nassau, was a great soldier, but a narrow and ambitious politician. The pensionary Barneveldt succeeded, against the wishes of Maurice in obtaining, in 1609, a twelve years' truce with Spain, and for years held Maurice in check in his attempts to secure for himself and his family a hereditary sovereignty over the States. Maurice, though himself said to have been an Arminian in sentiment, placed himself at the head of the Gomarists, who constituted the majority of the clergy and people; while the leading statesmen and patriots, as has been said, were on the other side. One of his measures was to change the municipalities of the cities wherever the Arminians were in power, and to substitute Calvinistic burgomasters and governors. Another was to imbue the popular mind with the belief that Barneveldt, Grotius, and the Arminians were secretly aiming to deliver the country up to Spain.

By means of the changes thus effected, the States-General came finally to be strongly in favor of Maurice, and willing to carry out all his measures, whether political or religious.

James I of England was greatly interested, on political grounds, in the peace and prosperity of the United Provinces. Moreover, his pride and pedantry were involved in securing the condemnation of Vorstius, who had been elected to fill the chair of Arminius, and who was charged with Socinianism. *SEE VORSTIUS*. In 1613 (March 6) he wrote an autograph letter to the States-General, urging that the difficult question of predestination should be kept out of the pulpit, and that there should be "mutual tolerance," especially as the "opinions of neither party were inconsistent with Christian truth and with the salvation of souls" (*Epist. Praest. et Erudit. virorum*, Amst. 1660, page 393). But on the 20th of March, 1616, he wrote again to the States-General, urging that the "false and pestilent opinions" should be put down until a national synod could be summoned to decide and settle the question (see the letter in *Epist. Praest. Virorum*, page 480. See also the reply of the [Arminian] State of Holland to king James, in the same collection of letters, page 492).

The States of Zealand, Friesland, Groningen, and Guelderland demanded a national synod. The States of Utrecht, Holland, and Overyssel were opposed to it, although some of their chief cities (e.g. Amsterdam) favored it. The States, under the guidance of Maurice, resolved, November 11, 1617, to convoke a national synod, to be held May 1 the following year. All opposition to the convocation was at last forcibly put down by the arrest and imprisonment of the great leaders of the Arminians-Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hogerbeets (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.*, ed. by Smith, volume 4, § 43) who maintained, in advance of their times, the doctrine that the State had no right to interfere in questions of religious doctrine, and therefore had no right to order a national synod whose decisions should be authoritative. Opposition in various quarters caused a further decree of the States that the national synod should be summoned for November 1, 1618, for the time, and at Dordrecht for the place. Letters of the StatesGeneral, dated June 25, 1618, invited the Reformed churches of England, France, the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Bremen, Embden, Brandenburg, Geneva, and Nassau to send as delegates some of their theologians to aid the deputies of the Belgic churches in "settling the controversies." The Reformed Church of Anhalt was not invited, nor were the Lutheran churches. The aim of the States-General was to constitute a body holding

Calvinistic views on the points in dispute. The British deputies were George Carlton, bishop of Llandaff; John Davenant, professor of theology at Cambridge; Samuel Ward, of Sidney College, Cambridge; and Joseph Hall, afterwards bishop of Norwich. These took their seats at the beginning of the synod; but Dr. Hall returned to England on account of sickness, and was replaced by Thomas Good, of St. Paul's, London. Walter Balcanqual, a Scotch presbyter, was also deputed by king James to represent the Scottish Church. He wrote minutes which are published with Hales's Letters, mentioned below. John Hales, of Eton, "the ever-memorable," was then chaplain to Sir Guy Carlton, English ambassador at the Hague, and in that capacity attended many of the sessions, taking minutes, which he regularly transmitted to the ambassador. These minutes are to be found in Hales's Golden Remains.

II. *Organization of the Synod*. — The States-General ordered the delegates to the synod to be chosen as follows. Each province was to call a provincial synod, from which six persons, of whom three or four should be pastors, were to be chosen as delegates to the synod. Holland and Utrecht, in which the Arminians were numerous, were excepted from this provision. It was ordered that the provincial synod of Holland should be made up of four ordinary delegates from each Classis in which no separation on account of the dispute had taken place; while each Classis in which such separation had taken place should send two Calvinists and two Arminians. The provincial synod, thus constituted, was to select its delegates to the national synod. In Utrecht and South Holland several Arminian divines (among them Uitenbogaert) were deposed from the ministry before the selection of delegates was al. lowed. Nevertheless, three of the delegates from Utrecht were Arminians, and "they were the only Arminians who had seats in the synod." They were allowed to sit on condition "that while the affairs of the Remonstrants were under discussion they should not disturb the proceedings of the synod by unseasonable interruptions, and not acquaint their party with anything done or said in the synod which concerned their cause." These three, moreover, did not remain long in the synod.

The synod, when organized, consisted, first, of the deputies from the States, who properly constituted the national synod, viz. 39 ministers, 5 professors, and 18 ruling elders; and, secondly, of 24 foreign divines. The States-General were represented by lay commissioners, of whom Daniel

Heinsius was secretary. The only Protestant kingdom in Europe that sent deputies to the synod was Great Britain. Besides these, and the divines of the United Provinces, there were delegates from Switzerland, the Palatinate, Hesse, Wetterau, Emden, and Bremen. The Lutheran churches were not represented. No delegates from France were present, as Louis XIII forbade Rivet and Dumoulin, who were chosen as deputies by the French Protestants, to attend.

This synod was, therefore, not a council of the Protestant churches of Europe, nor even of the Reformed Church of Europe, but a Dutch national synod, to which Reformed theologians were invited from various parts of Europe. "Whosoever casts his eye over the list of the foreign divines that composed this last of Protestant councils will find scarcely one man who had not distinguished himself by his decided opposition to the doctrine of conditional predestination, and who was not consequently disqualified from acting the part of an impartial judge of the existing religious differences, or that of a peace-maker."

III. *Acts of the Synod*. — The synod was opened November 13, 1618, with public worship in the church of Dort. At the second session, John Bogermann, a pastor in Friesland, was chosen president, with Jacobus Rolandus, of Amsterdam, and Herman Fankelius, of Middleburg, as assistants, or vice-presidents. Sebastian Dammann, of Zutphen, and Festus Hommius, of Leyden, were appointed secretaries. We cannot go into detail as to the course of procedure; the sources of information are announced at the end of this article. ,A summary account, from the Calvinistic point of view, may be found in Dr. Miller's I*ntroductory Essay to Scott's Synod of Dort* (Presbyt. Board of Publication); and another, from the Arminian point of view, in Watson, *Theological Dictionary*, s.v. Dort (chiefly taken from Nichols, Protestantism and Arminianism). The following short statement is partly from the sources just named, and partly translated from Heppe, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, 3:486 sq.

At the third session the credentials of the deputies were received. In the fourth it was ordered that Episcopius and twelve other Remonstrants should be cited to appear in a fortnight to state and defend their views. "In the mean time the Remonstrants, without knowing the resolution of the synod, had deputed three of their body from Leyden, to obtain leave for their appearance at the synod, in a competent number and under safe conduct, to defend their cause. On making their request known to the lay

commissioners, they were informed of the resolution which had passed the synod only the preceding day. To which they replied that it was unreasonable to cite those to justify themselves who were both ready and willing to come of their own accord; and that, if they persisted in proceeding with their plan of citation, they would by that act furnish just cause, not only to them, but to all good men, to entertain strange notions and suspicions of the synodical proceedings. Not being permitted to choose those men from their own body whom they deemed the best qualified to state and defend their cause, they accounted it an additional hardship that their enemies should assume that unlawful authority to themselves. But neither at that time nor afterward, when they wished to add two of the most accomplished of the brethren to their number, were their representations successful."

During this fortnight the synod considered various matters apart from the Remonstrant question, ordered the preparation of a new version of the Bible, ordained rules for catechization, and prepared instructions for the Dutch missionaries in the East Indies, etc.

At the twenty-second session the Remonstrants appeared, with Episcopius at their head. After some delay, Episcopius defended the Arminian doctrine in a discourse which produced a profound impression. Disputes arose in subsequent sessions as to the topics to be treated, and the order in which they should be taken up. In the session of December 10 the Remonstrants gave great offense by reading a document from the pen of Episcopius, in which it was declared that "the Remonstrants did not own the members of the synod for lawful judges, because the great majority of them, with the exception of the foreign divines, were their professed enemies; and that most of the inland divines then assembled, as well as those whose representatives they were, had been guilty of the unhappy schism which was made in the churches of Holland. The second part contained the twelve qualifications of which the Remonstrants thought a well-constituted synod should consist. The observance of the stipulations proposed in it they would gladly have obtained from the synod, averring that they were exceedingly equitable, and that the Protestants had offered similar conditions for the guidance of the Papists, and the Calvinists for the direction of the Lutherans." On January 14 the Remonstrants were dismissed from the synod. Their views, as gathered from their own writings, were subsequently passed upon and condemned.

The doctrinal discussion in the synod showed that its members were not so fully at one in their positive views of doctrine as in their opposition to Arminianism. The question whether, according to [40104]Ephesians 1:4, Christ is the ground of election (*fundamentum electionis*), gave rise to strong debates, the Anglicans and the Germans taking the affirmative, while other deputies, in view of the divine decree, maintained the negative; the Melancthonian element was obviously not yet uprooted. It was found difficult at last to harmonize the various views of election in one formula. The deputies from Hesse, Bremen, Nassau, and England seemed to favor a doctrine on the extent of the atonement similar to Baxter's so-called Universalism. *SEE ATONEMENT*. The Canones Synodici (sess. 136, April 23, 1616) set forth clearly the doctrine of predestination, but not in the supralapsarian sense.

After the condemnation of the Arminian tenets, it remained to punish those who upheld them. The Hessians and Anglicans opposed the infliction of personal penalties. Nevertheless, the synod; "deposed the Arminian ministers, excluded them and their followers from the communion of the Church, suppressed their religious assemblies, and, by the aid of the civil government, which confirmed all their acts, sent a number of the clergy of that party, and of those who adhered to them, into banishment" (Miller, *Introductory Essay to Scott's Synod of Dort*, page 29).

In the later sessions the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession were adopted as orthodox statements of doctrine, in full harmony with the Word of God. In the 144th session the synod read before a large concourse, in the great church of Dort, the Canons on the five articles, and the Censura Ecclesiastica passed against the Remonstrants. The 154th and last session was held on May 9. Five days after (May 14) the great Barneveldt was beheaded at the Hague.

Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 11:723 (Hamb. 1705, 14 volumes), gives an account of the Synod of Dort, from which we extract the following statement (translated by Nichols) as to the publication of its Acta (Journals). "For the publication of the Acts, the divines chosen out of various districts of the United Provinces were John Polyander, Anthony Walaeus, Anthony Thysius, Daniel Heinsius, Festus Hommius, Daniel Colonius, and John Laets. But Dr. Wm. Bates informs us, in his L*ife of A. Walceus*, that the chief merit of the publication is due to Festus Hommius, who was a ready and elegant writer, and, as secretary to the synod, had

noted with greater diligence than the others the matters that had been transacted.' These Acts were published at Dort in the year 1620, in folio, in the neat types of Elzevirs at Leyden, and were soon afterwards executed with greater correctness, in the same year, at Hanover, in quarto, with the addition of a copious index. Prefixed to the Acts stand the epistle of their high mightinesses the States-General, addressed to the monarchs and kings, to the princes, courts, cities, and magistrates (of the Christian world), and vouching for the fidelity and authority of these Acts; and likewise the ample preface of Daniel Heinsius, addressed to the Reformed churches of Christ, concerning the origin and increase of the Dutch controversies, for the purpose of appeasing which the synod had been convened. The Acts themselves consist of three parts:

(1.) The rules for holding the synod; the form of the synodical oath; decrees and judgments concerning the translation of the Bible, catechizing candidates for, the sacred ministry, and concerning the removal of the abuses of printing; the canons against the five points of the Remonstrants; the Confession of the Dutch churches; the approbation of the Palatine Catechism; the judgment passed on the doctrine of Conrad Vorstius; a writing of the Remonstrants respecting the conditions on which the synod ought to be held; the theses of the Remonstrants on the five points, and the various exceptions and protestations against the synod; a writing by Simon Episcopius, in which he defends himself; the confession of the two brothers Geisteeren; and, lastly, the orations of those very celebrated men, Balthasar Lydius, Martin Gregory, Joseph Hall, John Polyander, John Acronius, and of the memorable Episcopius.

(2.) The judgments of the foreign divines on the five points of the Remonstrants.

(3.) The judgments of the Dutch divines on the same points."

The *Canons of Doctrine* are given under five heads:

I. Of predestination, 18 articles.

II. Of the death of Christ, and of the redemption of men thereby, 9 articles.

III and IV. Of man's corruption, and of his conversion, 17 articles.

V. Of the perseverance of the saints, 15 articles. They may be found, in English, in Scott's Synod of Dort, and in the Constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church (Philadel. 1840, *Appendix*, page 72 sq.).

They were officially received by Holland, France, the Palatinate, and Switzerland, but were merely countenanced by England and Brandenburg. The English Church afterwards "rejected the decisions of the synod, and a royal mandate of James I, who favored Arminianism as strongly in his later years as he had favored Calvinism before, in 1622, forbade the preaching of the doctrine of predestination" (Shedd, *History of Doctrine*, 2:477; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, Harpers' ed., 1:272). The Reformed churches of other countries did not consider them as binding. They received legal authority in no other country but France. The divines of Bremen were very moderate at the synod, and afterwards, headed by Martinius, they rejected its decisions. Martinius wrote: "O Dort, Dort, would to God I had never seen thee." Hales, of Eton, was converted from Calvinism to Arminianism at the synod. *SEE HALES*.

IV. No Church council has given rise to more bitter controversy than the Synod of Dort. Arminian writers have denounced it in the strongest language as unworthy the name of a Christian synod, while, on the other hand, Calvinistic writers have extolled its fairness and impartiality. All depends upon the point of view, and upon the notion of the true purpose of the synod which is adopted. If this celebrated assembly is conceived as a deliberative body, designed for the discussion of the five points of theology in question, then all that the Arminians have said of it would be well deserved. If, on the other hand, it be conceived as a body of divines holding Calvinistic views, believing those views to be true, and called for the purpose of condemning and prohibiting the contrary opinions in the Belgic churches, the course of the synod was consistent throughout. And this we believe to be the true view. It was not a free assembly for the discussion of controverted points in theology, but a national ecclesiastical court for the trial of alleged heretics. The judgment of Moses Stuart will probably be generally acquiesced in: "That the Synod of Dort should have been highly celebrated by those contemporaries who sympathized with it in feeling and in doctrine, was natural. Hence we find that, on the one hand, it has been eulogized as the most perfect of ecclesiastical councils that have ever been held; but, as one might also expect, on the other hand, its opponents have been more loud, if possible, in their complaints than its

friends in their praises. A deep sense of injury and persecution of course remained infixed in the minds of the Remonstrants, and of all who sympathized with them; and this feeling was greatly aggravated by the appeal made to the civil power to carry into execution the decrees of the synod, by banishment, by imprisonment, and by fine. Both the parties undoubtedly went too far in their praise and their blame. The Expositio of the synod in question is an able paper; yet I cannot see that, compared with other declarations of the like nature, it calls for any very extravagant eulogy. Certainly the Westminster Confession is superior, as a whole. Men of great talent, much learning, warm piety, and well-meaning intentions belonged, no doubt, to the Council of Dort, and perhaps an unusual number of such men; but no one of them has ever been so distinguished as a theologian and a writer as many other men who can be easily named among the Reformed churches. That the measures of force which the spirit of dispute and of the day urged them to take were misjudged, of hurtful tendency, and against the true spirit of prudence and Protestantism, I suppose no one in our time and in our country will venture to call in question. But, at the same time, their opponents were more concerned in the blame of these measures than they were willing to allow. They were violent, heated, sarcastic, contemptuous. They felt a deep sense of injury, and they gave vent to it in no very measured terms. They had reason to complain that the principles of religious liberty were violated in respect to them; but their opponents might well complain also that the principle of Christian moderation, and lenity of manner, and respect for differing sentiments, had not unfrequently been violated on the part of the Remonstrants. Nor can there be any room to doubt that if the latter had been the dominant party they would have taken as effectual measures to carry their points as the Gomarists did, although, perhaps, not in the same way" (*American Biblical Repository*, 1:258).

Literature. — The official Acts — *Acta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechti habitae* (1620, 4to); soon transl. into Dutch; also into French, *Les Actes de la Synode de Dort* (Leyden, 1624, 4to); *Judicium Synodi Nationalis Reform. Ecclesiastes Belg. habit. Dordrechti* (Dort, 1619, 4to; transl. into English by Bill, 1619); *Remonstrant collection of minutes — Actae et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium* (Hardervici. 1620, 4to); Hales, of Eton, *Letters*, in his *Golden Remains* (Lond. 1673, 4to); translated into Latin, with notes and additions, by Mosheim, *Historia Concilii Dordraceni* (Hamb. 1724); Balcanqual's *Letters*; the account in

Epistole Praestant. ac Erudit. Virorum (Amst. 1660, page 512 sq.), and many letters in that collection; Hales's and Balcanqual's *Letters*, in German, by D. Hartnack (Zeitz, 1672, 12mo); G. Brandt (Remonstrant), *Historie der Reformatie* (Amsterd. and Rotterd. 1663-1704, 4 volumes; transl. into English by Chamberlayne, Lond. 1720-23, 4 volumes, fol.; also abridged, 1725, 2 volumes, 8vo); Leydekker (Calvinist), *Eere van de Nationale Synode van Dordregt* (2 parts, Amst. 1705-1707, 4to), a reply to G. Brandt; to which reply his son, Job. Brandt, replied in *Verantwoording van de historie van G. Brandt* (Amst. 1705); *Letters of the Hessian Delegates* (Literae Deleg. Hassiacorum), ed. by Heppe, in *Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie*, 23:226 sq.; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, part 2, chapter 2; Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (Lond. 1841, 7:404 sq.;); Nichols, *Calvinism and Arminianism* (Lond. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:143, and 2:576 sq.; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*, cent. 17, section 2, part 2, chapter 3; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ed. Smith, 4, § 43; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reformation*, 5:246 sq.; Scott, *Articles of the Synod of Dort*, transi. with notes (Phila. Presb. Board: severely reviewed in Nichols, Calvinism and Arminianism, volume 1; favorably reviewed in *Christian Observer*, 18:794, and in *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, 4:256). The *Canons of Doctrine*, in Latin, are given in the *Sylloge Confessionum* (Oxon. 1804, page 364 sq.); in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum* (1840, page 690); in Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum* (Elberfeld, 1827, pages 198-240); in English, in Scott's *Synod of Dort*, cited above; also in the Appendix to the Constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church (Phila. 1840, 18mo); and in Hall, *Harmony of the Protestant Confessions* (Lond. 1842, page 539 sq.). See also Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, 1, book 2 and 3; Cunningham, *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation*, Essay 7; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, chapter 25, § 1, 2; and the articles *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE EPISCOPIUS*; *SEE GROTIUS*; *SEE VORSTIUS*; *SEE REMONSTRANTS*.

Dortus

(Δόρτος), a leading Jew, charged before Quadratus, president of Syria, with inciting his countrymen to revolt against the Romans (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:6, 2).

Dorym'enes

(Δορυμένης), father of Ptolemy, surnamed Macron (1 Macc. 3:38; 2 Macc. 4:45). As this Ptolemy was in the service of Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt, before he deserted to Antiochus Epiphanes, it is possible that his father is the same Dorymenes who fought against Antiochus the Great (*Polyb.* 5:61).

Dositheans

SEE DOSITHEUS.

Dosith'eiis

(Δοσίθεος), the name of several men in the Apocrypha.

1. "A priest and Levite," who, according to the apocryphal additions to the book of Esther, carried the letter of Mordecai respecting the feast of Purim to Egypt (Esther 11:1, 2). It is scarcely likely that he is identical with the Dositheus who is mentioned by Josephus (*Ap.* 2:5) as one of the "commanders of the forces" of Ptolemy VI Philometor, though he probably lived in the reign of that monarch. Josephus also speaks of a Dositheus who betrayed to Herod a hostile letter of Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 15:6, 2).

2. One of the generals of Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc. 12:19, 24).

3. A cavalry soldier in the army of Judas Maccabieus, of the company of Bacenor (2 Macc. 12:35).

4. A renegade Jew in the camp of Ptolemy Philopator (3 Macc. 1:3).

Dositheus

a Samaritan, in the first century, who claimed to be Messiah, or the prophet promised in ‹05818›Deuteronomy 18:18. The Church fathers ascribe to him peculiarly many doctrines which had always been held by the Samaritans. He was chiefly distinguished by an ascetic life, and an over-scrupulous observance of the Sabbath (Origen, *De princ.* 4, c. 17: Quo quisque corporis situ in principio sabbathi inventus fuerit, in eo ad vesperum usque ipsi permanendum esse), which originated evidently in a verbal interpretation of ‹02169›Exodus 16:29. As late as the year 588 the followers of Dositheus were engaged in a controversy with the other Samaritans concerning the passage, ‹05818›Deuteronomy 18:18 (Eulogius *ap. Phot. bibl.*

cod. page 230; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, 1, § 18). Instead of being included in the class of heretics, he ought to be classed among those lunatics who have fancied themselves divine messengers. His impious claims caused an order from the Samaritan high-priest for his apprehension; and Dositheus took refuge in a cave, where he is said to have starved to death (Epiphanius, Hares. 13, cited by Mosheim, *Hist. Comment*. N.Y. 1851, 1:240 note).

Dositheus

the founder of the Russian sect called after him Dositheowschtschina. He taught that it was sufficient to confess one's sins and to receive the Lord's Supper once every ten years, and at the close of one's life. — Allgem. *Real-Encyklop*. 4:817.

Dositheus

Greek patriarch of Jerusalem. He assembled, in 1672, a synod at Jerusalem for the purpose of rooting out Calvinism, which, in his opinion, had been introduced into the Greek Church by the patriarch Cyril Lucaris. He died in 1706. — Allgem. *Real-Encyklop*. 4:817.

Do'thaim

(Judith 4:6). *SEE DOTHAN*.

Do'than

(Hebrews *Dothan'*, ˆ t Dø contracted for ˆ yæ Dø two cisterns, which occurs with h directive, *Dotha'yenah*, hn y] * t Dø "to Dathan," <01937>Genesis 37:17 [first clause]; Sept. Δωδαείμ and Δωδαΐμ, the latter in Judith; Vulg. *Dothain*), the place where Joseph found his brethren, who had wandered thither with their flocks from Shechem, and where he was treacherously sold by them to the Ishmaelites (<01937>Genesis 37:17). It next appears as the residence of Elisha, and the scene of a remarkable vision of horses and chariots of fire surrounding "the mountain" (r h ḥ) on which the city stood, while the Syrians were smitten with blindness at the word of Elisha (<120613>2 Kings 6:13). It is not again mentioned in the O.T. (Reland, *Palaest.* page 739); but later still we encounter it — then evidently well known — as a landmark in the account of Holofernes's campaign against Bethulia (Judith 4:6; 7:3, 18; 8:3). In the Vat., and Alex., and Vulg. text — it is also mentioned in Judith 3:9, where the A.V. has "Judaea" (Ἰουδαία for

Δωταία). This passage was a great puzzle to the old geographers, not only from the corrupt reading, Ἰουδαίας, but also from the expression, still found in the text, τοῦ πρίονος τοῦ μεγάλου; A.V. "the great strait," literally, "the great saw." The knot was cut by Reland, who conjectured most ingeniously that πρίων was the translation of רסמי Massor = a saw, which was a corruption of רשימ Mishor" the plain" (Palaest. page 742 sq.). All these passages testify to its situation being in the center of the country, near the southern edge of the great plain of Esdraelon. Dothan is placed by Eusebius and Jerome twelve Roman miles north of Sebaste; or Samaria (Onomast. s.v. Δωθαείμ, *Dothaim*). The well into which Joseph was cast by his brothers, and consequently the site of Dothan, has, however, been placed by tradition in a very distant quarter, namely, about three miles south-east from Safed, where there is a khan called Khan Jubb Yusuf, the Khan of Joseph's Pit, because the well connected with it has long passed among Christians and Moslems for the well in question (Robinson, *Res.* 3:317). The true site of Dothan was known to the Jewish traveler Rabbi ha-Parchi, A.D. 1300 (see Zunz's extracts in notes to Benjamin of Tudela, Asher's ed. 2:434), and to Schwarz, A.D. 1845 (Palest. page 168); but neither of these travelers gives any account of the site. It was accidentally discovered in 1852 by Van de Velde (Narrative, 1:364-369). Dr. Robinson, in his last visit to Palestine, likewise identified the true site of Dothan in the modern name Dothan, a place which he found in the middle of a beautiful plain extending south-westerly from Kefr Kud (Capharcotia) to Attil, southeast of Lejjunm. He thus speaks of it: "It is now a fine green tell (knoll), with a fountain on its southern base, corresponding entirely to the position assigned to it by Eusebius. We were told at Ya'bad that the great road from Beisan and Zer'in to Ramleh and Egypt still leads through this plain, entering it west of Jenin, passing near Kefr Kud, and bending south-westward around Ya'bud to the western plain. It is easy to see, therefore, that the Midianites, to whom Joseph was sold in Dothan, had crossed the Jordan at Beisin, and were proceeding to Egypt along the ordinary road. It is obvious, too, that Joseph's brethren well knew the best places for pasturage. They had exhausted that of the Mukna by Shechem (Nablus), and had afterwards repaired to the still finer pastures here around Dothan"'(*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1853, pages 122, 123).

Doty, Elihu

was born in 1812, graduated at Rutgers College in 1835, and from the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church, New Brunswick, N.J., in 1836, and was licensed and ordained as a missionary to the heathen in the same year. He was a member of the first mission sent by the Reformed Dutch Church and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to Java, where he labored from 1836 to 1840, when he was transferred to Borneo, and labored among the Dyaks until 1844. Thence he was removed to China, and was connected with the Amoy Mission until his decease, which occurred at sea on his return from China in March, 1865, but four days before the arrival of the ship at New York. Mr. Doty was an excellent Chinese scholar and preacher; an indefatigable, courageous, self-denying laborer; a man of singular frankness, piety, and zeal; and was closely identified with the celebrated mission at Amoy from its origin, and through all the steps of its remarkable success. Few men have surpassed him in the toils and faithfulness of an evangelist. For years he was regarded as the father of what has been termed "the model mission" of the American Board and of the Reformed Dutch Church.

Douai, Or Douay

a town in France, of the Department of Nord; it formerly belonged to Flanders. Philip II, in 1561, founded a university here after the model of that of Louvain. In 1568 a Jesuits' college was founded in connection with the university by Jean Lentceilleur, head of the neighboring abbey of Auchin, who devoted part of the revenues of the abbey to the support of the college, which soon became very powerful. Cardinal William Allen (q.v.) established also a college at Douai for the education of Roman Catholic English youth. — Ranke, History of the Papacy, book 6. For the Douai Bible, *SEE VERSIONS*.

Double

(represented by several Hebrews and Greek words) has many significations in Scripture. "A double garment" (comp. Exodus 39:9) may mean a lined habit, such as the high-priest's pectoral, or a complete habit or suit of clothes, a cloak and a tunic, etc. Double heart, double tongue, double mind, are opposed to a simple, honest, sincere heart, tongue, mind, etc. Double, the counterpart to a quantity, to a space, to a measure, etc., which

is proposed as the exemplar. "Double money" — the same value as before, with an equal value added to it (<0143 12>Genesis 43:12, 15). If a stolen ox or sheep be found, the thief shall restore double, that is, two oxen or two sheep. For the right understanding of <2340 2>Isaiah 40:2, "She hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," read the counterpart, that which fits, the commensurate quantity, extent, or number of her sins; that which is adequate, all things considered, as a dispensation of punishment. This passage does not mean twice as much as had been deserved, double what was just, but the fair, commensurate, adequate retribution. The same is the meaning of this phrase in other places (<2361 7>Isaiah 61:7; <2416 18>Jeremiah 16:18; 17:18.-Calmet, s.v.

Double Sense Of Scripture.

In certain prophetic passages there is a double import or twofold application, a lower and a higher, a nearer and a more remote. The former relates to the present and immediate, while the latter usually refers to the Messianic period and spiritual deliverance. This distinction, however, has been contested by many. It is undeniable that several of the fathers maintained, the so-called double sense of prophecy, particularly Theodore of Mopsuestia; and there is little doubt that numbers in modern times have rejected it on account of the unfortunate appellation. Twofold reference would be much more appropriate; but the name is of little consequence. A recent writer asks, "How could such positions form part of a revelation when, after we have ascertained their meaning, we are still left as ignorant as ever of their import, since under these words another deeper meaning still lies hidden? Besides, how, and upon what principle, can we ever be sure that we have arrived at the true secondary meaning, or that we have perfectly exhausted the burden of these passages, or that our work as commentators is accomplished? There may be a third, fourth, fifth, or as the Rabbis maintain seventy meanings lurking still deeper under these very words" (Wolfe, Messiah in the Psalms, page 74). But neither the single nor the double sense of prophecy can justly be argued on a priori grounds. Thus Arnold (*Sermons*, 1:427) tries to show that "a double sense appears to be a necessary condition of the very idea and definition of prophecy, as having, so to speak, a human as well as a divine author." This language applies to all inspired composition, and would therefore imply a double sense in all Scripture. The true and only philosophical method is to consider the actual phenomena of prophecy as they lie before us in the

Scriptures, and see whether the one-sense theory meets all the exigencies in every case.

At the outset it is proper to deny that the theory of double-sense rests wholly upon the construction put upon the formulae by which the N.T. writers frequently introduce the quotations from the O.T., e.g. (40122)Matthew 1:22, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, "that it might be fulfilled," and the like (Wolfe, page 76). *SEE FULFIL*. The basis of this method of interpretation lies far broader and deeper than this; it is founded in part on the typical character of the O.T. institutions, and on symbolical transactions and teachings; it is derived from the language of many individual passages, which is both historical and hyperbolical; it is inherent in the nature of a theocracy like that of the Jews, which was elementary, symbolical, typical, preparatory to a better and a spiritual economy. It is freely allowed that a double sense should not be admitted when another explanation is more probable. No doubt it has been assumed in some cases too hastily; but there are cases which cannot be fairly interpreted without it. *SEE QUOTATION* (of O.T. in the New).

The language of prophecy is generally vague and obscure; the ideas of the seers — their visions and dreams, were tinged with darkness. In many instances, it would seem that they had not themselves a clear perception of all the meaning of what they were prompted to utter ((60111)1 Peter 1:11). Some of their predictions, therefore, are fairly susceptible of various references, and were doubtless intended to be so taken. Indeed, it is a good rule, in the interpretation of Scripture generally, to adopt that signification which is the most comprehensive, and which frequently includes two or more senses upon which commentators have generally been divided; but this, of course, cannot be done when these meanings are diverse in principle, but only where, as in the case of the double references now spoken of, they are but branches of the same wider extension, or applications coming under the same analogy. That one event in this manner frequently adumbrates another in Scripture is unquestionable, and the language is often adapted to such a twofold import. Remarkable instances of this may be seen even in the New Testament, as, for example, in our Lord's blended prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world (Matthew 24); and a similar ambiguity runs through all the O.T. utterances respecting "the latter days," the details of which are applicable in various degrees to the Restoration and to the Messianic sera. *SEE ESCHATOLOGY*. Indeed, more recent expositors are strongly inclining, in

the case of the Apocalypse, to that system of exposition which regards its language, its visions, and its symbols as designed to refer not so much to any specific event or series of events as to various historical occurrences and periods; that wherever general agencies appear in operation, as distinguished from individual transpirations — wherever general causes and influences exist, there the Apocalyptic prophecies apply; that they comprehend various events and periods, because they speak of general influences or agencies producing similar results. *SEE REVELATION (BOOK OF)*. Hence the scenery is largely borrowed from Daniel and Ezekiel, not in a sense foreign to its original import, but merely as a fresh application or extension to cognate incidents. According to Alexander (*Commentary on Isaiah*, Introd. page 37), " all predictions, or prophecies in the restricted sense, are not specific and exclusive, i.e., limited to one occasion or emergency, but many are descriptive of a sequence of events which has been often realized. Thus, in some parts of Isaiah there are prophetic pictures of the sieges of Jerusalem which cannot be exclusively applied to any one event of that kind, but the terms and images of which are borrowed partly from one and partly from another through a course of ages. Thus the threatening against Babylon contained in Isaiah 13, 14, if explained as a specific and exclusive prophecy of the Medo-Persian conquest, seems to represent the downfall of the city as more sudden and complete than it appears in history. . . . . It is a panorama of the fall of Babylon, not in its first inception merely, but through all its stages till its consummation." It therefore depicts different and distinct occurrences, separated by intervals of time from one another. Each is a certain grade and stage of fulfillment. If referred to one occurrence, or to a series of occurrences taking place together, the prophecy certainly applies to them — it has its meaning in them; but it has not its full sense or entire fulfillment till applied to other occurrences. The sense of it is springing or germinant; coming to widen till it embraces various references-allusions and applications to various events. *SEE PROPHECY*.

A still more striking instance of this twofold reference is found in Isaiah 49, which nearly throughout alludes most palpably to the Messiah, yet under the more immediate imagery of the return and restoration of the Babylonian exiles. Thus Jehovah's "Servant" (see Umbreit, *Knecht Gottes*, Hamb. 1840), chosen from his birth for the redemptive and evangelizing work (verses 1, 2), is explicitly styled "Israel" (verse 8), and a similar blending of the national and the Messianic references is continued through

the chapter. That the speaker is not Isaiah himself, nor the prophets as a class, is evident from the fact that neither of these were ever entrusted with a message to the Gentiles. That the address is put into the mouth of the chosen people is favored by various considerations, but there are at the same time clear indications that the words are those of the Messiah. These two interpretations can only be reconciled by assuming that in this passage (as in others that might be cited) the ideal speaker is the Messiah considered as the head of his people, and as forming with them one complex person, according to the canon of Tichonius, quoted by Augustine: "Mention is often made in Scripture of Christ and his body the Church as of one person, to whom some things are attributed which reside only in the Head, some which belong only to the Body, and :some again which pertain to both" (Alexander, *Later Prophecies of Isaiah*, page 170). *SEE ISAIAH (BOOK OF)*.

Another example is Psalm 16, which, although in the first instance, as explained by all good commentators (e.g. Calvin, De Wette, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Alexander, Olshausen, Hupfeld), describes a pious sufferer in peril of death, either David himself or some other, yet in a higher sense passes through one stage of fulfillment in every pious sufferer; while its highest fulfillment is if Christ, as is proved by the quotations of Peter and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles. The same may be said of Psalm xxii: few will deny that it has reference, chiefly or in its highest import, to Christ, the head of the righteous afflicted; but verses 6, 9, 10 demonstrate that it has a literal application to the writer's own sacred sorrows. We may also point to Isaiah 40-66 as a more extended example. We cannot doubt that this portion of the book refers primarily to a historical object, the exile, and the deliverance of Israel from Babylon. But along with the description of this restoration there is a deeper and higher reference, namely, to the time of the Messiah, in which comes spiritual deliverance. The two are spoken of together, and blended in the description given. The prophecy was fulfilled in the last; it had an incipient fulfillment, if we may be allowed the phrase, in the first. It matters not whether the prophet himself distinctly intended to speak of both; it is highly probable that he had no very clear perception of the manner in which his language would be verified by history in its highest sense. The descriptions are of such a kind as to forbid their exclusive application either to the New dispensation or to events in the Old; both must be combined in order to bring out the true interpretation; they relate both to historical events under the Old, and spiritual ones under the New

economy. Nor are the references to the historical and the spiritual kept apart; the one merges into the other; in some parts the descriptions point to the two as successive, while in others they embrace both together. *SEE PSALMS*.

A common objection to this mode of interpretation is that it is arbitrary to apply one part of a prophecy to a historical person or place, and another part of the same passage spiritually; to interpret one verse literally and another emblematically; for example, to say that David is meant in this clause, and Christ in that. Those who do not explain the same prophecy throughout in one consistent method are justly liable to this objection: the two methods, the historical and the spiritual, or the nearer and more remote, should be adopted together and applied throughout the same passage, except that in certain parts a preponderance may be allowed to one or the other import; while those who. prefer the historical alone, or the spiritual alone, should adhere to each respectively: it is wrong to run from one to another in the same prophecy, unless there be evident marks of a transition. This objection, therefore, does not lie against the legitimate use of the twofold-reference scheme, but against its abuse.

As to the other objection urged against this method of interpretation, that it opens the door for many, even an indefinite number of senses, as well as two, it may be sufficient to reply, in the first place, that if there be evidence of several senses inhering in a given prophecy, they ought, of course, all to be admitted, however numerous they may be. But, secondly, there will rarely, if ever, be found to exist more than two such senses, and these not really distinct, but related to each other as special and general, as local and universal, or as primary and secondary, as germinal and complete, as historical and spiritual, etc. In short, one event is to be viewed as the type of another, because involving the same principle in the divine economy; e.g. the "Man of Sin" (q.v.) is Antichrist as a spiritual antagonist, whether in the form of the Seleucid persecutors, pagan Rome, or the papacy. *SEE LITTLE HORN*. See Davidson, in *Home's Introduction*, new ed. 2:458 sq.; on the other side, Stuart, in the *Biblic. Repos*. 1831, page 63 sq.; in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1852, page 459 sq.; comp. Stier, Words of Jesus, 1:431 sq., Am. ed.; *Meth. Quart. Review*, April, 1867, page 195 sq. *SEE HERMENEUTICS*.

Doubt

(dubito, to go two ways). "Man knows some things and is ignorant of many things, while he is in doubt as to other things. Doubt is that state of mind in which we hesitate as to two contradictory conclusions, having no preponderance of evidence in favor of either. Philosophical doubt has been distinguished as provisional or definitive. Definitive doubt is skepticism. Provisional or methodical doubt is a voluntary suspending of our judgment for a time, in order to come to a more clear and sure conclusion. This was first given as a rule in philosophical method by Des Cartes, who tells us that he began by doubting everything, discharging his mind of all preconceived ideas, and admitting none as clear and true till he had subjected them to a rigorous examination. Doubt is some degree of belief, along with the consciousness of ignorance, in regard to a proposition. Absolute disbelief implies knowledge: it is the knowledge that such or such a thing is not true. If the mind admits a proposition without any desire for knowledge concerning it, this is credulity; if it is open to receive the proposition, but feels ignorance concerning it, this is doubt. As knowledge increases, doubt diminishes, and belief or disbelief strengthens (Taylor, Elements of Thought)." — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, Phila. 1860. *SEE DES CARTES*; *SEE SCEPTICISM*.

Doubts, Dissolving Of,

Chald. ^yrçpæ rwtm; *meshare' kitrin'*, to unbind knots, i.e. solve problems; a form of speech still commonly employed in the East for the determination of difficult questions (see Roberts, Burder, Bush, *Illustra.* in loc.).

Dough

Picture for Dough

(qxB; *batsek'*, so called from swelling in fermentation, <02234>Exodus 12:34, 39; <24718>Jeremiah 7:18; <28704>Hosea 7:4; "flour," <10308>2 Samuel 13:8; t/syrçæ; *arisoth'*, grits, so called as being pounded, <04150>Numbers 15:20, 21; <16107>Nehemiah 10:37; <26480>Ezekiel 44:30). *SEE COOK*. The dough, we are told, which the Israelites had prepared for baking, and on which it appears they subsisted after they left Egypt for a month, was carried away by them in their kneading-troughs on their shoulders (<02234>Exodus 12:34). *SEE*

KNEADING-TROUGH. In Oriental countries, and indeed in all tropical climates, the process of preparing the materials for baking is very expeditious, and generally performed in the house for each meal, including grinding the meal. *SEE BREAD*. The fermentation is often dispensed with altogether. *SEE LEAVEN*. From Hosea 7:8, it appears that the dough had to be turned in the process of baking, in order to be well done. *SEE BAKE*.

Dougharty, George,

a Methodist Episcopal minister of the South Carolina Conference. The date of his birth is wanting. He entered the itinerancy in 1798, was presiding elder 1802-6, became superannuate in 1807, and died March 23, 1807, at Wilmington, N.C. Mr. Dougharty was one of the greatest preachers of his Conference. His mind and memory were capacious; he had a large fund of knowledge, was indefatigable in labor and study, and "totally dead to the world." He was far in advance of his associates with regard to education, and labored in 1803 to establish a Methodist academy in South Carolina. In 1801 he was attacked by a mob, gathered in the interest of slavery in Charleston. They dragged him to a pump, and pumped water on him till he was nearly exhausted, when a heroic woman interfered and kept the mob at bay till help arrived and saved him from probable death. — Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, volumes 3 and 4; *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:155, Deems, *Annals of Southern Methodism*, page 228; Sprague, Annals, 7:290.

Doughty

John, was born at Martley, near Worcester, England, about 1598; was educated at Oxford, and became fellow of Merton College. About 1631 he was made rector of Lapworth, Warwickshire; and after the restoration of Charles II he was appointed prebendary of Westminster and rector of Cheam, Surrey. He died at Westminster, December 25, 1672. He published, under the Latinized name Doughtaeus, *Analecta Sacra, sive excursus philologici breves super div. S. Scripturae locis* (Lond. 1658-60, 2 vols. 8vo); 2d ed. with Knatchbull's *Animadver. in N.T.* (Amst. 1694, 8vo); *De Calicibus eucharisticis vet. Christianorum* (Bremae, 1694, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1:949; Orme, *Bibliotheca Biblica*.

Doughty

Samuel, a Methodist Episcopal minister of the Philadelphia Conference, was born in Philadelphia in January, 1794, was converted in 1816, entered the itinerancy in 1823, was stationed successively at New Brunswick, N.J., and at St. George's, Philadelphia, and died at Wilmington, Delaware, September 17, 1828. Mr. Doughty was one of the most popular, useful, and eloquent preachers of his time. He was an eloquent advocate for the benevolent institutions of the Church, especially for Sunday-schools, of which he was a distinguished promoter, both before and after his entrance to the regular ministry. His literary and theological requirements and talents were of a high order, as his published Sermons in the Methodist Magazine sufficiently attest, especially one upon "Instability in Religion." He was rapidly rising in influence and usefulness when he was suddenly cut down. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:38; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:672.

Douglas, Gawin, Or Gavin

bishop of Dunkeld, Scotland, was the third son of Archibald, earl of Angus, and was born at Brechin in 1474, or the beginning of 1475. He received his education first in his own country, and then on the Continent. On his return to Scotland he was made provost of the collegiate church of St. Giles, at Edinburgh, and afterwards abbot of Aberbrothick. He was also nominated by the queen regent to the archbishopric of St. Andrews, but this dignity he never obtained, owing to the refusal of the pope to confirm the appointment. He was, however, confirmed as bishop of Dunkeld through the interest of Henry VIII with pope Leo X. His administration fell in a troubled time, and after many vexations he retired to England, where Henry VIII granted him a pension. He died of the plague at London in 1522. Bishop Douglas translated the AEneid of Virgil into Scottish verse, printed at London in 1553, 4to. His other works are a poem called The Palace of Honor, 4to, and King Hart, printed in 1786. His Virgil was reprinted at Edinburgh in folio, with a glossary, in 1710. — Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 5:338.

Douglas, John

D.D., bishop of Salisbury, was born in 1721 at Pittenweem, Fifeshire, and was educated at Baliol College, Oxford. He was chaplain in the Guards at the battle of Fontenoy, became canon and dean of Westminster in 1762,

was made bishop of Car lisle in 1787, and in 1791 was transferred to Salisbury. He died May 18, 1807. Dr. Douglas was intimate with Dr. Johnson, and all the most celebrated of his contemporaries. He was an accurate scholar and critic, and exposed Lander in his Milton no Plagiary, and ably attacked Hume in his Criterion of Miracles. Both these essays are given in Douglas's Select Works (Salisbury, 1820, 4to). He also wrote largely against Archibald Bower, aiming to show that he was a literary and religious impostor, in his *Six Letters to Sheldon* (Lond. 1756, 8vo), and in his *Bower and Tillemont compared* (London, 1757, 8vo). A new edition of his *Criterion* appeared from the Clarendon Press (1833). See Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism* (Lond. 1851), page 525; Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures.*

Douglass, Thomas Logan

an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister of the Virginia Conference, and afterwards of the Tennessee Conference, was born in Person County, N.C., July 8, 1781, entered the Virginia Conference on trial in 1801, traveled on important circuits and districts until 1813, was then transferred to the Tennessee Conference, and died near Franklin, Tenn., April 9, 1843. Mr. Douglass was eminently useful both as a preacher and presiding elder, and his influence was very great in the Conferences with which he was connected during more than thirty years. His sermons were pregnant with thought, and his appeals were full of pathos. Few preachers of his time had such command of their hearers. He was an excellent disciplinarian, and thoroughly versed in the history and economy of Methodism. "His piety was uniform and deep, his temper sweet," and his old age was bright and blessed. He was several times elected a delegate to the General Conference. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:457; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:352; Summers, *Biographical Sketches*, page 103.

Dove

Picture for Dove 1

Picture for Dove 2

(הנּיָ, *yonah'*, prob. referring to the sexual warmth of that bird; περιστερά; both terms occasionally rendered "pigeon"). There are probably several species of doves or pigeons included in the Hebrew name

with its Greek equivalent. It may contain all those that inhabit Palestine, exclusive of the turtle-doves properly so called. *SEE TURTLE DOVE*. In modern systems, the doves are included in the natural family of Columbida, or pigeon tribe, which comprises the pigeons, doves, and turtles; but naturalists are still divided as to the proper place of the family, and the limits of the respective subdivisions (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:542 sq.). Syria possesses several species of pigeon: the *Columba enas*, or stock-dove; *C. palumbus*, or ring-dove; *C. domestica, lisia*; the common pigeon in several varieties, such as the Barbary, Turkish or Persian carrier, crisp, and shaker. These are still watched in their flight in the same manner as anciently their number, gyrations, and other manoeuvres were observed by soothsayers. The wild species, as well as the turtle-doves migrate from Palestine to the south, but stock and ring-doves are not long absent. In the wild state, doves generally build their nests in the holes or clefts of the rocks, or in excavated trees, but they are easily taught submission and familiarity with mankind, and, when domesticated, build in structures erected for their accommodation, called "dove-cotes" (comp. <22214>Song of Solomon 2:14; <24828>Jeremiah 48:28; <23608>Isaiah 60:8). Doves are kept in a domesticated state in many parts of the East. The pigeoncot is a universal feature in the houses of Upper Egypt. In Persia pigeon-houses are erected at a distance from the dwellings, for the purpose of collecting the dung as manure. The allusion in <23608>Isaiah 60:8, is to the immense compact masses of these birds that Eastern travelers describe, as they are seen flying to their cotes or places of general resort. They sometimes resemble a distant heavy cloud, and are so dense as to obscure the rays of the sun. Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* page 257), speaking of Ascalon as the haunt of the Syrian Venus, says: "Her temple is destroyed, but the sacred doves — sacred by immemorial legends on the spot, and celebrated there even as late as Eusebius still fill with their cooings the luxuriant gardens which grow in the sandy hollow within the ruined walls." See below. The dove has been by some considered (though in an obscure passage) as an early national standard (<19813>Psalm 68:13), being likewise held in pagan Syria and Phoenicia to be an ensign and a divinity, resplendent with silver and gold, and so venerated as to be regarded as holy, and forbidden as an article of food. (See Engel, *Kypros*, 2:184; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2:70-77.) It is supposed that the dove was placed upon the standards of the Assyrians and Babylonians in honor of Semiramis. This explains the expression in <24538>Jeremiah 25:38, "from before the fierceness of the dove," i.e., the Assyrian (comp. <24616>Jeremiah 46:16; 1, 16). There is, however, no representation of the dove among the

sculptures of Nineveh, so that it could hardly have been a common emblem of the nation at the time when they were executed; and the word in the above three passages of Jeremiah admits another interpretation (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 601 a). By the Hebrew law, however (see Mishna, *Yom Tob*, 1:3; *Baba Bathra*, 2:5 sq.; *Bab-kamma*, 7:7), doves and turtle-doves were the only birds that could be offered in sacrifice, and they were usually selected for that purpose by the less wealthy (<01509>Genesis 15:9; <03307>Leviticus 5:7; 12:6; <42224>Luke 2:24); and, to supply the demand for them, dealers in these birds sat about the precincts of the Temple (<42112>Matthew 21:12, etc.). The brown wooddove is said to be intended by the Hebrew name; but all the sacred birds, unless expressly mentioned, were pure white, or with some roseate feathers about the wing coverts, such as are still frequently bred from the carrier-pigeon of Scandiroon. It is this kind which Tibullus notices (1:7). The carrier-birds are represented in Egyptian bas-reliefs, where priests are shown letting them fly on a message. All pigeons in their true wild plumage have iridescent colors about the neck, And often reflected flashes of the same colors on the shoulders, which are the source of the silver and gold feathers ascribed to them in poetical diction; and thence the epithet of purple bestowed upon them all, though most applicable to the vinous and slatycolored species. This beauty of plumage is alluded to in <19816>Psalm 68:16, where the design of the Psalmist is to present, in contrast, the condition of the Hebrews at two different periods of their history: in the day of their affliction and calamity they were covered as it were with Shame and confusion, but in the day of their prosperity they should resemble the cleanest and most beautiful of birds. The dove was the harbinger of reconciliation with God (<01808>Genesis 8:8, 10, etc.), when Noah Sent one from the ark to ascertain if the waters of the Deluge had assuaged. The association of the dove and the olive is not only natural, but highly emblematical (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:69). The dove is frequently mentioned in the Scriptures as the emblem of purity and innocence, and so it doubtless was viewed by the Psalmist (<19506>Psalm 55:6-8), although with a special allusion to the swiftness of that bird's flight (comp. Sophocl. (Ed. Colossians 1081; Eurip. Bacch. 1090). By an almost anthropomorphic extension of this idea, the dove is, figuratively, next to man, the most exalted of animals, symbolizing the Holy Spirit, a sentiment that appears to be couched in the description of creation (<01002>Genesis 1:2), where the Spirit is represented as brooding ("moved") over the surface of chaos. (See treatises on this point by Augusti, Die Taube, in Gieseler and Lucke's *Zeitschr.* 3:56-64; Moller, *De columba*, Frib. 1721; Schmid, *De*

columbis, Helmst. 1711, 1731; Schwebel, *De columbarum cultu*, Onold. 1767; E. F. Wernsdorf, De simulacro columbae,Viteb. 1773; Id. *De columba sanc*ta *Syrorum*, Helmst. 1761; J. C. Wernsdorf, *De columba*, Helmst. 1770; Ziebich, *De columba pentecostali*,Viteb. 1737.) The Holy Spirit descended, as a dove descends, upon our Savior at his baptismvisibly with that peculiar hovering motion which distinguishes the descent of a dove (<40316>Matthew 3:16; <41010>Mark 1:10; <42322>Luke 3:22; <43032>John 1:32). (See the treatises on this incident, in Latin, by Adler [Sorav. 1822], Bohmer [Jen. 1727], Christ [Jen. 1727], Riess [Marb. 1736], Kechenberg [Cob. 1741], Varemus [Kil. 1671; Viteb. 1713, 1728], Ziebich [Ger. 1772]; in German by Schulthess [in Winer's *Krit. Jour.* 4:257-294].) The dove is also a noted symbol of tender and devoted affection, especially in the Canticles (1:15; 2:14, etc.). The conjugal fidelity of the dove has been celebrated by every writer who has described or alluded to her character (<22015>Song of Solomon 1:15). She admits but of one mate, and never forsakes him until death puts an end to their union. The black pigeon, when her mate dies, obstinately rejects another, and continues in a widowed state for life. Hence among the Egyptians a black pigeon was the symbol of a widow who declined to enter again into the marriage relation. These facts have been transferred, by later authors, to the widowed turtle, which, deaf to the solicitations of another mate, continues, in mournful strains, to deplore her loss until death puts a period to her sorrows. (On the emblematical uses of the dove, see further Wemyss, *Symbol.* Dict. s.v.) The cooing of the dove, when solitary, is often alluded to in Scripture (<23814>Isaiah 38:14; 59:11; <34207>Nahum 2:7). *SEE PIGEON*.

Picture for Dove 3

In Christian art, the dove is employed as the emblem of the Holy Ghost, following the literal interpretation, which is doubtless the true one, of <40316>Matthew 3:16. After images and pictures began to be allowed in churches, the Holy Ghost was represented by the effigies of a silver dove hovering over the altar, and the baptistery had the same. The place over the altar where it was suspended was called peristerion, from περιστερά, a dove (Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 6, § 19).

"From the dove being a symbol of purity, it is generally represented white, with its beak and claws red, as they occur in nature. In the older pictures, a golden nimbus surrounds its head, the nimbus being frequently divided by a cross, either red or black. In stained-glass windows we see the dove with

seven rays proceeding from it, terminating in seven stars, significative of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Holding an olive-branch, the dove is an emblem of peace. When seen issuing from the lips of dying saints and martyrs, it represents the human soul purified by suffering. A dove with six wings is a type of the Church of Christ; and when so employed, it has the breast and belly of silver, and the back of gold, two wings being attached to the head, two to the shoulders, and two to the feet. The pyx or box for containing the Host (q.v.) in Roman Catholic churches is sometimes made in the form of a dove, and suspended over the altar, and the dove is often placed on the covers of fonts. In this position it may still be seen in parish churches in England" (Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s.v.). See also Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites Chretiennes* (Paris, 1865, page 164; Didron, *Christian Iconography* (Bohn), page 451; Jehan, *Dict. des Origines du Christianisme* (Paris, 1856), art. Colombe.

Dove-Cot.

Picture for Dove-Cot

Isaiah (60:8) clearly refers to such structures in describing the final restoration of Israel after their long exile: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" (µymæKiµhytkonaJla, like the doves to their lattices). They doubtless derived their Hebrews name from their latticed or window-like form. *SEE WINDOW*. Morier illustrates this comparison from what he observed in Persia. "In the environs of the city, to the westward, near the Zainderood, aie many pigeon-houses, erected at a distance from habitations, for the sole purpose of collecting pigeons' dung for manure. They are long round towers, rather broader at the bottom than the top, and crowned by conical spiracles, through which the pigeons descend. Their interior resembles a honey-comb, pierced with a thousand holes, each of which forms a snug retreat for a nest. More care appears to have been bestowed upon their outside than upon that of the generality of the dwelling-houses, for they are pointed and ornamented. The extraordinary flights of pigeons which I have seen alight upon one of these buildings afford, perhaps, a good illustration of that passage in <2308>Isaiah 60:8. Their great numbers, and the compactness of their mass, literally look like a cloud at a distance, and obscure the sun in their passage" (Second *Journey through Persia*, page 140). Not only are these birds profitable as food, but both Porter and Morier assure us that their manure is used in Persia. According to the latter, "the dung of pigeons is

the dearest manure that the Persians use; and as they apply it almost entirely for the rearing of melons, it is probably on that account that the melons of Ispahan are so much finer than those of other cities. The revenue of a pigeon-house is about a hundred tomauns per annum" (*Second Journey*, page 141). Porter says "two hundred tomauns" (*Travels*, 1:451). See below.

Doves' Dung

Picture for Doves' Dung

occurs in 2 Kings 6:25, as a literal translation of µynæAyrê}(*charey'-yonim*), which in the margin is written, µynæAbÞDæ(*edib-yonin'*), both meaning the same thing. By many the expression is considered to signify literally the dung of pigeons as food in the last degree of human suffering by famine: "And there was a great famine in Samaria, and behold they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for threescore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a cab of doves' dung for four pieces of silver." Different opinions, however, have been entertained respecting the meaning of the words which are the subject of this article, namely, whether they should be taken literally, or as a figurative name of some vegetable substance. The strongest point in favor of the former view is that all ancient Jewish writers have understood the term literally, and generally as an article of food. That this interpretation is not forced appears from similar passages in Josephus (*War*, 5:13, 7): "Some persons were driven to such terrible distress as to search the common sewers and old dunghills of cattle, and to eat the dung which they got there, and what they of old could not endure so much as to look upon they now used for food;" see also Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 3:6): "Indeed necessity forced them to apply their teeth to every thing; and, gathering what was no food even for the filthiest of irrational animals, they devoured it." Celsius, who is strongly in favor of the literal meaning, quotes the following passage from Bruson (*Memorabil.* 2, c. 41): "The Cretans, during the siege by Metellus, on account of the scarcity of wine and drinks, allayed their thirst with the urine of cattle;" and one much to the point from a Spanish writer, who states that in the year 1316 so great a famine distressed the English that men ate their own children, dogs, mice, and pigeons' dung." As an additional argument in favor of the literal interpretation of the passage in question may be adduced the language of Rabshakeh to the Jews in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:27;

2362Isaiah 36:12). Other and more modern instances have been adduced, and among them the famine in England during the reign of king Edward II, A.D. 1316, when "pigeons' dung" is mentioned as being eaten by the poor (*Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, No. 122). It may be, however, that the sacred writer means only to say that the famine was so severe, and every thing so exorbitantly dear, that an instance occurred when an ass's head was sold for eighty pieces of silver, and a cab of doves' dung for five; so that the passage may be understood literally, since it is not incredible that persons oppressed by severe famine should devour even the excrements of animals. In the account of the famine and pestilence in Egypt, A.D. 1200, 1201, written in Arabic by the physician Abd-allatif, we have a remarkable illustration of this passage. He says, "The poor, already pressed by the famine which increased continually, were driven to devour dogs, and the carcasses of animals and men, yea, even the excrements of both." Taking the term, however, in a literal sense, various other explanations have been given of the use to which the doves' dung was applied. Some of the Rabbins were of opinion that it was used for fuel, and Josephus (*Ant*. 9:4) that it was purchased for its salt. Mr. Harmer (*Observ*. 3:185) has suggested that it might have been a valuable article, as being of great use for quickening the growth of esculent plants, particularly melons; and he shows, what is well known, that the Persians live much on melons in the summer months, and use pigeons' dung in raising them. All travelers describe the number of pigeon-homes in Persia. See above. Mr. Edwards, was cited by Dr. Harris, remarks that it is not likely they had much ground to cultivate in so populous a city for gardens; and is disposed therefore to understand it as meaning the offals or refuse of all sorts of grain, which was wont to be given to pigeons, etc. Dr. Harris, however, observes that the stress of the famine might have been so great as to have compelled the poor among the besieged in Samaria to devour either the intestines of the doves, after the more wealthy had eaten the bodies, or, as it might perhaps be rendered, the crops, with the undigested contents, as suggested by Fuller (*Miscell. Sacr*. 6:2, page 724). Bochart, indeed, has shown (*Hieroz.* 2:573) that the term "pigeons' dung" was applied by the Arabs to different vegetable substances. He quotes Avicenna as applying the term stercus columbarum to two different plants or substances. One of these is described by Avicenna and other Arab authors under the names *kuz-kundem* and *joug-kundem*, as a light substance like moss. Secondly, this name was given to the ashnan or usnan, which appears to be a fleshy-leaved plant, that, like the salsolas, sdlicornias' or mesembryanthemnums,

when burnt, yields alkali in its ashes. From this Bochart has been led to consider it as identical with another plant, which occurs under the name of kali both in the Hebrew and Arabic languages, and which was used in ancient times, as at the present day, as an article of food. *SEE PARCHED CORN*. Celsius, however (*Hierob.* 2:32), has shown that Bochart was mistaken in affirming that the article of food known among the Arabs by the epithet doves' or sparrows' dung was pulse or chick-peas, and therefore the connection between the Hebrew and Arabic terms kali falls to the ground. Still it remains certain that the Arabs call the maritime plant kali, from the ashes of which soda (hence called *al-kali*) is obtained, by the epithet sparrows' dung. But this, if accessible at all in Samaria, would hardly be a regular article of food, even in a siege, much less be stored up for the purpose of sale, as the article in question appears to have been. We may also compare the German Teufelsdreck ("devil's dung") as expressive of the odor of asafaetida (see Gesenius, *Thesaur*. page 516). Linnaeus suggested (*Praelectiones*, ed. P.D. Giseke, page 287) that the Hebrews term may signify the *Ornithogalum umbellatum*, "Star of Bethlehem." On this subject the late Dr. Edward Smith remarks (*English Botany*, 4:130, ed. 1814): "If Linnaeus is right, we obtain a sort of clew to the derivation of ornithogalum (birds' milk), which has puzzled all the etymologists. May not this observation apply to the white fluid which always accompanies the dung of birds, and is their urine? One may almost perceive a similar combination of colors in the green and white of this flower, which accords precisely in this respect with the description which Dioscorides gives of his ornithogalum." Sprengel (*Comment. on Dioscorides*, 2:173) is inclined to adopt the explanation of Linnaeus. The late Lady Callcott, in her Scripture Herbal (1842, page 130) infers that the pigeons' dung which has been mentioned above as being eaten in England in the famine of 1316 was the roots of this plant. It is a native of that country, and also of Taurus, Caucasus, and Northern Africa. Dioscorides states that its bulbs were sometimes cooked with bread, in the same way as the melanthium, and also that it was eaten both raw and roasted. The roots were also commonly eaten in Italy and other southern countries at an early period. If the besieged had communication with the exterior, or even if any of their body could have dug in the neighborhood of the walls, for the kind of "earth-nut" offered by the bulbs of the ornithogalum, or Star of Bethlehem, which is said to be, abundant in the neighborhood of Samaria, there does not appear any good reason why it should not be the substance alluded to. But it does not seem so likely to have been stored up; and no distinct reference

has been found in the Arab authors to such a plant under the name of stercus columbarum.

None of the above explanations of the difficult term in question appear satisfactory. Those that proceed upon the supposition that the substance designated was not intended as an article of food, give us only other purposes which are too petty to deserve such emphatic notice, as marks of famine in a siege, and the rest fail to identify any substance with the terms employed. Nevertheless, having seen that the name "pigeons' dung" has been, and probably still is, applied by the Arabs to different vegetable substances, we are not disposed to adopt the. literal meaning of the term, since doves' dung, being devoid of nutriment, was not likely to have served as food, even during the famine, especially as we find that an ass's head was sold for sixty pieces of silver. Now, if any asses remained for sale, or ass-loads of corn, as the expression has been interpreted, there is no reason for supposing that other substances may not have remained stored up in secret for those who had money to buy. But it is not easy to say what vegetable substance, serving as an article of diet, is alluded to by the name of "doves' dung." We must therefore rest, for the present, with the conclusion that it was a preparation from some plant, which, as being popularly known by this repulsive name, was not ordinarily resorted to for food, and of which, therefore, there has been no occasion elsewhere to make mention. Future naturalists may hereafter succeed in determining the point more definitely. Or it may be true that several species of plants and vegetable productions were anciently designated by this and similar terms, as the instances adduced above seem to show; and analogous cases in the popular nomenclature of modern nations go far to justify this assumption (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:200).

Dove, John

commonly called "the Hebrew tailor," on account of his trade, was distinguished as a Hutchinsonian. He possessed a good knowledge of the Hebrew language, and was considered a man of learning, but intemperate in his language. He died in 1772. His principal works are, *The Importance of Rabbinical Learning*, etc. (Anon.) (Lond. 1746, 8vo): — *A Creed founded on Truth and Common Sense*, etc. (London, 1750, 8vo): — *An Essay on Inspiration* (Lond. 1756, 8vo): — *Plain Truth; or, Quakerism unmasked* (Lond. 1756, 8vo): — *A Dissertation upon the supposed Existence of a Moral Law of Nature, and upon the Being of a Triune God*

(Lond. 1757, 8vo): — *Miscellaneous Dissertations on Marriage, Celibacy, Covetousness, Virtue*, etc. (Lond. 1769, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclop. *Bibliographica*, s.v.

Dow, Daniel, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Ashford, Connecticut, February 19, 1772. He graduated at Yale in 1793; entered the ministry May, 1795, and was installed pastor at Thompson, April 20, 1796, where he labored until his death, July 19, 1849. He was chosen fellow of Yale in 1824, and was made D.D. by Williams' College in 1840. Among his publications were *Familiar Letters to Reverend John Sherman* (1806): — *The Pedo-Baptist Catechism* (1807): — *A Dissertation on the Sinaitic and Abrahamic Covenants* (1811): — *Conn. Election Sermon* (1825): — *Free Inquiry recommended on the Subject of Freemasonry* (1829). — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:369.

Dow, John G.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Gilmanton, N.H., June 15, 1785; entered the New England Conference in 1822; in 1833 was made presiding elder; in 1839 was agent of Newbury Seminary; was superannuated in 1857; and died at Chelsea, Massachusetts, May 18, 1858, having preached thirty-six years. Mr. Dow was "an excellent man and minister, sound in doctrine, deep in experience, and uniform in piety. His preaching was full of thought, and in demonstration of the Spirit." — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1859, page 141.

Dow, Lorenzo

an eccentric American preacher, was born in Coventry, Connecticut, October 18, 1777. He began traveling and preaching in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1798, and in 1799 he was appointed to Essex Circuit, but soon departed for Europe, under the impression that he had a special mission to Ireland. He was "dropped" by the Conference, and ever after continued to travel and preach independently, although still adhering to Methodist doctrines. He rode at the rate of forty to fifty miles a day, and preached often four or five times daily. In his sermons he. particularly "argued against Atheism, Deism, Universalism, and Calvinism." His final efforts were directed against the Jesuits, whose influence he thought would be fatal to the country. He died suddenly at Washington, February 2, 1834.

Dow figured considerably as a writer. Among his publications are, *A short Account of a long Travel*; with *Beauties of Wesley* (Phila. 1823, 8vo): — *History of a Cosmopolite*; or the *Writings of the Reverend Lorenzo Dow*; containing his *Experience and Travels in Europe and America up to near his fiftieth Year*; also his *Polemic Writings* (often reprinted; latest, Cincinnati. 1851, 1855, 8vo): — *The Stranger in Charleston; by the Trial and Confession of Lorenzo Dow* (Phila. 1822, 8vo): — *Polemical Works* (N.Y. 1814, 12mo), etc. See Peck, *Early Methodism* (New York, 1860, 12mo, page 198); *Dealings of God, Man, and the Devil, containing Dow's Life and Miscellaneous Writings* (N.Y. 1854,2 volumes in 1, 8vo); Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 3 and 4.

Dowdall, George

archbishop of Armagh, a native of Lowth, was appointed to the see of Armagh in 1543 by Henry VIII. The pope refused to confirm the nomination, but Dowdall, nevertheless, retained the see. He was a zealous papist, and introduced the Jesuits into Ireland. He resisted the introduction of the English Prayer-book in 1551, and the viceroy (Sir James Crafts) summoned him to a conference with the bishop of Meath. Their curious colloquy on points of faith is given in Hook, Ecclesiastes Biography, 4:493 sq. Dowdall was deprived of his primacy, which was given to Browne, archbishop of Dublin (q.v.). He fled to the Continent, but was restored to his see by queen Mary in 1553, and labored earnestly to re-establish popery. He died in London in 1558. — Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland*; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 1.c.; Rose, *New Biog. Diet.* s.v.

Down

a town in Ireland, forming part of the title of the diocese of Down, Connor, and Dromore, of which Robert Bent Knox (consecrated in 1849) is at present bishop (1868). The see of Dromore, a town in the west of the County Down, was founded in the 6th century, but is now united with Down and Connor. The Roman Catholic. Church has one bishop of Down and Connor, and another of Dromore.

Downame, Or Downham, George, D.D.

a learned English divine, was born at Chester (of which diocese his father was bishop), studied at Cambridge, and was elected fellow of Christ College in 1585. He was afterwards professor of logic, and was finally

made bishop of Derry in 1616. He died in 1634. His principal works are: A Treatise of Justification (London, 1639, fol.): — *An Abstract of the Duties commanded in the Law of God* (London, 1635, 8vo): — *The Christian's Freedom* (reprinted Lond. 1836, 18mo): — A godly and learned Treatise of Prayer (Lond. 1640, 4to): — *A Treatise concerning Antichrist* (London, 1603, 4to): — *Papa Antichristus* (1620).

Downe, John

a minister of the Church of England, was born in 1570, in Devonshire, and was educated at the University of Cambridge, where he passed B.D. in 1600. He was first presented to the vicarage of Winsford, and afterwards to the living of Instow, worth about a hundred pounds a year, where he spent his days in diligent and useful pastoral labor. His skill in the languages, particularly Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and Spanish, was extraordinary. He was diligent in expounding, catechizing, and preaching the Scriptures: in his ministry he went through the whole body of the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation. He died at Instow in 1631. — Middleton, *Evangelical Biography* (London. 1816), 3:36.

Downham

SEE DOWNAME.

Dowry

(rhmo *mo'har*, prop. price paid for a wife, Genesis 34:12; Exodus 22:17; 1 Samuel 18:25; dbz, *ze'bed*, a gift, Genesis 30:20; φερνή, 2 Macc. 1:14). Nothing distinguishes more the nature of marriage among us in Europe from the same connection when formed in the East than the different methods of proceeding between the father-in-law and the intended bridegroom. Among us, the father usually gives a portion to his daughter, which becomes the property of her husband, and which often makes a considerable part of his wealth; but in the East the bridegroom offers to the father of his bride a sum of money, or value to his satisfaction, before he can expect to receive his daughter in marriage. The sum which the bridegroom was required to pay to the father of his bride as a nuptial present or dowry was to be according to the rank she sustained, and such as the fathers of virgins of the same rank were accustomed to receive for their daughters. Of this procedure we have instances from the earliest

times. When Jacob had nothing which he could immediately give for a wife, he purchased her by his services to her father Laban (<012918>Genesis 29:18; 30:20; 34:12; <091825>1 Samuel 18:25; <022216>Exodus 22:16, 17; <061518>Joshua 15:18; <280302>Hosea 3:2). (See Senkenberg, *De juribus dotium*, Giessen, 1729; Walch, *De privilegio dotis Judaece*, Jena, 1785.) *SEE MARRIAGE*.

Doxology

(δοξολογία, a praising, giving glory), an ascription of glory or praise to God.

1. *Doxologies in N.T.* — Short ascriptions, which may be called doxologies, abound in the Psalms (e.g. 96:6; 112:1; 113:1), and were used in the synagogue. We naturally, therefore, find the apostles using them; e.g. <451136>Romans 11:36; <490321>Ephesians 3:21; <540117>1 Timothy 1:17. The Apocalypse (19:1) gives, as a celestial doxology, "Alleluia! Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power unto the Lord our God;" and another (5:13), "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." The song of the angels, <420214>Luke 2:14, is a doxology (see below, No. 2). The doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer — "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen" — is thought by most critics to be an interpolation. It is not used in the Roman liturgy in repeating the Lord's Prayer, but is used in the worship of the Greek Church, and in all Protestant churches. *SEE LORDS PRAYER*.

2. *Liturgical Doxologies.* — There are three doxologies of special note, which have been in use in Church worship from a very early period, viz.:

(1.) The Lesser Doxology, or Gloria Patti, originally in the form, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;" to which was added later, "world without end;" and later still the form became what it is now: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen." The use of this noble doxology has been a constant testimony to the Church's faith in the Holy Trinity. In the Church of England it must be said or sung at the end of the reading of every psalm; in the Protestant Episcopal Church it may be said or sung at the end of every psalm, but either it or the greater doxology must be said or sung at the end of the whole portion of Psalms for the day. For further details, *SEE GLORIA PATRI*.

(2.) The Greater Doxology, or Gloria in Excelsis, called also the Angelical Hymn (q.v.), a doxology of praise and thanksgiving founded on the song of the angels, ◁2114Luke 11:14 ("Glory be to God on high," etc.). For its form and history; *SEE GLORIA IN EXCELSIS*. It is used in the eucharistic services of the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches, and, in fact in most Protestant churches.

(3.) The Trisagion (Latin *Tersanctus*), a doxology as old as the second century, beginning with the words, "Therefore, with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name." It is used in the communion service of the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal, Protestant Episcopal, and some other Protestant churches. For its form and history, *SEE TRISAGION*.

3. *Metrical Doxologies*. — It is usual in Protestant churches, at the end of the singing of a hymn, or at least at the end of the last hymn in the service, to sing the doxology in the same meter. The hymn-books of the churches, therefore, contain a collection of versions of the *Gloria Patri* in various metres, adapted to all the metres of the hymns. See Bingham, *Biog. Ecclesiastes* book 14, chapter 2; Siegel, *christl. Alterhümer*, 1:515 sq.; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, page 212; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg*. 4, § 23.

Doyle, James Warren

a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, was born in 1786 at New Ross, near Wexford, and was appointed bishop of Kildare in 1819. He was a copious writer on controversial topics, and in the Emancipation movement was one of the most valuable coadjutors of O'Connell. He died June 15, 1834. For his testimony before the Lords Commissioners, March 11, 1825, as to the symbolical books of the Roman Catholic Church, see Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, book 1, chapter 1; and for some severe criticisms on bishop Doyle, see the same. work (Lond. edit.), book 3, chapter 3. *His Life*, by Fitzpatrick, was republished in Boston in 1862.

Doyly, George, D.D.

an eminent divine .of the Church of England, was born in London October 31, 1778, and graduated B.A. at Benedict College, Cambridge, in 1808, as second wrangler and second Smith's prizeman, and M.A. in 1803. In 1811 he was made Christian advocate, and D.D. in 1821. He became rector of Buxted in 1815, rector of Lambeth, and of Sundridge, Kent, in 1820, and

died January 8, 1846. He was a frequent contributor on theological subjects to the *Quarterly Review*. Among his other numerous writings are Life of Abp. Sancroft (Lond. 1621, 2 volumes, 8vo; 1840, 8vo): — Sermons, chiefly doctrinal (London, 1827, 8vo): — Sermons at St. Mary, Lanbeth (London, 1847, 2 volumes, 8vo). He also, with bishop Mant, edited Notes explanatory and practical on the, authorized Version of the Bible (Lond. 1845, 3 volumes, royal 8vo). There is a good American edition of this work, which, as a judicious compilation from the best annotators, has a special value for popular use, as well as for theological students (edited by bishop Hobart, 1818-20, 2 volumes, 4to, with additional notes).

Drabicius

(Drabitz, or Drabich), NICOLAUS, a Mystic of the 17th century, was born at Stradteiss, in Moravia, in 1585 (according to Bayle, in 1587; according to Moreri, in 1588). He became an evangelical preacher in 1616, but, in consequence of difficulties with the Protestant clergy, was obliged to leave his native country. In 1629 he went to Lednitz, in Hungary, where he supported himself by mercantile pursuits. In the mean time he turned his attention to theosophy, and claimed, after February, 1638, to have visions. He prophesied that the imperial house of Austria would end in 1657, and that in 1666 Louis XIV of France would succeed as Roman emperor. This was to be followed by the downfall of papacy, a great reformation of the Church, and the conversion of all heathen and unbelievers. By order of the Austrian authorities, he was arrested at Presburg as a political offender in 1671, and executed July 17th. His corpse and his book of prophecies were burned by the executioner. J.A. Comenius (q.v.) published the prophecies of Drabicius, together with those of other enthusiasts, under the title Lux in tenebris (1657); the second edition (1659) appeared under the title *Historia revelationum Chr. Kotteri, Chr. Poniatovice, Nic. Drabicii*, etc. A third edition appeared under the original title in 1665. See Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Arnold, *Kirchen-u. Ketzerhist*. (Schaffh. ed., 2:353-56); Koler, *Disp. de Nic. Drabitio* (Alt. 1791); Schrockh, *K.G. seit d. Ref*. 5:688; 7:508-9; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 3:493.

Drachma

(δραχμή, "*drachm*," 2 Macc. 4:19; 10:20; 12:43; "piece of silver," Luke 15:8, 9), a Greek silver coin, consisting of 6 oboli (Bockh,

Staatshaus. 1:16 sq.), but varying in weight on account of the use of different talents. The Jews must have been acquainted with three talents — the Ptolemaic, used in Egypt, and at Tyre, Sidon, and Berytus, and adopted for their own shekels; the Phoenician, used at Aradus and by the Persians; and the Attic, which was almost universal in Europe, and in a great part of Asia. The drachmae of these talents weigh respectively, during the period of the Maccabees, about 55 grs. Troy, 58.5, and 66 (see *De Rome de l'Isle, Metrologie*, Paris, 1789, page 81 sq.). The drachms mentioned in 2 Macc. are probably of the Seleucidae, and therefore of the Attic standard; but in Luke denarii seems to be intended, for the Attic drachma had been at that time reduced to about the same weight as the Roman denarius (q.v.) as well as the Ptolemaic drachma, and was wholly or almost superseded by it. This explains the remark of Josephus that "the shekel was worth four Attic drachmae" (*Ant*. 3:8, 2), for the four Ptolemaic drachmse of the shekel, as equal to four denarii of his time, were also equal to four Attic drachmase; and the didrachm (q.v.) was equivalent to the sacred half shekel (*War*, 7:6, 6; <40 17 24>Matthew 17:24) of the Temple-tax. (See Bockh, *Metrolog. Unters. Berl*. 1838.) — Smith, s.v. *SEE DRAM*; *SEE DARIC*; *SEE SILVER, PIECE OF*.

Draconites

(Germ. Drach, or Trach), JOHANNES, (or, according to his native town, Carlstldt), was born at Carlstadt in 1494. He became professor at Erfurt, and canon of the church of St. Severin. Having shown great friendship for Luther, particularly when the reformer passed through Erfurt in 1521 on his way to Worms, he lost his situation and went to Wittenberg. Here he was made D.D. in 1523, and then became pastor at Mildenberg. He returned to Wittenberg in 1524. In 1534 he accepted a call as preacher and professor of theology at Marburg. He died at Wittenberg April 18, 1566. He prepared a Biblia pentapla, of which only fragments have been published (1563-65); he also wrote Commentaries on the Psalms, on several chapters of Genesis (1537), and on Obadiah (1537):-a Latin Translation of the Psalms (Strasb. 1538): — *Commentary on Daniel* (1544): — *Commentariorum ev. de Jesu Christo*, lib. 2 (Basel, 1545): — *Oratio de pia morte D. 1. Lutheri* (1546), etc. See *Adami Vitae theol. Germ.*; Striegel, Hessische Gelehrtenund Schriftstellergeschichte (3 volumes); Strobel, Neue Beitrage zur Literatur, besonders des 16 Jahrhunderis (4 volumes). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 3:495.

Dracontius

a Spanish priest, lived about the year 450. He is the author of a poem describing the history of the six days of creation (lexcemeron, seu opus sex dierum). In its original form this poem had 176 verses, and is followed by an elegy addressed to the emperor Theodosius the Younger, consisting of 98 verses. In the 7th century, bishop Eugen of Toledo revised the poem, and added a description of the seventh day. In this new shape the Hexaemeron, or rather Hepteemeron, contains 634 verses. The original poem of Dracontius was published in Fabricius, *Corpus christ. Poetarum* (Basel, 1564), and with notes, by Weitz, at Frankfort (1610); also in the Magna Bibl. Patrum. volume 6, and in the *Bibl. Patrum*, volume 8. As revised and enlarged by bishop Eugen. it has been published by Rivin (Leips. 1651), Arevali (Rome, 1791), Carpzov (Helmstadt, 1794), in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, volume 9. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 14:718.

Draeseke, Johann Heinrich Bernhiard,

one of the most brilliant and popular of modern preachers in Germany. Born at Brunswick, January 18, 1774, he was educated at Helmstadt, where he was greatly influenced by Henke, and devoted himself to the humanistic literature then prevalent, especially to the drama. In 1804 he became pastor at Ratzeburg, and in 1814 at Bremen. His patriotic labors during the Napoleonic wars gave him great reputation, and his great pulpit talent spread his name far and wide. In 1832 he succeeded Westermeier as bishop of the province of Saxony. He died at Potsdam December 8, 1849. His printed sermons are very numerous. The earlier ones are rationalistic, the later more orthodox and full of Christian feeling. The most celebrated of them are *Predigten fur denkende Verehrer Jesu*, of which the best edition is that of 1836, 2 volumes, edited by his son. He published also Glaube, *Liebe, Hoffnung* (6th ed. 1834*); Deutschland's Wiedergeburt (2d edit. 1818); Gemalde* aus d. Heil. Schrift (4 volumes, 1821-28). His *Nachgelassene Predigten* appeared at Magdeburg, 1850 (2 volumes). See Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, chapter 21.

Drag

(תרמכ, *mikme'reth*, <3010>Hebrews 1:15, 16; or תרמכמ, *mikmo'reth*, <2908>Isaiah 19:8, “net"), a seine or fishing-net. *SEE FISH*; *SEE NET*.

Dragon

(from the Greek δράκων, as in the Apocrypha and Revelation frequently), an imaginary serpent of antiquity, especially in mythology, supposed to be supplied with feet and often with wings, stands in our version usually as a translation of two Hebrews words of different signification, but common derivation — *tan*, ˆTi and *tannian*, ˆyNæTi (according to Gesenius, from ˆnTi; to extend, with reference to the great length of one or both of them). The similarity of the forms of the words may easily account for this confusion, especially as the masculine plural of the former, *tannin*, actually assumes (in <2043>Lamentations 4:3) the form *tannin*, and, on the other hand, *tannim* is evidently written for the singular *tannin* in <2629>Ezekiel 29:3; 32:2. But the words appear to be quite distinct in meaning; and the distinction is generally, though not universally, preserved by the Sept. Bochart, however, proposes (Hieroz. 2:429) to read uniformly *tannin* as the plur. of tan, and thus merge both terms into one. *SEE WHALE*.

1. The former (always "dragon" except <2632>Ezekiel 32:2 "whale") is used, always in the plural, in <1830>Job 30:29; <2343>Isaiah 34:13; 43:20 (Sept. σειρῆνες); in <2322>Isaiah 13:22 (ἐχῖνοι); in <2402>Jeremiah 10:22; 49:33 (στρουθοί); in <1944>Psalm 44:19 (τόπῳ κακώοντες); and in <2491>Jeremiah 9:11; 14:6; 2:37; <3301>Micah 1:8 (δράκοντες). The feminine plural t/NTi *tannoth'*, is found in <3003>Malachi 1:3; a passage altogether differently translated by the Sept. It is always applied to some creatures inhabiting the desert, and connected generally with the words hn;[yi ("ostrich") and yaæ ("jackal"?). We should conclude from this that it refers rather to some wild beast than to a serpent, and this conclusion is rendered almost certain by the comparison of the tannim in <2446>Jeremiah 14:6, to the wild asses snuffing the wind, and the reference to their "wailing" in <3301>Micah 1:8, and perhaps in <1830>Job 30:29. The Syriac renders it by a word which, according to Pococke, means a "jackal" (a beast whose peculiarly mournful howl in the desert is well known), and it seems most probable that this or some cognate species is to be understood whenever the word tan occurs. This interpretation, however, although favored by the grammatical forms, is supported by little more than conjecture as to the identification with the jackal, or wild dog of the desert, which the Arabs call *awi*, plur. *awin* (corresponding to the Hebrew yaæ¤yYia;, "wild beasts of the islands," <2322>Isaiah 13:22; 34:13; Jeremiah 1, 39, i.e., jackals), so called from their

howling, although they call the wolf by the name *taynan*, which is
somewhat like ˆyNæTe *SEE JACKAL*.

2. The word *tannin'*, ˆyNæTe (plur. µynIïTe), is always rendered by δράκων in the Sept. except in <01001>Genesis 1:21, where we find κῆτος. It generally occurs in the plural, and is rendered "whale" in <01001>Genesis 1:21; <18712>Job 7:12; "serpent" in <02709>Exodus 7:9-12; "sea-monster" in Lath. 4:3. It seems to refer to any great monster, whether of the land or the sea, being indeed more usually applied to some kind of serpent or reptile, but not exclusively restricted to that sense. When referring to the sea it is used as a parallel to ˆ tyw]l ae ("*leviathan*"), as in <23701>Isaiah 27:1; and indeed this latter word is rendered in the Sept. by δράκων, in <19744>Psalm 74:14; 104:26; <18420>Job 40:20; <23701>Isaiah 27:1; and by μὲγα κῆτος in <18308>Job 3:8. When we examine special passages we find the word used in <01001>Genesis 1:21, of the great sea-monsters, the representatives of the inhabitants of the deep. The same sense is given to it in <19743>Psalm 74:13 (where it is again connected with "*leviathan*"), <19807>Psalm 148:7, and probably in <18712>Job 7:12 (Vulg. *cetus*). On the other hand, in <02709>Exodus 7:9,10,12; <05323>Deuteronomy 32:33; <19113>Psalm 91:13, it refers to land-serpents of a powerful and deadly kind. It is also applied metaphorically to Pharaoh or to Egypt (<23509>Isaiah 51:9; <26203>Ezekiel 29:3; 32:2; perhaps <19743>Psalm 74:13), and in that case, especially as feet are attributed to it, it most probably refers to the crocodile as the well-known emblem of Egypt. When, however, it is used of the king of Babylon, as in <24634>Jeremiah 51:34, the same propriety would lead us to suppose that some great serpent, such as might inhabit the sandy plains of Babylonia, is intended. *SEE LEVIATHAN*.

3. In the New Test. dragon (δράκων) is only found in the Apocalypse (<66203>Revelation 12:3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 17, etc.), as applied metaphorically to "the old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan," the description of the "dragon" being dictated by the symbolical meaning of the image rather than by any reference to any actually existing creature. Of similar personification, either of an evil spirit or of the powers of material Nature as distinct from God, we have traces in the extensive prevalence of dragon-worship, and existence of dragon temples of peculiar serpentine form, the use of dragonstandards both in the East, especially in Egypt, and in the West, more particularly among the Celtic tribes. The most remarkable of all, perhaps, is found in the Greek legend of Apollo as the slayer of the Python, and the supplanter of the serpent-worship by a higher wisdom. The reason,

at least of the scriptural symbol, is to be sought not only in the union of gigantic power with craft and malignity, of which the serpent is the natural emblem, but in the record of the serpent's agency in the temptation (Genesis 3). For the ancient allusions to these fabulous or monstrous animals, see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Draco. A well-known story of one of these occurs in the mediaeval legend of "St. George (q.v.) and the Dragon," and a still earlier one is named below. *SEE MONSTER*.

Dragon At Babylon.

In the Sept. version of Daniel there occurs, as chap. xiv, an account entitled Bel and the Dragon (q.v.), which states that at Babylon, under Cyrus, an enormous dragon (δράκων μέγας) was worshipped (? by lectisternia, i.e., by spreading viands on a couch as an offering). This serpent-worship, however, is certainly not of Babylonian origin (see Selden, *De diis Syr.* 2:17, page 365 sq.), since the two silver serpents mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (2:9) as being in the temple of Belus (q.v.) were not forms of divinities, but only emblems of the gods there represented; yet possibly the conception had reference to the Persian symbol of the serpent, which signified Ahriman (*Zendavesta*, by Kleuker, 1:6). Accordingly the serpent appears also in later Jewish representations as an evil daemon (Revelation 12, 13; comp. Genesis 3). *SEE SERPENT*.

Dragon-Well

(ˆyNæhiˆy[, *eyn hat-tannin'*, fountain of the dragon; Sept. πηγὴ τῶν συκῶν) Vulg. *fons draconis*), the name of a fountain situated opposite or near the valley gate of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 2:13). It is probably identical with the modern "Upper Pool of Gihon," on the north-western side of the city, and also with the "Serpent's Pool" mentioned by Josephus (*War*, V, 3:2). (See Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. 2, page 8.) *SEE JERUSALEM*.

Dragon

(in symbolism). The dragon, in Christian art, is the emblem of sin in general and of idolatry in particular. Its usual form is that of a gigantic winged crocodile. "It is often represented as crushed under the feet of saints and martyrs, and other holy personages. Sometimes its prostrate attitude signifies the triumph of Christianity over paganism, as in pictures of St. George and St. Sylvester; or over heresy and schism, as when it was

adopted as the emblem of the Knights of the order of the Dragon in Hungary, which was instituted for the purpose of contending against the adherents of John Huss and Jerome of Prague." — Chambers, *Encyclopedia* s.v.; Jamieson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, 1:26.

Dragon, Order of the

was founded in 1408 by the emperor Sigismund, chiefly for fighting against the infidels. The members wore on the breast a cross, on which hung a killed dragon.

Dragonnades, Or Dragoonings

one of the modes of persecution employed against the Protestants of France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV; so called because the chief soldiers engaged in the service were dragoons. *SEE FRANCE*; *SEE PERSECUTIONS*.

Dram

Picture for Dram 1

(<1Ch 29:7>1 Chronicles 29:7; <Ezr 2:69>Ezra 2:69; 8:27; <Neh 7:70>Nehemiah 7:70, 71), or Drachm (Tobit 5:14; 2 Macc. 4:19; 12:43). The term rendered thus in our version (Sept. δραχμή and χρυσοῦς, Vulg. *drachma* and *solidus*; µynædmKr Dy; *darkemonim'*, <Ezr 2:69>Ezra 2:69; <Neh 7:70>Nehemiah 6:70-72; or with a letter prefixed µynædrkod }y; *adarkonim'*, <1Ch 29:7>1 Chronicles 29:7; <Ezr 8:27>Ezra 8:27) is usually thought to denote the DARIC (δαρεικός) of the Persians (from the Persic dara, a king, whence perhaps the title Darius), and seems to be etymologically connected with the Greek DRACHMA (δραχμή). The daric is of interest not only as the most ancient gold coin of which any specimens have been preserved to the present day, but as the earliest coined money which, we can be sure, was known to and used by the Jews; for, independently of the above passages, it must have been in circulation among the Jews during their subjection to the Persians. It even circulated extensively in Greece. The distinguishing mark of the coin was a crowned archer, kneeling on one knee, stamped on one side, and on the other a deep irregular cleft. Harpocration says that, according to some persons, the daric was worth twenty silver drachmae, which agrees with the statement of Xenophon (*Anab.* 1:7, 18), who informs us that 3000 darics were equal to ten talents, which would consequently make the daric equal to twenty

drachmae. The value of the daric in our money, computed thus from the drachma, is 16s. 3d. sterling, or $3.93; but, if reckoned by comparison with our gold money, it is much more. The darics in the British Museum weigh 128.4 grains and 1286 grains respectively. Hussey (*Anc. Weights*, 7:3) calculates the daric as containing on an average about 123.7 grains of pure gold, and therefore equal to £1 ls. 10d. 1 76 gr., or $5.29. There are also silver coins which go by the name of darics, on account of their bearing the figure of an archer; but they were never called by this name in ancient times. *SEE DARIC*.

Picture for Dram 2

The drachma (δραχμή, "piece of silver," <42150>Luke 15:8, 9) was a coin of silver, the most common among the Greeks, and which, after the Exile, became also current among the Jews (2 Macc. 4:19; 10:20; 12:43). The earlier Attic drachmae were of the average weight of 66-5 grains, and in a comparison with the shilling would be equal to 9.72d., or about 19 cents. After Alexander's time there was a slight decrease in the weight of the drachma, till, in course of time, it weighed only 63 grains, and specimens of the later times are in some cases even of less weight than this. In this state the drachma was counted equal to the denarius, which was at first worth 8½d., and afterwards only 7½d., or about 15 cents; which may therefore be considered as the value of the drachma in the New Testament — that is, the nominal value, for the real value of money was far greater in the time of Christ than at present. That the drachma of Alexandria was equal to two of Greece is inferred from the fact that the Sept. makes the Jewish shekel equivalent to two drachmae, *SEE DIDRACHMA*; and, in fact, an Alexandrian drachma weighing 126 grains has been found. There was also the tetradrachm, or four-drachmae piece, in later times called the stater (q.v.). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq*. s.v. Drachma.) *SEE DRACHMA*.

Draught

occurs in our version as a translation of ἀφεδρών (literally a place of sitting apart), a sink or privy (<401517>Matthew 15:17; <411019>Mark 7:19).

Draught-House

similarly occurs as a translation of ha;r;j}m; (*macharaah'*, literally an easing one's self, <121027>2 Kings 10:27 for which in the margin, by euphemism,

hax;m, *motsaah'*, an outgoing), a privy or sewer. Jehu, in order to show his contempt for the worship of Baal, ordered his temple to be destroyed, and the place converted to a vile use, that of receiving offal or ordure. On this mode of degradation, comp. 2Ki 10:27Ezra 6:11; Da 2:5Daniel 2:5.

Drawer

Picture for Drawer

OF WATER (µyæibawo, *shob' ma'yim*; Sept. ὑδροφόρος, i.e., water-carrier) occurs in De 29:11Deuteronomy 29:11; Jos 9:21Joshua 9:21, 23; and in both instances it is spoken of as a hard and servile employment: to it the crafty Gibeonites were condemned. In the East water must be fetched from the river or the wells. In towns this is rarely done by the householders themselves, or by their servants. There are persons who make a trade of it to supply every day, to regular customers, the quantity required. They carry about the water in a well-prepared goat-skin, which is slung to the back; the neck is usually brought under the arm and compressed by the hand, serving as the mouth of this curious but very useful vessel. Those who drive a great trade have an ass, which carries two skins at once, borne like panniers. These men, continually passing to and fro with their wet bags through the narrow streets, are great nuisances in the towns from the difficulty of avoiding contact with them. There are no vehicles of draught in Asiatic towns; the water-carriers with their bags, and the "hewers of wood," bearing large fagots on their backs, or the backs of horses or mules, form the only obstructions in the streets. In a time of public calamity the water-carriers are the last to discontinue their labor; and their doing so is a sure indication that the distress has become intense and imminent. *SEE WATER*.

Dream

(µ/lj} *chalom'*; Sept. ἐνύπνιον; but καθ ὕπνον and κατ ὄναρ in Matthew are generally used for "in a dream"). Dreams have been the subject of much curious speculation in all ages. The ancients had various theories respecting them, the most notable of which for our present purpose is that of Homer (*Iliad*, 1:63), who declares that "they come from Jove." The most philosophic opinion of antiquity respecting dreams was that of Aristotle, who thought that every object of sense produces upon the human soul a certain impression, which remains for some time after the

object that made it is removed; and which, being afterwards recognised by the perceptive faculty in sleep, gives rise to the varied images which present themselves. This view nearly approaches that of modern mental science, which teaches that dreams are ordinarily the re-embodiment of thoughts which have before, in some shape or other, occupied our minds (Elwin, *Operations of the Mind in Sleep*, Lond. 1843). They are broken fragments of our former conceptions revived, and heterogeneously brought together. If they break off from their connecting chain and become loosely associated, they exhibit oft-times absurd combinations, but the elements still subsist. If, for instance, any irritation, such as pain, fever, etc., should excite the perceptive organs while the reflective ones are under the influence of sleep, we have a consciousness of objects, colors, or sounds being presented to us, just as if the former organs were actually stimulated by having such impressions communicated to them by the external senses; whilst, in consequence of the repose of the reflecting power, we are unable to rectify the illusion, and conceive that the scenes passing before us, or the sounds that we hear, have a real existence. This want of mutual cooperation between the different faculties of the mind may account for the disjointed character of dreams. This is in accordance with the theory of dreams alluded to in <2105:7>Ecclesiastes 5:7; <2908>Isaiah 29:8.

"The main difference between our sleeping and waking thoughts appears to lie in this, that in the former case the perceptive faculties of the mind (the sensational powers [not their organs; see Butler, *Analogy*, part 1, c. 1], and the imagination which combines the impressions derived from them) are active, while the reflective powers (the reason or judgment by which we control those impressions, and distinguish between those which are imaginary or subjective and those which correspond to, and are produced by, objective realities) are generally asleep. Milton's account of dreams (in *Par. Lost*, 5:100-113) seems as accurate as it is striking. Thus it is that the impressions of dreams are in themselves vivid, natural, and picturesque, occasionally gifted with an intuition beyond our ordinary powers, but strangely incongruous and often grotesque; the emotion of surprise or incredulity, which arises from a sense of incongruity, or of unlikeness to the ordinary course of events, being in dreams a thing unknown. The mind seems to be surrendered to that power of association by which, even in its waking hours, if it be inactive and inclined to 'musing,' it is often carried through a series of thoughts connected together by some vague and accidental association, until the reason, when it starts again into activity, is

scarcely able to trace back the slender line of connection. The difference is that, in this latter case, we are aware that the connection is of our own making, while in sleep it appears to be caused by an actual succession of events. Such is usually the case; yet there is a class of dreams, seldom noticed, and, in. deed, less common, but recognized by the experience of many, in which the reason is not wholly asleep. In these cases it seems to look on as it were from without, and so to have a double consciousness: on the one hand we enter into the events of the dream, as though real; on the other we have a sense that it is but a dream, and a fear lest we should awake and its pageant should pass away. In either case the ideas suggested are accepted by the mind in dreams at once and inevitably, instead of being weighed and tested, as in our waking hours. But it is evident that the method of such suggestion is still undetermined, and, in fact, is no more capable of being accounted for by any single cause than the suggestion of waking thoughts. The material of these latter is supplied either by ourselves, through the senses, the memory, and the imagination, or by other men, generally through the medium of words, or, lastly, by the direct action of the Spirit of God, or of created spirits of orders superior to our own, or the spirit within us. So also it is in dreams. In the first place, although memory and imagination supply most of the material of dreams, yet physical sensations of cold and heat, of pain or of relief, even actual impressions of sound or of light will often mold or suggest dreams, and the physical organs of speech will occasionally be made use of to express the emotions of the dreamer. In the second place, instances have been known where a few words whispered into a sleeper's ear have produced a dream corresponding to their subject. On these two points experience gives undoubted testimony; as to the third, it can, from the nature of the case, speak but vaguely and uncertainly. The Scripture declares, not as any strange thing, but as a thing of course, that the influence of the Spirit of God upon the soul extends to its sleeping as well as its waking thoughts. It declares that God communicates with the spirit of man directly in dreams, and also that he permits created spirits to have a like communication with it. Its declaration is to be weighed, not as an isolated thing, but in connection with the general doctrine of spiritual influence, because any theory of dreams must be regarded as a part of the general theory of the origination of all thought."

Whatever may be the difficulties attending the subject, still we know that dreams have formed a channel through which Jehovah was pleased in

former times to reveal his character and dispensations to his people. This method of divine communication is alluded to in <183314>Job 33:14. The most remarkable instances recorded in the Old Testament are those of Abimelech with regard to Abraham (<012003>Genesis 20:3), Jacob on his way to Padan-Aram (<012808>Genesis 28:8), and again on returning thence (<013110>Genesis 31:10), Laban in pursuing Jacob (<013124>Genesis 31:24), Joseph respecting his future advancement (<013706>Genesis 37:6-11), Gideon (Judges 7) and Solomon (<110305>1 Kings 3:5). In the New Testament (as was predicted, <290228>Joel 2:28) we have the equally clear cases of Joseph respecting the infant Jesus (<400120>Matthew 1:20; 2:12, 13, 19), Paul (<441609>Acts 16:9; 18:9; 27:23), and perhaps Pilate's wife (<402719>Matthew 27:19).

"It must be observed that, in accordance with the principle enunciated by Paul in <461415>1 Corinthians 14:15, dreams, in which the understanding is asleep, are recognized indeed as a method of divine revelation, but placed below the visions of prophecy, in which the understanding plays its part. It is true that the book of Job, standing as it does on the basis of 'natural religion,' dwells on dreams and 'visions of deep sleep' as the chosen method of God's revelation of himself to man (see <181043>Job 4:13; 7:14; 33:15). But in <041206>Numbers 12:6; <051301>Deuteronomy 13:1, 3, 5; <242709>Jeremiah 27:9; <290228>Joel 2:28, etc., dreamers of dreams, whether true or false, are placed below 'prophets,' and even below 'diviners;' and similarly in the climax of <091806>1 Samuel 28:6, we read that ,'the Lord answered Saul not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim [by symbol], nor by prophets.' Under the Christian dispensation, while we frequently read of trances (ἐκστάσεις) and visions (ὀπτασίαι, ὁράματα), dreams are not referred to as regular vehicles of divine revelation. In exact accordance with this principle are the actual records of the dreams sent by God. The greater number of such dreams were granted, for prediction or for warning, to those who were aliens to the Jewish covenant. Thus we have the record of the dreams of Abimelech (<012003>Genesis 20:3-7); Laban (<013124>Genesis 31:24); of the chief butler and baker (<014005>Genesis 40:5); of Pharaoh (<014101>Genesis 41:1-8); of the Midianite (<070713>Judges 7:13); of Nebuchadnezzar (<270201>Daniel 2:1, etc.; 4:1018); of the magi (<400212>Matthew 2:12), and of Pilate's wife (<402719>Matthew 27:19). Many of these dreams, moreover, were symbolical and obscure, so as to require an interpreter. Again, where dreams are recorded as means of God's revelation to his chosen servants; they are almost always referred to the periods of their earliest and most imperfect knowledge of him. 'So it is in the case. of Abraham (<011512>Genesis 15:12, and perhaps 1-9), of Jacob

(<01B812>Genesis 28:12-15), of Joseph (<013705>Genesis 37:5-10), of Solomon (<110305>1 Kings 3:5), and, in the N.T., a similar analogy prevails in the case of the otherwise uninspired Joseph (<400120>Matthew 1:20; 2:13,19, 22). It is to be observed, moreover, that they belong especially to the earliest age, and become less frequent as the revelations of prophecy increase. The only exception to this (at least in the O.T.) is found in the dreams and 'visions of the night' given to Daniel (2:19; 7:1), apparently in order to put to shame the falsehoods of the Chaldaean belief in prophetic dreams and in the power of interpretation, and yet to bring out the truth latent therein (comp. Paul's miracles at Ephesus, <441911>Acts 19:11, 12, and their effect, 18-20).

"The general conclusion therefore is, first, that the Scripture claims the dream, as it does every other action of the human mind, as a medium through which God may speak to man either directly, that is, as we call it, 'providentially,' or indirectly in virtue of a general influence upon all his thoughts; and, secondly, that it lays far greater stress on that divine influence by which the understanding also is affected, and leads us to believe that as such influence extends more and more, revelation by dreams, unless in very peculiar circumstances, might be expected to pass away." (See the *[Am.] Christ. Rev.* October 1857.)

The Orientals, and in particular the Hebrews, greatly regarded dreams, and applied for their interpretation to those who undertook to explain them. Such diviners have been usually called oneirocritics, and the art itself oneiromancy. We see the antiquity of this custom in the history of Pharaoh's butler and baker (<014001>Genesis 40:1-23); and Pharaoh himself, and Nebuchadnezzar, are also instances. *SEE DIVINATION*. It is quite clear from the inspired history that dreams were looked upon by the earliest nations of antiquity as premonitions from their idol gods of future events. One part of Jehovah's great plan in revealing, through this channel, his designs towards Egypt, Joseph individually, and his brethren generally, was to correct this notion. The same principle is apparent in the divine power bestowed upon Daniel to interpret dreams. Jehovah expressly forbade his people from observing dreams, and from consulting explainers of them. He condemned to death all who pretended to have prophetic dreams, and to foretell events, even though what they foretold came to pass, if they had any tendency to promote idolatry (<051301>Deuteronomy 13:1-4). But they were not forbidden, when they thought they had a significant dream, to address the prophets of the Lord, or the high-priest in his ephod, to have it explained (<041206>Numbers 12:6; compare the case of Saul, <091806>1 Samuel 28:6,

7). False and true dreams are expressly contrasted in Jeremiah 23:25, 28. *SEE NIGHT-VISION*.

Dregs

(µyrIaev;, *shemnarim'*, lees of wine [as everywhere rendered except in] Psalm lxxv. 8; so called from settling or being kept; t[Bqu, *kubba'ath*, Isaiah 2:17, 22, means a goblet-cup merely). *SEE LEES*. The best wines of the East are much mixed with dregs, in the vessels in which they are preserved, so that commonly when drawn out the liquor is strained for use. It is to this condition of the wine that the Psalmist appears to refer: "He poureth out of the same; but the dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them" (Psalm 75:8). This is probably intended to denote that the pure and clean wine should be given as a wine of blessing to the righteous, while the wicked should drink the thick and turbid residue. The punishments which God inflicts upon the wicked are compared to a cupful of fermenting wine mixed with intoxicating herbs, of which all those to whom it is given must drink the dregs or sediment. The same image occurs in several Arabian poets. Thus Taabbata Sharran says, "To those of the tribe of Hodail we gave the cup of death, whose dregs were confusion, shame, and reproach." *SEE WINE*.

Drelincourt, Charles

an eminent minister of the Reformed Church of France, was born at Sedan July 10, 1595. He was educated at Saumur, and in 1618 became pastor near Langres, In 1620 he was called to the pastorate of the church at Charenton, near Paris, where he served faithfully, and with excellent reputation. He died at Paris November 3, 1669. Drelincourt was a very voluminous writer. For lists of all his writings, see Niceron, Memoires, volume 15; Haag, *La France Protestante*, 4:332. Among them are, Priparation a la Sainte Cene, 3 volumes, 8vo, often reprinted: — *Consolations contre les frayeurs de la mort* (40 editions); translated, *The Christian's Defense against the Fears of Death* (13th ed. London, 1732, 8vo, with memoir): — *Les Visites Charitables pour toutes sortes de personnes affligees* (Charenton, 1669, 5 volumes, 12mo, translated into six languages). — Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 14:746.

Dress

(does not occur in Scripture in the sense of clothing, but only in the older acceptation of preparing or tilling). *SEE COSTUME*.

1. *Materials*. — These were various, and multiplied with the advance of civilization. The earliest and simplest robe was made out of the leaves of a tree (הנאת, "A.V. fig-tree" — and comp. the present Arabic name for the fig, *tin*), portions of which were sewn together so as to form an apron (Genesis 3:7). Ascetic Jews occasionally used a similar material in later times. Josephus (*Life*, 2) records this of Banus (ἐσθῆτι μὲν ἀπὸ δένδρων χρώμενος); but whether it was made of the leaves or the bark is uncertain. After the Fall, the skins of animals supplied a more durable material (Genesis 3:21), which was adapted to a rude state of society, and is stated to have been used by various ancient nations (*Diod. Sic.* 1:43; 2:38; Arrian, *Ind*. 7, 3). Skins were not wholly disused at later periods: the *adde'reth* (תרדא) worn by Elijah appears to have been the skin of a sheep or some other animal with the wool left on (in the Sept. the word is rendered μηλωτή, 1 Kings 19:13, 19; 2 Kings 2:13; *Sopa*, Genesis 25:25; and δέῤῥις, Zechariah 13:4; and it may be connected with δορά etymologically, Saalchutz, *Archaeol*. 1:19; Gesenius, however, prefers the notion of amplitude, רדא; in which case it = רדא, of Micah 2:8; *Thesaur*. page 29). The same material is implied in the description of Elijah (רעל־בעל איש, Sept. ἀνὴρ δασύς; A.V. "hairy man," 2 Kings 1:8), though these words may also be understood of the hair of the prophet; and in the comparison of Esau's skin to such a robe (Genesis 25:25). It was characteristic of a prophet's office from its mean appearance (Zechariah 13:4; comp. Matthew 7:15). Pelisses of sheepskin still form an ordinary article of dress in the East (Burckhardt's *Notes on Bedouins*, 1:50). The sheepskin coat is frequently represented in the sculptures of Khorsabad: it was made with sleeves, and was worn over the tunic: it fell over the back, and terminated in its natural state. The people wearing it have been identified with the Sagartii (Bonomi's *Nineveh*, page 193). The addereth worn by the king of Nineveh (Jonah 3:6), and the "goodly Babylonish garment" found at Ai (Joshua 7:21), were of a different character, either robes trimmed with valuable furs, or the skins themselves ornamented with embroidery. The art of weaving hair was known to the Hebrews at an early period (Exodus 26:7; 35:6); the sackcloth used by mourners was of this material *SEE SACK-CLOTH*, and

by many writers the addereth of the prophets is supposed to have been such. John the Baptist's robe was of camels' hair (Matthew 3:4), and a similar material was in common use among the poor of that day (Joseph. *War*, 1:24, 3), probably of goats' hair, which was employed in the Roman cilicium. At what period the use of wool, and of still more artificial textures, such as cotton and linen, became known, is uncertain: the first of these, we may presume, was introduced at a very early period, the flocks of the pastoral families being kept partly for their wool (Genesis 38:12): it was at all times largely employed, particularly for the outer garments (Leviticus 13:47; Deuteronomy 22:11; Ezekiel 34:3; Job 31:20; Proverbs 27:26; 31:13). *SEE WOOL*. The occurrence of the term ketoneth in the book of Genesis (3:21; 37:3, 23) seems to indicate an acquaintance, even at that early day, with the finer materials; for that term, though significant of a particular robe, originally appears to have referred to the material employed (the root being preserved in our cotton; comp. Bohlen's *Introd*. 2:51; Saalchutz, *Archaeol.* 1:8), and was applied by the later Jews to flax or linen, as stated by Josephus (*Ant*. 3:7, 2, Χεθομένη μὲν καλεῖται. Λίνεον τοῦτο σημαίνει, χέθον γὰρ τὸ λίνον ἡμεῖς καλοῦμεν). No conclusion, however, can be drawn from the use of the word: it is evidently applied generally, and without any view to the material, as in Genesis 3:21. It is probable that the acquaintance of the Hebrews with linen, and perhaps cotton, dates from the period of the captivity in Egypt, when they were instructed in the manufacture (1 Chronicles 4:21). After their return to Palestine we have frequent notices of linen, the finest kind being named shesh (vvE; and at a later period buts (/WB), the latter a word of Syrian, and the former of Egyptian origin, and each indicating the quarter whence the material was procured: the term chur (rWj) was also applied to it from its brilliant appearance (Isaiah 19:9; Esther 1:6; 8:15). It is the byssus (βύσσος) of the Sept. and the N.T. (Luke 16:19; Revelation 18:12, 16), and the "fine linen" of the A.V. It was used in the vestments of the high-priests (Exodus 28:5 sq.), as well as by the wealthy (Genesis 41:42; Proverbs 31:22; Luke 14:19). *SEE LINEN*. A less costly kind was named bad (dB; Sept. λίνεος), which was used for certain portions of the high-priest's dress (Exodus 28:42; Leviticus 16:4, 23, 32), and for the ephods of Samuel (1 Samuel 2:18) and David (2 Samuel 6:14): it is worthy of notice, in reference to its quality and appearance, that it is the material in which angels are represented (Ezekiel 9:3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7; Daniel

10:5; 12:6; Revelation 15:6). A coarser kind of linen, termed ὠμολινον (Ecclus. 40:4), was used by the very poor. The Hebrew term *sadin'* (ˆydæ; = σινδών, and satin) expresses a fine kind of linen, especially adapted for summer wear, as distinct from the sardaballa, which was thick (Talmud, *Menach.* pages 41, 1). What may have been the distinction between shesh and sadin (Proverbs 31:22, 24) we know not the probability is that the latter name passed from the material to a particular kind of robe. Silk was not introduced until a very late period (Revelation 18:12): the term *meshi'* (yvæ; Sept. τρίχαπτον; Ezekiel 16:10) is of doubtful meaning. *SEE SILK*. The use of a mixed material, *shaatnez'* (znéÜ][iv; Sept. κίβδηλον, i.e., spurious; Aquila, ἀντιδιακείμενον; Ven. Gr. ἐριολινον), such as wool and flax, was forbidden (Leviticus 19:19; Deuteronomy 22:11), on the ground, according to Josephus (*Ant*. 4:8, 11), that such was reserved for the priests, or as being a practice usual among idolaters (Spencer, *Leg. Hebrews Rit.* 2:32), but more probably with the view of enforcing the general idea of purity and simplicity. *SEE DIVERSE*.

2. *Color and Decoration*. — The prevailing color of the Hebrew dress was the natural white of the materials employed, which might be brought to a high state of brilliancy by the art of the fuller (Mark 9:3). Some of the terms applied to these materials (e.g. vve/WB, rWj) are connected with words significant of whiteness, while many of the allusions to garments have special reference to this quality (Job 38:14; Psalm 104:1, 2; Isaiah 63:3): white was held to be peculiarly appropriate to festive occasions (*Eccl.* 9:8; comp. Horace, *Sat.* 2:2, 60), as well as symbolical of purity (Revelation 3:4, 5; 4:4; 7:9,13). It is uncertain when the art of dyeing became known to the Hebrews; the µySæi tn,tK; *ketho'neth passim'* worn by Joseph (Genesis 37:3, 23) is variously taken to be either a "coat of divers colors" (Sept. ποικίλος; Vulgate *polymita*; comp. the Greek πάσσειν, II. 3:126; 22:441), or a tunic furnished with sleeves and reaching down to the ankles, as in the versions of Aquila, ἀστραγάλειος, καρπωτός, and Symumachus, χειριδωτός, and in the Vulg. (2 Samuel 13:18) *talaris*, and as described by Josephus. (*Ant.* 7:8, 1). The latter is probably the correct sense, in which case we have no evidence of the use of variegated robes previously to the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt, though the notice of scarlet thread (Genesis 38:28) implies some acquaintance with dyeing, and the light summer robe (ãy[æ;

Sept. θέριστρον; A.V. "veil") worn by Rebekah and Tamar (<01245>Genesis 24:65; 38:14, 19) was probably of an ornamental character. The Egyptians had carried the art of weaving and embroidery to a high state of perfection, and from them the Hebrews learned various, methods of producing decorated stuffs. The elements of ornamentation were, (1) weaving with threads previously dyed (<02525>Exodus 35:25; compare Wilkinson's *Egyptians,* 3:125); (2), the introduction of gold thread or wire (<02806>Exodus 28:6 sq.; (3) the addition of figures, probably of animals and hunting or battle scenes (comp. Layard, 2:297), in the case of garments, in the same manner as the cherubim were represented in the curtains of the tabernacle (<02601>Exodus 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35). These devices may have been either woven into the stuff, or cut out of other stuff and afterwards attached by needlework: in the former case the pattern would appear only on one side, in the latter the pattern might be varied. Such is the distinction, according to Talmudical writers, between cunning-work and needlework, or as marked by the use of the singular and dual number, hmqrae needlework, and µyaemqrae needlework on both sides (<07050>Judges 5:30), though the latter term may after all be accepted in a simpler way as a dual = two embroidered robes (Bertheau, *Comm.* in 1.c.). The account of the corslet of Amasis (Herod, 3:47) illustrates the processes of decoration described in Exodus. Robes decorated with gold (t/xBvimæ <19513>Psalm 45:13), and at a later period with silver thread (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:8, 2; comp. <44121>Acts 12:21), were worn by royal personages: other kinds of robes were worn by the wealthy both of Tyre (<26163>Ezekiel 16:13) and Palestine (<07050>Judges 5:30; <19514>Psalm 45:14). The art does not appear to have been maintained among the Hebrews: the Babylonians and other Eastern nations (<06072>Joshua 7:21; <26724>Ezekiel 27:24), as well as the Egyptians (<26707>Ezekiel 27:7), excelled in it. Nor does the art of dyeing appear to have been followed up in Palestine dyed robes were imported from foreign countries (<360108>Zephaniah 1:8), particularly from Phoenicia, and were not much used on account of their expensiveness: purple (<203122>Proverbs 31:22; <421619>Luke 16:19) and scarlet (<100124>2 Samuel 1:24) were occasionally worn by the wealthy. The surrounding nations were more lavish in their use of them: the wealthy Tyrians (<26707>Ezekiel 27:7), the Midianitish kings (<070826>Judges 8:26), the Assyrian nobles (<262306>Ezekiel 23:6), and Persian officers (<170815>Esther 8:15), are all represented in purple. The general hue of the Persian dress was more brilliant than that of the Jews: hence Ezekiel (<262312>Ezekiel 23:12) describes the Assyrians as l/lkmæ evelu] lit. clothed in perfection;

according to the Sept. εὐπάρνφα, wearing robes with handsome borders. With regard to the head-dress in particular, described as yjwr s]µyl[ef] (Sept. τιάραι βαπταί; A "dyed attire;" comp. Ovid, Met. 14:654, *mitrapicta*), some doubt exists whether the word rendered dyed does not rather mean flowing (Gesen. *Thesaur*. page 542; Layard, 2:*308).*

3. *The Names, Forms, and Mode of wearing the Robes*. — It is difficult to give a satisfactory account of the various articles of dress mentioned in the Bible: the notices are for the most part incidental, and refer to a lengthened period of time, during which the fashions must have frequently changed; while the collateral sources of information, such as sculpture, painting, or contemporary records, are but scanty. The general characteristics of Oriental dress have indeed preserved a remarkable uniformity in all ages: the modern Arabs dress much as the ancient Hebrews did; there are the same flowing robes, the same distinction between the outer and inner garments-the former heavy and warm, the latter light, adapted to the rapid and excessive changes of temperature in those countries; and there is the same distinction between the costume of the rich and the poor, consisting in the multiplication of robes of a finer texture and more ample dimensions. Hence the numerous illustrations of ancient costume, which may be drawn from the usages of modern Orientals, supplying in great measure the want of contemporaneous representations. With regard to the figures which some have identified as Jews in Egyptian paintings and Assyrian sculptures, we cannot but consider the evidence insufficient. The figures in the painting at Beni Hassan, delineated by Wilkinson (*Ancient Egypt.* 2:296), and supposed by him to represent the arrival of Joseph's brethren, are dressed in a manner at variance with our ideas of Hebrew costume: the more important personages wear a double tunic, the upper one constructed so as to pass over the left shoulder and under the right arm, leaving the right shoulder exposed: the servants wear nothing more than a skirt or kilt, reaching from the loins to the knee. Wilkinson suggests some collateral reasons for doubting whether they were-really Jews; to which we may add a further objection that the presents which these persons bring with them are not what we should expect from Genesis 43:11. Certain figures inscribed on the face of a rock at Behistun (q.v.), near Kermanshah, were supposed by Sir R. K. Porter to represent Samaritans captured by Shalmaneser: they are given in Vaux's *Nineveh*, page 372. These sculptures are now recognized as of a later date, and the figures evidently represent people of different nations, for the tunics are alternately short and long.

Again, certain figures discovered at Nineveh have been pronounced to be Jews: in one instance the presence of hats and boots is the ground of identification (Bonomi, *Nineveh*, page 197; compare <27021>Daniel 3:21); but if, as we shall hereafter show, the original words in Daniel have been misunderstood by our translators, no conclusion can be drawn from the presence of these articles. In another Instance the figures are simply dressed in a short tunic, with sleeves reaching nearly to the elbow, and confined at the waist by a girdle, a style of dress which was so widely spread throughout the East that it is impossible to pronounce what particular nation they may have belonged to: the style of head-dress seems an objection to the supposition that they are Jews. These figures are given in Bonomi's *Nineveh*, page 381.

The costume of the men and women was very similar; there was sufficient difference, however, to mark the sex, and it was strictly forbidden to a woman to wear the appendages (yl ,k ,e, Sept. σκεύη), such as the staff, signet-ring, and other ornaments, or, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8,43), the weapons of a man; as well as to a man to wear the outer robe (hl ,m ,c ,e) of a woman (<052205>Deuteronomy 22:5): the reason of the prohibition, according to Maimonides (Mor. *Neboch.* 3:37), being that such was the practice of idolaters (comp. Carpzov, *Appar.* Page 514); but more probably it was based upon the general principle of propriety. (See Mill, *Dissertt. select.* page 196 sq.; Carpzov, *De mundo muliebri viris inderdicto*, Rost. 1752.)

a. Robes common to the sexes.

(1.) The *ketho'neth* (tn ,t ,k ,, whence the Greek χίτων) was the most essential article of dress. It was a closely-fitting garment, resembling in form and use our shirt, though unfortunately translated “coat" in the A.V. The material of which it was made was either wool, cotton, or linen. From Josephus's observation (*Ant.* 3:7, 4) with regard to the *meil* (that it was οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων), we may probably infer that the ordinary *kethoneth* or tunic was made in two pieces, which were sown together at the sides. In this case the seamless shirt (χίτον ἄῤῥαφος) worn by our Lord (<431923>John 19:23) was either a singular one, or, as is more probable, was the upper tunic or *meil*. The primitive kethoneth was without sleeves, and reached only to the knee, like the Doric χίτεν; it may also have been, like the latter, partially opened at one side, so that a person in rapid motion

was exposed (<10620>2 Samuel 6:20). Another kind, which we may compare with the Ionian χίτων, reached to the wrists and ankles: such was probably the *kethoneth passim* worn by Joseph (<01303>Genesis 37:3, 23) and Tamar (<10318>2 Samuel 13:18), and that which the priests wore (Josephus, *Ant.* 3:7, 2). It was in either case kept close to the body by a girdle (q.v.), and the fold formed by the overlapping of the robe served as an inner pocket, in which a letter or any other small article might be carried (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:5, 7). A person wearing the kethoneth alone was described as µrf; naked: we may compare the use of the term γυμναί as applied to the Spartan virgins (*Plut. Lyc*. 14), of the Latin *nudus* (Virgil, *Georg.* 1:299), and of our expression stripped. Thus it is said of Saul, after having taken off his upper garments (wydgB], <09624>1 Samuel 19:24); of Isaiah (<23202>Isaiah 20:2) when he had put off his sackcloth, which was usually worn over the tunic (comp. <32306>Jonah 3:6), and only on special occasions next the skin (<12630>2 Kings 6:30); of a warrior who has cast off his military cloak (<30216>Amos 2:16; comp. Livy, 3:23, *inermes nudique*); and of Peter without his fisher's coat (<42107>John 21:7). The same expression is elsewhere applied to the poorly clad (<18206>Job 22:6; <23807>Isaiah 58:7; <59025>James 2:15).

The annexed wood-cut (fig. 1) represents the simplest style of Oriental dress, a long loose shirt or hethoneth without a girdle, reaching nearly to the ankle. The same robe, with the addition of the girdle, is shown in fig. 4. In fig. 2 we have the ordinary dress of the modern Bedouin; the tunic overlaps the girdle at the waist, leaving an ample fold, which serves as a pocket. Over the tunic he wears the *abba*, or striped plaid, which completes his costume.

Picture for Dress 1

(2.) The *sadin'* (^ydæ) appears to have been a wrapper of fine linen (Sept. σινδών), which might be used in various ways, but especially as a night-shirt (<41451>Mark 14:51; comp. Herod. 2:95; Schleusner's *Lex.* in N.T. s.v.). (The Hebrew term is given in the Syriac N.T. as = σουδάριον, <42910>Luke 19:20, and λέντιον, <43004>John 13:4.) The material or robe is mentioned in <07412>Judges 14:12, 13 ("sheet," "shirt"), <23124>Proverbs 31:24, and <23323>Isaiah 3:23 ("fine linen"); but in none of these passages is there anything to decide its specific meaning. The Talmudical writers occasionally describe the tallith under that name, as being made of fine linen: hence Lightfoot (Exercitations on <41451>Mark 14:51) identifies the σινδών worn by the

young man as a tallith, which he had put on in his haste without his other garments.

(3.) The *meil'* (לעמ) was an upper or second tunic, the difference being that it was longer than the first. It is hence termed in the Sept. ὑποδύτης ποδήρης, and probably in this sense the term is applied to the kethoneth passim (2 Samuel 13:18), implying that it reached down to the feet. The sacerdotal meal is elsewhere described. *SEE PRIEST*. As an article of ordinary dress it was worn by kings (1 Samuel 24:4), prophets (1 Samuel 28:14), nobles (Job 1:20), and youths (1 Samuel 2:19). It may, however, be doubted whether the termed is used in its specific sense in these passages, and not rather in its broad etymological sense (from לעמ; to cover), for any robe that chanced to be worn over the kethoneth. In the Sept. the renderings vary between ἐπενδύτης (1 Samuel 18:4; 2 Samuel 13:18; 1 Samuel 2:19, *Theodot.*), a term properly applied to an upper garment, and specially used in John 21:7, for the linen coat worn by the Phoenician and Syrian fishermen (*Theophyl.* in 1.c.), διπλοΐς (1 Samuel 2:19; 15:27; 24:4, 11; 28:14), ἱμάτια (Job 1:20), στόλη (1 Chronicles 15:27; Job 2:12), and ὑποδύτης (Exodus 39:21; Leviticus 8:7), showing that, generally speaking, it was regarded as an upper garment. This further appears from the passages in which notice of it occurs: in 1 Samuel 18:4, it is the "robe" which Jonathan first takes off; in 1 Samuel 18:14, it is the "mantle" in which Samuel is enveloped; in 1 Samuel 15:27, it is the "mantle," the skirt of which is rent (comp. 1 Kings 11:30, where the הלמח; *samlah'*, is similarly treated); in 1 Samuel 24:4, it is the "robe" under which Saul slept (generally the דגב, *be'ged*, was so used); and in Job 1:20; 2:12, it is the "mantle" which he rends (comp. Ezra 9:3, 5): in these passages it evidently describes an outer robe, whether the simlah, or the meil itself used as a simlah. Where two tunics are mentioned (Luke 3:11) as being worn at the same time, the second would be a *meil*; travelers generally wore two (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:5, 7), but the practice was forbidden to the disciples (Matthew 10:10; Luke 9:3).

The dress of the middle and upper classes in modern Egypt (fig. 3) illustrates the customs of the Hebrews. In addition to the shirt, they wear a long vest of striped silk and cotton, called *kaftan*, descending to the ankles, and with ample sleeves, so that the hands may be concealed at pleasure. The girdle surrounds this vest. The outer robe consists of a long cloth coat,

called gibbeh, with sleeves reaching nearly to the wrist. In cold weather the abba is thrown over the shoulders.

Picture for Dress 2

(4.) The ordinary outer garment consisted of a quadrangular piece of woollen cloth, probably resembling in shape a Scotch plaid. The size and texture would vary with the means of the wearer. The Hebrew terms referring to it are *simlah'* (hl,m]c;, occasionally hm;l]c;), which appears to have had the broadest sense, and sometimes is put for clothes generally (<013912>Genesis 35:2: 37:34; <023222>Exodus 3:22; 22:9; <051308>Deuteronomy 10:18; <230307>Isaiah 3:7; 4:1), though once used specifically of the warrior's cloak (<230905>Isaiah 9:5); *be'ged* (dg,B), which is more usual in speaking of robes of a handsome and substantial character (<012715>Genesis 27:15; 41:42; <022832>Exodus 28:2; <112210>1 Kings 22:10; <141809>2 Chronicles 18:9; <236301>Isaiah 63:1); *kesuth'* (tWsK), appropriate to passages where covering or protection is the prominent idea (<022226>Exodus 22:26; <183606>Job 26:6; 31:19); and, lastly, *lebush'* (vWbl), usual in poetry, but specially applied to a warrior's cloak (<100818>2 Samuel 20:8), priests' vestments (<121022>2 Kings 10:22), and royal apparel (<170611>Esther 6:11; 8:15). A cognate term, *malbush'* (vWBal]m), describes specifically a state dress, whether as used in a royal household (<110105>1 Kings 10:5; <140904>2 Chronicles 9:4) or for religious festivals (<121022>2 Kings 10:22): elsewhere it is used generally for robes of a handsome character (<182716>Job 27:16; <236103>Isaiah 63:3; <261613>Ezekiel 16:13; <360108>Zephaniah 1:8). Another term, mad (dm;, with its derivatives hD;m;, <198302>Psalm 133:2, and wd;m, <100104>2 Samuel 10:4; <130904>1 Chronicles 19:4), is expressive of the length of the Hebrew garments (<090412>1 Samuel 4:12; 18:4), and is specifically applied to a long cloak (<070816>Judges 3:16; <100818>2 Samuel 20:8), and to the priest's coat (<030810>Leviticus 6:10). The Greek terms ἱμάτιον and στόλη express the corresponding idea, the latter being specially appropriate to robes of more than ordinary grandeur (1 Macc. 10:21; 14:9; <411238>Mark 12:38; 16:5; <422052>Luke 15:22; 20:46; <660611>Revelation 6:11; 7:9, 13); the χίτων and ἱμάτιον (A.V. "coat," "cloak," Vulg. *tunica*, pallium) are brought into juxtaposition in <400540>Matthew 5:40, and <440939>Acts 9:39. The beged might be worn in various ways, either wrapped round the body, or worn over the shoulders, like a shawl, with the ends or "skirts" (µyapn;K;; Sept. πτερύγια; Vulg. *anguli*) hanging down in front; or it might be thrown over the head so as to conceal the face (<101530>2 Samuel 15:30; Esth. 6:12). The ends were

skirted with a fringe, and bound with a dark purple ribbon (<04158>Numbers 15:38): it was confined at the waist by a girdle, and the fold (qyjeSept. κόλπος; Vulg. *sinus*) formed by the overlapping of the robe served as a pocket in which a considerable quantity of articles might be carried (<1049>2 Kings 4:39; <19912>Psalm 79:12; <37012>Haggai 2:12; Niebuhr, *Description*, page 56), or as a purse (<20723>Proverbs 17:23; 21:14; <23516>Isaiah 65:6, 7; <24218>Jeremiah 32:18; <4168>Luke 6:38).

The ordinary mode of wearing the outer robe, called abba or abayeh, at the present time, is exhibited in figs. 2 and 5. The arms, when falling down, are completely covered by it, as in fig. 5; but in holding any weapon, or in active work, the lower part of the arm is exposed, as in fig. 2.

b. The dress of the women differed from that of the men in regard to the outer garment, the kethoneth being worn equally by both sexes (<22103>Song of Solomon 5:3). The names of their distinctive robes were as follows:

(1) nitpachtath (tjPif]næSept. περίζωμα; Vulg. *pallium*, *linteamen*; A.V. "veil," "wimple"), a kind of shawl (<08015>Ruth 3:15; <23122>Isaiah 3:22);

(2) maataphah' (hp;f;[}mi; Vulg. *palliolun*; A.V. "mantle"), another kind of shawl (<23122>Isaiah 3:22), but how differing from the one just mentioned we know not: the etymological meaning of the first name is expansion, of the second env(loping;

(3) *tsa'iph* (ãy[æ; θέριστρον; "veil"), a robe worn by Rebekah on approaching Isaac (<01245>Genesis 24:65), and by Tamar when she assumed the guise of a harlot (<01814>Genesis 38:14, 19) it was probably, as the Sept. represents it, a light summer dress of handsome appearance (περιέβαλε τὸ θέριστρον καὶ ἐκαλλωπίσατο, <01814>Genesis 38:14), and of ample dimensions, so that it might be thrown over the head at pleasure;

(4) *radid'* (dydæ; "veil"), a similar robe (<23123>Isaiah 3:23; <22107>Song of Solomon 5:7), and substituted for the *fsaiph* in the Chaldee version — we may conceive of these robes or shawls as resembling thepeplum of the Greeks, which might be worn over the head (as represented in Smith's *Dict. of Ant.* Page 753), or again as resembling the habarah and milayeh of the modern Egyptians (Lane, 1:73, 75);

(5) *pethigil'* (לִגְפֶּת; χιτὼν μεσοπόρφυρος; "stomacher"), a term of doubtful origin, but probably significant of a gay holiday dress (Isaiah 3:24)-to the various explanations enumerated by Gesenius (Thesaur. page 1137), we may add one proposed by Saalchutz (*Archeol.* 1:31), תֶּפֶת, wide or foolish, and לַעַג, pleasure, in which case it = unbridled pleasure, and has no reference to dress at all;

(6) *gilyonim'* (גִּלְיֹנִים; Isaiah 3:23), also a doubtful word, explained in the Sept. as a transparent dress, i.e., of gauze (διαφανῆ Λακωνικά) — Schroeder (*De Vest. mul. Hebrews* page 311) supports this view, butpperhaps the word means, as in the A.V., "glasses." The garments of females were terminated by an ample border or fringe (שׁוּלַיִם; ὀπίσθια; skirts), which concealed the feet (Isaiah 47:2; Jeremiah 13:22).

Figs. 6 and 7 illustrate some of the peculiarities of female dress: the former is an Egyptian woman (in her walking dress); the latter represents a dress, probably of great antiquity, still worn by the peasants in the south of Europe: the outer robe, or *hulaliyeh*, is a large piece of woolen stuff wound round the body, the upper parts being attached at the shoulders; another piece of the same stuff is used for the head-veil, or *tarhah*.

Picture for Dress 3

c. Having now completed our description of Hebrew dress, we add a few remarks relative to the selection of equivalent terms in our own language. It must at once strike every Biblical student as a great defect in our Auth. Vers. that the same English word should represent various Hebrew words; e.g. that "veil" should be promiscuously used for *radid* (Isaiah 3:23), *tsaiph* (Genesis 24:65), *mitpachath* (Ruth 3:15), *masveh* (Exodus 34:33); "robe" for *meil* (1 Samuel 18:4), *kethoneth* (Isaiah 22:21), *addereth* (Jonah 3:6), *salmah* (Micah 2:8); "mantle" for *meil* (1 Samuel 15:27), *addereth* (I Kings 19:13), *maataphah* (Isaiah 3:22); and "coat" for *meil* (1 Samuel 2:19), *kethoneth* (Genesis 3:21); and conversely that different English words should be promiscuously used for the same Hebrew one, as *meil* is translated "coat," "robe," "mantle;" *addereth* "robe," "mantle." Uniformity would be desirable, in as far as it can be attained, so that the English reader might understand that the same Hebrew term occurred in the original text where the same English term was found in the translation. Beyond

uniformity, correctness of translation would also be desirable: the difficulty of attaining this in the subject of dress, with regard to which the customs and associations are so widely at variance in our own country and in the East, is very great. Take, for instance, the *kethoneth*: at once an under garment, and yet not unfrequently worn without anything over it — a shirt, as being worn next the skin, and a coat, as being the upper garment worn in a house: deprive the Hebrew of his *kethoneth*, and he was positively naked; deprive the Englishman of his coat, and he has under garments still. So again with the *beged*: in shape probably like a Scotch plaid, but the use of such a term would be unintelligible to most English readers; in use unlike any garment with which we are familiar, for we only wear a great-coat or a cloak in bad weather, whereas the Hebrew and his *beged* were inseparable. With such difficulties attending the subject, any attempt to render the Hebrew terms must be, more or less, a compromise between correctness and modern usage, and the English terms which we are about to propose must be regarded merely in the light of suggestions. Kethoneth answers in many respects to "'frock;" the sailor's "frock" is constantly worn next the skin, and either with or without a coat over it; the "smockfrock" is familiar to us as an upper garment, and still as a kind of undress. In shape and material these correspond with kethoneth, and, like it, the term "frock" is applied to both sexes. In the sacerdotal dress a more technical term might be used: "vestment," in its specific sense as = the chasible, or *casula*, would represent it very aptly. Meil may perhaps be best rendered "gown," for this too applies to both sexes; and, when to men, always in an official sense, as the academic gown, the alderman's gown, the barrister's gown; just as meal appears to have represented an official, or, at all events, a special dress. In sacerdotal dress "*alb*" exactly meets it, and retains still, in the Greek Church, the very name, poderis, by which the meil is described in the Sept. The sacerdotal ephod approaches, perhaps, most nearly to the term "*pall*," the ὠμοφόριον of the Greek Church, which we may compare with the ἐπωμίς of the Sept. Addereth answers in several respects to "*pelisse*," although this term is now applied almost exclusively to female dress. *Sadin* = "linen wrapper." *Simlah* we would render "garment," and in the plural "clothes," as the broadest term of the kind; *beged* "vestment," as being of superior quality; *lebush* "robe," as still superior; *mad* "cloak," as being long; and *malbush* "dress," in the specific sense in which the term is not unfrequently used as = fine dress. In female costume *mitpachath* might be rendered "shawl," *maatapha* "mantle," *tsaiph* "handsome dress," *radid* "cloak."

Picture for Dress 4

d. In addition to these terms, which we have thus far extracted from the Bible, we have in the Talmudical writers an entirely new nomenclatur. The tallith' (tyLfæ) is frequently noticed: it was made of fine linen, and had a fringe attached to it, like the beged; it was of ample dimensions, so that the head might be enveloped in it, as was usual among the Jews in the act of prayer. The *kolbin'* (ˆyBæ/q) was probably another name for the tallith, derived from the Greek κολόβιον; Epiphanius (1:15) represents the στολαί of the Pharisees as identical with the Dalmatica or the colobium; the latter, as known to us, was a close tunic without sleeves. The *chaluk'* (qWlj) was a woolen shirt, worn as an under tunic. The *macto'ren* (ˆr/fqm) was a mantle or outer garment (comp. Lightfoot, *Exercitation on* <4054>*Matthew 5:40*; <4114>Mark 14:51; <4003>Luke 9:3, etc.). Gloves (hy;sp;i or ãKi) are also noticed (Chelim, xvis 6; 24:15; 26:3), not, however, as worn for luxury, but for the protection of the hands in manual labor.

With regard to other articles of dress, *SEE GIRDLE*; *SEE HANDKERCHIEF*; *SEE HEAD-DRESS*; *SEE HEM OF GARMENT*; *SEE SANDALS*; *SEE SHOES*; *SEE VEIL*; also the several words above used in the A.V.

e. The dresses of foreign nations are occasionally referred to in the Bible; that of the Persians is described; in <2702>Daniel 3:21 in terms which have been variously understood, but which may be identified with the statements of *Hero'dotus* (1:195; 7:61) in the following manner:

(1) The *sarbaln'* (ˆylæ;rÞ;s; A.V. "coats") ἀναξύριδες, or drawers, which were the distinctive feature in the Persian as compared with the Hebrew dress;

(2) thepattish' (vyfæ; A.V. "*hosen*") = κιθὼν ποδηνεκὴς λίνεος, or inner tunic;

(3) the karbela' (alBÞrÞK; A.V. "hat") = ἄλλος εἰρίνεος κιθών, or upper tunic, corresponding to the meal of the Hebrews;

(4) the *lebush'* (vWbl; A. V. "garment") = χλανίδιον λευκόν, or cloak, which was worn, like the *beged*, over all. In addition to these terms, we have notice of a robe of state of fine linen, *takrik* (Ëyræ;T;

διάδεμα *sericum pallium*), so called from its ample dimensions (<17815>Esther 8:15). The same expression is used in the Chaldee for purple garments in <262716>Ezekiel 27:16.

The references to Greek or Roman dress are few; the χλαμύς (2 Macc. 12:35; <402728>Matthew 27:28) was either the *paludamentum*, the military scarf of the Roman soldiery, or the Greek chlamys itself, which was introduced under the emperors (Smith's *Dict. of Ant.* s.v. Chlamys); it was especially worn by officers. The traveling cloak (φελόνης) referred to by Paul (<550413>2 Timothy 4:13) is generally identified with the Roman paenula, of which it may be a corruption; the Talmudical writers have a similar name (ˆyylp or aynlp). It is, however, otherwise explained as a traveling case for carrying clothes or books (Conybeare, *St. Paul*, 2:499).

4. The customs and associations connected with dress are numerous and important, mostly arising from the peculiar form and mode of wearing the outer garments. The beged, for instance, could be applied to many purposes besides its proper use as a vestment; it was sometimes used to carry a burden (<022134>Exodus 12:34; <070725>Judges 8:25; <203104>Proverbs 30:4), as Ruth used her shawl (<180315>Ruth 3:15); or to wrap up an article (<092109>1 Samuel 21:9); or again as an impromptu saddle (<402107>Matthew 21:7). Its most important use, however, was a coverlet at night (<022227>Exodus 22:27; <080309>Ruth 3:9; <261608>Ezekiel 16:8), whence the word is sometimes taken for bed-clothes (<091913>1 Samuel 19:13; <110101>1 Kings 1:1); the Bedouin applies his abba to a similar purpose (Niebuhr, Description, page 56). On this account a creditor could not retain it after sunset (<262226>Ezekiel 22:26; <052412>Deuteronomy 24:12, 13; compare <182206>Job 22:6; 24:7; <300208>Amos 2:8). The custom of placing garments in pawn appears to have been very common, so much so that fybj pledge = a garment (<052412>Deuteronomy 24:12,13); the accumulation of such pledges is referred to in <350206>Habakkuk 2:6 (that loadeth himself with fyfbe[i i.e., pledges; where the A.V. following the Sept, and Vulg. reads fyfbe[i "thick clay"); this custom prevailed in the time of our Lord, who bids his disciples give up the ἱμάτιον = *beged*, in which they slept, as well as the χιτών (<400540>Matthew 5:40). At the present day it is not unusual to seize the abba as compensation for an injury: an instance is given in Wortabet's *Syria*, 1:293.

The loose, flowing character of the Hebrew robes admitted of a variety of symbolical actions: rending them was expressive of various emotions, as

grief (<01529>Genesis 37:29, 34; <18120>Job 1:20; <10102>2 Samuel 1:2), *SEE MOURNING*, fear (<11217>1 Kings 21:27; <12211>2 Kings 22:11, 19), indignation (<12107>2 Kings 5:7; 11:14; <40465>Matthew 26:65), or despair (<07135>Judges 11:35; <17401>Esther 4:1): generally the outer garment alone was thus rent (<01534>Genesis 37:34; <18120>Job 1:20; 2:12); occasionally the inner (<10532>2 Samuel 15:32), and occasionally both (<15903>Ezra 9:3; <40465>Matthew 26:65, compared with <41463>Mark 14:63). Shaking the garments, or shaking the dust off them, was a sign ,of renunciation (<44806>Acts 18:6); spreading them before a person, of loyalty and joyous reception (<12013>2 Kings 9:13; <40208>Matthew 21:8); wrapping them round the head, of awe (<11913>1 Kings 19:13) or of grief (<10530>2 Samuel 15:30; <17612>Esther 6:12; <24408>Jeremiah 14:3, 4); casting them off, of excitement (<44223>Acts 22:23); laying hold of them, of supplication (<09157>1 Samuel 15:27; <23306>Isaiah 3:6; 4:1; <38823>Zechariah 8:23).

The length of the dress rendered it inconvenient for active exercise; hence the outer garments were either left in the house by a person working close by (<40248>Matthew 24:18), or were thrown off when the occasion arose (<41050>Mark 10:50; <43304>John 13:4; <44758>Acts 7:58), or, if this was not possible, as in the case of a person traveling, they were girded up (<11846>1 Kings 18:46; <12429>2 Kings 4:29; 9:1; <60113>1 Peter 1:13); on entering a house the upper garment was probably laid aside, and resumed on going out (<44208>Acts 12:8). In a sitting posture, the garments concealed the feet; this was held to be an act of reverence (<23602>Isaiah 6:2; see Lowth's note). The proverbial expression in <09252>1 Samuel 25:22; <11440>1 Kings 14:10; 21:21; <12908>2 Kings 9:8, probably owes its origin to the length of the garments, which made another habit more natural (comp. Herod. 2:35; *Xenoph. Cyrop.* 12:16; *Ammian. Marcell.* 23:6); the expression is variously understood to mean the lowest or the youngest of the people (Gesen. *Thesaur.* page 1397; Jahn, *Archaol.* 1:8, § 120). To cut the garments short was the grossest insult that a Jew could receive (<10104>2 Samuel 10:4; the word there used wdmi is peculiarly expressive of the length of the garments). To raise the border or skirt of a woman's dress was a similar insult, implying her unchastity (<23702>Isaiah 47:2; <24132>Jeremiah 13:22, 26; <34805>Nahum 3:5).

The putting on and off of garments, and the ease with which it was accomplished, are frequently referred to; the Hebrew expressions for the first of these operations, as regards the outer robe, are vbil; *labash'*, to put on, hf;[; *atah'*, hsK; *kasah'*, and ãfi[; *ataph'*, lit. to cover, the latter three having special reference to the amplitude of the robes; and for the

second fvP;*pashat'*, lit. to expand, which was the natural result of taking off a wide, loose garment. The ease of these operations forms the point of comparison in <19A26>Psalm 102:26; <24812>Jeremiah 43:12. In the case of closely-fitting robes the expression is rgij;*chagar'*, lit. to gird, which is applied to the ephod (<09218>1 Samuel 2:18; <10614>2 Samuel 6:14), to sackcloth (<10331>2 Samuel 3:31; <23211>Isaiah 32:11; <24408>Jeremiah 4:8); the use of the term may illustrate <01307>Genesis 3:7, where the garments used by our first parents are called trgwj}*chagoroth'* (A.V. "aprons"), probably meaning such as could be wound round the body. The converse term is jtP;*pathach'*, to loosen or unbind (<19011>Psalm 30:11; <23202>Isaiah 20:2).

The number of suits possessed by the Hebrews was considerable; a single suit consisted of an under and upper garment, and was termed µydgB;Ër,[e(Sept. στολὴ ἱματίων, i.e., *apparatus vestium*; <07310>Judges 17:10). Where more than one is spoken of, the suits are termed t/pylj}a}(ἀλλασσόμεναι στολαί; A.V. "changes of raiment;" compare Homer, Od. 8:249, εἵματα ἐξημοιβά). These formed in ancient times one of the most usual presents among Orientals (Harmer, Observations, 2:379 sq.); five (<01452>Genesis 45:22) and even ten changes (<12605>2 Kings 5:5) were thus presented, while as many as thirty were proposed as a wager (<07142>Judges 14:12,19). The highest token of affection was to present the robe actually worn by the giver (<09304>1 Samuel 18:4; comp. Homer, II. 6:230; Harmer, 2:388). The presentation of a robe in many instances amounted to installation or investiture (<01442>Genesis 41:42; <17805>Esther 8:15; <23221>Isaiah 22:21; comp. Morier, *Second Journey*, page 93); on the other hand, taking it away amounted to dismissal from office (2 Macc. 4:38). The production of the best robe was a mark of special honor in a household (<42522>Luke 15:22). The number of robes thus received or kept in store for presents was very large, and formed one of the main elements of wealth in the East (<18716>Job 27:16; <40619>Matthew 6:19; <59302>James 5:2), so that to have clothing to be wealthy and powerful (<23306>Isaiah 3:6, 7). On grand occasions the entertainer offered becoming robes to his guests (*Trench on Parables*, page 231). Hence in large households a wardrobe (hj;T;l]m)was required for their preservation (<12022>2 Kings 10:22; compare Harmer, 2:382), superintended by a special officer, named µydgB}hirm,vo, keeper of the wardrobe (<14342>2 Chronicles 34:22). Robes reserved for special occasions

are termed t/xl;jmi (A.V. "changeable suits;" <232222>Isaiah 3:22; <380304>Zechariah 3:4), because laid aside when the occasion was past.

The color of the garment was, as we have already observed, generally white, hence a spot or stain readily showed itself (<236303>Isaiah 63:3; Jude 23; <660304>Revelation 3:4); reference is made in <031347>Leviticus 13:47 sq. to a greenish or reddish spot of a leprous character. Jahn (*Archeol.* 1:8, § 135) conceives this to be not the result of leprosy, but the depredations of a small insect; but Schiling *De Lepra*, page 192) states that leprosy taints clothes, and adds m" the spots are altogether indelible, and seem rather to spread than lessen by washing" (Knobel, *Comm.* in 1.c.). Frequent washings and the application of the fuller's art were necessary to preserve the purity of the Hebrew dress. *SEE SOAP*; *SEE FULLER*.

The business of making clothes devolved upon women in a family (<202222>Proverbs 21:22; <440939>Acts 9:39); little art was required in what we may term the tailoring department; the garments came forth for the most part ready made from the loom, so that the weaver supplanted the tailor. The references to sewing are therefore few: the term rpiT;*taphar'* (<010307>Genesis 3:7; <181615>Job 16:15; <211207>Ecclesiastes 3:7; <261318>Ezekiel 13:18) was applied by the later Jews to mending rather than making clothes.

The Hebrews were liable to the charge of extravagance in dress; Isaiah in particular (3:16 sq.) dilates on the numerous robes and ornaments worn by the women of his day. The same subject is referred to in <240430>Jeremiah 4:30; <261610>Ezekiel 16:10; <360108>Zephaniah 1:8, and Ecclus. 11:4, and in a later age <540209>1 Timothy 2:9; <600303>1 Peter 3:3. *SEE APPAREL*; *SEE ATTIRE*; *SEE CLOTHING*; *SEE GARMENT SEE RAIMENT*, etc.

Dress Of Clergy.

SEE VESTMENTS.

Drew, Samuel, A.M

an English Methodist local preacher and metaphysical writer, was born March 3, 1765, in the suburbs of St. Austle, of a poor family, and learned the shoemakers' trade. In 1785, under the preaching of Adam Clarke, he became a Methodist, and in 1788 he became a local preacher. Drew had received no early instruction, but the passion for reading was natural to him, and he early became himself an author. But his gains from literature

did not suffice for his maintenance till 1809, when he finally quitted the shoe-bench. In 1819 he was invited to Liverpool to take the management of the Imperial Magazine, published by the Caxtons. He accepted it, and in his hands the enterprise was very successful. Mr. Drew continued to edit the magazine, after its removal to London, up to the year of his death. In 1824 he received the degree of A.M. from Marischal College, Aberdeen. His literary labors were very abundant apart from the journal; he took no rest till the "wheels of life stood still," at Helston, March 29, 1833. His principal work is entitled Treatise on the Existence and Aitributes of God (Lond. 1820, 2 volumes, 8vo). Among his other works are *Remarks upon the first part of the "Age of Reason,"* by Thomas Paine (1799, 3d ed.; 1820, 12mo, and N.Y. 1831, 12mo): — *Observations upon the Anecdotes of Methodism in Polwhele* (1800): — *Essay upon the Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul* (1802; 2d ed. 1803, and N.Y. 1829, 12mo): — *Essay on the Resurrection of the Body* (1809, 8vo; 2d ed. 1822): — *Life of Dr. Coke* (1816, 8vo), and *History of Count Cornouailles* (1820-24, 2 volumes, 4to). See *Life of Drew* by his eldest son (N.Y. 1835, 12mo); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 2:290; 3:491; S. Dunn, in *The Methodist*, N.Y., November 24, 1866.

Drexelius, Jeremias

a Jesuit, was born at Augsburg in 1581, entered the order of Jesuits at 17, was for 23 years preacher at the court of the elector Maximilian I, and died at Munich in 1638. The people worshipped him as a saint. He wrote a number of works on practical religion, which have been used even by Protestants. Collections of his works have been several times published, and some of his productions have been translated into different languages. His works, in complete editions, appeared at Cologne, 1715; Mainz, 1645; Munich, 1628; Antwerp, 1657-60. There is a new edition of his Reflections on Eternity (Lond. 1844, 12mo).

Drey, Johann Sebastian Von,

a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born October 16, 1777, at Killingen. He was ordained priest May 30, 1801; was appointed in 1806 professor at the Roman Catholic school of Rottweil, and in 1812 professor of dogmatic theology at the newly-established university of Ellwangen. In 1817 he was transferred, with the whole theological faculty, to the University of Tiubingen, at which he lectured on dogmatic theology,

history of doctrines, apologetics, and theological encyclopaedia (from 1838 only on the two last-named branches). He resigned in 1846, and died at Tübingen on February 19, 1853. Drey was one of the ablest scholars of Roman Catholic Germany. He is especially known for his great work on *Apologetics* (Christliche Apologetik, Mainz, 1838-47, 3 volumes). He also wrote an *Introduction to the Study of Theology* (*Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie*, Tubing. 1819), *Researches on the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons* (*Untersuchungen fiber die Constitutionen und Canones der Apostel*, Tübingen, 1832), and several other works. He established, with Gratz (q.v.) and Hirscher (q.v.), in 1819, the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, which is still (1868) one of the ablest journals of scientific theology published in the Roman Catholic Church. He also contributed a large number of articles to the *Kirchen-Lexikon* of Wetzer and Welte. See Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 12:307.

Driedo, Or Dridoens, Jan

a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Turnhout, in Brabant. He studied at the University of Louvain, where he was a pupil of Adrian Florent, afterwards Adrian VI, and became professor of theology there. In the controversy between the Lutherans and Roman Catholics he took an active part; and, according to the testimony of Erasmus, in one of his letters, disputed both coolly and learnedly. He died at Louvain in 1535. He wrote *Lib. IV de Scripturis et Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*: — *Lib. II de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio: — De Concordia Liberi Arbitrii et Praedestinationis*: — *De Captivitate et Redemptione Generis Humani; and De Libertate Christiana*. — Moreri, cited by Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 4:501.

Driessen, Antonius

was born in the year 1684 at Sittard, was successively settled as pastor at Maestricht and Utrecht, and was in 1717 inaugurated as professor of theology in the University of Groningen. This position he held till released by death, November 11, 1748. He was a man of sincere piety and eminent learning, and was ardently attached to the doctrines of the Reformed Church. He was, withal, a man of melancholic temperament, and of an intolerant spirit. His zeal for truth, or what he regarded as such, involved him in many unpleasant controversies, and that, too, with some of the most eminent divines of his day — with Wittichius, his colleague, and, as a consequence of that, with Taco van den Honert, professor at Leyden, both

of whom he accused of Spinozism; with Lampe, and professor Ode, of Utrecht, whom he accused of Roellism, or heterodox views respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, the charge being founded upon Lampe's interpretation of <40556>John 5:26, and 15:26; with the celebrated Venema, whom he charged with Arminianism; and with the learned Schultens, because he endeavored to elucidate the Hebrew by the aid of the kindred dialects, especially by that of the Arabic. These controversies were all carried on in Latin, and were on both sides characterized by the acrimony common to theological disputes in those days. His writings are very voluminous, chiefly of a polemic character, and mostly in Latin. His treatise on Evangelical Morality, or the Christian Virtues, is written in Dutch.

Drink

(the verb is expressed in Hebrews by the cognate terms hqˆv; *shakah'*, and ht,v; s*hathah'*; Greek πίνω). The drinks of the Hebrews were:

1. Water (q.v.);
2. Wine (q.v.);
3. Artificial liquor (rk,ve σίκερα, "strong drink" *SEE SHEKAR*;
4. Vinegar (q.v.).

As drinking utensils, they made use of various forms of vessels:

1, the cup (q.v.), the most general term (s/K);

2, the goblet (r/PKæ covered tankard) or "basin" (q.v.), from which the fluid was poured into the chalice ([ybeæ bumper, comp. <24535>Jeremiah 35:5) and bowl (qrz]mi, mixing-cup, *cratera*);

3, the mug (tjPxi, "*cruse*") or pitcher; and,

4, the saucer (hcq;hwcÜpi patera) or shallow libation dish (q.v.) Horns were probably used in the earliest times. *SEE BEVERAGE*.

The term "drink" is frequently used figuratively in the Scriptures (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:496). The wise man exhorts his disciple (<20515>Proverbs 5:15) to "drink water out of his own cistern;" to content himself with the lawful pleasures of marriage, without wandering in his affections. To eat and drink is used in <21518>Ecclesiastes 5:18, to signify

people's enjoying themselves; and in the Gospel for living in a common and ordinary manner (<40118>Matthew 11:18). The apostles say they ate and drank with Christ after his resurrection; that is, they conversed, and lived in their usual manner, freely, with him (<44041>Acts 10:41). Jeremiah (<24218>Jeremiah 2:18) reproaches the Jews with having had recourse to Egypt for muddy water to drink, and to Assyria, to drink the water of their river; that is, the water of the Nile and of the Euphrates; meaning, soliciting the assistance of those people. To drink blood signifies to be satiated with slaughter (<263918>Ezekiel 39:18). Our Lord commands us to drink his blood and to eat his flesh (John 6): we eat and drink both figuratively in the Eucharist. To drink water by measure (<260411>Ezekiel 4:11), and to buy water to drink (<250504>Lamentations 5:4), denote extreme scarcity and desolation. On fast-days the Jews abstained from drinking during the whole day, believing it to be equally of the essence of a fast to suffer thirst as to suffer hunger. *SEE FAST*.

Drink, Strong,

stands in the A.V. as the rendering of the Hebrews word רכש *shekar'* (Graecized σίκερα, <40115>Luke 1:15), which, in its etymological sense, applies to any beverage that had intoxicating qualities: it is generally found connected with wine, either as an exhaustive expression for all other liquors (e.g. <070704>Judges 13:4; <40115>Luke 1:15), or as parallel to it, particularly in poetical passages (e.g. <230511>Isaiah 5:11; <330211>Micah 2:11); in <042807>Numbers 28:7, and <196912>Psalm 69:12, however, it stands by itself, and must be regarded as including wine. The Bible itself throws little light upon the nature of the mixtures described under this term. We may infer: from <220802>Song of Solomon 8:2 that the Hebrews were in the habit of expressing the juice of other fruits besides the grape for the purpose of making wine: the pomegranate, which is there noticed, was probably one out of many fruits so used. In <232409>Isaiah 24:9 there may be a reference to the sweetness of some kind of strong drink. In <042807>Numbers 28:7, strong drink is clearly used as equivalent to wine, which was ordered in <022940>Exodus 29:40. With regard to the application of the term in later times we have the explicit statement of Jerome (*Ep. ad Nepot.*), as well as other sources of information, from which we may state that the following beverages were known to the Jews:

1. Beer, which was largely consumed in Egypt under the name of zythus (*Herod.* 2:77; *Diod. Sic.* 1:34), and was thence introduced into Palestine

(Mishna, *Pesach*, 3:1). It was made of barley; certain herbs, such as lupin and skirrett, were used as substitutes for hops (*Colum.* 10:114). The buzah of modern Egypt is made of barley-bread, crumbled in water and left until it has fermented (Lane, 1:131): the Arabians mix it with spices (Burckhardt's *Arabia*, 1:213), as described in Isaiah 5:22. The Mishna (1.c.) seems to apply the term shekar more especially to a Median drink, probably a kind of beer made in the same manner as the modern buizah; the Edomite chomets, noticed in the same place, was probably another kind of beer, and may have held the same position: among the Jews that bitter beer does among ourselves.

2. Cider, which is noticed in the Mishna (*Terum.* 11:2) as apple-wine.

3. Honey-wine, of which there were two sorts; one like the οἰνόμελι of the Greeks, which is noticed in the Mishna (Shabb. 20:2; *Terum.* 11:1) under a Hebraized form of that name, consisting of a mixture of wine, honey, and pepper; the other a decoction of the juice of the grape, termed debash (honey) by the Hebrews; and dibs by the modern Syrians, resembling the ἕψημα of the Greeks and the defrutum of the Romans, and similarly used, being mixed either with wine, milk, or water.

4. Date-wine, which was also manufactured in Egypt (οἶνος φοινικήος, *Herod.* 2:86; 3:20). It was made by mashing the fruit in water in certain proportions (*Plin.* 14:19, 3). A similar method is, still used in Arabia, except that the fruit is not mashed (Burckhardt's *Arabia*, 2:264): the palm wine of modern Egypt is the sap of the tree itself, obtained by making an incision into its heart (Wilkinson, 2:174).

5. Various other fruits and vegetables are enumerated by Pliny (14:19) as supplying materials for factitious or home-made wine, such as figs, millet, the carob fruit, etc. It is not improbable that the Hebrews applied raisins to this purpose in the simple manner followed by the Arabians (Burckhardt, 2:377), viz., by putting them in jars of water and burying them in the ground until fermentation takes place. *SEE WINE*.

Drink-Offering

(Ësn, *ne'sek*, or Ëysæ *nasik'*; σπονδή, compare σπένδεσθαι, Philippians 2:17). One form of this consisted, according to the ritual law, of wine (Numbers 15:5; Hosea 9:4; Sirach 1:15 [17]; compare *Curt.* 7:8, 18; Pliny, 14:14; *Iliad*, 1:463; 10:579; *Odys.* 12:362; on the best

sorts of wine for this purpose, see the Mishna, Menach. 8:6 sq.), which, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 3:9, 4), was poured around the altar (rept (περὶ τὸν βωμόν; i.e., the burnt altar, <022909>Exodus 30:9), and not, as the Jews understand it (Mishna, *Succah*, 4:9), in a channel or tube of it. Drink-offerings were commonly joined with meatofferings (<040615>Numbers 6:15, 17; <121633>2 Kings 16:13; <290109>Joel 1:9, 13; 2:14), an addition to the burnt and thank offerings (not the sin and trespass offering), which consisted of quadrupeds (<040617>Numbers 6:17; 15:5, 10; <132921>1 Chronicles 29:21; <143535>2 Chronicles 29:35), and were, like these, presented, sometimes by private persons and sometimes in the name of the people, daily (<022940>Exodus 29:40; <042807>Numbers 28:7), on the Sabbath (<042809>Numbers 28:9), and on feast-days (<042814>Numbers 28:14; 29:6, 16, 24), in such proportion that one lamb was reckoned to require one fourth of a bin of wine, one ram a third of a hin, and one bullock a half hin (<041515>Numbers 15:5 sq.; 28:7, 14). In the (second) Temple liquors were kept ready for drink-offerings (Joseph; *War*, 10:13, 6), and were dispensed (Mishna, Shekal. 5:1, 3 and 4) by the praefect of libations (µyksen]hi l [i). The Israelites frequently devoted drink-offerings also to foreign deities (<235706>Isaiah 57:6; 65:11; <240718>Jeremiah 7:18; 19:13; 44:17; <261918>Ezekiel 20:28), as throughout antiquity libations of wine were made to heathen gods (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Sacrificium, page 846). On the water-libation at the festival of booths, see *TABERNACLES, FEAST OF*. Libations of water occur in individual cases even prior to the exile (<102316>2 Samuel 23:16; <090706>1 Samuel 7:6). On the other hand, Elijah poured water on the altar (<111834>1 Kings 18:34 sq.) merely to heighten the effect of his miracle in contrast with his idolatrous competitors (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:13, 5). On the oillibation of <013514>Genesis 35:14, *SEE STONE*. <191606>Psalm 16:6 (but probably not <381907>Zechariah 9:7) appears to contain an allusion to heathenish drink-offerings consisting of wine mingled with blood (vinum assiratum), which, especially when persons bound themselves to a fearful undertaking, it was customary to drink (Sallust, *Catil.* 22:1; Sil. Ital. 2:426 sq.). *SEE OFFERING*.

Dromedary

Picture for Dromedary 1

Picture for Dromedary 2

Picture for Dromedary 3

Picture for Dromndary 4

stands in the A.V. for the following Hebrews words: רֶכֶב, *be'ker*, <23406>Isaiah 40:6 (Sept. κάμηλος, Vulg. *dromedarius*), fem. הָרִכְבָה, *bikrah'*, <24023>Jeremiah 2:23 (Sept. mistranslates ὀψέ, as if reading הָרֶגַע; Vulg. *cursor levis*), a young camel (see Bochart, Hieroz. 1:82 sq.; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 206); רֶכֶשׁ, *re'kesh*, <111048>1 Kings 4:28 (Sept. ἅρμα; Vulg. *jumentum*; A.V. "mule" in Esth. 8:10, 14; "swift beast" in <330101>Micah 1:13), a steed or fleet courser (see Bochart, Hieroz. 1:95); אֱמֻרִי, Esth. 8:10 (Sept. and Vulg. altogether paraphrase), a mare (fully בְּנֵי הָרַכָּשִׁים הָאֲחַסְתְּרָנִים מֻכָּאִים, *ha-achasteranim beney ha-rammakim*, the mules, sons of mares, A.V. "young dromedaries"). *SEE HORSE*; *SEE MULE*. The dromedary is properly the African or Arabian species of camel (*Camelus dromedarius*), having only one hump (Wellsted, 1:204), in distinction from the Bactrian (Aristotle, Anim. 2:2; Pliny, 8:26; *Apulej. Asin.* 7, page 152, Bip.), which has two (דַּבֶּשֶׁת, <233016>Isaiah 30:6). It is thus the kind usually spoken of in Scripture (Hebrews גָּמָל, *gamal'*) and in the East (Arabic *jaml*), where it is a widely-found and exceedingly useful animal. It has a slender bodily frame, long neck, small head and ears, and is of a gray or brown (very seldom black) color of skin, and usually 61 feet high. (The Talmud, *Shabbath*, 5:1, speaks of a peculiar variety, קַנְקָן, which the Gemara interprets to mean the white camel.) The double-humped (called also Turkish) camel is the largest and strongest (being capable of carrying from 800 to 1500 pounds), but is so much affected by the heat of the sun as to be unserviceable during the summer months. The one-humped camel, or proper dromedary, which is everywhere met with in Syria and Palestine (Seetzen, 18:448), is the one referred to in <236620>Isaiah 66:20 (see Gesenius, *Comment.* in loc.) by the term כִּרְכָּרוֹת, *kirkaroth'* (the versions all vague or wrong: Sept. σκιάδια, Vulg. *carracae*, A.V. "swift beasts"), so called from their bounding motion (Bochart, Hieroz. 1:90), which is very rapid

(Burckhardt, *Bedouins*, 2:76), and is sometimes accelerated by musical instruments (Sadi *Gulist.* page 190). Its greater speed is in consequence of a finer and more elegant structure (Russel, *Aleppo*, 2:44; Prosp. *Alp. Rer.* AEg. 4:7, page 223 sq.; Sonnini, *Trav.* 1:969), so that it can not only make more miles per hour (Shaw, *Trav.* page 149), but maintain this pace for a great number of days together (Pococke, East, 1:309; Volney, 2:260; Host, *Nachr. v. Marokko*, page 289). They carry only 500 to 700 pounds. A dromedary is properly a camel, distinguished from the common one only by its breed and training, as a saddlehorse is distinguished from a cart-horse. This breed is called swift with respect to other camels, not with respect to other animals; for the camel is not eminently a swift animal, and those most renowned for their fleetness are not in any way comparable to the horse. The best-trained camels cannot sustain a gallop above half an hour, in which, at forced speed, they may make about eight or nine miles. This is their highest exertion. A forced trot is not so contrary to the camel's nature, and it will support it for several hours without evincing any symptoms of fatigue; but even here the utmost degree of celerity of the very best-bred dromedary does not exceed about twelve miles an hour; and it is therefore in this pace also less expeditious than a moderately good horse (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on 2423Jeremiah 2:23). "It is not therefore," says Burckhardt, to whom we owe this statement, "by extreme celerity that the hejeins and delouls are distinguished, however surprising may be the stories related on this subject both in Europe and the East; but they are perhaps unequalled by any quadrupeds for the ease with which they carry their rider through an uninterrupted journey of several days and nights, when they are allowed to persevere in their own favorite pace, which is a kind of easy amble, at the rate of about five miles or five miles and a half in the hour" (*Notes on the Bedouins*, page 262). In proportion to its weight, the camel takes but little nourishment (*Philostr. Apol.* 1:41): it eats in twenty-four hours a single meal of barley or beans (husks, Mishna, *Shabb.* 7:4; comp. Minutoli, *Nachtr.* page259; see Wellsted, 1:206); also dough or cakes; and in the want of all these, grass and thistles, about a pound's weight; it drinks slowly (Cotovic. *Itiner.* 3:21), after it has made the water muddy with its feet, and can go even 16 (some say 20) days without drinking (Aristotle, *Anim.* 8:10, and Pliny, 8:26, give only four days; but this probably means its ordinary intervals between drinking times: see Russel, *Aleppo*, 2:34); although the herbs wet with dew in the desert constantly supply moisture; besides, the camel's double cell-formed stomach apparently serves as a receptacle of water, from which it moistens

its usually dry fodder, and by means of rumination can even assuage its thirst. Travellers suffering from want of water in the desert not unfrequently slaughter a camel, and allay their thirst with the water from its stomach, which is clear and pure. (On the diseases of the camel, see Browne, *Trav.* page 365.) Camels were in use as early as the patriarchal ages (<01216>Genesis 12:16; 24:10 sq.; 30:43; 31:17; 32:7; compare <18103>Job 1:3; 42:12; see Aristotle, *Anim.* 9:10), and in later times these animals were a very valuable possession to the Israelites (1 Chronicles 37:30; Tob. 10:11; <15167>Ezra 2:67; comp. Harmer, 3:355); although they appear to have been less precious than with the neighboring Arabic tribes (<07065>Judges 6:5; 7:12; <09503>1 Samuel 15:3; 27:9; <01325>Genesis 37:25; <24932>Jeremiah 49:32; comp. Mishna, *Shabb.* 24:3; see Leo *Afric. Descr. Afr.* 9, page 145; *Descr. de l'Egypte*, 16:186). They were generally used, however (especially in the caravans of the desert), for transportation of wares and baggage (<01325>Genesis 37:25; <07065>Judges 6:5, <13240>1 Chronicles 12:40; <11002>1 Kings 10:2; <14414>2 Chronicles 14:14; <12009>2 Kings 8:9; <23007>Isaiah 30:7; 60:6; comp. Josephus, *Life*, 24; Curt. 5:6, 9), since they carry a large load (Volney, 2:311; Lorent, Wand. Page 120; Russel, 2:34; see *Diod. Sic.* 2:54), and are more sure-footed in hilly regions than the ass (Wellsted, 1:205; 2:68). They were also used for riding (<01246>Genesis 24:64; <09017>1 Samuel 30:17; comp. Troilo, *Trav.* page 455; Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1:215), and women, seldom males, generally sat in a kind of basket or Sedan-chair (rKj; see Gesenius, *Thes.* page 715), which was fastened on the back of the camel (<01334>Genesis 31:34), being spacious, and covered on all sides (see Kimpfer, *Amoen.* page 147; Pococke, *East*, 1, pl. 58). On account of its long but slow stride and its light gait (Tischendorf, *Reis.* 1:258), the beast has a regular rocking motion, not disagreeable in itself to the rider, but so uniform as at length to become wearisome (Lorent, *Wander.* page 119). Cyrus trained camels to fight (in order to make the horses of the enemy turn, Herod. 1:80; AElian, *Anim.* 3:7; comp. Pliny, 8:26; *Polyeen.* 7:6, 6), and had even a camel troop (camels ridden by horsemen, <23207>Isaiah 21:7; comp. *Xenoph. Cyrop.* 6:2, 8; 7:1, 27, 48 sq.; Herod. 7:86; on the military use of camels among other people, see Diod. *Sic.* 2:54; 3:45; Livy, 37:40; Appian, *Syr.* 32; Pollux, *Onom.* 10:8; Herodian, 4:15, 4; Veget. 3:23; comp. Gesen. *Comment. z. Jes.* 1:661; and <07072>Judges 7:12). Bonaparte, when commanding the French army in Egypt, formed a military corps mounted on dromedaries. In loading or mounting the camel, it is made, on a given signal, to fall on the knees and breast (Ëyrahæ; comp. Arnob. *Adv. gentt.* 2:25), and receive the

burden, which hangs over the back on both sides; and when it is too heavy the animal utters a mournful cry (Pliny, 8:26; compare Schweigger, *Reise*, page 264; Host, *Marokko*, page 288; Cotovic. *Itiner.* page 404). On the Assyrian monuments a kneeling camel receiving its load is found, designed with considerable truth and spirit: the legs bent under, the tail raised, the foot of the man on the neck of the animal to keep it from rising, while a second adjusts the burden from behind, form a group seen every day in the Desert and in an Eastern town (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* page 495). They are often stubborn and vicious, although generally tractable, except in the time of heat (Leo *Afric.* 9:30; Chardin, *Voyage*, 3:378; comp. <24023>Jeremiah 2:23); among the Arabs they are regarded as very revengeful (compare Olear. *Trav.* page 300; hence also their name, from lm;g; to treat evil; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 293). They are taught to go by a touch (Kampfer, *Amoen.* page 724), and are guided by certain (guttural) sounds; and their necks are hung with ornaments (<07021>Judges 8:21, 26; see Wellsted, 1:209). Camel-drivers are called in the Talmud ˆylmg; *gammalin* (Mishna, 2:101; 3:74). Camels' milk has always been highly esteemed in the East as a cooling drink (Pliny, 11:96; 28:33; Aristotle, *Anim.* 6:25; Diod. *Sic.* 3:45; Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1:314; Russel, *Aleppo*, 2:46; Buckingham, *Mesopot.* page 142; Host, *Marokko*, page 288; Tischendorf, *Reise*, 1:258); when fermented it has an intoxicating quality (Pallas, *Russ.* 1:240). The flesh, especially of the hump (Freytag, *Darstell. d. Arab. Verskunst*. page 55), is eaten by the Arabs with great relish (Aristotle, *Anim.* 6:26; Diod. *Sic.* 2:54; Herod. 1:123; Jerome, in *Jovin.* 2:6; Host, *Marok.* page 288; Russel, 2:32 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Morg.* 2:163 sq.); to the Hebrews it was forbidden (<03104>Leviticus 11:4; see Rosenmiiller in Bochart, 1:12; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* 4:202). Of the hair (Talmud, wool, rm,[, Mishna, Chil. 7:1), which in the spring falls off of itself, are made coarse cloths and garments (<40304>Matthew 3:4), and tent-covers (Buckingham, *Trav.* 2:86; Mesop. page 142, Russel, *Aleppo*, 2:47; Harmer, 3:356; Otho, *Lex. Rabb*. page 114; yet fine textures of camels' hair are also mentioned, AElian, *Anim.* 17:34). Of the hide, sandals and water-skins are made, and the dung serves as fuel (Volney, 1:296). The proverb of <401924>Matthew 19:24 also occurs in the Koran (Sur. 7:38), and the Talmudists employ in the same sense apwqB] lyfd]a lyPa fjmd, an elephant entering a needle's eye (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1722). On <402324>Matthew 23:24, and other Arab and Rabbinic proverbs which are spoken of the camel, see Bochart, Hieroz. 1:25. See generally Bochart, 1:3 sq.; Fabri Evagat, 2:381 sq.; Burckhardt, *Bedouins*,

page 157 sq.; 357 sq.; Oken, *Naturgesch.* III, 2:704 sq.; Tilesius in the *Hall. Encyklop.* 21:28 sq. *SEE CAMEL*.

Drontheim

(Norweg. Trondhjem), a city in Norway, with a population in 1865 of 19,287 inhabitants. About 1020 the first episcopal see of Norway was established at Drontheim, which was thenceforward the center of the missionary efforts for the Christianization of the country. At first the bishopric belonged to the episcopal province of Hamburg-Bremen; on the elevation of Lund to be an archiepiscopal see, Drontheim, with all the Scandinavian dioceses, became subordinate to the archbishop of Lund. In 1152 Drontheim was made the metropolitan see for all Norway, and as such it embraced seven suffragan bishops, namely, Bergen, Stavanger, Hammer, and Anslo (Opslo) in Norway, Sodren in the Orkney Islands, Holum in Iceland, and Garde in Greenland. The cathedral of Drontheim contained the relics of king Olav the Saint, who was venerated by the whole kingdom as its patron, and whose grave was consequently visited by numerous pilgrims. It was also the capital of Norway, and had before the Reformation ten churches and five convents. Since the Reformation it has remained the seat of a Lutheran bishop. *SEE NORWAY*. A list of the bishops of Drontheim is given in Torfaeus, *Historia Norvegiae*, — Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:305.

Dropsy

a well-known disease (mentioned only in Luke 14:2, in the case of the dropsical man, ὑδροπικός, cured by our Savior on the Sabbath), manifested by a morbid collection of watery secretion in any of the cavities of the body. *SEE DISEASE*.

Dross

(gysa, sig, once [Ezekiel 22:18, text] gWs, suq. what goes off in refining), the scorice or impurities of silver separated from the ore, or rusted or adulterated forms, by the process of melting (Proverbs 25:4; 26:23; Psalm cxix. 119); also the base metal, or mixture itself prior to smelting (Isaiah 1:22, 25; Ezekiel 22:18, 19). *SEE METAL*.

Droste zu Vischering, Clemens August,

Baron von, archbishop of Cologne, was born at Münster, Westphalia, January 22, 1773. He studied theology and philosophy at Munster, and was early introduced into the literary circle of the princess Amalia of Gallitzin (q.v.). After traveling for some time in Italy, where he devoted himself to the study of art, he was consecrated a priest at Minster on May 14, 1798, by his brother Kaspar Maximilian, who had been, since 1795, assistant bishop (*weihbishof*) of Münster. In 1807 he was elected by the chapter vicar general, and, as such, administered the diocese until 1813, when Napoleon appointed the baron von Spiegel bishop of Münster. In order to avoid a schism, Droste conferred the administration of the diocese upon the new bishop. During the Congress of Vienna he went to Rome, to make a report on the situation of the Church of Rome in Germany. On his return, March, 1815, he published a papal brief, which dissolved the chapter established by Napoleon, and relieved the baron von Spiegel from the administration of the diocese. The papal decree was recognized by the king of Prussia, who had become the sovereign of Münster; but soon conflicts arose between the Prussian government and Droste, who had again taken charge of the administration of the diocese. He forbade Roman Catholic theological students to study at the new Prussian University of Bonn. After the conclusion of the concordat between Prussia and the pope, Droste again retired into private life, and devoted himself wholly to the extension of a new association of Sisters of Charity which he had founded. In 1827 he was consecrated assistant bishop of Münster. In 1835 he was elected archbishop of Cologne, he having previously promised to adhere to an agreement concluded between the Prussian government and the late archbishop of Cologne concerning marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants. But soon after his inthronization, the new archbishop was involved in serious conflicts with the government. He maintained that he had been deceived by the Prussian government as to the true meaning of the agreement between the government and archbishop Spiegel (to which all the other bishops of Prussia had also given their adhesion), and declared that he would strictly carry out the views of the pope. He also proceeded with great rigor against the Hermesians (q.v.), whose views had been repeatedly condemned in Rome, but who were patronized by the Prussian government. Repeated efforts of the government to prevail upon Droste to abdicate having failed, he was, on November 20, 1837, arrested and sent to the fortress of Minden. Soon after the accession of Friedrich Wilhelm IV to

the throne of Prussia, the difficulties between the State and Church of Rome were settled by a compromise, and Droste restored to liberty. He had, however, to accept a coadjutor (bishop Geissel, of Spires), to whom he wholly left the administration of the diocese. He also refused a cardinal's hat which was offered to him by the pope. He died at Munster on October 19,1845. He published several pamphlets on the relation between Church and State, one ascetical book, and a volume of sermons, none of which are of permanent value.-Wetzer u, Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:306; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 3:506. *SEE DUNIN*; *SEE COLOGNE*; *SEE PRUSSIA*.

Drought

(תרְצִבָּה *batstso'reth*, restraint of rain, <24708>Jeremiah 17:8; "dearth," 14:1; בֹּרֶחַ *cho'reb*, dryness, <01340>Genesis 31:40; Jeremiah 1, 38; <37011>Haggai 1:11; elsewhere "heat," etc.; or חֲרָבוֹן *charabon'*, the same, <19204>Psalm 32:4; צִחְצָחוֹת *tsachtsachoth'*, dry places, <23811>Isaiah 58:11; יְעִיָּה *tsiyah'*, <18249>Job 24:19; <24006>Jeremiah 2:6, a dry land, as elsewhere usually rendered; צִמָּאוֹן *tsimmaon'*, a parched region, <01085>Deuteronomy 8:15; "dry ground," <19733>Psalm 107:33; "thirsty land," <23507>Isaiah 35:7; תַּלֻּאָה *talubah'*, thirst, <28305>Hosea 13:5). *SEE DESERT*; *SEE PALESTINE*. In Judaea, during the months of April, May, August, and September, before and after the height of summer, and after the early and before the latter rains, the earth is refreshed with dews so copious as in a great measure to supply the place of showers. But, however copious the dews, they nourish only the more robust or hardy plants; and, as the season of heat advances, the grass withers, the flowers fade, every green herb is dried up by the roots and dies, unless watered by the rivulets or by the labor of man. To this appearance of the fields during an Eastern summer the sacred writers often allude (<19204>Psalm 32:4; <23406>Isaiah 40:6, 7). Should at this season a single spark fall upon the grass, a conflagration immediately ensues, especially if there should be any briers or thorns, low shrubs, or contiguous woods (<19814>Psalm 83:14; <23918>Isaiah 9:18; 10:71, 18; <24214>Jeremiah 21:14). From the middle of May to the middle of August, therefore, the land of Judaea is dry. It is the drought of summer (<01340>Genesis 31:40; <19204>Psalm 32:4). The parched ground is often broken into chasms (<19610>Psalm 103:4). The heavens seem like brass, and the earth like iron, and all the land and the creatures upon it suffer (<05823>Deuteronomy 28:23); and nothing but the very

slight dews of the night preserve the life of any living thing (<30111>Haggai 1:11). *SEE DEW*.

Drove

(rdEe, *e'der*, a flock or herd, <013216>Genesis 32:16, 19; hnjmi, *machaneh'*, a troop or army, <013308>Genesis 33:8). *SEE CATTLE*.

Drown

(tfv; *shataph'*, <220807>Song of Solomon 8:7, to overflow, as elsewhere usually rendered; [qv; *shaka'*, to subside or be submerged, <300905>Amos 9:5; 8:8; elsewhere "quench," "sink," etc.; [bf; *taba'*, to immerse, <021504>Exodus 15:4; elsewhere "sink;" βυθίζω, *whelm*, <540609>1 Timothy 6:9: "sink," <420507>Luke 5:7; καταπίνω, <581129>Hebrews 11:12, to swallow, as elsewhere rendered; καταποντίζομαι, <401806>Matthew 18:6, to be sunk, as in <401403>Matthew 14:3). Drowning was a mode of punishment in use among the Syrians, and was well known to the Jews in the time of our Savior (<401806>Matthew 18:6), though we have no scriptural evidence that it was practiced by them. It was in use also among the Greeks and Romans. The emperor Augustus punished certain persons who had been guilty of rapacity in the province of Syria or of Lycia by causing them to be thrown into a river, with a heavy weight about their necks. Josephus also tells us that the Galilaeans revolting, drowned the partisans of Herod in the sea of Gennesareth (*Ant.* 14:15, 10). To this mode of capital punishment Christ alludes in <401806>Matthew 18:6. It is still practiced in India: a large stone is tied around the neck of the criminal, who is cast into the sea or into deep water. *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Droz, Francois Xavier Joseph,

a French writer on philosophical and religious subjects, was born at Besanaon October 31, 1773. After serving for three years in the army of the French republic, he was for some years teacher at the central school of the department Doubs. In 1803 he went to Paris where he devoted his whole time to literary studies. He became first lnown by his work *Essai sur l 'art d'etre heureux* (Par. 1806). In 1823 he wrote the work *De la Philosophie morale, ou des dsiferents Systemes sur la science de la vie* (Sd ed. Par. 1843), which obtained the Monthyon prize, and opened to the author the way into the French Academy, of which he became a member in

1824. His most important work is a *Histoire du regne de Louis XVI* (Par. 1838-42, 3 volumes), on which he worked thirty years. Being in his earlier years a sensualist and Epicurean, Droz in the latter part of his life became an outspoken Roman Catholic. He then wrote Pensees sur le Christianisme (Paris, 1842; 6th edit. 1844). He died November 5, 1850. — Brockhaus, Convers. — Lex. s.v.

Drum

SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

Drunk

(this and its related words, "drunken," "drunkard," etc., are represented in Hebrew by some form of the verbs rkv; *shakar'*, to become intoxicated; ht,v; *shathah'*, to drink simply; hw;r; *ravah'*, to drink to satiety; abs; saba', to drink to excess; Gr. μεθύω). The first instance of intoxication on record is that of Noah (<010921>Genesis 9:21), who was probably ignorant of the effects of the expressed juice of the grape. The sin of drunkenness is most expressly condemned in the Scriptures (<451313>Romans 13:13; <460609>1 Corinthians 6:9, 10; <490518>Ephesians 5:18; <520507>1 Thessalonians 5:7, 8). *SEE TEMPERANCE*. The use of strong drink, even to excess, was not uncommon among the Jews. This is inferred from the striking figures with which the use and effects of it have furnished the sacred writers, and also from the various express prohibitions and penalties (<19A727>Psalm 107:27; <230511>Isaiah 5:11; 24:20; 49:26; 51:17-22; <202031>Proverbs 21:1; <350215>Habakkuk 2:15, 16). *SEE DRINK, STRONG*. Men are sometimes represented as drunk with sorrow, with afflictions, and with the wine of God's wrath (<236306>Isaiah 63:6; <245715>Jeremiah 51:57; <261823>Ezekiel 23:33). (See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s.v.) Persons under the influence of superstition, idolatry, and delusion are said to be drunk, because they make no use of their natural reason (<232807>Isaiah 28:7; <661702>Revelation 17:2). Drunkenness sometimes denotes abundance, satiety (<053242>Deuteronomy 32:42; <234926>Isaiah 49:26). To "add drunkenness to thirst" (<052919>Deuteronomy 29:19) is to add one sin to another; i.e., not only to pine in secret after idol-worship, but openly practice it (see Stuart's Hebrews Chrest. on this passage).

Druids

(Lat. *Druidae* or *Druides*; Gr. Δρυΐδαι or Δρουΐδαι). Various etymologies have been given of this word, all indicative of some characteristic of Druidism, viz.

(1.) the Greek word δρῦς, an oak;

(2.) the Celtic words *deru* or *derw*, an oak, and *udd*, lord or master, or *hud*, an incantation;

(3.) the Celtic compound *derouyd* or *derawydd*, from *de*, God, and *rouyd* or *rawydd*, speaker, i.e., God's speaker or theologian;

(4.) the old British word *deruidhan*, very wise men; and

(5.) the Hebrew *derussim*, contemuplators. Compare also the Anglo-Saxon *dry*, the Irish *drui*, the Romance *drudo*, and the German *drude*.

The Druids were an order of ecclesiastical nobility among the ancient Celts in Gaul and Britain, enjoying high prerogatives, and living in a sort of monastic way in communities, under the presidency of an archdruid appointed for life, who exercised the chief authority among them, and whose successor was designated by virtue of superior dignity, or chosen by suffrage when there were several of equal rank. Sometimes, however, this choice was decided by an appeal to arms. Like other ancient hierarchies, they were divided into several classes; but there is some difference of opinion as to the exact number of such, as well as the character and offices of each. Strabo and Ammianus Marcellinus mention three, viz. Bards, Vates, and Druids; Diodorus Siculus only two — Bards and Druids, which latter class embraced apparently the Vates. To the Druids proper was assigned the highest rank, and they exercised in some sense government and superintendence over the others; were the depositaries of the will of the gods, the judges and religious teachers, who, as Strabo says, πρὸς τῇ φυσιολόγίᾳ καὶ τὴν ἠθικὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἀσκοῦσι. The vates were, according to the same authority, priests and physiologists; according to Marcellinus, only the latter, seeking to discover the order and secrets of nature. Strabo says the bards were minstrels and poets. Marcellinus states that they "sang the brave deeds of illustrious men in heroic verses, with sweet modulations of the lyre;" and Diodorus, that "they sang songs of praise or invectives to the accompaniment of a sort of lyre."

Very little is known with certainty, of their origin or history. If in their secret archives the ancient Druids kept any written or other records of their order, none survived the overthrow of their power and influence by the Romans, while the few extant notices of them by Greek and Roman authors are very brief and unsatisfactory, especially in this respect. The views of modern writers can claim no higher authority than speculations based on grounds more or less probable, yet not certain. Some fragmentary Welsh poems, known from the peculiar form of composition as the Triads, are supposed to preserve some of the traditions current among the Welsh bards in regard to the history, doctrines, and customs of the Druids; and, according to these triads, they came into Gaul from the East, during the first invasion or migration of the Kymry under Hu-Cadarn, or Hu the Mighty. The opinion that they were of Eastern origin, and made their appearance in Britain and Gaul at a very early period, is supported by the similarity of their doctrines, rites, and architectural monuments to those of certain early Oriental nations. The Druidical order has been by various authors connected with the Persian, the Hindoo, the Egyptian, and the Phoenician priestly caste, and the Pythagorean fraternity; while their choice of groves, especially of oak, as places of residence and worship, and their pillars and altars of rough stone, are deemed, by some, striking coincidences with the usages of patriarchal times as described in the Pentateuch. Caesar speaks of Britain as the parent seat of Druidism, affirming that those in Gaul who sought a fuller knowledge of it went thither to learn. This statement accords well with the theory of their Phoenician origin, since opportunity and motive for their early appearance in Britain may be found in that early and extensive commercial intercourse between the British Isles and Phoenician merchants in search of tin, to which we probably owe the name of Britain, i.e., the land of tin — according to some, from the Celtic *bruit*, tin, and *tan*, land; according to others, from a Phoenician word, whose modern representative is found in the Arabic *beret-anic*, or *barat-anic*. It is stated that the Druids held to the belief in one supreme God, the Creator and Ruler of all things, in the fall of man, and a future state of rewards and punishments. To these esoteric doctrines was added the public worship of the sun and moon, and of fire, as well as of divinities corresponding in functions with those of Greece and Rome, e.g. Mercury as Teutates, Mars as Hesus, Jupiter as Taranis, Apollo as Belin, probably the Baal of the East, Minerva as Belisama, and Hercules as Ogmius. We are told that "another remarkable principle of primitive Druidism appears to have been the worship of the serpent, a superstition so

widely extended as to evince its derivation from the most ancient traditions of the human race;" and Pliny has left us a curious account of the anguinum, or serpent's egg, worn by the Druids as a distinguishing badge, its marvelous origin fully agreeing with the wondrous virtues ascribed to it. The same author testifies to their veneration for the mistletoe and its parent oak, and thus describes the ceremony of gathering (on the sixth day of the moon) of the sacred parasite, which was called by them the all-healer: "When preparations for the sacrifice and feast under the tree have been duly made, they, bring up to it two white bulls, whose horns are then for the first time bound. The priest, clothed in white, ascends the tree, and with a golden sickle cuts off the mistletoe, which, as it falls, is caught in a robe, also white. The victims are then immolated, with the prayer that God would make his gift propitious to its recipients." In another place Pliny also makes mention that a sacrament of bread and wine formed part of the ceremonies observed in gathering the plant selago. We have also the rite of baptism reckoned among their ceremonies.

From other classic authors we learn that they held the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which, as they taught, does not perish, but passes after death into other bodies, either directly or, after a certain time. They used this belief as an inenetive to valor among their countrymen, since death was only the entrance-way to a higher and better life for the brave man, and in keeping with this faith they put off the settlement of accounts and the exaction of debts to .the future meeting in another life, and also buried with the dead articles useful to the living, of which practice we find proof in the contents of their barrows or tombs, exhumed in recent times. Caesar's account further implies a recognition of the vicarious nature of sacrifices. Strabo says that they taught that this material world would never be annihilated, but undergo a succession of revolutions through the agency of fire and water: this latter element, it would appear from other accounts, they also held sacred, and in some sort worshipped. Diogenes Laertius sums up their ethical system with that of the Hindoo gymnosophists, in their favorite triad form, "to honor the gods, to do no evil, and to practice manliness." According to Higgins, the characteristics of Druidism in all ages and nations were “the worship of one supreme Being, the doctrine of metempsychosis and future rewards and punishments, hatred of images, open circular temples, the worship of fire as the emblem of the sun, the' celebration of the most ancient Tauric festival, and the possession of a

seventeen-letter alphabet, although their instructions were always orally given."

In their character of priests they had control of all matters pertaining to divine worship, officiated at the public and private sacrifices and other ceremonial rites. In the gloomy recesses of their deeply-shaded oakgrove temples, human victims writhed under the barbaric cruelty of their forms of sacrifice. Sometimes the victim was stabbed above the diaphragm, so that during a lingering death auguries might be drawn from the contortions of the sufferer, and the current and flow of his blood. Some were crucified; some shot to death with arrows. Sometimes huge images of wicker-work were filled with living men, or men and animals, and then set on fire, so that all perished together. Diodorus states that criminals were kept under ground for five years, and then sacrificed to the gods by being impaled and burned in great fires, together with vast quantities of other offerings; and that prisoners taken in war were immolated, and with them the captured cattle destroyed. Caesar says that they held criminals to be the more acceptable offering to the gods, but in default of such victims they sacrificed the innocent. We may suppose that in some of these cases civil and not religious ends were sought — punishment and not sacrifice.

In the capacity of judges they took cognizance of all questions, civil and criminal, public and private, enforcing their decrees by the terrible power of an interdict applied to communities as well as individuals, which excluded the recusants from the sacrifices, and consequently from the association or sympathy of others, who shunned the excommunicated as being without the pale of human or divine protection, and infecting with their guilt and pollution all who held any intercourse with them. According to Caesar, each year, at a stated period, the Gallic Druids were wont to meet in a consecrated place within the territories of the Carnutes, whither all litigants repaired to have their controversies decided. This would seem to have been a high court of appeals, and perhaps a like one for Britain met at Stonehenge, or in the island of Anglesea, the ancient Mona.

They were also the teachers of youth, and possessed some knowledge of Astronomy, Geography, Geometry, Botany, Medicine, Physics, Mathematics, Rhetoric, and other polite arts. This, in addition to their religious doctrines, was imparted to the pupils who thronged their schools. Attracted by the honors and privileges belonging to their order, many even of noble rank eagerly sought admission into it, though a rigid novitiate,

sometimes lasting twenty years, was required. A vast number of verses, in which doubtless the history's lectrines, and precepts of the order were contained, had to be committed to memory, for the Druids forbade the writing out of these instructions, although, according to Caesar, they were acquainted with written characters, and used them for other purposes. While their sanction was requisite in all undertakings, they paid no taxes, and were exempt from the dangers of war, and we are told that their highest order enjoyed, vast revenues, and lived in more than regal splendor, receiving the homage of the people seated on golden thrones.

The Druidesses are divided by Borlase into three classes:

> **"1.** Those who vowed perpetual virginity, and were constant attendants on the sacred rites.
>
> **2.** Those who were married, but only saw their husbands once a year, that they might have children.
>
> **3.** Those who were married, and performed all conjugal offices" (Fosbroke).

The priestesses of Dionysus, located by Strabo on an island near the mouth of the river Loire, and by Pomponius Mela on the isle of Sena, in the British Sea, were doubtless Druidesses of the 1st and 2d class. Notwithstanding the severe edicts of the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, and Glaudius against the Druids, the order seems not to have been entirely suppressed until a much later period. The vast structures, of which remains still exist at Stonehedge and Averbury, in Wiltshire, England, and Carnac, in Brittany, together with numerous smaller ones in Great Britain and France, are supposed to be of Druidical origin. (See illustrations, under ALTAR *SEE ALTAR* , in this Cyclopedia, 1:178, and ARK *SEE ARK* , page 401.) Similar ones are also found in various parts of Europe and Asia.

Literature. — Caesar, *De Bel. Gall*. 6:13-18; Pliny, *Hist. Nat*. 16:95; 24:62; 30:4; Lucan, *Pharsal*. 1:444 sq.; 3:399 sq.; Tacitus, *Annals*, 14:30; Ammianus Marcellinus, 15:9, 8; Pomponius Mela, *De tu orbis*, 3:2 and 6; Suetonius, *De vita Coesarum*, 5:25; Diodorus Siculus, *Biblioth*. *Hist.* 2:47; 5:31; Strabo, *Geographica*, 4, § 197-8; Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis Philosophorum*, *Proemium*, 1:1 and 3; Frickius, *Comnm. de Druidis* (Ulm, 1744, 4to); *Iconographic Encyclopedia*, 4:74-79 (N.Y. 1851); Godwin, *History of France*, 1:44-53 (N.Y. 1860); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1854,

456-470; *Edinburgh Review*, July 1863, 20-36 (Amer. edit.); *Pictorial History of England*, volume 1, chapter 2, 5; Knight, *Popular History* (England, 1:3-10; ib., *Od England*, volume 1, chapter 1; Mountain, *Ancient Gaul* (in *History of Roman Empire, Encyclopedia Metrop. crown* 8vo ed., pages 5-10); Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (see Index); Chambers, *Book of Days* (see Index); Fosbroke, *Encyclopedia of Antiquities* (see Index); Maurice, *Indian Antiquities*, volume 6, part 1; Higgins, *Celtic Druids* (London. 1829, 4to); Davies, C*eltic Researches, and Rites and Mythology of British Druids*; Borlase, *Antiquities of Cornwall*; Rowland, *Mona Antiqua*; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain* (London, 1846, 2d ed.); Toland, *Critical History of the Celtic Religion* (n.d.); Barth, *Ueber, d. Druiden der Kelten* (Erlang. 1826); Burton, *History of Scotland*, volume 1 (Edinburgh, 1867, 4 vols.); Richards, *Welsh Memorial and Essay on Druidism* (London, 1820, 8vo); Alger, *Future Life*, page 83. *SEE CELTIC RELIGION*.

Drummond, Robert Hay, D.D,

archbishop of York, son of the Earl of Kinnoul, was born in London in 1711. He studied at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, and became rector of Bothal, Northumberland, in 1735. He was made bishop of St. Asaph in 1748, and was translated to Salisbury in 1761. In the same year he was appointed archbishop of York. He died in 1776. His sermons, published separately during his lifetime, obtained great celebrity, and have been collected and published under the title Sermons on Public Occasions, with a Letter on Theological Study; and Memoirs of his Life by George Hay Drummond, A.M. etc. (Edinburgh, 1803, 8vo). Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, s.v.

Druses

the name of certain tribes of Syria (Asiatic Turkey), inhabiting a tract of land on the southern side of Mount Lebanon and the western side of Anti-Lebanon, between Beirut and Sur, and extending from the shores of the Mediterranean to Damascus. They exclusively inhabit 37 villages in the Lebanon and 69 in the Anti-Lebanon. The Maronites are mingled with them in about 210 villages. They are said to be about 100,000 in number. The name Druse is derived from that of Mohammed Ben Israel Darasi (see below), although the Druses do not acknowledge him as the founder of

their religion, and many of their writers even call him by opprobrious names, e.g. Satan, the Impostor, etc.

I. *History*. — Their origin dates back to the tenth century, where they are found under the government of their founder, Hakim (996-1021). "After the second captivity of Israel, Esarhaddon (7th century BC) re-peopled the wasted strongholds of Samaria with certain fierce tribes, some of whom, called in the Scriptures Cuthites, and known in subsequent times to the Greeks as Carduchi, and familiar to us as Kurds, settled in Lebanon. From them the present Druses are supposed to have originally sprung. More than thousand years later a fresh colonization took place. The Mardi, a warlike tribe who dwelt to the north of the Caspian, originally of Persian extraction, were transplanted thither by Constantine IV, in AD 686, to the number of 12,000, to act as a bulwark against Mohammedan invasion. The Arabs also, in sweeping through the mountain fastnesses, left a permanent impression there. Thus Cuthites, Mardi, and Arabs, or rather Mohammedans of various races, have combined to form that strange being, the modern Druse. It has also been supposed by some that there runs in his veins not a little of the blood of the Crusaders, but this is doubtful. No immigrations, however, of any importance into the country of the Druses took place after the close of the 10th century; and this period seems naturally to conclude the first great section of Druse history. The nationality of these mountaineers having now been consolidated, their peculiar and mysterious religion began gradually to be developed" (Chambers' *Encyclopedia*, s.v.). Hakim Biamrillah succeeded as caliph of Egypt in 996, and distinguished his reign by cruel persecutions of the Christians; it is said that 30,000 churches and monasteries were destroyed by his command. Some years before his death (about AD 1026), "Mohammed Ben Israel Darasi, a teacher belonging to the Batinites who had come from Persia, entered his service, and became an especial favorite at the palace. In return for the favors received from the caliph, he publicly ascribed to his master divine honor and majesty; but when he attempted to teach this doctrine in the mosque, from a book he had written, he was violently assaulted, and escaped with difficulty from the hands of the enraged worshippers. By the advice of Hakim he fled to Syria, and began to propagate his doctrines among the races dwelling on Lebanon, near the sources of the Jordan. In less than ten years, nearly all the Arab tribes that had become located here professed the religion of the Druse. Living at a distance from the place of Mohammed's power, and their fathers never

having joined in the forays of the Prophet, or reaped the pillage of his battles, they were less attached to his faith than its other adherents. It is supposed that Darasi perished in a battle with the orthodox Moslem from the plain, as they resolutely opposed him, and he had to defend himself constantly from their attacks. There was a turban-maker, called Hamsa, and surnamed Hadi, the Leader, from whom Darasi received the instructions that induced him to deify the caliph. It is not improbable, however, that Hakim himself was the real author of this impious assumption, and that the others became his agents of proselytism by the promise of a royal reward. The sect grew in influence until the cadi, when in the mosque, was summoned to embrace the new faith; but the attempt was fatal to the neophyte who made it, as he and his attendants were slain. The presumption of the caliph was equal to the credulity of his disciples. When the divine name was ascribed to him, he willingly received it, and openly proclaimed himself to be the creator and ruler of the beneficent Nile, from which the land received all its luxuriance, and the people all their prosperity" (*London Review*, January 1860, page 159). He was slain at last; but Hamsa, the apostle, survived, and wrote books which are still regarded as the oracles of the Druses.

From the tenth century onward the Druses maintained their separate religion and a *quasi* nationality. They lived under the orders of separate chieftains, or sheiks, without any supreme authority, and committed depredations on the neighboring Turkish countries. Frequent complaints were presented against them to the Porte for depredations committed, and Murad III finally an expedition against them in 1588, under the orders of Ibrahim Pacha. The Turks were successful, established one of their own emirs as king over the Druses, and exacted tribute from them. The emirs then united against the common enemy, and became dangerous to the Porte, particularly the emir Fakir Eddin, who, in the 17th century, became so strong that the Porte determined on taking the most active measures against him. Fakir Eddin fled to Italy, leaving his son Ali as regent in his place. The latter drove the Turks away, and restored peace; but Fakir Eddin having returned, after imbibing the love of splendor which distinguished the court of the Medici, laid such heavy taxes on the people that a revoluation broke out. The Porte sent another expedition against him in 1632. His son Ali fell in battle, a second son was made prisoner, and Fakir Eddin himself was obliged to flee to the mountains. He was betrayed by his own followers in October, 1633, and was strangled at

Constantinople in 1635. His descendants held their position as emirs in subjection to the Porte. After the extinction of this family, that of the *Schebabs*, originally from Mecca, became emirs. The powerful Melhem (1740-1759) restored to the Druses some of the power they had lost after the downfall of Fakir Eddin. Emir Beschir, born in 1763, is one of the most noted of the recent emirs. In 1819 he took part in the insurrection of Abdallah, and was deposed in consequence, but was pardoned by the Porte in 1823, through the influence of Mehemet Ali. An insurrection of the Druses against the viceroy took place in 1834, but was subdued by Ibrahim Pacha in 1835, and the Druses of Lebanon were disarmed. Emir Beschir then sided with the Egyptians until 1840, when he was deposed. After Ibrahim Pacha had retired from Syria, the land of the Druses passed again under the direct dominion of the Turks. At the same time bloody conflicts broke out between the Druses and the Christian Maronites. To put an end to these troubles, the emirs of both parties were called to Constantinople in 1842, deposed, and Omar Pasha was appointed Turkish administrator in their place. He was sent to Lebanon to consult with the principal chiefs of the Druses and the Maronites, who were to form a permanent council of administration. But the two parties soon united against Omar Pasha, and open conflict speedily followed. The battle of Ehden, October 13, 1842, proved a success for the malcontents. An edict of December 7, 1842, granted to the Druses and Maronites the right of self-government, and the Mohammedan Kaimakam to reside at the south, the Christian at the north. Yet, as the population are not thus geographically divided, but, on the contrary, rather mixed up, the edict did not satisfy either party. New troubles breaking out, the Porte sent Halil Pacha and 1000 soldiers into the land. An assembly of the mountain chieftains having been called by Halil Pacha, an arrangement was made; but hardly had Halil Pacha left the country when troubles broke out among the Maronites themselves, arising from religious differences. A mob of peasants drove the patriarch from his residence. At the same time, the old hatred of the Druses against the Maronites was revived. The Porte at last sent 12,000 men to Lebanon, where some forty chiefs of the Druses and Maronites were taken prisoners. One of the principal Maronites, Zable, was suddenly disarmed October 16, 1845, and the others followed without any successful resistance being made. In the spring of 1846 the Porte granted the country a new Constitution, whereby a permanent council was added to each of the two Kaimakams. These councils are to be composed of members of the different sects inhabiting Lebanon (2 Maronites, 2 Druses, 2 United

Greeks, 2 Non-united Greeks, 2 Turks, and 1 Mutuali). The strife between the Druses and the Maronites continued, however, and another appeal was made to the European powers in 1847, yet without any result, on account of the contending claims of the Roman Catholic clergy as possessors of many conventual domains, of the other religious parties, of the rich landowners, and of the Turkish officials. A terrible outbreak again occurred in May, 1860. Throughout the Lebanon the Druses attacked the Maronites, plundered and burned their villages, and massacred a large number of persons without distinction of age or sex. The Turkish authorities made no efforts to stop these outrages, and in some instances Turkish troops even took part in the massacres and pillages. The war continued throughout the month of June; the Maronites suffered terribly, and in Damascus some 6000 Christians were reported to have perished. Upon the news of this massacre France sent a corps of 12,000 men to Syria while England increased its fleet on the coast, in order to assist, if necessary, the French in re-establishing order. The commander of the French troops prevailed upon Fuad Pasha, who had been sent by the Turkish government to Syria as extraordinary commissioner, to order the execution of 168 of the chief accomplices of the massacre. Soon after even Achmet Pasha, the governor of Damascus, and a number of prominent Turkish officers, were executed. Several chiefs of the Druses were also sentenced to death, but this sentence was for most of them commuted into lifelong imprisonment. On the 5th of October an international commission of plenipotentiaries of European powers met at Beirut to investigate the causes of the late disturbances, and to secure the punishment of the guilty and indemnification of the sufferers. In the way of punishment and indemnification little was obtained; but the representatives of the great powers prevailed upon the Turkish government to agree, on June 9, 1861, to a special treaty concerning the administration of the Lebanon. According to this agreement, the administration of the whole mountain was placed for a term of three years under one Christian governor, who was to reside at Deir el Kamar, and to be directly dependent upon the Turkish government. The government appointed for this position Daud-Effendi, a Roman Catholic Armenian, who, after the expiration of his first term of office, was re-appointed for five years. No disturbance took place under his administration, as far as the Druses were concerned.

II. *Usages, Religion, etc*. — The Druses are of Caucasian extraction. They are violent, cunning, treacherous, covetous, warlike, love

independence, and have successfully defended their liberty. If they have the faults of Eastern nations, they also possess their highest virtues: they are hospitable, obliging to a certain extent, careful, clean, and industrious, but with hardly any intellectual culture. Reading and writing are almost unknown among them; they look upon revenge for bloodshed as a sacred duty. They raise grain, wine, tobacco, and silk. Their language is a dialect of the Arabic; their religion, a mixture of idolatry, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. They make no secret of their doctrines, and yet they are but little known. They look upon the caliph Hakim, of Egypt, as holy; teach metepsychosis and the second advent of the prophet (incarnation of God); they permit polygamy, but it is only practiced by the richer classes. There is no regular order of priesthood, the office being filled by consecrated or learned persons called Akkals, comprising, especially the emirs and sheiks, who form a secret organization divided into several degrees, keep the sacred books, and hold secret religious assemblies. The great mass of the people are almost ignorant of any principles of religion. They recognize neither ceremonies, festivals, nor fasts.

The following summary of their doctrines is given in the *London Review*, October 1860, page 161: "We are told that there is one God, unknown and unknowable; the Creator, Preserver, and Judge of the universe. We cannot speak of him by comparison or by negation. 'He is,' is all we can say of him; and if we go further than this, we bring in the human element, and therefore fail to set forth the truth. There can be no representation of God beside the form of man, who reflects the image of God, as the mirror reflects the object before which it is placed; and man is chosen to be the veil of God, as being the noblest work of his creatures. There have been nine avatars of the one God, who has appeared in the form of men, but without man's impurity or corruption. They were not properly incarnations. God did not become flesh, but assumed the veil of flesh, as the man who puts on a robe is still distinct from the robe. The Druses admit the doctrine of free will in opposition to Islam, and think that predestination is irreconcilable with eternal justice. There are five invisible intelligences of a superior order, all of whom have been impersonated in as many Druse teachers, of whom Habmsa was the chief. These intelligences are regarded as mediators in behalf of those who in earnest seek wisdom. The souls of men migrate into other human bodies, and rise to higher grades of intelligence by an attention to outer duties and submission to the divine

will. In the religions that appeared in the ages preceding Hakim there was a mixture of truth; but these were only as starlight revelations, all of which were to be overpowered by the radiance of the full-orbed sun, which rose in its perfect majesty when the system of the Druses was proclaimed to the world. They have seven great precepts:

1. To speak the truth.
2. To render to each other mutual assistance.
3. To renounce all error.
4. To separate entirely from the wicked and the ignorant.
5. To assert on all occasions the everlasting unity of God.
6. To be submissive under trial.
7. To rest contented in whatever situation they may be placed, whether of joy or sorrow.

The first is the principal precept. But these obligations are not to be regarded as in force when intercourse is held with the unbeliever. Of their outward forms and ceremonies we have little or no information of a character upon which we can rely. In their temples there are no ornaments, and their sacred edifices are found among the shadows of high trees, or on the summit of the mountain. They have no prescribed rites, and do not offer prayer. When outwardly conforming to the practices of other sects, they refrain from the prayer of the heart. There are instances in which a spirit more in accordance with man's weakness is manifest; but even then there is inconsistency between the profession and the practice. An akkal, on visiting Damascus, as we learn from colonel Churchill, having alighted at the house of a sheik of Islam, the two friends entered into conversation, when the sheik asked the Druse if there were any true Mussulmans in his country. He replied that there were, and that they read the Koran. He was requested to show how they prayed. 'Who is without prayer?' was the reply. But the sheik then wished to know in what manner prayer ought to be presented to God. The okkal proceeded to say: 'When I enter the house of God, I endeavor to do so with pure thoughts and a clean heart, and call out, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God." I listen to the words of the book with an earnest and teachable spirit. I look down in contrition and penitence, and, bowing down my head, kiss the earth, praying that I may be enabled to walk in humility and the fear of God, and to resign myself in all things to his will and decrees; to think that heaven is on my right hand and hell on my left; and to bear in mind that,

wherever I go, I am always in the presence of God, and that he is ever before me. That is enough.' His host of the city, turning to those present, said, 'All your prayers, compared to that, are useless.' The akkals are the more devoted professors of the Druse religion, and they may be of either sex. They are not priests, and neither teach nor exercise discipline. They must remain a year on trial before they can be admitted to the secrets of the fraternity; after that they may wear a white turban as an emblem of the purity they are to cultivate. They dress in plain garments, wearing no ornament, and are required to be simple in their manners, and careful in their mode of speech. At their funerals they receive marks of great respect; and their tombs are afterwards visited by the superstitious, who worship the departed spirit, and deposit candles or ornaments in the vault of the deceased. Hymns are sung in the Druse temples, and the people listen to the reading of the sacred books; they eat figs and raisins together at the expense of the community; and all matters of public interest are brought before a select council. They thus combine in one service the religious, social, and political elements. They have a golden calf covered with secret characters, which is kept in a sacred chest, but whether it symbolizes some object of veneration, or, as some say, is intended to remind them of the dangers attendant on the errors of Darasi, whom they call in derision 'the Calf,' is not ascertained with certainty. The Druses are extremely sensitive when inquiries are made of them respecting their religious practices, and usually parry the question by some evasive reply. A Druse, met with by Dr. Wilson at Hasbeiya, told him that there is little difference between their creed and observances and those of the orthodox Mussulmans, while others tell us that they respect Christ and abhor Mohammed. No one has been more favorably situated than colonel Churchill for learning their real sentiments and customs, but even he was not permitted to penetrate into the mysteries of their faith. 'Two objects,' he says, 'engrossed my attention the religion of the Druses, and the past history of the races which now occupy the mountain range of the Lebanon. In vain I tried to make the terms of extreme friendship and intimacy which existed between myself and the Druses available for the purpose of informing myself on the first of these points. Sheiks, akkals, and peasants alike baffled my inquiries, either by jocose evasions or by direct negation."

At a meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, March 20, 1865, the Reverend A. Tien read a paper entitled "Druse Religion Unveiled," which throws light upon the present doctrines and usages of the Druses.

"Outwardly the Druses conform to the observances of Mohammedanism, though they entertain really the utmost aversion to that religion. They believe they are the descendants of Jacob, and in many respects they adhere to Jewish rites. Their Sabbath commences after sunset on Friday, when they assemble in places of worship that are guarded from intrusion. They chant an invocation to the deity, a translation of which was read by Mr. Tien, resembling a lamentation of the Israelites in captivity, imploring for the restoration of power in Jerusalem, to which they add a prayer for the destruction of Mecca. Their sacred books are contained in a silver casket carefully preserved, which is considered like the ark. They are inveterate to the Mohammedans and to Christians, though professing the religion of the former and attending the mosques. The doctrine of metepsychosis is strongly believed in, with some curious modifications. The deity whom they worship, under the title of El Hakim, is supposed to have appeared on the earth at two different periods, with different names and attributes, and his principal agent, also, is believed to have assumed different forms. At the creation of the world, it is assumed that a certain number of souls was created which has not since been added to nor diminished; every soul, whether in human or in animal form, having been on death transferred to some other body, either more elevated or more debased, according to the conduct of the individual or animal during life. In one of the seven books there is a catechism, from which Mr. Tien read several questions and answers, containing an exposition of the principal articles of faith of the Druses. The books are written in Arabic of very ancient character. The Druses are divided into three classes or castes, according to religious distinctions. To enable one Druse to recognize another, a system of passwords is adopted as by Freemasons, without an interchange of which no communication is made that may give an idea of their religious tenets."

III. *Literature*. Wolff (Philip), *Die Drusen und ihre Vorlaifer*; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall* (Boston, 1850, 12mo), 5:531 (and especially Milman's note); De Sacy, *Expose de la Religion des Druses* (Paris, 1838, 2 volumes); G.W. Chasseaud, *The Druses of the Lebanon; their Manners, Customs, and History* (London, 1855, 8vo); Churchill, *Matthew Lebanon; a Ten Years Residence, from 1842-1852,* with supplementary volume on *The Druses and the Maronites under Turkish Rule* (London 1855-1862, 4 volumes, 8vo); *Foreign Quarterly Review*, 29, page 205; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Robinson, *Biblical Researches* (London 1840); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, page 205; *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 19:489;

New Englander, January, 1861, art. 2; Kelly, *Syria and the Holy Land* (compiled from Burckhardt and others, London, 8vo, n.d.), chapter 12; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:246, 249); Caernarvon, *Recollections of the Druses of the Lebanon, and Notes on their Religion* (London 1860); H. Guys, *La Nation Druse* (Paris, 1863); H. Guys, *Theogonie des Druses ou abrege de leur systeme religieux, traduit de l'arabe, avec notes explicatives et observations critiques* (Paris, 1863); G. de Alaux, *Le iban et Daud Pasha,* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1865, July 1, and 1866, May 1; Allgem. *Real Encyklopadie*, s.v.

Drusilla

(Δρούσιλλα), youngest daughter of Herod Agrippa I by his wife Cypros, and sister of Herod Agrippa II, was only six years old when her father died in AD 44 (Josephus, *Ant*. 19:9, 1; 20:7, 1 and 2). Being celebrated for her beauty, she had already been promised in marriage to Epiphanies, son of Antiochus, king of Comagene, but the match was broken off in consequence of Epiphanes refusing to perform his promise of conforming to the Jewish religion. Hereupon Azizus, king of Edessa, obtained Drusilla as his wife, and performed the condition of becoming a Jew (Josephus, *Ant*. 10:7, 1). Afterwards Felix, the procurator of Judaea, fell in love with her, and induced her to leave Azizus, a course to which she was prompted not only by the fair promise of Felix, but by a desire to escape the annoyance to which she was subjected by the envy of her sister Berenice, who though ten years older, vied with her in beauty (*ib*. 2). She though, perhaps, that Felix, whom as accepted as a second husband, would be better able to protect her then Azizus, whom she divorced. In the Acts (24:24) she is mentioned in such a manner that she may naturally be supposed to have been present when Paul preached before Felix, in A.D. 55. Felix and Drusilla had a son, Agrippa, who perished in an eruption of Vesuvius (Josephus, *Ant*. 19:7; 20:5). Tacitus (*Hist*. 5:9) says that Felix married Drusilla, a granddaugther of Cleopatra and Anthony. The Drusilla he refers to, if any such person every existed, must have been a daughter of Juba and Cleopatra Selene, for the names

and fate of all the other descendants of Cleopatra and Anthony are known from other sources. But the account given by Josephus of the parentage of Drusilla is more consistent than that of Tacitus with the notice in the Acts, by which it appears that she was a Jewess. Some have supposed that Felix married in succession two Drusillae; and countenance is lent to this

otherwise improbable conjecture by an expression of Suetonius (Claud. 28) who calls Felix "the husband of three queens." (See Noldii *Hist. Idum*. page 464 sq.; Walch, *De Felice*, Jen. 1747, page 63 sq.), *SEE FELIX*.

Drusius, Johannes

(Jan van den Driesche), an eminent critic and Orientalist, was born at Omdenarde, in Flanders, June 28, 1550, and was educated at Ghent and Louvain. "His father, having been outlawed in 1567, and deprived of his estate, retired to England, and Drusius soon followed him. His mother, who continued a Roman Catholic, did all she could to prevent him. His studies were taken care of, and masters provided for him; and he had soon an opportunity of learning Hebrew under Anthony Cevellier, who was come over to England, and taught that language publicly in the University of Cambridge. Drusius lodged at his house, and had a great share in his friendship. He did not return to London till 1571, and, while he was preparing to go to France, the news of the massacre on St. Bartholomew made him change his resolution. Soon after this he was invited to Cambridge by Cartwright, the professor of divinity and the Oriental languages there, at the age of twenty-two. He taught at Oxford four years with great success; after which, being desirous of returning to his own country, he went to Louvain, where he studied the civil law. The troubles on the account of religion obliged him to come back to his father at London, but upon the pacification of Ghent, 1576, they both returned to Louvain" (*New Gen. Dictionary*, 4:506). He was made professor of Oriental languages at Leyden in 1577, and of Hebrew at Franeker 1585, where he died February 12, 1616. His works, which are held in great esteem, have been for the most part incorporated into the Critici Sacii. Among the most important are Veterum interpretum Grcecorum in totum vetus Testamentur fragnenta (Arnhemiae, 1622, 4to): — *Annotationum in totum Jesu Christi Testamentum libri decem* (Franek. 1612, 4to): — Ecclesiasticus, *Greece et Latine* (Franek. 1600, 4to): — *Proverbiorum Sacrorum classes duce* (Franek. 1590, 4to): — *Parallela Sacra, seu comparatio locorum Vet. Test. cum iis, quae in Novo citantur* (Franek. 1588, 4to): — *Libri decem Annotationum in totum Jesu Christi Testamentum* (Amst. 1632, 4to). For a list of his writings, see Niceron, *Menoires*, 22:65; see also Richard Simon, *Histoire Crit. du N.T.* (Paris, 1680); Curiander, *Vita Drusii* (Francf. 1616); Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop*. 3:529.

Druthmar, Christian

a monk in the abbey of Corbey in the ninth century, was born in Aquitaiie, and afterwards taught in the monasteries of Stavelo and Malmedy, in the diocese of Liege. He left a commentary on St. Matthew (Strasburg, 1514; Haguenau, 1530, fol.). "It contains some opinions respecting transubstantiation decidedly opposed to those of modern Romanism, though they were regarded as orthodox at the time of his writing. He commenced a commentary on St. Luke and St. John, which he did not live to finish. For St. Mark he refers his pupils to a commentary of Bede." His commentary on St. Luke and St. John was printed at Haguenan in 1530, in the Bibliotheca Patrum (t. 15, page 86). The edition of Haguenau was edited by Johann Secer, a Lutheran, and Wetzer und Welte (*Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:321) say that he perverted and garbled the text so as to make it oppose transubstantiation. His text runs: "Hoc est corpus meum, i.e., in sacramento . . . transferens *spiritualiter* corpus in panem, in vinum sanguinem." On the other hand, Sixtus of Siena asserts that he found a MSS. in the Franciscan monastery at Lyons, in which the words run: Hoc est corpus meum, *hoc est, vere in sacramento subsistens . . . transferens panem in corpus* et *vinum in sanguinem*. See Wetzer n. Welts, *Kirchen Lexikon*, 1.c. ; Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers*, cent. 9; Mosheim, *Ch. H*istory, cent. 9, chapter 2, n. 46; Ceillier, *Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, Paris, 1862, 12:419 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop*. 3:531.

Dryander

SEE ENZINAS, FRANCISCO DE.

Drysdale, John, D.D,

an eminent divine of the Church of Scotland, was born in 1718; entered the University of Edinburgh in 1732; became minister of Rukliston in 1748; appointed minister of the Tron church, and also king's chaplain, in 1765; and died in 1788. He was one of the leaders of the moderate party in the Church of Scotland, and was supposed to be inclined to Arminianism. See his Sermons, with Life by Dalzel (Edinb. 1793, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Dualism

in philosophy, is that system which explains the phenomena of the universe by assuming two primal principles instead of one (Monism). In theology,

Dualism explains evil by assuming two original principles or beings, one good, the other evil. The doctrine of two primal causes, one good and the other evil, constantly warring with each other, lay at the foundation of the system of Zoroaster (q.v.). It was also developed later in Manicheism (q.v.); and among the Sclavonians, who, during the interval between their undisturbed faith in their national mythology and their conversion to Christianity, added to the worship of the good being that of a supremely evil one, viz. Czernebog (the Black God) (*London Review*, April 1855, page 11). It was in this Sclavonic soil that the Oriental dualism found a congenial home, and from it seems to have originated the dualism of the Cathari and other sects during the Middle Ages. *SEE CATHARI*.

Its root is always found in imperfect speculation on the relation of God to the world, and on the origin of evil. It is apt to spring up, also, in the practical sphere, from the sense of personal sin, which seeks relief in a transfer of guilt from the real self the man to something outside of him, e.g. to the physical side of his own nature, or to the general laws of nature.

1. *Oriental Dualism*. — The Chinese, at a very early period, adopted a dualistic philosophy and theology. The ordinary speech of their philosophers was dualistic, implying two primal essences, "one a power or cause, the other a more passive something on which that power or cause could operate. The former may be styled the ultimate immaterial principle of the universe (*Le*); the second, consisting of ethereal matter, is the ultimate material principle (*Ke*). The latter, again, is dual (*yang and yin*), viz. the paternal and maternal principles in nature. Man is the product of the marriage of the male and female principles in nature. Yang and yin, coexisting as the material ground in which the ultimate principle (*Ke*) takes effect, enter into the composition of rational as well as of irrational beings. In moral speculation, however, this dualism passed into a sort of pantheism" (Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, part 3, chapter 1).

The *Persian* Dualism. The Persian system, whether originated by Zoroaster, or, what is more likely modified by him from older doctrines, taught that there is "a supreme Being, all powerful and eternal, from whom have eternally proceeded, by his creative word (*Honofer*), two principles, Ormuzd and Ahriman; Ormuzd (*Oromasdes*) being pure and infinite Light, Wisdom, and Perfection, the Creator of every good thing; Ahriman the principle of darkness and evil, opposed to Ormuzd, either originally or in consequence of his fall. To this belief are attached fables respecting the

conflicting efforts and creations of these two powers; on the universal dominion ultimately reserved for the good principle, and the return of Ahriman during four periods, each of which is to last three thousand years; on the good and the evil spirits (*Amshaspands*, *Izeds*, *Ferfers*, and *Dives*), and their differences of sex and rank; on the souls of men (*Ferfers*), which, created by Ormuzd before their union with the body, have their habitation in the heavens; and which ultimately, according as in this world they have served Ormuzd or Ahriman, pass after death into the dwellings of the blessed, or are precipitated into obscurity: finally, respecting the future resurrection of the bodies of the wicked after the victory of Ormuzd and the restoration of all things" (Tennemann, *Manual Hist. of Philosophy*, § 71; see also Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, part 3, chapter 3). The Oriental Dualism first sets the Hyle (ὕλη, matter) as an original principle over against the divinity. The Eastern philosophers soon found it necessary to run into Pantheism; for, the necessity of unity pressing on them, they found no other way of escape except to make God the soul of the world. But, the gulf between matter and divinity still remaining, they had to fall upon two principles, the material and spiritual; and, not willing to identify the original spiritual principle with matter, darkness, and evil, they fell upon the idea of two antagonistic beings or gods, a good and an evil one, the god of light and the god of darkness, the god of matter and the god of spirit Ahriman the evil principle, and Ormuzd the good.

2. *Dualism in the Christian Age*. — This Oriental Dualism, carried out into the various departments of nature and mind, and embellished by innumerable beautiful fancies, had a great charm for the imagination of even the primitive Christian mind; and it seemed also to form a certain kind of natural and easy alliance with the doctrines of good and evil, God and Satan, spirit and matter, in the human constitution, as these are unfolded in the Christian revelation, so that this dualistic mode of thinking failed not to insinuate itself largely into the thinking of many in the primitive Church. It has also revealed itself, more or less, in various sects and systems in every period of Christian history, and its false theories have often troubled the mind of the Church in the development and statement of its dogmas. Thus in Gnosticism, and especially in the Docetic phase of it, Dualism enters as a ruling element. The Gnostics found it difficult to explain the existence of the sensible world, and especially the existence of evil, on the direct assumption of one absolutely good Being. Hence they mixed into their theory some elements of the Oriental philosophy. "They thought

themselves compelled to combine with the doctrine of emanation that of Dualism, in order, by the commixture of two hostile realms, by the products of two opposite principles, to explain the origin of a world not answering to the divine idea, with all the defects cleaving to it, all the evils it contains" (Neander, *Hist. of the Chr. Church*, Bohn's ed. 2:14). For the Manichaean Dualism, *SEE MANICHEISM*; and for that of the Cathari, *SEE CATHARI*.

That the ascetic tendencies of the early Christian age were strongly stimulated, if not unconsciously caused by a leaven of Dualism, can hardly be doubted. "A dark instinct of a state of abnormal and dangerous antipathy to God leads the devotee to take vengeance in time upon that part of himself which is outside, and which may be hardly treated, and even tortured, at far less cost than the renewal of the spirit of his mind, and the bringing of his whole inner man back to gravitate towards God instead of turning upon itself. Manes endeavored to unite Christianity and the noblest form of Oriental paganism in his brilliant and elaborately constructed speculative system. The Church repulsed the heresiarch because of his personal pretensions, his rival hierarchy, and his too open importations from the religion of Persia; but it was not the less profoundly modified by the tendencies which it nominally rejected. Monasticism in Syria and Egypt was the direct result of the contact of degenerating Christianity with pagan habits of thought. The idea that abstinence from food was meritorious in itself, the notion of impurity attached to the sexual relation, the growing tendency to look upon marriage as a state less holy than celibacy these were so many triumphs of the invading pagan conception. The errors and extravagances of the ascetic life were especially prevalent in the Eastern Church. Schmid quotes authorities to show that remembrances of Manichaeism were long kept up in Oriental convents, and also that sundry Greek monks, in their solitude, imagined they had constantly to struggle with the devil, whose power they magnified until they put him almost on a rank with God" (*London Review*, April 1855, page 10; see also Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, Phila. 1867, page 42 sq.).

The progress of philosophy and theology in all Christian ages has been a continuous struggle to overcome Dualism, to bring God and the world, the infinite and the finite, heaven and earth, spirit and matter together, and to do this without violence to the essential nature of either, by, on the one hand, confusing them, or, on the other, annihilating one or the other by identification of them. Pantheism, as it has sprung up on the arena of

modern theological investigation, has been an earnest, though mistaken effort to overcome Dualism. Much as Pantheism is to be abhorred and dreaded, yet ought its service to be acknowledged in helping philosophy and theology to master Dualism. It has both suggested and stimulated the movement that aims at the creation of a christological theology, and we may also say philosophy, which professes, not without hope of success, to overcome that mischievous Dualism which knows only to negate, and which, in a cowardly manner, has only given up the great fundamental problems. It holds that the great gulf can be, and can only be, bridged by the God man in whose mysterious person all dualismn is overcome the center and perennial source of all life and thought, the principle of all unities and the unity of all principles, the whole of all that is divided, the harmony of all manifoldness and diversity, the center of all science, and the imperial, incarnate Word of all authority and truth, the final rest of all minds, as he is also of all hearts. Hardwick, Christ and other Masters (London. 1863, 2 volumes, 12mo); Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, Smith's ed., § 51, 127; *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken* (1837), page 357; Lange, *Life of Christ* (Edinb. 1854, 6 volumes, 8vo), 1:135 sq.; H. Schmid, in Herzog, *Real Encykl*. 19:432.

Du Bartas, Guillaume De Salluste,

a French Protestant poet of the sixteenth century, born about 1544, near Auch, in France; died 1590. His poem on the Creation obtained so great celebrity that in the course of six years more than thirty editions of the first "Semaine" were published. It was translated into Latin, Italian, Spanish, German, and English. The English version is entitled Du Bartas, his Divine Weekes and Workes, translated by J. Sylvester (London 1641, fol.).

Dublin

the capital of Ireland, on the river Liffey.

I. *Synods of Dublin*. — Several important synods have been held at Dublin.

1. In AD 1186, chiefly to rebuke the drunkenness and incontinence of the clergy.

2. In 1518, under William Rokeby, archbishop of Dublin, at which ten canons were published for reformation of manners and discipline, one of them "forbidding the clergy to play at tennis upon pain of a fine of twenty-four pence for each offense half to be paid to the bishop, and the other half to the church of the place where they play" (Wilkins, Concilia, 3:660).

3. In 1615, by the archbishops, bishops, and clergy of Ireland in convocation, Thomas Jones, archbishop of Dublin, being speaker of the House of Bishops. In this synod certain articles of religion, framed by Usher, in one hundred and four sections, under nineteen heads, conveying the Calvinistic doctrine, were drawn up and approved. These articles included the celebrated "Lambeth Articles" (q.v.). By the decree of the synod, any minister, of whatsoever degree or quality, publicly teaching any doctrine contrary to the Articles, was ordered, after due admonition, to be silenced (Wilkins, *Concilia*, 3:447).

4. In 1634, composed of the archbishops, bishops, and clergy of Ireland, to adopt the 39 Articles of the Church of England. "No formal abrogation, however, of the Calvinistic articles of 1615 was made, which led to very inconvenient results; some, among whom was Bramhall, justly considering that the adoption of the English articles ipso facto annulled those of 1615, while Usher and many others, who favored the doctrines contained in the Irish Articles, maintained that both sets of articles were to be observed, and, in consequence, some few bishops, for a time, required subscription to both the English and Irish, discordant as they were. This unhappy state of things appears to have continued until 1641, when the Irish rebellion broke out. On the restoration, of the Church, no attempt was made to revive the Irish articles, which fell into entire disuse." At this synod 100 canons were adopted, which received the royal assent (Mant, *Irish Church*, page 483 sq.; Wilkins, Concilia, 3:496). Landon, *Manual of Councils*, page 211 sq.

II. *University*. — The University of Dublin (Trinity College) was founded in 1592. It is, in fact, a college, with the powers of a university. "Trinity College, indeed, was intended merely as the nucleus of a university, but, as no colleges have since been added, it remains in undisputed possession of all university privileges. Queen Elizabeth provided the charter, the corporation of Dublin bestowed the ground and ruins of the suppressed monastery of All-Hallows, and the Irish gentry supplied by subscription the funds necessary for the erection of the buildings. The income of the college was very limited and very precarious till James I endowed it with certain

estates in the province of Ulster, and a yearly pension of £388 15s. English money, from the public purse" (Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, s.v.). The college has in its gift twenty-one Church livings.

III. *Hierarchy*. — An Episcopal see was established at Dublin in 1038 by king Sitrik, and in 1152 it was made the see of an archbishop. In the Established Church Dublin is now (1868) the head of a province, including six bishoprics, viz. Dublin, Ossory, etc., Cashel, etc., Limerick, etc., Killaloe, etc., and Cork, etc. The present archbishop is Richard Chenevix Trench, DD, primate of Ireland and metropolitan, consecrated 1863. The Roman Catholic Church has also an archbishop at Dublin, at present (1868) Paul Cullen, consecrated 1850, and a cardinal since 1866. The suffragans of the Roman Catholic archbishop are the bishops of Ossory, Kildare Leighlin, and Ferns. See Neher, *Kirchl. Statistik*, 1:27.

Dublin Manuscript

Picture for Dublin Manuscript

(CODEX DUBLINENSIS RESCRIPTUS), so called from Trinity College, Dublin, in the library of which it was discovered by Dr. John Barrett in 1787, written under some cursive Greek extracts made in the tenth century from Chrysostom, Epiphanius, etc. It is itself much older, probably of the sixth century, and of Alexandrian origin, and is one of the most important uncial palimpsests of the Gospels, of which it is designated as Codex Z. Thirty-two of the leaves contain a large part of the Gospel of Matthew in twenty-two fragments (<40117>Matthew 1:17-2:6; 2:1320; 4:4-13; 5:45-6:15; 7:16-8:6; 10:40-11:18; 12:43-13:11; <40137>Matthew 13:57-14:18; 15:13-23; 17:917; 17:26-18:6; 19:4-12; 21-28; 20:7-21:8; 21:23-45 22:16-25; 22:37-23:3; 23:1323; <40245>Matthew 24:15-25; 25:1-11; 26:21-29; 62-71). These were published in facsimile, with a (not very accurate) decipherment in ordinary type by Dr. Barrett (Dublin, 1801), and they have since been carefully restored by a chemical process by Dr. Tregelles. Each page contains but one column, generally of 22 lines, in quarto. The Ammonian sections are given, but not the Eusebian canons; the τλοι are written at the top of the pages, the numbers being set in the margin. The writing is continuous, the single point either rarely found or quite washed out; the abbreviations are very few, and there are no breathings or accents. A space proportionate to the occasion is usually left where there is a break in the sense, and the capitals extend into the margin when a new section begins.

The letters are in a plain, steady, beautiful hand, some 18 or 20 in a line. — Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd*. 4:180 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd*. page 119 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL*.

Dubno, Salomo Ben-Yoel,

born October 12, 1738, at Dubno, Russia, is best known by his Masoretic labors on the Pentateuch, and by his efforts to advance poetic culture among his countrymen. The great reformation in Judaism and Hebrew literature, which had commenced under the leadership of Mendelssohn, attracted Dubno to Berlin, where he at one time lived and labored with the great Jewish reformer. At the age of 26 he edited Salomo ben-Moses's (also called Lemberger) work on the accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, which he published in 1765, under the title of hmy[æ rqe}ci *Portae Jucunditatis* (2d ed. 1777). In 1768 he commenced, in Hebrew, a commentary on the Pentateuch, which Mendelssohn translated into German. Some misunderstanding having sprung up between himself and Mendelssohn, he discontinued this work, after having completed only rpse l[irWaBætyVærB] Commentary on Genesis (Berlin 1781-83; Vienna, 1791, 1806, etc.). The remaining books were finished by Mendelssohn, with the aid of other learned men. *SEE MENDELSSOHN*. He wrote also ^WqTæyrædso a *Masoretic Commentary on Genesis and Exodus*, printed with Mendelssohn's translation in 1831-33. He died in Amsterdam June 26, 1831. — Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, pages 395, 421; Kitto, *Cyclopaedia*, 1:707.

Dubois, Guillaume

a French prelate and statesman, was born at Brives-la-Gaillarde September 6, 1656. He studied at the college of St. Michael, at Paris, and afterwards became tutor in the family of the marquis de Pleuvant, and later of the duke of Orleans. He spared no pains to obtain the full confidence of his pupil, and for that end connived at all his excesses. Finally he succeeded, in 1692, in inducing the duke to marry Mademoiselle de Blois, a legitimized daughter of Louis XIV, who rewarded him for this service by giving him the abbey of St. Just. We now find him mixed in all the political events of the time. Two years after the death of Louis XIV he was made councilor of state by the regent, and soon found himself at the head of the government. Intent only on furthering his own interests, Dubois's policy was the precise

opposite of Louis XIV's, and he became the obedient agent of England, with which power and Holland he concluded the treaty called the Threefold Alliance, at Hague, January 14, 1717. Appointed minister of foreign affairs, Dubois wished to be also archbishop, and especially cardinal, as Richelieu and Mazarin had been. He had caused, for that end, the bull Unigenitus to be registered in France, but had obtained nothing but promises from Clement XI. The archbishopric of Cambrai becoming vacant, Dubois applied for it, although he had only received the tonsure, without being in holy orders. The regent acceded to his demand, and after receiving all the necessary ordinations in one day, Dubois was consecrated June 9, 1720, all the most eminent members of the French clergy, with the exception of the cardinal de Noailles, taking part in the ceremony. He was made a cardinal in 1721 by Innocent XI (q.v.), whom, it is said, he helped with large sums of money at the time of his election. Dubois finally became prime minister in 1722, and president of the assembly of the French clergy. In this position he proved a capable and intelligent administrator, but ambitious and thoroughly unprincipled. He died at Versailles August 10, 1723. The duchess of Orleans, mother of the regent, wrote of him: "If abbot Dubois had as much honesty and religion as he has wit, he should be an excellent man; but he believes in nothing, and regards neither manners nor truth. He is very learned; he has taught my son, but yet I could wish that he had never seen him." Dubois, besides the archbishopric of Cambrai, had seven abbeys, and his revenues amounted to two millions, not counting a million he was said to have received from England for his secret services." See Duclos, *Mem. secrets sur les reignes de Louis XIV et de Louis XV*; Saint-Simon, *Memoires*, 18-20; G. Brunet, *Memoires de la Princesse Palatine*; Sismondi, *Hist. des Franzais*, 26 to 28; Sevelinges, *Mem. secr. et Corresp. ined. du Cardinial G. Dubois*, etc. Paris, 1814; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 13:859 sq.

Dubosc, Pierre Thomines

a French Reformed minister, was born in 1623 at Bayeux, in Normandy, and became minister of the Protestant church at Caen, and afterwards at Rotterdam, where he died in 1692. Having, in 1688, addressed Louis XIV on the subject of an edict directed against the Protestants, the king said that "Dubosc was the finest orator of the whole kingdom." He had a grand and elevated genius, a happy imagination; a discriminating and solid judgment. His constant aim in his sermons was to enforce the inseparable

connection between faith, and holiness, and final salvation. He published *Sermons sur l'ptre aux Ephesiens* (Rott. 1699, 3 volumes, fol.) *Sermons sur divers textes* (Rott. 1692-1701,4 volumes, 8vo). See *Vie de Du Bosc* (Rott. 1794, 8vo); Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*; Haag, *La France Protestante*, t. 3; Vinet, *Histoire de la Predication*, Paris, 1860, 350 sq.

Dubourg, Anne

one of the most interesting characters of French Protestantism, is noteworthy on account of his accomplishments, his lovely character, and his tragical end. He was born in the year 1521, of one of the best families in the Auvergne. In early life he devoted himself to the study and practice of law, and afterwards became a professor of civil law in the University of Orleans. At this period Calvin's writings were universally read, and Marot's psalms were upon every lip. Dubourg conscientiously examined the Protestant doctrines in order to arrive at the truth. He was well versed in the Scriptures, and acquainted with the early fathers and with the history of the Church, as his replies to his judge clearly show. On Easter 1557, he still belonged to the Roman Church, and communed in it. On October 19 of that year he was appointed as a spiritual counselor to the Parisian Parliament, which exercised the immediate supervision over the University of Orleans. His learning had procured him this position without cost, which was rare in those days. His religious convictions were unknown; but, in order to enter upon his position, he was ordained subdeacon and deacon. His real views, however, soon became apparent. During Easter 1558, he attended mass for the last time, and soon afterwards he took part in Protestant assemblages, and communed with them. The choicest members of the Parliament, including the presidents Harlay and Seguier, sympathized with him. The Roman Catholic party, finding the Parliament likely to be at least just, if not kind, towards Protestantism, appealed to the king (Henry II), representing to him the danger which threatened the faith. He appeared in Parliament attended by a large train, and in a short and violent speech expressed his desire that the Parliament would be more zealous in its support of the Church. When it was Dubourg's time to speak, he pointed out the wrong involved in permitting great criminals, as blasphemers, adulterers, etc., to go unpunished, while the most severe measures were adopted against innocent persons. Henry II was highly offended, and Dubourg was dragged to the Bastile, and his trial was at once ordered. Contrary to the laws, by which members of Parliament could

only be tried by the assembled chamber, the king appointed a commission, made up of avowed enemies of Protestantism, and Dubourg was ordered to acknowledge this tribunal, if he did not desire to be condemned without a trial. Dubourg appealed in vain to the archbishops of Paris, Sens, and Lyons, who had jurisdiction over him as a spiritual councilor. The death of Henry II brought the Guises into power, who were still more zealous in the persecution of Protestants. Dubourg openly avowed his connection with the new Church, but could not be induced to discover the names of its members, or the time and place of their assemblages. He intended to hand a strongly evangelical and scriptural confession of faith to his judges, but some of his friends induced him to compose and transmit another, which was less objectionable to the Catholics. A letter from Marlorat, at that time pastor of the evangelical church at Paris, induced him, however, to forward the first confession, and he thus sealed his doom. According to law, an avowal of Protestantism was punishable with death. The cardinal of Lorraine urged the prosecution of Dubourg because he had ascertained that elector Friederich III of the Palatinate intended to secure Dubourg as a professor for Heidelberg. The president Minard was assassinated on December 12, and this was construed into a conspiracy in favor of the accused. Sentence was pronounced by Parliament against Dubourg on the 21st of December, to the effect that he was to be hanged and then burnt. No voice was raised in his favor. Two days later the sentence was executed (December 23, 1559). Dubourg was the first French Protestant of the upper classes who sealed his confession with his blood. His creed (noticed above) sides completely with the teaching of Calvin as contra-distinguished from the Lutheran doctrines. — *La vraye histoire contenant l'inique jugement contre Anne Dubourg* (Anvers, 1561, 12mo); Haag, *La France Protestante*, volume 4; Schott, in Herzog's *Real Encyklop*. 19:437.

Due, Fronton Du

(Latin form FRONTO DUCAEUS), a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Bordeaux in 1558, and entered the order of Jesuits at an early age. In 1604 he was made librarian of the college of Clermont, in Paris, in which office he spent the rest of his life, devoted to literature, especially Patristics. He died at Paris, September 25, 1624. Among his numerous publications are *Opuscula Gregorii Nysseni* (Ingolstadt, 1596, 8vo); *Laudatio Sanctorum Martyrum* (Paris, 1606, 4to); *S. Joannis Chrysostomi Oplera Omnia* (Paris, 1609-1624, 6 volumes, fol.), a work which is very

creditable to the editor's erudition and industry; *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, seu Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* (Paris, 1624, 2 volumes, fol.); *Nicephori Callisti Ecclesiasticce Historice libri 18* (Paris, 1630, 2 volumes fol., posthumous). See Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers*, cent. 17; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*; Niceron, *Memoires*, 38:103.

Ducange, Charles Du Fresne

an eminent French scholar, was born at Amiens December 18, 1610. His name was really Du Fresne; but as he was sieur Du Cange, he is generally named by the latter title. He studied at the Jesuits College in Amiens, and afterwards pursued law studies at Orleans. He was received as *advocat au parlement* at Paris in 1631. In a few years he abandoned the bar, returned to Amiens, and devoted himself to the study of history and philosophy. In 1668 he was driven back to Paris by the plague, and died there October 23, 1688. His works, which in number and extent are almost incredible, abundantly prove his right to be considered a consummate historian, an exact geographer, and a good lawyer, genealogist, and antiquary. He knew nearly every language, and derived, from his researches into an infinite number of ancient monuments, a singular acquaintance with the manners and usages of the Middle Ages." Among his publications are *Histoire de l'Einpire de Constantinople sous les Empereurs Francois* (Paris, 1657, fol.): — *Traite historique du chef de S. Jean Baptiste* (Paris, 1666, 4to): *Glossarium ad scriptores medice et infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1678, 3 volumes, fol.; Frankfort, 1681, and again in 1710; Benedictine edition, 6 volumes, fol., 1733-36, to which Peter Carpentier published a Supplement, Par. 1766, 4 volumes, fol.; new edition, by Henschel, Paris, 1840-48, 7 volumes, 4to; also supplementary volume by Diefenbach, Frankf. 1857; abridgment by Adelung, Halae, 1772, 6 volumes, 8vo): *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et inimae Grecitatis* (Par. 1688, 2 volumes, fol.). The *Glossarium Latinitatis* is "a most useful work for the understanding of the numerous writers of the Dark or Middle Ages, when, for many centuries, a corrupt and barbarous Latin was the only literary language of Europe. All the words used by these writers, which are not found in classical Latinity, are ranged in alphabetical order, with their various meanings, their etymology, and references to the authorities. This work is also useful for understanding old charters, and other legal documents of an early date. The labor and research required for the compilation of such a work can be best appreciated by those who have frequent occasion to consult it" (*Engl.*

Cyclopaedia, s.v.). Many MS. works of Ducange are preserved in the royal library at Paris. See Faugere, Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Ducange (Par. 1852); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 14:911.

Duchal, James, Dd,

an Independent divine, was born in Ireland in 1697, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. He served an Independent congregation at Cambridge for ten years, and afterwards another at Dublin, where he died in 1761. He published *Ten Sermons*; *Presumptive Arguments for the Truth of the Christian Religion* (London 1753, 8vo); also (posthumous) *Sermons* (London, 1765, 3 volumes, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1:968.

Duchatel, Pierre

(CASTELLANUS), a French prelate, was born at Arc, in Burgundy (date unknown), and was educated at Dijon, where he distinguished himself by his successful study of Greek. "He assisted Erasmus in his translations from the Greek, and became corrector of the press in Frobenius's office at Basle. He next studied the law at Bourges, after which he went to Rome, where he found little enjoyment except in contemplating the remains of antiquity. The corruption of morals in the Church of Rome filled him with indignation, and he appears to have conceived as bad an opinion of it as any of the Reformers, and expressed himself respecting it with as much severity as they did. From thence he traveled to Venice, and next visited Cyprus, where he read lectures for two years with great success. He afterwards went to Egypt, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and on his return home was appointed reader to Francis I, who made him bishop of Tulle, and afterwards of Mason. Henry II translated him to Orleans, where he died in 1552. He was a strenuous defender of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and exceedingly liberal to the Protestants. He wrote an oration on Francis, and a Latin letter for that king to Charles V. In his funeral oration on Francis, he hinted that the soul of the king had gone to heaven, which excited the ire of the doctors of the Sorbonne, who thought that by so doing he opposed the doctrine of purgatory" (Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, s.v.); see also Jortin, *Life of Erasmus*; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v. Castellanus.

Duche Jacob, D.D,

a minister of the English Church in America, was born in Philadelphia in I737, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania. He went soon after to England, and spent some time at Cambridge. In 1759 he became an assistant minister in Philadelphia, having been licensed by Dr. Sherlock, then bishop of London. He was appointed shortly after professor of oratory in the college, and in 1762, after his return from a second visit to England, he was received as "one of the ministers of the United Churches." He was appointed chaplain to Congress, and continued in this office a short time. His political views, however, underwent a change, to which he incautiously gave expression, so that in 1777 he found himself under the necessity of retiring to England, where he was appointed to preach in the Lambeth Asylum, London. In 1790 he returned to Philadelphia, where he died January 3, 1798. His publications comprise Sermons (1780, 2 vols. 8vo); *Observations Moral, etc., by Caspapina* (1773); and four detached Sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 5:180.

Duchobortzi

the name of a Russian sect, not certainly known to have existed before the 18th century. The word is the plural of Duchobozetz, meaning Spirit Wrestler. It is the name of one of the many sects of the Russo Greek Church. The designation was adopted by themselves upon their separation from the sect called Molokans, or Duchowny Christiany, "Spiritual Christians."

No records being kept by these people, it is impossible to ascertain the true time when the separation took place. It is, however, known that a certain Ilarion Pobirochin originated it by teaching. That God was not an essential being, but existed only in the generation of the righteous. 2. That the soul of the righteous at death passes over into another human being, and that of the wicked into an animal. 3. That there are no higher beings of any kind. 4. That to read the Bible is needless trouble, for the spirit of God will teach every one his duty. Krazinski, in his work named at the end of this article, gives the following summary of a creed delivered by the Duchobortzi to a provincial governor at the time of Catherine's persecution: "God is one, but one in the Trinity. This holy Trinity is an inscrutable being. The Father is light, the Son is life, the Holy Ghost is peace. They are manifested in man — the Father by memory, the Son by reason, the Holy Ghost by will. The

human soul is the image of God; but this image is nothing but memory, reason, and will. The soul existed and had fallen before the creation of the visible world; it is this fall that is recounted in the story of Adam and Eve, which, like most other portions of the Bible, should be taken allegorically. In the beginning the soul's fall was occasioned by the circumstance that it contemplated itself and commenced to love itself alone, thereby abandoning the contemplation and the love of God through willful pride. The soul is placed in the present life as in a place of purification, in order that, clothed in the flesh and abandoned to its will and reason, it may choose between good and evil, and thus obtain pardon of its primary sin, or incur eternal torment. When a body is prepared for us in this world, our soul descends from above, comes to take possession, and the man is then called into existence. Our body is the house in which the soul is received, and in which we lose all memory and feeling off what we had been before incarnation," etc. (page 271, note).

Pobirochin considered and called himself one of the righteous, and a son of God. Of his followers he selected twenty-four of the most trustworthy and able bodied; twelve of them he called archangels, and the other twelve mortiferous angels. The duty of the latter was to dispose of such as would backslide. They refused to serve in the army, on which account they were much persecuted under the czarina Catherine II, and exiled in the days of the emperor Paul. Alexander granted them a settlement on the banks of the Moloshna, near the Sea of Azof, where they numbered about two thousand. In 1839, the real or alleged discover that a secret tribunal had existed among them caused their banishment to the other side of the Caucasus. At present this sect exists principally in the districts along the Caucasus, but in smaller numbers, and less attached to the peculiarity of the sect. They are to be found wherever there is a community of the Duchownv Christiany, or Molokans. An effort was made in 1861 by a certain Ivan Gregorieff to found the sect among the Molokans residing at Tultscha, in Bulgaria, but failed, whereupon he returned to Russia. For the usages of the sect, *SEE MOLOKANS*. See Lenz, *de Duchobortzis* (Dorpat, 1829, 8vo); Seebohm, *Life of Stephen Grellet,* 1:456; Krasinski, *Histoire Religieuse des Peuples Slaves* (Paris, 1853, 8vo).

Duchowny

(Spiritual), the name of a Russian sect which arose among the Duchowny Christiany, or Molokans, on the Caucasus, in the following manner. In the

year 1833 a certain aged man came from Jerusalem to the Caucasus, and taught that he possessed the power of bringing down the Holy Spirit, and of bestowing new tongues. He proved his commission by teaching his nearest friends a song which he said was in the language of Jerusalem, and the sense of which could be comprehended only by those who had received the Holy Spirit. The principal founder of this sect was, however, Maksim Rudometkin Komar, who also organized congregations in the surrounding places among the Molokans, and enjoyed the highest estimation from them. The sect adopted the creed of the Molokans, with the following addition:

1. The Holy Spirit descends upon the elect either directly or indirectly by being breathed upon.

2. Jumping, shaking, contortions, etc., are infallible signs of the presence of the Spirit.

3. The swooning from exertion, and consequent unintelligible speaking, is considered as the new language, which none understand except the select, whose duty it is to explain the muttering of the enthusiasts.

4. The expectation of the near end of all things, and consequent inutility of labor beyond extreme necessity, is matter of faith.

5. The literalism of the holy Scriptures is assumed, even so far that Komar once, for the sake of punishing his followers for their slothfulness, went to the nearest mountain, pretending to ascend and to leave them alone; the mass of the people fell on their knees, and prayed him not to leave them, and promised to be obedient.

6. Repentance consists in the payment of such amounts of money as the leader estimates their sins to be worth, for which he grants indulgence in the shape of pieces of muslin on which are embroidered signs of mysterious signification. The Duchowny are found principally in the Caucasus, but almost every community of Molokans has a few of them among its members. *SEE MOLOKANS*.

Duchowny Christiany

SEE MOLOKANS.

Dudaim

SEE MANDRAKE.

Dudgeon, David

a Scotch sceptic, was born in 1706. Little is known of his early history. In 1732 he published a treatise entitled *The Moral World*, which teaches that "there is no evil in the moral world but what naturally ariseth from the nature of imperfect creatures, who always pursue their good, but cannot but be liable to error or mistake, and that evil or sin is inseparable in some degree from all created beings, and most consistent with the designs of a perfect Creator." He was called to answer for it before the Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, but no decision appears to have been reached. His most important work is *Philosophical Letters concerning the Being and Attributes of God* (1737). "These letters were written in the midst of pressing agricultural cares, to the Reverend Mr. Jackson, author of a work written in the spirit of Clarke, T*he Existence and Unity of God*. In these letters Dudgeon reaches a species of refined Spinozism, mingled with Berkeleyanism. He denies the distinction of substances into spiritual and material, maintains that there is no substance distinct from God, and that all our knowledge but of God is about ideas; they exist only in the mind, and their essence and modes consist only in their being perceived." In 1739 he published *A Catechism founded upon Experience and Reason, collected by a Father for the Use of his Children*; and in an ‘Introductory Letter' he wishes that natural religion alone was embraced by all men, and states that though he believes there was an extraordinary man sent into our world seventeen hundred years ago to instruct mankind, yet he doubts whether he ever commanded any of those things to be written concerning him which we have. The same year he published *A View of the Necessitarian or Best Scheme, freed from the Objections of M. Crousaz*, in his *Examination of Pope's Essay on Man*. Dudgeon died at Upsettlington, on the borders, January 1743. His works were published in a combined form in 1765, in a volume without a printer's name attached, showing that there was not as yet thorough freedom of thought in Scotland. His writings had for a time a name in the district (the Catechism reached a third edition), but afterwards passed away completely from public notice." McCosh, in *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, July 1865, page 552.

Dudith, Andreas Sbardellati,

was born at Buda, in Hungary, in 1533, and became bishop of Tina, in Dalmatia, in 1560. He was afterwards appointed successively bishop of Csanad, then of Fiinfkirchen, secretary of the Hungarian chapter, and in

1562 was sent to the Council of Trent as the representative of the Hungarian clergy. Here he advocated the giving of the cup to the laity very strenuously, and also opposed the celibacy of the clergy. A secret marriage he had contracted led him to resign his office in 1567. He then resided for some time at Cracow where he openly professed the Protestant religion; afterwards he lived on his estates in Moravia, and died at Breslau in 1589. In one part of his career he inclined to Socinianism, but in the latter years of his life he professed the evangelical doctrines. Some of his writings were published at Offenbach in 1610. In respect to toleration, Dudith was in advance of his age. He writes to Beza, "You try to justify the banishment of Ochino, and the execution of others, and you seem to wish Poland would follow your example. God forbid! When you talk of your Augsburg Confession, and your Helvetic Creed, and your unanimity, and your fundamental truths, I keep thinking of the sixth commandment, Thou shalt not kill (Benedict, *History of the Baptists*). The speeches made by him at Trent were published by Schwarz under the name of Lorandus Samuelfy (Halle, 1743). See Mosheim, *Church Hist*. (N.Y. 1854), 3:231, note; Stief, *Geschichte vom Leben Dudith's* (Breslau, 1756).

Duel

SEE COMBAT.

Duffield, George, D.D,

an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, October 7, 1732, and graduated at Nassau Hall in 1752, where, after completing his theological studies, he became tutor for two years. He was licensed in 1756, and having accepted a call from the united churches of Carlisle, Big Spring, and Monahan, Pennsylvania, was ordained in 1761. He was a very popular preacher, and a zealous promoter of revivals. In 1766 he undertook an important mission along the frontiers of Pennsylvania to the Potomac, with a view to the organization of churches. Some time after he was called to the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and became chaplain to the Colonial Congress for part of a session. He attended the American army through New Jersey in the darkest hours of the Revolution, and manifested himself on all occasions the uncompromising advocate of civil and religious freedom. He died February 2, 1790. He published *An Account of his Tour along the*

Frontiers of Pennsylvania: A Thanksgiving Sermon, 1783. Sprague, *Annals*, 3:186.

Du Fresne

SEE DUCANGE.

Dugdale, Sir William,

an English antiquary, was born in Warwickshire, September 12, 1605, and devoted his life chiefly to the study of English antiquities. He died February 10, 1686. Among his writings, the most notable is the Monasticon Anglicanum (1655-73, 3 volumes, fol. London; new ed. of volume 1:1682; 3d edit. 1817-29, 8 volumes, fol.), containing an account of the religious houses of England, with abundant illustrative plates; an English version (probably by James Wright), abridged, appeared in 1692, and another in 1718 (fol.), probably by John Stevens, who also published *The History of the Ancient Abbeys, Monasteries, etc*., being two additional volumes to Dugdale's *Monasticon* (2 volumes, fol. 1722-23). Dugdale also wrote a *History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1716, fol.; 2d edit. by Ellis, London, 1818). — Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 5:479.

Duguet, Jacques Joseph

an eminent Jansenist divine, was born at Montbrison, December 9, 1649. He was ordained priest in 1677. He belonged to the Congregation of the Oratory till 1686, when the Congregation declared against Cartesianism and Jansenism. He then went to Brussels to enjoy the society of his friend Antoine Arnauld, with whose doctrinal views he thoroughly sympathized. Duguet returned to France very shortly afterwards, and spent the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Paris October 25, 1733. His life was embittered by the theological disputes of the age; and his opposition to the bull *Unigenitus*, his attachment to Quesnel, whose piety and talents were akin to his own, with his general adhesion to the principles of Jansenism, caused him great annoyance from the ruling Church party. Among his works are *Explication du livre de la Genese selon la methode des Saints Peres* (Paris, 1732, 6 volumes, 12mo): — *Explication de livre de Job* (Paris, 1732, 4 volumes, 12mo): — *Traite de la croix de notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ* (Paris, 1713, 9 volumes): — *Traites dogmatiques sur l'Eucharistie* (1727, 12mo): — *Conferences Ecclesiastiques* (Paris, 2

volumes, 12mo): — *Explication des xxv premiers chapitres d'Isaie* (Paris, 1734, 6 volumes, 12mo). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 3:535.

Du Halde, Jean Baptiste

a learned Jesuit, was born at Paris, 1674, and entered the Jesuit order in 1708. His superiors gave him the task of editing the letters of missionary Jesuits, especially of those in China. The fruit of his labors appeared in his *Description geographiue et historique de 'l'empire de la Chine* (Paris, 1735, 4 volumes, fol.); translated, *The general History of China* (London, 1736,4 volumes, 8vo). After the death of Legobien (q.v.), Du Halde continued the publication of the celebrated *Letters Edifantes et Curieuses ecrites des missions etrangeres, depuis le 9'"e recueil jusqu'au 26*^{me}. He died at Paris August 18, 1743.

Duke

(from the Latin *dux*, a leader) stands in our version for two Hebrews terms: ãWLai(see a dissertation on this word by Sprenger, in the *Zeitschr. f. deutsch. nmorgen. Gesellschvft*, XII, 2:316), *alluph'*, a leader, which, besides its ordinary sense of guide or friend, is used technically of the *phylarch*, or head of a tribe or nation, especially of the Edomitish chieftains (<01665>Genesis 36:15-43; <02155>Exodus 15:15; <13015>1 Chronicles 1:51-54), rarely of the Jews ("governor," <38907>Zechariah 9:7; 12:5, 6), and once of chiefs in general ("captain," <24321>Jeremiah 13:21); also Ëysæ,*nasik'*, one anointed (usually in poetry), spoken of the magnates of Sihon, perhaps by a paraphrase for that king himself (<06321>Joshua 13:21), elsewhere of other "princes" (<19811>Psalm 83:11; <26230>Ezekiel 32:30; <27108>Daniel 11:8; "principal men," <33505>Micah 5:5).

Dukiphath

SEE LAPWING.

Dul'cimer

(Chald. hyņæwmÞs, *sumponyah'*; Sept. συμφωνία, Vulg. *symphonia*), a musical instrument, not in use among the Jews of Palestine, but mentioned in <27305>Daniel 3:5, 15, and at verse 10 under the shorter form of ayņþwsæ (*syphonya'*, where the text correctively points ayņÞWs), along with several other instruments, which Nebuchadnezzar ordered to be sounded before a

golden image set up for national worship during the period of the captivity of Judah. Luther translates it *lute*. Grotius adopts the view of Servius, who considers simphonia to be the same with the crooked *trumpet* (*tibia obliqua*, πλαγίαυλος); he also quotes Isidore (2:22), who speaks of it as a long drum. Rabbi Saadia Gaon (*Comm. on Dan*.) describes the *sumphonyah* as the bag-pipe, an opinion adopted by the author of *Schilte hag-giborim* (in Ugolini *Thesaur*. 32:39-42; see Joel Brill's *Preface to Mendelssohn's version of the Psalms*), by Kircher, Bartholoccius, and the majority of Biblical critics. The same instrument is still in use among peasants in the NW of Asia and in Southern Europe, where it is known by the similar name *sampogna* or *zampogna*. With respect to the etymology of the word a great difference of opinion prevails. Some trace it to the Gr. συμφωνία (whence Eng. symphony), and Calmet, who inclines to this view, expresses astonishment that a pure Greek word should have made its way into the Chaldee tongue: it is probable, he thinks, that the instrument dulcimer (A.V.) was introduced into Babylon by some Greek or Western-Asiatic musician who was taken prisoner by Nebuchadnezzar during one of his campaigns on the coast of the Mediterranean. Geseniuas adopts this derivation (Thes. *Hebrews* page 941), and cites Polybius (*ap. Athen*. 10:52, page 439, ed. Casaub.) and Isidore (*Orig*. 3:21) in confirmation. Others regard it as a Shemitic word, and connect it with ˆpms, "a tube" (Furst). The word ˆwpms occurs in the Talmud (*Sukka*, 36 *a*), where it evidently has the meaning of an air-pipe, with a case (*Chelim*, 16:8); but the explanation (*Chelim*, 2:6) by µypns is not clear (Rosenmuller on Daniel 1.c.). Landau (*Aruch*. Art. ˆwpms) considers it synonymous with siphon. Ibn Yahia, in his commentary on Daniel 3:5, renders it by çwnagrwa (ὄργανα), *organ*, the well known powerful musical instrument composed of a series of pipes. Rabbi Elias, whom Buxtorf quotes (*Lex. Talm*. col. 1504), translates it by the German word *Leier* (lyre). The old-fashioned spinet, the precursor of the harpsichord, is said to have resembled in tone the ancient dulcimer. The modern dulcimer is described by Dr. Busby (*Dict. of Music*) as a triangular instrument, consisting of a little chest, strung with about fifty wires cast over a bridge fixed at each end; the shortest wire is 18 inches in length, the longest 36; it is played with two small hammers held in the hands of the performer. *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*.

Dulcinists

followers of Dolcino, or Dulcinus, a priest and native of Novara, Italy, who followed Segarelli (q.v.) as leader of the Apostolici (q.v.), about AD 1300. He and his followers, being put under the ban, fortified a mountain in Novara, where they were taken prisoners. "He was charged with contempt of the Catholic hierarchy; also with asserting a succession of three theocracies — that those under the Father and the Son were already passed; that the third, under the Holy Spirit, was then in operation. His followers called themselves 'The Spiritual Congregation and the Order of the Apostles.' 'We alone (they said) are in the perfection in which the apostles were, and in the liberty which proceeds immediately from Jesus Christ. Wherefore we acknowledge obedience neither to the pope nor to any other human being; nor has he any power to excommunicate us . . . The pope can give no absolution from sins unless he be as holy as St. Peter, living in entire poverty and humility . . . so that all the popes and prelates since St. Sylvester, having deviated from that original holiness, are prevaricators and seducers, with the single exception of pope Celestine, Pietro di Morone, etc.' (See Fleury, 54:91, sec. 23) Lastly, to consummate his odium, his followers, who were not very numerous, were assailed with the primitive and accustomed calumny of promiscuous prostitution" (Waddington, *Church History*, chapter 22). Extracts from two of the writings of Dolcino are given in the *Historia Dulcini*, and in the *Additamentum ad Historiam Dulcini* in Muratori, *Script. Rer. Ital.* 9:425 sq., cited in Herzog, *Real-Ecyklop.* 3:468 sq., from which we condense the following statements.

After strongly asserting his orthodoxy, Dolcino predicted that in the year 1303 his opponents should be destroyed; that he and his followers should then, without molestation, preach publicly, and in these last days all Christians should embrace his doctrines. As this prophecy was not fulfilled in 1303, he postponed its fulfillment to 1304, under the pretense that God had especially called him, and made known to him the import of the Bible prophecies. He distinguished four epochs in the history of the divine life, each of which was good in the first instance, but had been superseded as it became degenerate. The patriarchs of the old covenant belonged to the first epoch. In the second, Christ appeared with his apostles, to supersede the degenerated Judaism by new virtues, especially celibacy, poverty, and the giving up of earthly goods. The third epoch began with pope Sylvester and

the emperor Constantine, when the Christians, in order to educate the newly-converted masses of heathen in Christian life and duty, were obliged to accept riches, and show the heathen how to apply the goods of this world to the honor of God. But zeal waxed cold, and the love of the world increased, until a reaction appeared in the Order of St Benedict. As this effort to induce self-denial in the clergy and the monks failed, the more stringent rules of the Dominicans and Franciscans followed. But these also were of no effect. The fourth epoch, according to Dolcino, was the renewal of apostolic life by Segarelli and himself, to continue to the end of the world. This apostolical life demands self-denial and renunciation of earthly possessions, and consists in the unity of the brethren in the love of the Holy Ghost, without external forms, usages, or regulations. From these doctrines it would appear that the teachings of the abbot Joachim (q.v.) had had a certain effect upon Dolcino, and that the views which Joachim cherished in ie rard to the era of the Holy Ghost were embraced by Dolcino, although this is generally denied. Aside from the apocalyptical prophecies, the doctrines of Dolcino seem to be penetrated by a mysticism which repudiated external things, considering them as the cause of evil. Love, in its perfection, was to be realized as the inner bond of souls, supreme over all law. All human relations, especially that of man and wife, were to be founded upon a merely spiritual union; all law, as well as all right of property, were to be removed, so that nothing should prevent man from enjoying the highest state of perfection. Dolcino lived himself with a former nun, Margaretha, whom he called his *diletissima soror*, in voluntary poverty. The dangerous tendency of such doctrines is obvious. That Dolcino perceived the true nature and causes of certain abuses in the Church, and that he honestly desired to correct them can hardly be questioned. His memory was long cherished by the common people; to them he seemed a hero and martyr, while to the armies which persecuted him he seemed a false prophet, punished by the powerful arm of God. Dante compares Dolcino to Mohammed (*Inferno*, 28:55, etc.). Dolcino was tortured to death at Vercelli by order of Clement V. See Mosheim (Murdoch's ed.), Church History, book 3, c. 13, part 2, chapter 5, § 14; Krone, *Fra Dolcino und d'e Patarener* (Leips; l,844); Mariotti, *Frad Doelcino and his Times* (London. 1853); Gieseler, *Church History*, 2, § 87; and APOSTOLICI *SEE APOSTOLICI* ; SEGARELLI *SEE SEGARELLI* .

Dulia

(δουλεία), worship paid to saints and angels. In the Greek Church, a distinction is made between λατρεία, worship due only to God, and τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις, adoration which may be rendered to images. Authority for this distinction is found in a decision of the second Council of Nicaea, AD 787 (sess. 7), as follows: "We decide that the holy images, whether painted or graven, or of whatever kind they may be, ought to be exposed to view, whether in churches, upon the sacred vessels and vestments, upon walls, or in private houses, or by the wayside, since the oftener Jesus Christ, his blessed mother, and the saints are seen in their images, the more will men be led to think of the originals, and to love them. Salutation and the adoration of honor ought to be paid to images, but not the worship of latria, which belongs to God alone: nevertheless, it is lawful to burn lights before them, and to incense them, as is usually done with the cross, the books of the Gospels, and other sacred things, according to the pious use of the ancients; for honor so paid to the image is transmitted to the original which it represents. Such is the doctrine of the holy fathers, and the tradition of the Catholic Church; and we order that they who dare to think or teach otherwise, if bishops or other clerks, shall be deposed; if monks or laymen, shall be excommunicated" (Landon, *Manual of Councils*, 437; Labbe and Cossart, *Concil*. 7:1-963; Mansi, *Concil*. 13:374 sq.; Hefele, *Contiliengeschichte*, § 354).

In the Roman Church a distinction is made between latria (λατρεία), worship due to God; dulia (δουλεία), adoration or invocation of saints and angels; and hyperdulia (ὑπερδουλεία), due to the Virgin Mary alone (Council of Trent, sess. 25). Protestants, of course, reject all these distinctions. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 188; Haag, *Histoire des Dogmes Chretiens*, 2:77; Burnet, *On the Articles*, art. 22; and the articles IDOLATRY *SEE IDOLATRY* ; *SEE IMAGE WORSHIP*; *SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS*.

Du'mah

(Hebrews *Dumah'*, דּוּמָה, *silence*), the name of a (person and) district and also of a town.

1. (Sept. Δουμά, Ἰδουμά, Ἰδουμαία; Vulg. *Duma*.) The fourth son of Ishmael (BC post 2064), and the tribe descended from him, as hence of the

region inhabited by them in Arabia (<01254>Genesis 25:14; <13010>1 Chronicles 1:30). In Isaiah (<23211>Isaiah 21:11), the "burden of Dumah" is coupled with Seir, the forest of Arabia, and Kedar. It is doubtless the same called at this day Stony or Syrian Duma, situated on the confines of the Syrian desert and Arabia, with a fortified castle (Niebuhr, *Arabien*, page 344), marked on D'Anville's map under lat. 291°, long. 580; the Dumath lying 5 or 7 days journey from Damascus, and 13 from Median, in the district Jof or Sirhan (Abulfeda, *Tab. Arab*. ed. Gagner, page 50); probably also the Dumaitha of Ptolemy (5:19). This identification (see Freytag, *Hist. Falebi*, page 53) with the name of a town in the north-western part of the peninsula is strengthened by Arab traditionists, who have the same belief (see the MS. *hir-at ez-Zeman*). The lexicographers and geographers of their nation expressly state that it is correctly "Dumat el-Jendel," or "Duma el-Jendel" signifying "Dumah of the stones or blocks of stone," of which it is said to have been built (MS. *Sihah*, *Marasid*, and *Mushtarak*, s.v.). El Jendel is said by some to mean "stones such as a man can lift" (see the Kamus), and seems to indicate that the place was built of unhewn or Cyclopean masonry, similar to that of very ancient structures. The town itself, which is one of the "Kureieyt" of Wady el ura (see the *Marasid*, s.v. Dumah), appears to be called Duma, and. the fortress which it contains to have the special appellation of "Marid."' *SEE ARABIA*.

2. (Sept. Ρεμνά v.r. Ρουμά; Vulgate *Ruma*.) A town in the mountain district of Judah (<06552>Joshua 15:52), in the group west by south of Hebron (Keil, *Comment*. in loc.). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomnast. s.v. Δουμά, *Duma*) say it was then a large village (κώμη μεγίστη), 17 miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrin), in the district of Daroma (i.e., "the south," from the Hebrew μwrD). Dr. Robinson passed the ruins of a village called ed Daumeh, 6 miles south-west of Hebron (*Res*. 1:314), and this is probably the same place. (See also Kiepert's *Map*, 1856; and Van de Velde's *Memoir*, page 308) *SEE RUMAH*.

Dumb

(μLa, *illem*; but in <36209>Habakkuk 2:9, μmD, *silent*; Gr. κωφός, which also signifies deaf, since the two defects generally accompany each other; also ἄλαλος, speechless, <41037>Mark 7:37; 9:17, 25; ἄφωνος, voiceless, <44832>Acts 8:32; <46212>1 Corinthians 12:2; <61026>2 Peter 2:16; and σιωπῶν, <42022>Luke 1:20), has the following significations:

(1.) One unable to speak by reason of natural infirmity (<2304>Exodus 4:11).

(2.) One unable to speak by reason of want of knowing what to say, or how to say it; what proper mode of address to use, or what reasons to allege in his own behalf (<2308>Proverbs 31:8).

(3.) One unwilling to speak (<1909>Psalm 39:9). We have a remarkable instance of this venerating dumbness, or silence, in the case of Aaron (<3803>Leviticus 10:3), after Nadab and Abihu, his sons, were consumed by fire. "Aaron held his peace;" did not exclaim against the justice of God, I but saw the propriety of the divine procedure, and humbly acquiesced in it. Christ restored a man who was dumb from daemoniacal influence (<4032>Matthew 9:32, 33; <4214>Luke 11:14), and another who was both blind and dumb from the same cause (<4022>Matthew 12:22). The man who was deaf and had an impediment in his speech (<4032>Mark 7:32-35), whom Christ restored, was not dumb, nor probably deaf by nature, but was one who had a natural impediment to enunciation, or who, having early lost his hearing, gradually lost much of his speech, and had become a stammerer. Such an impediment is either natural, arising from what is called a bos, or ulcer, by which any one is, as we say, tongue-tied, or brought on when, from an early loss of hearing, the membrane of the tongue becomes rigid and unable to perform its office. *SEE DEAF*; *SEE SILENCE*.

Dumont, Gabriel

was born at Crest, in Dauphiny, August 10, 1680. His first settlement was over the Walloon church in Leipzig. In 1720 he was called to Rotterdam. Here he was held in very high estimation. He was also for a time chaplain to the Dutch embassy at Paris. His essays, included in Saurin's Discours sur la Bible, and also in Masson's *Histoire critique de la republique des lettres*, bear witness to his extensive knowledge, and especially to his acquaintance with the Oriental languages. A volume of valuable sermons from his pen was published after his death by his colleague, De Superville (Rotterdam, 1749, 8vo). He died January 1, 1748.

Du Moulin, Charles

SEE MOULIN, DU.

Du Moulin, Pierre

SEE MOULIN,

Du Dumplers

a name of reproach given to the Dunkers, or German Baptists. *SEE BAPTISTS*, *SEE GERMAN*.

Dunash ben-Labrath ha-Levi

an eminent Jewish scholar, was born in Bagdad about AD 920, spent most of his life at Fez, and died at Cordova about AD 980. His writings contributed largely to the development of Hebrew lexicography and Biblical exegesis. These writings are chiefly in the form of controversies with Saadia (q.v.) and Menachem ben-Saruk (q.v.). His criticisms of the grammatical and exegetical works of Saadia are entitled t/bWvT]rpse (the Book of Animadversions), only fragments of which remain. They show that he was a better grammarian, especially as to knowledge of the verb, than Saadia. These fragments are preserved in the rty,tpic], a work of Aben Ezra (q.v.) written in defense of Sa'adia, published with a critical commentary by Lippmann, and with a preface by Jost (Frankf. a. M. 1843). His criticism of Menachem's Hebrew Lexicon contains, according to Furst, 200 articles, each concluding with some terse remark or saying in rhyme. It was published with notes by H. Filipowski, and with remarks by Leopold, Dukes, and Kirchheimer, by the London Antiquarian Society (London. and Edinb. 1855). The principal points may be summed up in the following:

1. Dunash classifies verbs and adverbs separately, and objects to the derivation of the former from the latter.

2. Distinguishes the servile letters of verbs from nouns similar in form by grammatical rules.

3. Shows the advantage of the application of the Chaldee and Arabic in the explanation of Hebrew words.

4. Departs in more than twenty-four different verses from the Masoretic text, which by many are thought to yield a better sense.

First says of this work that it is "of great interest in relation to a knowledge of Hebrew philology, of the new Hebrew poetry, and of the state of Jewish culture in Spain in the tenth century." The influence which Dunash exercised over Jewish grammarians and expositors of the Bible is seen in the frequent quotations made from his works by the principal

lexicographers and commentators, such as Rashi, Joseph Cara, Aben-Ezra, and Kimchi Dukes, *Liter. Mittheil. uber die attest. hebraisceien Exegeten, Grammatiker u. Lexicographen* (Stuttg. 1844), page 149, etc.; Steinschiieider, *Cat. Libr. Hebr.*; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebr. Literature*, pages 373 and 379; Furst, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Leips. and London. 1867), *Preface*, 25 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop*. 1:709.

Dunash

(ADONIM) ben-Tanim, the Babylonian, born at Irak about AD 900, was educated at Keirawan by the celebrated Isaac Israeli (q.v.), and died about 960. At the age of twenty he had become so proficient in Hebrew learning that he was able to write an elaborate critique of the works of Saadia, besides writing also a special Hebrew grammar containing a comparison of the linguistic characteristic of the Hebrew and Arabic languages, and a commentary on the Book of Creation. His writings (mostly yet in manuscript) are often referred to by Aben-Ezra and other expositors. Dunash was the first who maintained that the Hebrew language has diminutives, which are effected by the endings ˆ/ and ˆW; e.g. ˆ/nymæ; <10130>2 Samuel 13:20. Aben-Ezra opposes this opinion, and asserts that the Hebrew language has no diminutives; but Ewald, in his Grammar (c. 167), has espoused Dunash's opinion. — Kitto, *Cyclopcedia*. 1:710; Furst, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, Preface, page 25.

Dung

(prop. [ypæ; *tsaphi'a*, <26045>Ezekiel 4:15, spoken exclusively of animals, such as the cow or camel; also ˆmDo; *do nen*, ordure, as spread on land, <12937>2 Kings 9:37; <19910>Psalm 83:10; <24082>Jeremiah 8:2; 9:22; 16:4; 25:33; while vrP, *pe'resh*, signifies feces as contained in the entrails of victims, <02914>Exodus 29:14; <03411>Leviticus 4:11; 8:17; 16:27; <04905>Numbers 9:5; <39203>Malachi 2:3. On the other hand, human excrement is specially denoted by, haxe; *tseah'*, <05313>Deuteronomy 23:13; <26042>Ezekiel 4:12; a sense also applied to llGe; *ge'lel*, <18207>Job 20:7; <26042>Ezekiel 4:12,15; <36017>Zephaniah 1:17; but not necessarily to llG; *gal'*, <11140>1 Kings 14:10. The Greek word is *ricorpo*, whether of men or brutes; used in the Sept. for all the above, but found in the N.T. only in the form κοπρία, *manure*, <42313>Luke 13:8; while σκύβαλον, <50308>Philippians 3:8, properly signifies refuse. The use of such substances among the Jews was twofold.

1. *As manure*. This consisted either of straw steeped in liquid manure (hnmdmymB, lit. in dung-water, 2510Isaiah 25:10), or. the sweepings (hjWs, 2505Isaiah 5:25) of the streets and roads, which were carefully removed from about the houses and collected in heaps (tPvpa) outside the walls of the towns at fixed spots (hence the dung-gate at Jerusalem, 1613Nehemiah 2:13), and thence removed in due course to the fields (Mishna, *Shabb*. 3, § 1-3). See below. The mode of applying manure to trees was by digging holes about their roots and inserting it (4238Luke 13:8), as still practiced in Southern Italy (Trench, *Parables*, page 356). In the case of sacrifices the dung was burned outside the camp (2914Exodus 29:14; 1411Leviticus 4:11; 8:17; 5Numbers 19:5) hence the extreme opprobrium of the threat in 3Malachi 2:3. Particular directions were laid down in the law to enforce cleanliness with regard to human ordure (2312Deuteronomy 23:12 sq.) it was the grossest insult to turn a man's house into a receptacle for it (tarjmi 2107 2 Kings 10:27; Wlwn] 1611Ezra 6:11; 5Daniel 2:5; 3:29, A.V., " dunghill"); public establishments of that nature are still found in the large towns of the East (Russell's *Aleppo*, 1:34). The expression to "cast out as dung" implied not only the offensiveness of the object, but also the ideas of removal (1140 1 Kings 14:10), and still more exposure (2037 2 Kings 9:37; 2Jeremiah 8:2). The reverence of the later Hebrews would not permit the pronunciation of some of the terms used in Scripture, and accordingly more delicate words were substituted in the margin (ha/x, *tsoht'*, for µyaæj} *charaim*, or µyrjæ} *charim*, 2505 2 Kings 6:25; 10:27; 18:27; 2Isaiah 36:12). The occurrence of such names as Gilalai, Dimnah, Madmenah, and Madmannah, shows that these ideas of delicacy did not extend to ordinary matters. The term σκύβαλα (A.V., "ldung," 8Philippians 3:8) im applied by Josephus (*War*, 5:13, 7) to ordure (comp. Ecclus 27:4). *SEE MANURE*.

2. *As fuel*. In a district where wood is scarce, dung is so valuable for this purpose that little of it is spared for the former. The difficulty of procuring firewood in Syria, Arabia, and Egypt has therefore made dung in all ages highly prized as a substitute it was used for heating lime kilns (Theophr. *Lap*. 69), ovens, and for baking cakes (2Ezekiel 4:12,15), the even heat which it produced adapting it peculiarly for the latter operation. Cows and camels dung is still used for a similar purpose by the Bedouins (Burckhardt's *Notes*, 1:57) they even form a species of pan for frying eggs out of it (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1:39); in Egypt the dung is mixed with straw and

formed into flat, round cakes, which are dried in the sun (Lane, *Mod. Eg*. 1:252; 2:141). This use of dung for fuel by the ancient Israelites, however, is collected incidentally from the passage in which the prophet Ezekiel, being commanded, as a symbolical action, to bake his bread with human dung, excuses himself from the use of an unclean thing, and is permitted to employ cows dung instead (<2642>Ezekiel 4:12-15). This shows that the dung of animals, at least of clean animals, was usual, and that no ideas of ceremonial uncleanness were attached to its employment for this purpose. The use of cow dung for fuel is known to European villagers, who, at least in the west of England, prefer it in baking their bread "under the crock," on account of the long continued and equable heat which it maintains. It is there also not unusual in a summer evening to see aged people traveling the green lanes with baskets to collect the cakes of cow dung which have dried upon the road. This helps out the ordinary fire of wood, and makes it burn longer. In many thinly wooded parts of south-western Asia, the dung of cows, camels, horses, asses, whichever may happen to be the most common, is collected with great zeal and diligence from the streets and highways, chiefly by young girls. They also hover on the skirts of travelers, and there are often amusing scrambles among them for the droppings of the cattle. The dung is mixed up with chopped straw and made into cakes, which are stuck up by their own adhesiveness against the walls of the cottages, or are laid upon the declivity of a hill, until sufficiently dried. It is not unusual to see a whole village with its walls thus garnished, which has a singular and not very agreeable appearance to a European traveler. Towards the end of autumn, the result of the summer collection of fuel for winter is shown in large conical heaps or stacks of dried dung upon the top of every cottage. The usages of the Jews in this matter were probably similar in kind, although the extent to which they prevailed cannot now be estimated. (See Kitto, *Pictorial Hist. of the Jews*, 2, page 349.) *SEE FUEL*.

Dung-Gate

(tP/vÞah; r [iv; *sha'ar ha-ashpoth*, <1614>Nehemiah 3:14, or tPvÞah; r [iv; 2:13; 12:31; contracted tWpv]* h r [ic; *sha'ar ha-shepoth'*, 3:13, i.e., gate of the dung-hills; Sept. ἡ πύλη [v. r. in 12:31, τὸ τοίχος] τῆς κοπρίας; Vulg. *porta sterquilinii* or [2:13] *stercoris*; A.V. "dung-port" in 2:13) a gate of ancient Jerusalem on the south-west quarter, 1000 cubits from the Valley Gate (<1613>Nehemiah 3:13) toward the south (<1623>Nehemiah

12:31); a position that fixes it at the SW angle of Matthew Zion (see Strongs *Harm. and Expos of the Gospel*. App. 2, page 11). It was doubtless so called from the piles of garbage collected in the valley of Tophet (q.v.) below. *SEE BETHSO*. (Compare the Esquiline Hill at Rome.) Josephus (*War,* 5:4, 2) calls it the Gate of the Essenes (ηἘσσηνῶν πύλη). *SEE JERUSALEM*.

Dunghill

(t/Pçæ; *ashpoth*, <091318>1 Samuel 2:8; <193807>Psalm 113:7; <250405>Lamentations 4:5; hnmdjmi madmenah, a heap of compost, <232510>Isaiah 25:10; Chald. Wlwn] *nevalu'*, <150711>Ezra 7:11 or ylæ;n] *nevali'*, <270205>Daniel 2:5; 3:29, a sink; Greek κοπρία, Ecclus. 22:2; <421435>Luke 14:35). From <232510>Isaiah 25:10, we learn that the bulk of manure was increased by the addition of straw, which was, of course, as with us, left to rot in the dunghill. Some of the regulations connected with this use of dung we learn from the Talmud. The heaping up of a dunghill in a public place exposed the owner to the repair of any damage it might occasion, and any one was at liberty to take it away (*Baba Kama*, 1:3, 3). Another regulation forbade the accumulation of the dunghill to be removed in the seventh or sabbatic year to the vicinity of any ground under culture (*Shabb*. 3:1), which was equivalent to an interdiction of the use of manure in that year; and this must have occasioned some increase of labor in the year ensuing. *SEE AGRICULTURE*. To sit on a dung heap was a sign of the deepest dejection (<091318>1 Samuel 2:8; <193807>Psalm 113:7; <250405>Lamentations 4:5; comp. <180208>Job 2:8, Sept. and Vulg.). We are informed by Plutarch (*De Superstitione*) that the Syrians were affected with a particular disease characterized by violent pains of the bones, ulcerations over the whole body, swelling of the feet and abdomen, and wasting of the liver. This malady was in general referred to the anger of the gods, but was supposed to be more especially inflicted by the Syrian goddess on those who had eaten some kinds of fish deemed sacred to her (*Menander apud Porphyr*.). In order to appease the offended divinity, the persons affected by this disorder were taught by the priests to put on sackcloth, or old tattered garments, and to sit on a dunghill; or to roll themselves naked in the dirt as a sign of humiliation and contrition for their offense (Persius, *Sat*. 5; Martial, *Epigr*. 4:4). This will remind the reader of Job's conduct under his affliction, and that of other persons mentioned in Scripture as rolling themselves in the dust, etc. *SEE DUST*.

Dungal

a writer of the 9th century, of whose origin and history little is known, but who is supposed to have been of Scotch or Irish birth. According to Irish accounts, he was abbot of Glendolough, and after the destruction of his monastery by the Danes he fled to France. He calls himself "a recluse," and the *Hist. Litt. de la France* (4:493) notes him as a monk of the abbey of St Denis, in France. Muratori, however (*Rer. Ital*. 4:611), describes him as a monk of Pavia, in Italy. He wrote against the reforming movements of Claudius of Turin (q.v.), in 827, *Responsa contra perversas Claudii Taurinensis Episcopi sententias*, in which he defends the invocation of saints, the adoration of relics, etc., but seeks to guard these usages from superstitious abuse. The book was first published by *Papirius Masson* (Paris, 1608), and may be found in *Bibliotheca Max. Patrum* (Lyons), 14:196233; also in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, tom. 103. He was also celebrated as an astronomer. Moore, *History of Ireland*; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:333; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 23:414.

Dungeon

(רֹבּ, *bor*, <01015>Genesis 40:15; 41:14, etc., a pit, as often rendered; fully רֹבּהיתבּ, house of the pit, <02229>Exodus 12:29; <24676>Jeremiah 37:16), is properly distinguished from the ordinary prison (אלכ, or אלכ תיבּ, also הרצמ or רמוסמ) as being more severe, and usually consisting of a deep cell or cistern (<24806>Jeremiah 38:6; hence the propriety of the Hebrews word which indicates a hole), like the Roman inner prison (ἡ ἐσωτέρα φυλακή, <44624>Acts 16:24). Incarceration, a punishment so common in Egypt (<01940>Genesis 39:20 sq.; 40:3 sq.; 41:10; 42:19), was also in use among the later Israelites (comp. <15726>Ezra 7:26). But it is nowhere mentioned in the law, perhaps because among a people, every man of whom was a landed proprietor, it was easily dispensed with, a fine being always easy to inflict; partly, too, because it seemed improper to take cultivators of the earth from their land for any length of time. (Other reasons are suggested by Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, 5:45 so.) Arrest is mentioned, indeed (<03242>Leviticus 24:12), but not as a punishment. The guilty was simply kept in ward to await sentence (comp. <14826>2 Chronicles 18:26; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth*. II, 1:186). So it was a legal principle in Rome that a prison was to be used only to keep men, not to punish them. Under the later kings imprisonment was used as a penalty, yet, as it seems, not by judicial sentence, but at the

will of the sovereign, especially in the case of too plain spoken prophets (<14160>2 Chronicles 16:10; <24002>Jeremiah 20:2; 32:2 sq.; 33:1 sq.; 37:15). After the exile it became very customary (<40102>Matthew 11:2; <42030>Luke 3:20; <43024>John 3:24), and was sometimes used to punish religious offenses (<44018>Acts 4:18, 21; 8:3; 12:4; 22:4; 26:10), and in cases of debt (<40830>Matthew 18:30; comp. *Arvieux*, 1:411). The most ancient prisons were simply water cisterns, out of which, since the sides came together above, one could not easily escape without aid (<01720>Genesis 37:20,22). Imprisonment in these was often made the more unpleasant by deep mud (<24806>Jeremiah 38:6). There were at the gates, or in the watch houses at the palaces of kings, or the houses of the commanders of the body guard, who were the executors of criminal sentences, especial state prisons (<24002>Jeremiah 20:2; 32:2; <01910>Genesis 39:20 sq.; 40:4; comp. <24705>Jeremiah 37:15, 20; Harmer, *Obs*. 3:250 sq.). A prison of the kind last named is called prison house (tkPhMhi tyBe; <14160>2 Chronicles 16:10). The prisoners were kept in chains (<07162>Judges 16:21; <10334>2 Samuel 3:34; <24401>Jeremiah 40:1). Under the Roman empire they were chained, by one or both hands, to the soldiers who watched them (<44120>Acts 12:4; 21:33; Pliny, Ep. 10:65; Seneca, *Ep*. 5, and *De tranquil. An*. 10; Athen. 5. 213; Joseph. *Ant*. 18:6, 7), as is still the custom in Abyssinia (Rippell, *Abys*. 1:218). Sometimes the Israelites chained them by the feet to a wooden block (<18327>Job 13:27; 33:11; <44624>Acts 16:24; comp. Wetstein in loc.; Jacob, *ad Lucian. Toxar*. page 104), or by the neck (comp. Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 592), or by the hands and feet at once. Such severe imprisonment is to be understood in <24002>Jeremiah 20:2; 29:26, where our version has "in the stocks" (comp. Symmach. βασανιστήριον, στρεβλωτήριον; and the Greek κύφων, Schol. in *Aristoph. Plut*. page 476). Poor and meagre fare seems to have added to the severity of the penalty (<14826>2 Chronicles 18:26). An example of lax state imprisonment appears in <11237>1 Kings 2:37. Visits to prisoners are allowed with comparative freedom in the East (<42536>Matthew 25:36; <24208>Jeremiah 32:8; see Rosenmuller, *Morgenland*, 5:101). Roman prison discipline appears especially in the Acts of the Apostles. The keeper of the prison is called in Greek δεσμοφύλαξ (<44162>Acts 16:23; 27:36), but once πράκτωρ (<42158>Luke 12:58), and was armed (<44162>Acts 16:27). *SEE PRAETORIUM*. See in general A. Bombardini. *De carcere et antiquo ejus usu* (Padua, 1713). *SEE PRISON*.

Dung gate; Dung hill; Dung port

SEE DUNG.

Dunham, Darius,

one of the pioneers of Episcopal Methodism in Canada. He entered the itinerant ministry in 1788, and located in 1800. Mr. Dunham was a man of strong character, great practical ability, and abundant wit and satire. See Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism* (NY 12mo); Coles, *The Supernumerary* (N.Y. 18mo); Stevens, *Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, volume 3, chapter 6.

Dunin, Martin Von

archbishop of Posen, was born November 11, 1774, at Wat, near Rawa. He studied theology at Bromberg and at Rome, in the Collegium Germanicum, and was ordained priest in 1797. In 1829 he was made administrator of the archdiocese of Posen; as such he warned, in a pastoral of December 8, 1830, the Polish members of the diocese against taking part in the Polish Revolution. On July 10, 1831, he was consecrated archbishop of Gnesen and Posen. In 1834 he reorganized the episcopal seminaries of those two cities. At the beginning of the year 1837 arch bishop Dunin found his mind troubled by the deviations from the strict rules of the Church of Rome which had gradually come to be established in his diocese with regard to "mixed" marriages (between Roman Catholics and Protestants). He therefore asked the Prussian government to allow him either to publish in his diocese the brief on the subject by pope Pius VIII, or to ask in Rome for new instructions, or to proceed according to the bull of pope Benedict XIV of the year 1748. All these requests were refused by the Prussian government, and Dunin therefore, on February 27, 1838, by a pastoral letter, forbade the clergy of his diocese, under penalty of suspension, to solemnize any mixed marriage at all. A royal rescript (Cabinets order) demanded of him a recall of this letter; and, when he declined this, a ministerial rescript declared it null and void. Against the archbishop himself criminal proceedings were begun. Before the sentence was published, the king, in March, 1839, called him to Berlin to attempt a compromise. When it was found impossible to effect this, the archbishop was sentenced on April 25 to six months imprisonment in a Prussian fortress. The king pardoned him, and again summoned him to Berlin to

make propositions for a compromise; but when the archbishop suddenly, without informing the government, left Berlin on October 4, he was re-asserted on October 6, and removed to the fortress of Colberg. There he remained until August 1840, when the new king, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, desirous to end the conflict between the State and the Church of Rome, set him at liberty, after Dunin had signed certain declarations. He now instructed his clergy to desist from demanding any promises from persons about to conclude a "mixed" marriage, but also to refrain from anything that might imply an approval of such marriages. Another pastoral letter of February 1842, provided that in the case of persons who, contrary to the provisions of the Church, had concluded a mixed marriage, the priests must, in each individual case, judge by the disposition of the parties whether they might admit them to the sacraments or not. The archbishop died December 26, 1842. *SEE PRUSSIA*. A life of archbishop Dunin was published by F. Pohl (*Martin von Dunin*, Marienburg, 1843). The conflict of archbishop Dunin and of archbishop Droste (q.v.), of Cologne, with the Prussian government, is treated of in a special work by the Church historian K. Hase (*Die beiden Erzbischife*, Leips. 1839). Herzog, *Real-Encykl*. 3:549; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex*. 3:334.

Dunkers

SEE BAPTISTS (GERMAN).

Dunn, Thomas

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia in 1774; while young emigrated to Ohio; entered the Ohio Conference in 1835, and died at Cincinnati in April, 1850. "In 1837 Mr. Dunn addressed a note to the Western Christian Advocate, in which he called attention to the condition of the Germans in this country, suggested the importance of a German press, and forwarded a subscription for that purpose." This was the first public movement towards the important work of German Methodism. He was "a good man, a fervid and persuasive preacher a devoted pastor, a courteous gentleman, and a great peace maker. His understanding was solid, his impulses generous, and his influence strong and sweet. He died April, 1850. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:493 Thomson, *Biographical Sketches*, page 176.

Duns Scotus, Johannes

(Doctor Subtitis), on, of the most eminent of the Scholastic theologians, was born, according to one account, about 1265, at Dunstance, near Alnwick, Northumberland; according to another, at Duns, or Dunse, in Berwickshire, Scotland. In fact, both the place and the date of his birth are unknown. At an early age he joined the Minorit Friars, and was sent by them to Oxford, where he became fellow of Merton College. In 1301 he was appointed to the theological chair in Oxford, which he filled with so great reputation that it is said more than 30,000 scholars came to Oxford to hear him. In 1304 he removed to Paris, where he was made doctor of theology, and soon rose to the head of the theological schools. He here distinguished himself especially by his advocacy of the immaculate conception (q.v.) of the Virgin Mary against Thomas Aquinas and the Dominicans. He influenced the University of Paris to adopt this heresy. In 1308 Duns Scotus was ordered by Gonsalvo, the general of the Minorites, to Cologne, to oppose the Beguines. On the road he was met in solemn pomp, and conducted into the town by the whole body of citizens. He died of an apoplexy at Cologne November 8, 1308. Paul Jovius relates that, when he fell from apopleixy, he was immediately interred as dead; but that afterwards coming to his senses, he languished in a most miserable manner in his coffin, beating his head and hands against its sides till he died.

His philosophical views are thus stated by Tennemann: "His celebrated attack on the system of Thomas Aquinas drew this skillful reasoner very frequently into vain and idle distinctions, but in all his dialectic disputes he maintained a steady zeal for the promotion of real knowledge. He endeavored to ascertain some certain principle of knowledge, whether rational or empirical, and applied himself to demonstrate the truth and necessity of revelation. As a Realist, he differed from Thomas Aquinas by asserting that the universal is contained in the particular, not merely in posse, but in actu; that it is not created by the understanding, but communicated to it; and that the nature of things is determined in particular or universal by a higher or absolute principle. In Psychology he opposed the belief that the faculties of the soul are distinct. The object of Philosophy was, in his opinion, to become cognizant of the nature of things, or 'what is.' Although human philosophy teaches the sufficiency of reason, and that supernatural disclosures are superfluous, the theologian regards a certain supernatural revelation as necessary, because man can

never attain to certain truth by inspecting effects or secondary causes, whether ideas or sensations. The object of theology is God, an infinite Being, and the first principle of all things. Yet he is not to be regarded in the light of his infinity, but of his divinity, the latter idea being more perfect than the former, because God cannot be conceived apart from infinity, though infinity can be conceived without God. He attributed indeterminate freedom to God, and hence regarded the subjective will of God as the principle of morality. Sometimes he expressed doubts as to the possibility of a rational theology. Duns Scotus was the founder of a school, the Scotists, who distinguished themselves for subtlety of disputation, and for incessant disputes with the Thomists. These disputes were so frequently mixed up with human passions that science derived from them little benefit; and it very frequently happened that the points in question, instead of being elucidated, were obscured through their controversies" (Tennemann, *Manual History of Philosophy*, § 268). *SEE SCHOLASTIC*.

As to the will, Duns Scotus maintained its freedom, without any determinism. In fact, "the leading distinction between the Thomist and the Scotist psychology respects the relation of thinking and willing, which, although they are found united, unitive, in the soul, are really (formaliter) distinct, as well from each other as from the soul (*Op. Oxon*. 2, *d*. 16). The determinism of Thomas, according to which the will necessarily chooses what the thought presents to it as the best, Duns combats most emphatically. Not only that the will has the power to determine itself entirely alone (*ibid. d.* 25), and, under certain circumstances, to act against the reason (Disput. sctbtil. 9 and 16), but, in decided opposition to Thomas, it may be said that in very many cases the reason is determined by the will, e.g. when I will to think. It is most judicious to distinguish two different modes of thinking the first, which precedes the will; the second, which follows it; but even the former does not determine the will, for voluntas est superior intellectu (*Op. Oxon*. ii, *d.* 42, *qu.* 4). With Duns the will is entirely identical with liberum arbitrium; what it does is contingens et evitable, while the intellect obeys necessity (*Op. Oxon*, 2, *d.* 25). The function of the latter is to furnish to the will the material which it combines, the possibility being given to it of willing entire opposites (*Op. Oxon*. i, *dist.* 39)" (Erdmann, translated by Starbuck, *Amer. Presb. Review*, April 1865, page 299).

On the *Theology* of Scotus, we take the following from Erdmann's article just cited: "The peculiarities of Duns's psychology, as well as his deviations

therein from Thomas, reflect themselves in the manner in which he views the essence of God and the destiny of man, and, therefore, in his theology and ethics. As to his theology since the existence of God might be known without supernatural illumination, there is, therefore, ex puris naturalibus, a knowledge of the divine essence. But just as the former could not be proved a priori, the latter also cannot be derived from the highest metaphysical idea of the ens (*Theorem*. 14), but we raise ourselves to it by proceeding from the vestigium and the image of God. Our knowledge of the essence of God is therefore not intuitive, but abstractive (*Rep. Paris. Prol. qu*. 2). The distinction in the human soul between the intellectus, whose center is the memory and the will, must, and that eminenter, be found in the original ground of man, in God. Accordingly, in God, understanding and will must be distinguished, of which the former acts naturaliter, the latter libere; the former is the ground and sum of all necessity, the latter of all contingency, and therefore may be named the possibility of the contingent in God (*Rep. Paris*. 2, *d*. 1, *qu*. 3; *ibid*. 1, *d*. 40). Inasmuch, now, as these two determinations (Bestimmungen) give the foundation of Duns's doctrine of the Trinity, since the Son, as Verbum, has his ground in the memoria perfecta, the Holy Ghost, on the other hand, in the spiratio operated through the will (*Rep. Paris*. 1, *d*. 13; *Op. Oxon*. 1, *d*. 10 et al.); he does not hesitate to ascribe to the natural man such capacity as that he may know the Trinity (*Quodl. qu*. 14). These intra-divine relations (notlonalia) through which the three persons are, are the first deductions resulting from the essence of God, and are therefore to be derived from the known essentialibus (*ibid. qu*. 1). The case is otherwise with every relation of God ad extra. For, since all out of God proceeds from the divine will, and this cause acts contingenter (*Op. Oxon*. 1, *d*. 39), it can by no means be proved that anything out of God must exist, and that it must exist as it is. Truly his own being does God know and will of necessity; all else is only secundario volitum (*Rep. Paris*. 1, *d*. 17). That God might have created all things other than he has, or that he might do all things otherwise than he does, cannot be proved a logical impossibility, an incompassibilitas contrariorum; we can therefore only say, in the course of the established order chosen by God, this or that will or will not happen (*Rep. Paris.* 4, *d*. 49, *qu.* 11). Such an established order, limits which God has voluntarily fixed for himself, is postulated by Duns, because he distinguishes creation and preservation, i.e. bringing out of nothing into being, and out of being into being, as two essentially distinct relations of God to things, or, rather, of things (*Quodl. qu*. 12) to God. (*Op. Oxon*. 1,

d. 30 *qu* 2.) But it must never be forgotten that the ground why this particular order was established is to be found purely in the pleasure of God. Therefore, although it is true that God has created all things according to ideas which preceded the things in his intelligence, yet these archetypal forms have by no means determined his creating; least of all has he chosen any one form because it was the better gather it is only the better for the very reason that God has chosen it (*Op. Oxon*. 2, *d*. 19). There is, therefore, a scientific knowledge of the Trinity; of the creation there is none. It is with the incarnation precisely as it is with the creation. Had God willed, we might have become stone; there is no more impossibility in that than there was in his becoming man. Precisely the same is true of redemption through the death of Christ. A proof of the necessity of this is not possible. It is simply the pleasure of God that the death of the guiltless one should become the ransom for the guilty (*Op. Oxon*. 3, *d*. 7, *qu*. 1; *d*. 20; 4, *d*. 15). (Around this point revolve the controversies of the Scotists and Thomists respecting the merits of Christ.) Precisely as it must be said of these dogmas that they are certain, not through scientific proofs, but through thee fides infusa (*ibid. d*. 24), even so must we say of the moral commandments which are given us. It is not because it is evil that God has forbidden us this or that, but it is evil because he has forbidden it. Had he commanded murder or other trangressions, they would have been no transgressions and no sin (*ibid. d*. 37). The last adduced principle forms a convenient transition to his *ethics*. Whoever, like Thomas, lays the greater stress on the theoretical side of the soul, must, with Aristotle, put theory above practice, and with such a one, if the Christian idea of blessedness be added, it must assume a peculiar form. Here, therefore, blessedness is conceived as the knowing and beholding of God, as *delectati*o in God, and therefore, as a *theoretic* enjoyment. With Duns, who allows to the will precedence over the thinking power, the matter must naturally take another form. The authority of Aristotle alarms him not; it is, in his view, only the philosopher, with his temporal blessedness, who is opposed to him, when he himself maintains, as the Christian and theological view, that love, therefore the will, confers the highest blessedness, so that it seems to him almost too quietistic to call it delectatio (*Rep. Paris*. 4, *d*. 49, *qu*. 1 and 2). How he disposes of the Biblical authority, according to which eternal life consists in knowing God, has been mentioned above. As, through his stronger emphasizing of the will he separates himself from Aristotle's deification of theory, naturally with him the Augustinian will-lessness must disappear. Duns is a decided synergist. To be sure, the will is not sufficient

for salvation; it needs to be assisted through the infusion of the theological virtue of charitas (*ibid. qu*. 10); but it must be remembered also that Christ only names himself the Door, but the door does not render entrance superfluous. Entrance requires the cooperation of man (*Op. Oxon*. 3, *d*. 19). He does not scruple, therefore, to name the appropriation of salvation through faith a merit which will be rewarded. It is no contradiction to say that when God shows himself compassionate only, he, when just, also decides the act of man (*Rep. Paris*. 4, *d*. 46)."

"The admirers of Scotus extol his acuteness and subtlety as unrivalled, and he has always been accounted the chief glory of the Franciscans, as Thomas Aquinas has been of their rivals, the Dominicans. If in his short life he actually wrote all the works that are commonly attributed to him, his industry at least must have been prodigious. His fame during his lifetime, and long after his death, was not exceeded by that of any other of the Scholastic doctors. From him and Aquinas two opposing sects in theology took the names of Scotists and Thomists, and divided the schools down almost to the last age. The leading tenet of the Scotists was the immaculate conception of the Virgin, and they also differed from the Thomists on the subjects of free-will and the efficacy of divine grace. In philosophy the Scotists are opposed to the Occamists, or followers of William Occam, who was himself a pupil of Scotus, but differed from his master on the subject of universals, or general terms, which the Scotists maintained to be expressive of real existences, while the Occamists held them to be nothing more than names. Hence the Scotists are called Realists, the Occamists Nominalists. It is a favorite opinion of Bayle's that this doctrine of the Scotists was nothing less than an undeveloped Spinozism (*Dict. Crit.* art. Abelard, note C, and Andre Cisalpin, note B). It may be added that the English term 'dunce' has been commonly considered to be derived from the name of the subtle doctor 'perhaps,' says Johnson, 'a word of reproach first used by the Thomists, from Duns Scotus, their antagonist' "(*English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.).

The collected works of Duns Scotus first appeared at Lyons under the title of *Joannis Duns Scoti Opera omnia quae hucusque reperiri potuerunt collecta*, etc., edited by the Irish Minorite, Wadding (Lugd. 1639, 12 vols. fol.). It does not contain all the works of Scotus, but only those designated as his *Opera Speculativa* the contents are, volume 1, Wadding *Vita Scoti*, with *Grammatica speculativa*; *In universam logicam Quaestiones*; volume 2, *Comment. in libros* Physic. *Aristotelis*; *Quaestiones in libros Aristotelis*

De Anima; volume 3, *Tractatus de Rerum Principio*; *Tractatus deprimo Principio*; *Theoremata subtilitissima*; *De Cognitione Dei*; volume 4, *Expositio in* Metaphysicam *Aristotelis*; *Conclusiones Metaphysica*; *Quaestiones in Metaphysicam*; volumes 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, *Distinctiones in quatuor libros Sententiarum*; volume 11, *Reportatorum Parisiensium Libri* 4; volume 12, *Quaestiones quodlibetales*. The *Commentorii Sacr. Script*, were to be given in a later pullication by the same editor, which never appeared. Wadding's *Vita Joannis Duns Scoti* was reprinted at Mons (1644, 12mo). There is also a *Tractatus de Joannis Scoti Vita*, etc., Auctore R.F. Joanne Colgano, *Ord. Minor*. (Antw. 1655, 12mo). A summary of his theology is given in Albergoni, *Resolutio Doctrinae Scoticae* (Lugd. 1643, 8vo). Baumgarten-Crusius wrote a treatise on his theological system (*De Theologia Scoti*, Jena, 1826, 4to). See also Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Bohn's ed.), 2:544-590; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (Smith's ed.), 1:396 et al.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:255; *Christian Examiner* (Bost.), 1849, art. 1; *N. Brit Rev.* May 1855, art. 3; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* book 3, c. 14 part 2, chapter 2, § 38; Haureau, *Philosophie Scolastique*, chapter 25; Brucker, *Historia Critica* t. 3, page 825; Erdmann (translated in *Amer. Presbyt. Review*, April 1865, cited above).

Dunstan

archbishop of Canterbury, monk and statesman, was born at Glastornbury AD 924. He early entered into holy orders, and by means of his relative, archbishop Athelm, was introduced at court where he acquired great influence over the kings Athelstan and Edmund. He was afterwards; however persecuted on account of his independent spirit, an austerity which had excited the anger of king Edwin and of Ethelred. He was exiled for some time in Flanders, but was, on his return, made bishop of Lordon, and finally archbishop of Canterbury in 961. He died May 19, 988. He was canonized as a saint, and is commemorated on the 19th of May. He was well versed in the arts and sciences. The Congregation of Benedictines of St. Dunstan, which he founded, spread rapidly after 957. Writers differ greatly in their estimates of Dunstan's character. It is clear, however that he was "a man of extraordinary talents, of grem energy, stern self-will, and unscrupulous purpose; and that he exerted all his talents, energy, and unscrupulousness to advance the ecclesiastical power, and subject all to papal supremacy. The grand design of his life, viz. the complete

subjugation and conformity of the Anglo-Saxon Church to that of Rome, and the extension and multiplication of ecclesiastical interests, are not such as excite the admiration of model times, and all discerning people will regret the success that attended the unpatriotic labors of the saint. That he was successful there can be no manner of doubt. Though personally out of favor at court in the latter years of his life, his efforts to spread his official influence were unceasing. At an early period in his career he had introduced a new order of monks into the land, the Benedictines, whose strict discipline had changed the character and condition of ecclesiastical affairs, and in spite of the confusion and even opposition thus caused, he persevered to the end. Monasteries continued to be founded or endowed in every part of the kingdom; and such were the multitudes who devoted themselves to the cloister, that the foreboding of the wise Bede was at length accomplished above a third of the property of the land was in possession of the Church, and exempted from taxes and military service" (Chambers, *Encyclop*. s.v.). See *Acta Sanctorum* (May 19); Hume, *Hist. of England* (10th cent.); Churton, *Early English Church*; Southey, *Book of the Church*, page 67 sq.; Smith, *Relig. of Ancient Britain*, page 436 sq.; Turner, *Hist. Anglo-Saxons*, volume 2; Wright, *Biographia Literaria, Anglo-Saxon Period*, page 443 sq.; Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, tom. 2.

Dunster, Henry

a Congregational minister, the place and date of whose birth are unknown. He was a native of England, and was a student at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became BA 1630, and MA 1634. He fled to New England on account of his nonconformity in 1640, and was appointed president of Harvard, being the first master of the college called president, August 27, 1640. He filled the chair until 1654, when he resigned on account of his views in regard to infant baptism. He spent the remainder of his life in the ministry at Scituate, where he died February 27, 1659. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:125.

Dunton, John,

a bookseller and miscellaneous writer, was born at Graffham, Huntingdonshire, in 1659. After being in business some twenty years as a bookseller, he failed, and then devoted himself to authorship. He died in 1733. His principal works are, *The Devil's Martyrs; to which is added the High Church Martyrology* (London. 1716, 8vo): *Athenian Oracle, and*

Young Student's Library (London. 1704, 4 vols. 8vo): *The Hazard of a Death-bed Repentance* (1708, 8vo), etc. Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*.

Dunwody, Samuel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Chester County, Pennsylvania, August 3, 1780. In 1806 he entered the itinerant ministry in the South Carolina Conference, and in 1807 he organized the first Methodist Church in Savannah, Ga. In 1812 he was made presiding elder of Mississippi District, and was elected to the General Conference, in which body he served also at the session of 1844, at which the Church was divided on the slavery question. In 1846 he was made superannuate, and died July 8,1854. He was a very successful preacher, and one of the founders of Methodism in the Southern States. Deems, *Annals of Southern Methodism*, 1856, page 352; — Sprague, *Annals*, 7:435.

Duperron, Jacques Davy,

a French cardinal, was born of Protestant parents at St. Lo, Normandy, November 15, 1556. His father was a Protestant minister, and was compelled during the persecutions to take refuge in Switzerland, where the son was carefully educated. In 1576 he was presented at the court of France where Henry III gave him an office. Finding that the Roman Church would open to him a more brilliant career, he joined it, and took priest's orders, devoting himself to polemics and to proselytizing. He took an active part in the conversion of Henry IV, and, in cooperation with cardinal D'Ossat, secured from the Pope absolution for the king in 1595. On this occasion he was made bishop of Evreux by the Pope at the suggestion of the king. He also secured the divorce of Henry from Margaret of Valois. Among his most formidable opponents was Du Plessis (q.v.) In 1604 he was made cardinal, two years after grand almoner of France, and finally archbishop of Sens. He was also a member of the Congregatio de auxiliis (q.v.), and suggested the decision of Clement VII on the subject. He died at Paris. September 5, 1618. His works were published a few years afterwards (Paris, 1620-22, 3 volumes, fol.). The first volume contains his *Traite sur Eucharistie against Du Plessis*; and the collection contains a number of poems. See Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers*, cent. 17; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:286; Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3:339.

Dupin, Louis Ellies

a learned doctor of the Sorbonne, eminent as an ecclesiastical historian, was born at Paris June 17, 1657. In 1684 he became doctor of the Sorbonne, and was afterwards lecturer on moral philosophy, and devoted his life chiefly to the study of ecclesiastical history and literature. He died at Paris June 6, 1719.

Dupin rendered himself conspicuous as an opponent of the bull Unigenitus, and by his moderation gained the friendship of several Protestant divines, such as archbishop Wake. It is especially as the historian of ecclesiastical literature that Dupin has rendered valuable service to theology. He had an uncommon talent for analyzing the works of an author; and he gives not only a history of the writers, but also the substance of what they wrote, in his Bibliotheque, of which the best edition is Nouvelle Bibliotheque des auteurs ecclesiastiques contenant histoire de la vie, le catalogue, la critique et la chronologie de leurs ouvrages, etc., Paris, 1688 (47 volumes, 8vo); reprinted at Amsterdam (19 volumes, 4to); translated into English under the title A new History of Ecclesiastical Writers, etc., including the 17th century (London. 1693-1707, 17 volumes, fol., bound in 7). There is a Dublin edition without the 17th century (1722-24, 3 volumes, fol.). No theological library is complete without Dupin, although many of his statements must be corrected by the additional light which modern research has thrown upon Church history. The freedom and general impartiality of Dupin's views brought upon him attacks from the Benedictine monks and from Bossuet, with whom he maintained a very successful controversy.

Dupin was also brought into trouble by the celebrated Case of Conscience. This Case of Conscience was a paper signed by forty doctors of the Sorbonne in 1702, which allows latitude of opinion with respect to the sentiments of the Jansenists. It occasioned a bitter controversy, and most of those who signed it were censured or punished. Dupin was not only deprived of his professorship, but banished to Chatellerault. At length, by the interest of friends, he was permitted to return but his professorship was not restored. Clement XI sent formal thanks to Louis XIV for bestowing this chastisement upon Dupin; and in the brief which he addressed to the king on that occasion, characterized him as a man who held very pernicious opinions, and who had been guilty of a criminal opposition to the proper authority of the apostolical see. Dupin afterwards met with trouble under the regency on account of the correspondence which he held with Dr.

Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, which had for its object the formation of a union between the Church of England and the Church of France. Dupin drew up a Commonitorium, and discussed in it the Thirty-nine Articles. He insisted on the necessity of tradition, on the infallibility of the Church in faith and morals, and contended that the sacrifice of the mass was not a simple sacrament, but a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross. The word transubstantiation he seemed willing to give up if the Roman Catholic doctrine, intended to be expressed by it, were retained. He proposed that communion under both kinds, or under bread alone, should be left to the discretion of the different churches, and consented that persons in holy orders should retain their state, with such provisions as would place the validity of their ordination beyond exception. The marriage of priests in the countries in which such marriages were allowed, and the recitation of the divine service in the vulgar tongue, he allowed; and intimated that no difficulty would be found in the ultimate settlement of the doctrine respecting purgatory, indulgences, the veneration of saints, relics, or images. He seems to have thought that the pope can exercise no immediate jurisdiction within the dioceses of bishops, and that his primacy invested him with no more than a general conservation of the deposit of the faith, a right to enforce the observance of the sacred canons, and the general maintenance of discipline. He allowed, in general terms, that there was little substantially wrong in the discipline of the Church of England; he deprecated all discussion on the original merit of reformation, and he professed to see no use in the pope's intervention till the basis of the negotiation should be settled" (Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 4:512 sq.). The correspondence is given in Maclaine's 3d Appendix to his translation of Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*.

Besides his great work on *Ecclesiastical Writers*, Dupin published *De antiqua Ecelesiae Disciplina* (Paris, 1686, 4to): *Liber Psalmorum, cum notis* (Paris, 1691, 8vo): — *Le Livre des Psalmes, traduit selon hebreu* (Par. 1691, 12mo): — *S. Optati Afri Milevitani episcopi, De Schismate Donatistarum, cum notis* (Paris, 1700, fol.): — *Notae in Pentateuchum* (Paris, 1701, 8vo): — *Lajuste defense du sieur Dupin* (Cologne, 1693, 12mo): — *Defense de la censure de la Faculte de thiologie de Paris contre les Memoires de la Chine* [du P. Lecomte jesuite] (Par. 1701, 8vo): — *De la Necessite de la Foi en Jesus Christ pour etre sauve* (Paris, 1701, 8vo): — *Dialogues posthumes du sieur de la Bruyere sur le quietisme* (Paris, 1699, 12mo): — *Traite de la Doctrine chretienne et orthodoxe*

(Paris, 1703, 8vo): — *Joannis Gersonii, doctoris et cancellarii Parisiensis, Opera* (Amsterd. 1703, 5 volumes, fol.): — *L'Histoire d'Apollone de ,Tyane convaincue de faussete et d'imnposture* (Paris, 1705, 12mo): — *Traite de la Puissance ecclesiastique et temporelle* (Paris, 1707, 8vo): — *Bibliotheque universelle des Historiens* (Paris, 1707, 8vo): — *Lettre surfancienne Discipline de l'Eglise touchant la celebration de la Messe* (Paris, 1708, 12mo): — *Histoire des Juifs depuis Jesus-Christ jusqu'l present* (Par. 1710, 12mo): — *Dissertations historiques, chronologiques, et critiques, sur la Bible* (Paris, 1711, 8vo): — *L'Histoire de Eglise en abrege* (Paris, 1712, 12mo): — *Histoire profane, depuis son commencement jusqu'a present* (Par. 6 volumes, 12mo): — *Analyse de l'Apocalypse, contenant une nouvelle explication simple et litterale de cevre, avec des dissertations sur les Millinaires* (Paris, 1714, 12mo): — *Traite historique des excommunications* (Paris, 1715, 12mo): — *Methode pour etudier la theologie* (Paris, 1716, 12mo): — *Defense de la Monarchie de Sicile contre les entreprises de la cour de Rome* (Amsterdam, 1716, 12mo): — *Traite philosophique et theologique sur amour de Dieu* (Paris, 1717, 12mo): — *Bibliotheque des Auteurs separes de la communion romaine du seizieme et du dix septieme siecle* (Paris, 1718, 8vo).

Du Plessis-Mornay

(PHILIPPE DE MORNAY), a statesman and controvertist, and one of the most eminent French Protestants in the latter part of the 16th century, was born at Buhy, November 5, 1549. His father, James de Mornay, was a zealous Roman Catholic, but his mother, who inclined to the Protestant doctrines, gave her son a tutor who held the same views. His father, to counteract this influence, sent him in 1557 to the college of Lisieux, but died in 1559. Philip was now called home to his mother, who had openly embraced the cause of the Reformation. After completing his studies, he visited Italy and Germany from 1565 to 1572. On his return he addressed a memoir to admiral Coligny on the state of the Netherlands, and the expediency of a French expedition in that country. Coligny, struck by the memoir, contemplated sending the author on a mission to the prince of Orange, but in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in August 1572, the admiral was murdered. Mornay, saved by a Roman Catholic, fled to England, where he was well received. He, however, returned to France in the following year, and took an active part in the efforts made by the

Protestants to strengthen their cause by connecting it with that of the duke of Alenqon. At Sedan he married Charlotte Arbaleste de Feuquieres, January 3, 1576, and attached himself to the king of Navarre, who sent him on divers missions to England and Flanders. After his return to France (1582) he took part in the national synod of Vitre, where he proposed a general union of the Protestant churches of France, which proved unsuccessful, but yet greatly increased his consideration among the French Protestants. "From that time until his master ascended the throne of France," say Messrs. Haag, "Mornay was the chief man in his councils; he rendered him important services as a skillful warrior, a good administrator, a deep politician, and an indefatigable writer. If there was help to be asked from Protestant nations, or explanations to be given to foreign princes of the sometimes doubtful conduct of Henry, it was Mornay who drew up the instructions of the envoys when he was not sent himself. When churches had to complain of the non-execution of edicts, it was Mornay who had to draw up the account of their grievances. In short, nothing was done without him." One of his most important acts was his bringing about, in 1589, a reconciliation between Henry III and the king of Navarre. He was rewarded for this service by being appointed governor of Saumur. A short time after, Henry III was assassinated. Mornay then joined the king at Tours, and fought valiantly at Ivry. Henry appointed him one of his councilors, but, as he foresaw that he would be obliged to become a Romanist, the zeal of Mornay for Protestantism was now troublesome to him. He still used him, however, as his chief agent with the Protestants and with the foreign powers. Mornay thought this a favorable time to renew his attempts at conciliating the different Protestant churches among themselves, and even with the Roman Catholics, by means of reciprocal concessions discussed and accepted in a sort of grand council. Henry IV seemed to approve of this plan, and even advised Mornay to consult with the most learned Protestant ministers. But, while the zealous Protestant was calling even the English theologians to his aid in the coming council, Chiverny, the chancellor of Henry IV, wrote to the bishop of Chartres to come on, only without worrying about theology." Mornay saw now, but too late, that he had been duped, and that the abjuration would take place regardless of any discussion, yet he did not refuse being the mediator between the king and the envoys of the churches. But he insisted on the edict of Mantes (1593), which gave securities to the Protestants, and prepared the way for the edict of Nantes. Mornay had no part in framing the latter, but he carefully watched over its execution. Notwithstanding the

coolness with which Henry IV treated him during the later years of his reign, he sincerely mourned the king's death, as he foresaw that persecution would soon break forth again. Under Louis XII he attempted to soften the strict measures proposed against the Protestants, and was on that account deprived of his governorship in 1621. He died in 1623, at Laforet-sur-Sevre, in Poitou. He wrote: *Discours de la Vie et de la Mort* (Lausanne, 1586, 8vo); *Remonstrance aux Estats de Blois pour la paix* (Lyon, 1576, 12mo); *Traite de l'Eglise, oi l'on traite des principales questions qui ont ete mues sur ce point en nostre temps* (London. 1578, 8vo); *Trait de la verite de la religion chretienne, contre les athees, epicuriens, payens, juifs, mahumedistes et autres infideles* (Anvers, 1581, 4to; several times reprinted, last edition 1617); *Advertissement sur la reception et publication du concile de Trente* (Paris, 1583); *Declaration du roi de Navarre sur les calomnies publiees contre lui* (Orthez. 1585, 8vo); *Lettre dun gentilhomme catholique francois, contenant breve response aux calomnies d'un certain pretendu anglois* (1586, 8vo); *Declaration du roi de Navarre au passage de la Loire* (1589, 8vo); *De l'Institution, Usage et Doctrine du sainct sacrement de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise ancienne, comment, quand, et par quels degrez la messe s'est introduite en sa place, en iv livres* (La Rochelle, 1598, 4to); *Response a l'examen du docteur Bulenger, par laquelle sont justifiees les allegations par luy pretendues fausses et verifiees les calomnies contre la preface du livre De la saincte Eucharistie* (La Rochelle, 1599, 4to); *Verification des lieux impugnez de faux, tant en la preface qu aux livres De l'Institution de la saincte Eucharistie par le sieur Dupuy* (La Rochelle, 1600, ,8vo); *Sommation du sieur Duplessis-Mornay a M. l'Evesque d'Evreur, sur la sommation a lui faicte privement* (1600, 8vo); *Discours veritable de la conference tenue a Fontainebleau, le 4 may* 1600, *ou sont traities les principales matieres controversees* (Saumur,;1612, 4to); *Discours et meditations chrestiennes* (Saumur, 1619, 2 volumes, 12mo; 3d volume, 1624, 8vo); *Le mystere d'iniquite, c'est-a-dire Histoire de la papaute, par quels progres e'le est montee a ce comble, et quelles oppositions les gens de lien lui ont fait de temps en temps. Ou aussi sont defendus les droicts des empereurs, rois et princes chrestiens, contre les assertions des cardinaux Bellarmin et Baronius* (Saumur, 1611, fol.); *Testament, Codicile et dernieires heures de P. de Mornay, auxquelles a ete joint son Trait de le Vie et de la Mort, ses larmes sur la mort de son fils unique, et le discours de la mort de Dame Charlotte Arbaleste, son epouse* (La Forest, 1624, 8vo; La Haye, 1656, 8vo); *Memoires de Messire Philippes de Mornay, seigneur du Plessis-*

Marli, etc. (volumes 1 and 2, La Forest, 1624, 1625, 4to; volumes 3 and 4, Amsterdam, 1652, 4to). These Memites were reprinted, with some additions, under the title *Memoires, Correspondances et Vie de Duplessis Mornay, etc., par MM. de La Fontenel'e, de Vaudore et Auguis* (Paris, 1624-1625, 12 volumes, 8vo).

See Mornay de la Villetertre, *Vies de plusieurs anciens seigneurs de la maison de Mornay* (1699, 4to); Crusius, *Singularia Plessica, seu memorabilit de vita, meritis, factis, controversiis et morte. Phil. Morncei de Plessis*, etc. (Hamb. 1724, 8vo); Sismondi, *Hist. des Franfais*, volumes 19-22; Henry Martin, *Histoire de France*, volume 9 and 10; H. Duval, *Eloge de Philippians Duplessis-Mornay* (Paris, 1809, 8vo); J. Imbert, *Duplessis- Mornay* (Paris, 1847, 8vo); Garrison, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February 15, 1848; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Eugene Poitou, *Revue d'Anjou*, 1855; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 36:617; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie* 3:559.

Duppa, Brian

bishop of Winchester, was born, in 1588 at Lewisham, in Kent, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church. He was elected fellow of All Soul's in 1612, and in 1629 he was appointed dean of Christ Church. In 1634 he was constituted chancellor of the church of Sarum, and soon after made chaplain to Charles I. In 1638 he was nominated to the bishopric of Chichester, and in 1641 was translated to the see of Salisbury. At the Revolution he repaired to the king at Oxford, and after that city was surrendered, attended him in other places, particularly during his imprisonment in the Isle of Wight. He was a great favorite with Charles. When the Restoration took place, Dr. Duppa was translated to the bishopric of Winchester, and was also made lord almoner. He died at Richmond in 1662. On his deathbed king Charles visited him, and kneeling down by the bedside, begged his blessing, which the bishop, with one hand on his majesty's head and the other lifted to heaven, gave with fervent zeal. He wrote The Soul's Soliloquie, and Conference with Conscience (1648, 4to): — *Angels rejoicing for Sinners repenting, a sermon on* 42510 *Luke 15:10* (1648, 4to): *A Guide for the Penitent* (1660, 8vo). *New Genesis Biog. Dictionary*, 5:37 sq.; Neal, *History of the Puritans* (Harper's edit.), 2:207; Kippis, *Biog. Britannica*, 5:514.

Dura

(Chal. *Dura*, arWD, the circle, i.e., Hebrew rWD so the Sept. renders, τὸ περίβολον, but v.r. Δεείρα; Vulg. *Dura*), the plain where Nebuchadnezzar set up his golden colossus to be adored (Daniel 3:1). Interpreters usually compare Dura to a city mentioned by Aminian. Marcell (25:6), situated near the Tigris (*Mannert*, 5:462); or another of the same name (Δηρά) in Polybius (5:48, 16) and Ammian. Marcell (23:5), on the Euphrates, near the mouth of the Chaboras, 7 miles from Carchemish; or, finally, one of a similar name (Δηρά) in Susiana (*Ptol*. 6:3, 3). But these quarters are all too distant from Babylon to have been historically possible, as it is clear from the context that "the plain of Drea" could be no other than that plain (or some part of it) in which Babylon itself was situated (*Herod*. 1:178), i.e., Shinar (Genesis 11:2). Even against the first of these locations, the tract a little below Tekrit, on the left bank of the Tigris (Layard, *Nin. and Bab*. page 469), where the name Dur is still found, there are the following objections: (1) this tract probably never belonged to Babylon; (2) at any rate, it is too far from the capital to be the place where the image was set up, for the plain of Dura was in the province or district of Babylon (lbB;tnyDam;Bi), and therefore in the vicinity of the city; (3) the name Dur, in its modern use, is applicable to any plain. M. Oppert places the plain (or, as he calls it, the "valley") of Dura to the south-east of Babylon, in the vicinity of the mound of Dowair or Duair. He has discovered on this site the pedestal of a colossal statue, and regards the modern name as a corruption of the ancient appellation. The Talmudical notice (Sanhedr. fol. 92, 2: arwd t[qb hbr d[lva rhnm) is olscure (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm*. col. 520). See Lakemacher, *Observ. philol*. 7:28 sq. *SEE BABYLON*.

Duraeus

SEE DURY.

Duran

the name of a family originally of Provence, afterwards settlers in Spain, and ultimately in Algiers, which produced several men who are regarded as ornaments to Rabbinical learning. Simeon Duran, 1391, wrote a Commentary on Job, with an introduction on the principles upon which it should be expounded (Ven. 1590); and Salomon, who died 1467,

distinguished himself as a zealous apologist for Judaism. His brother Zemach is the author of a body of epistles, Shealoth vateshuvoth, on various subjects in Talmudic law and metaphysical philosophy (Livorno, 1782), and of several other Rabbinical works. Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature* (London. 1856), page 289.

Durand, David

a French Protestant divine, was born in 1681 at St. Pargoire, in Languedoc. He entered the ministry at Basle in 1703; afterwards went to Holland, and became chaplain of a regiment of refugees. Being taken prisoner, he narrowly escaped death, and was subsequently in equal danger from the Inquisition in Spain. He escaped, however, through the influence of the duke of Berwick, and in 1714 became preacher to the Savoy, in London. In this office he died in London, January 16, 1763. He wrote many books, among which are *Sermons sur divers textes* (London. 1728, 8vo); *La Religion des Mahometans*, from Reland (La Haye, 1721, 12mo); *La Vie de Lucilio Vanini* (Rott. 1717,12mo). Haag, *La France Prot.* volume 4.

Durand, Francois Jacques,

a French Protestant minister, was born at Semale, near Aleneon, in 1727, of a Roman Catholic family. As soon as he had completed his preparatory studies at Paris, Durand applied himself to the study of theology, and returned in 1775 to Lausanne to embrace the Reformed religion. He was licensed to preach in January, 1760, and soon acquired an enviable reputation as preacher. In 1768 Durand was appointed director of the new seminary at Berne and pastor of the French church at that place. At the same time he continued to instruct in ecclesiastical history, statistics, civil history and in Christian morals at Lausanne, where he died, April, 1816. Besides a number of miscellaneous works, Durand published *L'Esrit de Saurin, ouvrage utile a toutes les families chretiennes* (Lausanne, 1767, 2 volumes, 12mo): *Sermons sur les solemnites chretiennes* (Lausanne, 1767, 3 volumes, 8vo; Avignon and Paris, 1776): *L'Annee evangelique, ou sermons pour tous les dimanches ou fetes de l'annee* (Lausanne, 1780, 7 vols. 8vo; and with Supplement, Lausanne, 1792, 2 volumes, 8vo). A sketch of his life, with certain *Sermons nouveaux*, by Armand Delille, appeared at Valence (1805, 2 volumes, 12mo). Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:423.

Durand Or Duranti

(DURANDUS or DURANTUS), Guillaume, surnamed Speculator, was born about AD 1230 at Puimosson, in France. Studying at Bologna and Modena, he became a learned ritualist, and a great favorite of popes Clement IV and Gregory X. He was appointed by the latter pope legate to the Council of Lyons in 1274, and bishop of Mende in 1287. He died ill Rome November 1, 1296. His principal works are *Speculum juris* (Strasburg, 1475, 4 parts, and many editions later): *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Mayence, 1459, fol.; Augsb. 1470, fol.; Rome, 1473, 1477, fol.; Ulm, 1473, 1475, fol.). The first book of the Rationale has been translated, under the title The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments, by J. M. Neale and B. Webb (Leeds, 1843, 12mo).

Durand, De Saint-Pourgain

(DURANDUS A SANCTO PORTIANO), one of the most eminent of the later scholastic divines, was born at Saint Pourcain, Auvergne, about 1280. From early years a member of the Dominican order, he was made doctor in 1313. His great abilities were soon manifest. John XXII called him to Rome, and appointed him master of the palace. In 1318 Durand re-crossed the mountains, and accepted the bishopric of Puyen Velay. He became bishop of Meaux in 1326, and died in 1332. He is known among the great scholastics by the distinctive title Doctor Resolutissimus. His principal writings are, *In Sententias Lombardi commentariorum libri* 4 (Lugd. 1569; Venice, 1586, fol.): *De Origine Jurisdictionum, sive de jurisdictione ecclesiastica et de legibus* (Paris, 1564, 4to): *Statuta synodi dicecesis Aniciensis*, in a work of P. Gissey entitled *Discours historiques de la devotion a ND dupuy* (Lyon, 1620, 8vo).

In philosophy and theology Durand was naturally a Thoinist, but the course of his studies led him far away from the ground of Aquinas. He was a thorough Nominalist in philosophy. *SEE NOMINALISM*. He held theology to be a practical science, the object of which is, not the knowledge of God, but the life of faith. He pronounced the scientific knowledge of God to be beyond the reach of the human mind. Our knowledge of God rests on faith, and faith on the authority of the Church. Nevertheless, in his Comment in Sentent. Lombardi (1, *dist*. 3, *qu*. 1, cited by Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 164), he speaks of a threefold way which leads to the knowledge of God:

1. *Via eminentiae*, which ascends from the excellencies of creatures to the idea of the highest excellency, i.e. to the perfect God.

2. *Via causalitatis*, which ascends from the phenomena of creation to the first cause.

3. *Via remotionis*, which begins with changeable and dependent existence, and ends with necessary and absolute existence (esse de se). This is apparently in contradiction to his fundamental principle; but he clears it up by declaring that it is not the nature of God which is thus demonstrable, but his relation to the external world which can be thus demonstrated. It will be seen that the question of the relativity of knowledge is here involved; and that Sir W. Hamilton and Mansell, in our days, almost reproduce the theory of Durand. As to the sacraments, Durand declared that they are "not necessary nor sufficient in themselves for the salvation of men, since God has not so necessarily connected with these elements the power by which he upholds and redeems men in nature and in grace that he cannot work without them. They are instruments and means of grace, however, since, according to an appointment of God, every one who receives the sacrament receives also grace (provided he offers no impediment), but not from the sacrament, but from God. He makes use of the illustration that occurs elsewhere of a king who promises to bestow an alms on condition of the receiver bringing a leaden penny. The sacrament can impart no character spiritualis, for it is absurd to suppose that material things can effect such a communication to the spirit" (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Bohn's ed., 2:613). On transubstantiation he helped to prepare the way for the Lutheran view. Durand remarks: "It appears to be a reflection on the divine power to maintain that the body of Christ cannot be present at the Supper otherwise than by transubstantiation. The words of the institution also admit the view that the body of Christ was really contained in the sacrament (*Corpus Christi realiter contentum esse in elemento*). Yet the decision of the Church is contrary, in which we are not allowed to suppose an error" (Neander, 1.c.; see also Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 196); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:431; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3:895; Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1811, volume 8, part 2:803 sq.; Oudin, *De Scriptor.* 2087 *Ecclesiastes* 3:792 sq.; Haureau, *Philosophie Scolistique* (Paris, 1850, 3:411 sq.); Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 30:393; 34; 191 sq.

Durell, David, D.D,

was born in the Isle of Jersey in 1728, and was educated at Oxford, where he was afterwards fellow of Hertford College, and then principal. In 1764 he took his degree of DD, and in 1767 was made prebendary of Canterbury. He died in 1775. He published *The Hebrew Text of the parallel Prophecies of Jacob and Moses relating to the twelve Tribes* (Oxford, 1764, 4to): *Remarks on Job, Proverbs, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles* (Oxford, 1772, 4to).Kippis, *Biog. Britannica*, 5:518.

Durer, Albrecht

a German painter and engraver, was born in Nuremberg May 20, 1471. When fifteen years of age he was placed by his father with Michael Wohlgemuth, the leading painter of Nuremberg. With him he remained four years, after which he traveled through Germany and the Netherlands, studying his own art and the collateral branches. In 1494 he established himself permanently at Nuremberg, and shortly after married the beautiful daughter of Hans Fritz, a distinguished artisan. The union, on account of the shrewish temper of his wife, was not a happy one, and it is thought, even shortened his life. In 1506 Durer was enabled, by the aid of his celebrated friend, Wilibald Pirkheimer, to make a journey to Venice, Bologna, and other places of Northern Italy, where he was considerably influenced by the Italian art, especially by the works of Giovanni Bellini. With his return to Nuremberg in 1507 began the period of his great celebrity. The emperor Maximilian was one of the first to recognize his merits, and he, as well as his successor, Charles V, successively appointed Durer court painter, while many of the great cities contended for the possession of his works. In 1518 he was at the Diet of Augsburg, where he painted the portraits of many princes and prominent men. In 1520 and 1521 he made a journey to the Netherlands, where he was received with great honors. He was considerably influenced by the Dutch art, and found fault with his former pictures as being void of that simplicity of nature which now appeared to him as the greatest charm of art. The works which he produced under the influence of this changed conception of art exhibit a refinement of the exuberant fancy in which he formerly delighted, and the two pictures, in particular, which he produced in 1526, containing figures of the size of life of our apostles, are numbered among the greatest works which Christian art has ever produced. Diirer was an enthusiastic adherent

of the Reformation, though it is doubtful if he ever fully separated from the Church of Rome. He died April 6, 1528.

Both as an engraver and as a painter Durer belongs among the greatest artists of all ages. His works reflect the nobility of his character, to which many of his eminent contemporaries, as Melanathon, Camerarius, and Pirkheimer, bear testimony. Though a tendency to the fantastic, a peculiarity of old German art, somewhat obstructed the full development of his artistic power, especially in his youth, he surpassed all artists of his age in grandeur of conception. Among the best paintings of Durer belong the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (1509), which in 1674 was destroyed at the burning of the palace at Munich; the exhibition of the Holy Trinity, together with many saints and blessed (1511), now at Vienna; Adam and Eve, in figures of full size of life (1507), now at Madrid. Engraving he found in its infancy, and carried it to a perfection never since surpassed. Among his best copper-plate engravings belong "St. Jerome in his Cell," "Melancholy," and "the Knight, Death, and Devil." The most noted of his wood-cuts are the "Greater" and "Lesser Passion," and the "Life of the Virgin." Durer also wrote several works in the German language, which had a great influence, and were translated into Latin and several modern languages. On the tercentenary of his birth the corner-stone of a monument to Diirer was laid in his native city, Nuremberg, where his memory has always been held in great veneration. The work was completed by the addition of a bronze statue of the artist by Ranch. See Heller, *Leben u. Werke A. Diurers* (Leipz. 2 volumes); Von Eye, *Leben und Werke Albrecht Durers* (Nordlingon, 1860); H. Grimm, *Albrecht Durer* (Berlin, 1866); *Durer-Album* (Nuremb. 1857); *Durers Kupferstiche, Radirungen, Holzschnitte, und Zeichnungen* (Hanover, 1861); *Durers Handzeichnungen*, etc., *in* 16 *photograph. u. photolithograph. Nachbildungen* (Vienna, 1864).

Durham, James

a Scotch divine, was born in West Lothian about 1622, and was educated at St. Andrews. He was ordained at thirty, and was a popular preacher, and (from 1650) professor of divinity in Glasgow. He died June 25, 1658. He published *An Exposition of the Book of Job* (Glasgow, 1649, 12mo): — *An Exposition of the Song of Solomon* (London, 1669, 4to): — *A Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Amsterd. 1660, 4to; Glasgow, 1788, 4to): — *A Commentary on the 53d Chapter of Isaiah* (2 volumes,

8vo): — *Exposition of the Commandments* (London, 1675, 4to): *Christ Crucified* (7th ed., Glasgow, 1769, 8vo): — *Sermons on the Riches of Christ* (Berwick, 1794, 12mo). Howie, *Scots Worthies*, page 383.

Dursians

SEE DRUSES.

Dury (Durbeus), John,

an eminent Protestant divine, was born in 1595 or 1596 at Edinburgh. His father had been a monk, but, becoming a Protestant, he had to flee to Holland, and became minister to the English and Scotch at Leyden. Here John Dury was educated for the ministry. He visited Oxford in 1624 for the sake of the libraries. In 1628 he became pastor to the English factory at Elbing, Prussia, where he became acquainted with Dr. Godemann, one of the councilors of Gustavus Adolphus. Godemann suggested to Dury that whoever should bring about a reconciliation between the great parties into which Christendom was divided would be the greatest of peacemakers. From that time forward the greater part of his life was devoted to this object. He was invited to England in 1630 through the influence of Sir Thomas Rowe, English ambassador to the court of Gustavus Adolphus. He was well received, and his first plans were approved by archbishop Abbot, by Laud (then bishop of London,) bishop Bedell, and bishop Hall. In 1631 he laid his plans before Gustavus Adolphus, who was greatly interested in them, and gave him letters patent recommending him to all Protestant princes. From the Lutherans he turned to the Calvinists, and visited Hanau, the Palatinate, and other places. When Gustavus fell in 1632, the Protestant (and especially the Lutheran) ascendancy fell with him. But Dury's cause and plans gained friends throughout Europe. In 1633 he returned to England, and at the suggestion of Laud was ordained priest by bishop Hall (with no obligation of residence) in 1634. Armed with letters from Laud and other English prelates, he attended the meeting of Protestant States in Frankfort (1639). His life was thence forward an incessant round of journeyings, colloquies, letters, and publications; all futile, so far as his great aim was concerned. He died at Cassel September 28, 1680.

A summary account of them is given in the *Christian Remembrancer*, January 1855, art. 1, from which we take the following, account of the chief sources of information as to Dury:

"**1.** *A brief Relation of that which hath lately been attempted to procure ecclesiastical Peace among Protestants*, published by Samuel Hartlib (London. 1640).

2. *A summary Account of Master John Dury's former and latter Negotiations for the procuring of true Gospel Peace, with Christian Moderation and charitable Unity among the Protestant Churches and Academies* (London, printed for the author in 1657). These two are identical down to page 32 of the former, which is the same as page 23 of the latter. The Brief Relation has three more pages, containing a sort of epilogue, which concludes that portion of Dury's labors.

3. *The unchanged and single-hearted Peacemaker* (London. 1650).

4. *Consultationum Irenicarum* προδιόρθωσις (Amst. 1661).

Of biographies, the best are:

1. G. Arnoldus, *Historia Johannis Durai*, a university thesis, delivered under the presidency of J.C. Kohler, and usually quoted as that of Colerus (Wittenberg, 1716).

2. C.J. Benzelius, *Comm. Hist. Theol. de Jo. Duraeo maxime de actis ejus Suecanis, cum praef. L.L. Moshemii* (Helmst. 1744). The proceedings of Duraeus at Marburg are said to be related by Schenk in his *Vitae Professorum Theologiae Marburgensiumi*, page 207, but this book the writer has not been able to see. Jablonski has recorded his attempts in Prussia and Poland in his Histcria Consensus Sendomiriensis. His journeys in the Palatinate, Switzerland, and Denmark are related in Seelen's *Deliciae Epistolarum*; in the *Museum Helveticum*, and in the *Fasciculus Epistolarum Theologicarum* of Elswitch." His Latin writings include *Hypomnemata de Studio Pacis Ecclesiastica* (Amstel. 1636, 4to): — *Consultatio Theol. super Negotio Pacis Eccles. Promovendo* (London. 1636, 4to): — *Capita de Pace Evangelica* (London. 1657, 4to): — *Irenicorum Tractatuum Prodromus* (Amstelod. 1662, 8vo).

Dury unfolds his scheme at length in the Dedication of his *Irenicorum Tractuum Prodromus*. In every national church there was to be a *Collegium Pacificatorium*, constituted of some theologians and persons of high position; these colleges were to confer together upon the condition and means of union, and come into correspondence with one another. The main conditions were these:

1. Negotium per disputationem scholasticam nunquam esse agitandum.

2. Ad praxim pietatis omnia concordiae consilia et media esse referenda.

3. Per concessa in libris symbolicis semper esse procedendum.

4. Omnia esse subordinanda fundamentalibus et irrefragabilibus Christianismi dogmatibus, quae ipsi Pontificii negare non possint.

5. De Syncretismo; i.e., de nova quadam religionum miscella, non esse deliberandum, sed de fundamentali concordia.

6. Nunquam agendum de factione aliqua politica contra Pontificios formanda, sed de Protestantium innocentia manifestanda, ut pateat, haereseos crimen iis nullo jure a Pontificiis imputari.

7. Postquam in fundamentalibus inter partes consensum esse apparebit, in reliquis tolerantiae innoxiae locum esse dandum.

8. Prophetandi libertatem secundum s. Scripturas regulatam et quae personalia non tractet concedendam esse.

9. Injuriarum praeteritarum amnestiam esse faciendam, nec impune admittendum, ut ulli se novis injuriis lacessant.

10. Regimen Ecclesiarum utrique parti liberum esse relinquendum, ut illud, prout ex usu suo utilissimum judicabit Ecclesia quaelibet, constituat. The means recommended were, the setting aside of the prejudices of the parties against one another, the publication of books to recommend the union, and correspondence between the parties." Gieseler, *Church History*, (ed. by Smith, 4, § 51). See also (besides the works cited in the course of this article) Mosheim, *Church History* (New York, 1854, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:360; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v. ; Reid, *Westminster Divines*; Arnold, *Kirchenund-Ketzer Historie*, 17:11, § 23; Dowding, *Life of Calixtus* (London. 1864, 12mo).

Dust

(usually רפ;[; *aphar'*, but קבּא; *abak*, *pulverulence*, in <02999>Exodus 9:9; <23524>Isaiah 5:24; 29:5; <26610>Ezekiel 26:10; <34103>Nahum 1:3; "powder," Deuteronomy 38:24; and קיחַ; *shach'ak*, or *impalpable dust*, <23015>Isaiah 40:15; קקד; *dakak'*, to *triturate*, <14404>2 Chronicles 34:4; Gr. κονιορτός; but χόος, dirt, in <41061>Mark 6:11; <66189>Revelation 18:19). In the immediate

vicinity of Judaea there are vast plains or deserts of fine sand, which, when agitated by a violent wind, makes most terrific and desolating storms. Eastern travelers describe them particularly, and think them more dreadful than storms at sea. This affords us a striking illustration of the nature and horrors of the plague, mentioned in <02816>Exodus 8:16, 17, when, the extremely fine and penetrating dust of the land of Egypt was converted into gnats. Among the various fearful punishments denounced in the event of their forsaking Jehovah, the Hebrews are threatened that the rain of their land shall become "powder and dust" (<05824>Deuteronomy 28:24). *SEE STORM*. Among the Hebrews, to cast dust or ashes upon the head was a sign of mourning (<06706>Joshua 7:6), and sitting in the dust was a sign of extreme affliction (<23401>Isaiah 47:1; <25329>Lamentations 3:29). *SEE GRIEF*. The term "dust" is often used figuratively, sometimes to denote the grave (<18721>Job 7:21) or death itself (<01319>Genesis 3:19; <19215>Psalm 22:15), sometimes to express a numerous people (<04310>Numbers 23:10), and sometimes a low or mean condition (<09108>1 Samuel 2:8; <34318>Nahum 3:18). See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict*. s.v. To shake or wipe off the dust of a place from one's feet marks the renouncing of all intercourse with it in future (<40114>Matthew 10:14; <44151>Acts 13:51). To "lick the dust" signifies the most abject submission (<19709>Psalm 72:9). In almost every part of Asia those who demand justice against a criminal throw dust upon him. Thus Shimei cast dust at David (<10613>2 Samuel 16:13), signifying by that action that David ought to be put to death. This view is confirmed by the conduct of the Jews to Paul; when they seized him in the Temple they cried out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live; and as they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air, the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle" (<44223>Acts 22:23). *SEE ASHES*.

Dutch reformed Church

SEE REFORMED CHURCH.

Dutens, Louis

was born at Tours, France, January 16, 1730. When he was about eighteen his sister was put into a convent by order of the archbishop of Tours. This violence so irritated the young man that he left his country and settled in England, where he entered the ministry of the Established Church, and became rector of Elsdon, in Northumberland. He died in London, March

23, 1812. Dutens was a man of varied culture; was a member of the Royal Society, and had the title of historiographer to the king. Besides writing numerous works in science and literature, he edited the works of Leibnitz, Opera Omnia nuncprimum collecta, etc. (Geneva, 1769, 6 volumes, 4to); Le Tocsin, 1769 (against the infidels of the 18th century; reprinted under the title, *Appeal to Good Sense* (London, 1777, 8vo); *De ieglise, du Pape*, etc. (Geneva, 1781,. 8vo); *Recherches sur origine des decouvertes attribues aux modernes* (Paris, 1766, 8vo; 4th edition, 1812, 8vo; translated, *An Inquiry into the Origin of the Discoveries attributed to the Moderns*, London, 1769, 8vo). Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:496.

Dutoit, Jean Philippe,

also called Dutoit-Membrini, was born at Moudon (Switzerland) in 1721. He devoted himself at an early age to the study of theology at the academy in Lausanne, and in 1747 became a candidate for the ministry, but he never took a pastoral charge. In 1750 he had a severe illness, during which he underwent a thorough religious change. He was accustomed to preach extemporaneously, and although his sermons were generally long; he always attracted large audiences. It was not unusual to see, at the close of his discourses, men who had lived in enmity with each other be reconciled. In 1754, having accepted the appointment of missionary preacher and catechist, he resigned it after fourteen days. In 1759 impaired health obliged him to desist from preaching, and he caused his name to be stricken from the list of clergymen. He now devoted himself with all his energy to the study of the Church fathers, especially the Mystics. He himself became a strong representative of Mysticism in the French Reformed Church. His opposition to Voltaire, as well as his seclusion, made him many enemies, and on the 6th of January 1769, while on a bed of sickness, he was suddenly visited by the police, and, by order of the authorities, his papers and manuscripts were seized and forwarded to Berne; but, as his books were found to be of a very innocent character, nothing came of the affair. Upon Dutoit these proceedings made a lasting impression, much greater than could have been supposed of so pious a man. He never recovered from the shock, and died surrounded by a circle of friends and admirers, January 21, 1793. Dutoit is highly spoken of by the historians Monnard and Oliver, and of late attention has been called to his writings by a memoir of his life and works by Jules Chavannes, in the Chretien evangelique, 1861, pages 289, 369, 634. The most important works of Dutoit are *Philosophie*

divine, etc., par Keleph ben Nathan, 3 volumes, 1793; *Philosophie chretienne*, 4 volumes, 1800; and an edition of the *Letters of Madame Guyon, with additional reflections*. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 19:441 sq.

Dutton, Aaron

a Congregational minister, was born at Watertown, Connecticut, May 21, 1780. He graduated at Yale College in 1803, entered the ministry 1805, and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Guilford, December 10, 1806. He resigned June 8, 1842, and a year after was sent as missionary to Iowa by the Amer. Home Miss. Society. He accepted a call in 1843 from the church in Burlington, and returned to prepare for his removal, but was taken ill, and remained in New Haven until his death, June 1849. He was not only a successful minister, but an efficient educator. Many of his pupils were distinguished in college, and afterwards became eminent in the learned professions. His publications consist of some occasional discourses. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:489.

Dutton, Matthew Rice

a Congregational minister, was born at Watertown, Connecticut, June 30, 1783. He graduated at Yale in 1808. In 1810 he was made tutor at Yale; and in 1814 became pastor in Stratford, Connecticut, where he remained until 1821, when he was called to Yale College as professor of mathematics and natural philosophy. He entered on his duties with great vigor; but his health soon failed, and he died in July 1825. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:592.

Dutton, Samuel

W.S., a Congregational minister, son of the Reverend Aaron Dutton (q.v.), was born at Guilford, Connecticut, March 14, 1814, and graduated at Yale College in 1833 with distinguished honor. After three years of teaching, first at Baltimore, and then as rector of the Hopkins Grammar School at New Haven, he became one of the tutors at Yale College, prosecuting at the same time his studies in the theological department of the University. He was ordained pastor of the North Church, in New Haven, in June 1838. He has been widely known by his valuable contributions to the New Englander, and by other occasional publications. His Concio ad clerum, preached and published in 1855, on 'The relation of the atonement to holiness': (the subject being assigned to him by the General Association of

Connecticut), was a very able and timely theological treatise, and was highly commended by critics of various schools and denominations." The degree of DD was conferred upon him by Brown University in 1856. Dr. Dutton was a faithful and successful pastor, and a distinguished preacher. For the New Englander he wrote about two articles a year from its commencement to the year of his death. He died pastor of the North Church, January 27, 1866. — *The Independent*, January 1866; *Congregational Quarterly*, April 1866.

Duty

(רִבָּר; *dabar*, lit. a word or matter; Gr. ὀφείλω, *to owe*). For "duty of marriage" (הֹנָה, onah', dwelling together, Exodus 21:10; used in the Talmud for connubial right; i.q., ἡ ὀφειλομένη εὔνοια, "due benevolence," 1 Corinthians 7:3), *SEE COHABITATION*. For "the duty of a husband's brother" (יָבַם; *yabas'*, Deuteronomy 25, 5, 7, to marry a deceased brother's childless wife, Genesis 38:8), *SEE LEVIRATE LAW*. *SEE ETHICS*.

Duveil Charles Maria,

DD, a converted Jew of the 17th century, of the facts of whose life little is known. He was born at Metz, Lorraine. Carefully educated, his studies led him to abandon Judaism; and, as the Roman Church was the first Christian society with which he was brought into contact, he entered its communion and ministry, and received the title of DD. While a Romanist he published a Commentary on Matthew and Luke. But his further studies led him to Protestant views, and he passed from France into England, where he was well received by Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and other eminent men of the Church of England, and was admitted to orders. He died about 1700. Among his writings are Explicatio Literalis Cantici Canticorum (London, 1679, 8vo): — *Literal Exposition of the Minor Prophets* (London, 1680). Soon after this publication he became a Baptist, and wrote in Latin a Comment in Acta Apostol., which was translated under the title *A literal Explanation of the Acts of the Holy Apostles* (London. 1685, 8vo; new ed., edited by F.A. Cox for the Hansard Knollys Society [London. 1851, 8vo]). In this commentary Duveil vindicates the principles and usages of the Baptists. — Duveil, *Commentary on Acts, Historical Introduction.*

Duvergier Or Duverger, Jean De Hauranne

abbot of St. Cyran, was born at Bayonne, France, in 1581. He studied theology at Louvain. Here he made the acquaintance of Jansenius, with whom he went to Bayonne to continue their studies together from 1611 to 1616. In 1609 he began to distinguish himself as a casuist by his treatment of the Question royale. In 1617 he wrote in defense of his friend the bishop of Poitiers, who had been blamed for heading the troops sent against the Protestants. After going to Paris, where he carried on an extensive correspondence with Jansenius, who had returned to Louvain, and continuing to apply himself still more to the study of the fathers, especially of St. Augustine, he was called to England by Henrietta of France, wife of Charles I. He then conceived the idea of organizing the Roman Catholic Church of England on the plan of the Gallican Church. This brought him into conflict with the Jesuits, against whom he wrote (1631), under the assumed name of Petrus Aurelius, a book, which the Assemblee Generale of the French clergy approved and ordered to be printed (*Petri Aurelii theologi opera, jussu et impensis cleri gallicani denuo in lucem edita*, Paris, 1641; new edit. 1646). Duvergier and Jansenius soon after decided to form a congregation of their own. They attempted to win over the fathers of the Oratory, and had made some progress in that direction, when, in 1635, Duvergier was appointed spiritual director of the abbey of Port Royal (q.v.). Here the effect of his principles was apparent in the pure morals of his charge, which contrasted strongly with the general laxity of the time. He soon, however, incurred the displeasure of Richelieu (q.v.), who had him arrested and transferred to Vincennes, May 14, 1638. He was released in February, 1643, after Richelieu's death. He continued to labor as confessor and writer until his death, October 11, 1643. Parts of his body were preserved in the abbey of Port Royal as sacred relics. Besides the above mentioned works, he wrote also *Somme des fautes* (1626, against the Jesuit Garasse, who had accused the casuists of atheism), and other occasional pamphlets. See Sainte Beuve, *Hist. de Port Royal*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 3:577; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 15:542.

Dwarf

(qDj; *dak*, beaten small, as in ⁰³¹⁶²Leviticus 16:12), an incorrect rendering (Leviticus

21:20; Sept. ἔφηλος, Vulg. *lippus*) for a lean or emaciated person, i.e., by disease (as in 1401Genesis 41:3-24; 1330Leviticus 13:30). *SEE BLEMISH*.

Dwell

(expressed by various Hebrews and Gr. words often differently rendered, e.g. rWG, bvy; ^Wl, ^kv; lbz; κάθημαι, οἰκέω, μένω, σκηνόω). It has been thought, both from Scripture and from profane authors, that the first abodes of men were caves and clefts in the rock; these abound to a remarkable degree in those countries which we know to have been the earliest peopled, and still serve as ordinary habitations. *SEE CAVE*. In succeeding ages they abode generally in tents, as the Arabs of the desert do to this day. The invention of these is ascribed to Jabal, the son of Lamech, who is termed "the father of such as dwell in tents" (0104Genesis 4:20); though, from comparing this verse with the 17th, we may be led to suppose that men lived in houses of some kind before they lived in tents. *SEE TENT*. The art of multiplying stories in a building is very ancient, as we may gather from the construction of Noah's ark and the tower of Babel. The houses in Babylon, according to Herodotus, were three or four stories high, and those in Thebes, or Diospolis, in Egypt, four or five stories. They appear to have been low in Palestine in the time of Joshua; an upper story, although it may have existed, is not mentioned till a more recent age. Buckingham states that the houses at Mousul "are mostly constructed of small unhewn stones, cemented by mortar, and plastered over with mud, though some are built of burnt and unburnt bricks." Our Lord alludes to houses built of mud at the close of his sermon on the mount (4072Matthew 7:26, 27), which were ill calculated to resist the effects of the impetuous torrents that descended from the mountains of Palestine. In India, nothing is more common than for thieves to dig or break through these mud walls while the unsuspecting inhabitants are asleep, so as to plunder them. To similar depredations our Savior appears to allude when he exhorts his disciples not to lay up their treasure where thieves break through and steal (4069Matthew 6:19, 20). Job also seems to refer to the same practice (4024Matthew 24:16). In the holes of these walls serpents sometimes conceal themselves, which is alluded to by the prophet Amos (3059Amos 5:19). It appears from 0207Exodus 5:7, that in Egypt straw anciently entered into the composition of bricks; they were a mixture of clay, mud, and straw, slightly blended and kneaded together, and afterwards baked in the sun. Philo, in his Life of Moses, says that they used straw to bind their

bricks. In the remains of Egyptian edifices, the straw still preserves its original color and is a clear proof that they were never burnt in stacks or kilns. Dr. Richardson found near the ruins of Tentyra huts built of sun-dried brick made of straw and clay. *SEE DWELLING*.

God, it is said, "dwells in light," in respect to his independent possession of his own glorious attributes (<540616>1 Timothy 6:16; <620107>1 John 1:7). He dwells in heaven in respect to his more immediate presence there (<19C301>Psalm 123:1). He dwells in his Church in the continued bestowal of his ordinances, and of his gracious supporting and comforting influences (<190911>Psalm 9:11; <620412>1 John 4:12). Christ dwelt among men in his state of humiliation on earth (<430114>John 1:14). He dwells in our hearts by faith, he is united to us as our head; his righteousness is imputed to us, and applied to our consciences; his spirit and grace are fixed in our hearts; he loves and delights in us (<490317>Ephesians 3:17-19). The Holy Spirit dwells in us, and sheds abroad his gracious influence (Romans 8 and 9; <460316>1 Corinthians 3:16; <550114>2 Timothy 1:14). The Word of God dwells in us richly, when it is carefully studied, firmly believed, and diligently practiced (<19B911>Psalm 119:11; <510316>Colossians 3:16). Wickedness, vengeance, or judgment is said to dwell in or upon a person or land when it long continues there (<181114>Job 11:14; 18:15; <232216>Isaiah 32:16).

Dwell Deep

(tbv,l;Wqmhe, *heemi'ku la-she'beth*, make deep for dwelling; Sept. βαθύνατε ἑαυτοῖς εἰς κάθισιν, Vulg. *descendite in voraginem*), a phrase that occurs in <244908>Jeremiah 49:8, and seems to refer to the custom still common in the East of seeking retreat from danger in the recesses of rocks and caverns. When the wandering Arabs have drawn upon themselves the resentment of the more fixed inhabitants of those countries, and think themselves unable to stand against them, they withdraw into the depths of the great wilderness, where none can follow them. "Always on their guard against tyranny," says M. Savary, "on the least discontent that is given them, they pack up their tents, load their camels, ravage the flat country, and, loaded with plunder, plunge into the burning sands, whither none can pursue them, and where they alone can dwell." *SEE ARABIA*.

Dwelling

Picture for Dwelling 1

Picture for Dwelling 2

(hapl wbz, rgm; bv/m, ^/km; z/[m; ^Kv]mæ, etc.; κατοίκησις, etc.). The dwelling houses of Palestine (see generally Harmer, 1:152 sq.; Faber, Archaeol. 1:365; on Egyptian architecture, Rosellini, *Monum*. 104:2:378 sq.) were usually (Harmer, 1:165) built of burnt or merely dried bricks, µynbel] (Niebuhr, *Trav*. 2:287; Pococke, *East*, 2:173; Tavernier, *Trav*. 1:167, 287; Robinson, *Res*. 2:631-637; 3:514, 580), and therefore very perishable (<4007>Matthew 7:25; comp. <2612>Ezekiel 12:5, 7; 13:13 sq.; Tavernier, 1:287; Wellsted, 1:280); but frequently of stone (<3140>Leviticus 14:40, 42; comp. Robinson's *Res*. 3:316, 420, 496, 720), and palaces of squared stone (<1109>1 Kings 7:9; <2909>Isaiah 9:9; Josephus, *Ant*. 8:5, 2; compare Robinson, 1:354), or even of marble (vyæ; vve, comp. <1302>1 Chronicles 29:2; Josephus, *Ant*. 15:11, 3; *War*, 5:4, 4; of different building stone, see the Mishna, *Baba-bathra*, 1:1; the laying the foundation was an occasion of ceremony and festival, Zechaniah 4:7; compare <1510>Ezra 3:10; <1807>Job 38:7); These were held together by a cement (*mortar*, fl;m, <2409>Jeremiah 43:9; see Rosenmuller in loc.) of lime (rG;æ, <2709>Isaiah 27:9) or plaster of Paris (*gypsum*, dyvæ, <2332>Isaiah 33:12; comp. <0504>Deuteronomy 27:4; Theoph. Lapid. 68 sq.), perhaps also bitumen (*asphaltum*, rm;j, compare <0110>Genesis 11:3; Faber, 1:393 sq.). The exterior (and probably also the interior over the plaster) was usually whitewashed (lpe; κονία, <3144>Leviticus 14:41 sq.; <2630>Ezekiel 13:10 sq. ; <2705>Daniel 5:5 ; <4227>Matthew 23:27; Sirach, 22:17), bright wall-colors being used for royal residences (<2214>Jeremiah 22:14). The beams (<1411>2 Chronicles 34:11; on sypæ, <3211>Habakkuk 2:11, see Gesen. *Thesaur*. page 705, and Delitzsch in loc.) were of sycamore (<2909>Isaiah 9:9), sometimes of olive-wood, sandal, or cedar (<1102>1 Kings 7:2 sq.; <2909>Isaiah 9:9; <2214>Jeremiah 22:14). Elegant mansions were adorned externally with columns (of marble, <2205>Song of Solomon 5:15; <1105>1 Kings 7:15 sq.; <1253>2 Kings 25:13; Faber, Archeol. 1:414 sq.), and often whole porticoes (µlwa, στοά, l Kings 7:6; comp. Josephus, *War*, 4:4). *SEE TEMPLE*. The houses of the gentry (Niebuhr, Trav. 2:293; Shaw, *Trav*. page 182 sq.) were of several stories (<1102>1 Kings 7:2 sq.; comp. <4409>Acts 20:9; but see Korte, *Suppl*. page 177), generally

built in a quadrangle (comp. Kampfer, Amoen. p. 194; Burckhardt, Trav. 1:120), and enclosing (<4859>Luke 5:19) a spacious court-yamd (rx,ej;, <1078>2 Samuel 17:18; <1686>Nehemiah 8:16; comp. Esth. 1:5; 5:1; the impluvium or αὐλή, <4469>Matthew 26:69; see Harmer, 1:177), which, surrounded by colonnades and galleries (Shaw, p. 353), paved (Harmer, 1:175), and containing fountains (<1078>2 Samuel 7:18; comp. Joseph. *Ant*. 12:4, 11; Harmer, 1:175), baths (<1102>2 Samuel 11:2), and trees (Harmer, 1:175), formed the guest-chamber or drawing-room for the reception of visitors (Shaw, *Trav*. page 183; Fabet, 1:401; Harmer, 1:174; comp Esth. 1:5 sq.), being often screened from the sun's rays by an awning (Rosenmiller, *Morg*. 3:297). The flat roof, covered on the top with tiles, earth, or stone, and surrounded by a low parapet, was used sometimes for household or religious purposes, at others as a place of meeting or recreation. *SEE ROOF*. In connection with it (<1232>2 Kings 23:12) was an upper room (hY;l[}, ὑπερ ον), which was used (comp. Niebuhr, *Trav*. 1:380, 400; Shaw, page 188 sq.) as a private chamber (<1833>2 Samuel 18:33; <2761>Daniel 6:11; Judith 8:5); also as a spare bedroom (<1232>2 Kings 23:12; Tobit 3:12; <4013>Acts 1:13; 20:8), a sleeping apartment especially for guests (<1040>2 Kings 4:10), and as a sick-chamber (<1179>1 Kings 17:19; Joseph. *Ant*. 18:8, 2), or room for laying out a corpse (<4087>Acts 9:37, 39), but in summer resorted to for fresh air (<7030>Judges 3:20); and was often furnished with two modes of exit, one leading within the house, the other by a staircase directly to the street. Larger residences had an additional front court (rx,ej;, προαύλιον, πρόθυρον, πυλών, αὐλή; <2832>Jeremiah 32:2; <4140>Mark 14:68; <2160>Luke 16:20; <3816>John 18:16; <4407>Acts 10:17, etc.), which served as an anteroom (so the Rabbins understand ^/rD]s]mæ <7023>Judges 3:23; see Faber, page 440), and from which, by means of stairs (hL;s.ma, <1491>2 Chronicles 9:11; a winding staircase, lWl, <1068>1 Kings 6:8), often finished with costly wood (<1491>2 Chronicles 9:11), persons passed to the roof or upper story. A door led from the fore-court to the inner court, and from the latter was the entrance to the rooms on the ground floor of the house proper. These last were variously decorated with wainscoting (<1107>1 Kings 7:7; <2214>Jeremiah 22:14; <3704>Haggai 1:4), ivory (<1229>1 Kings 22:39; <3315>Amos 3:15; compare <1969>Psalm 45:9; Homer, Odyss. 4:72 sq.; Horace, Od. 2:18, 1 sq.; Pliny, 36:5; Harmer, 1:168 sq.; 2:171 sq.; Faber, page 399 sq.; also with precious metals inlaid or plated, Tibull. 3:3, 16; Horace, *Od*. 2:18, 1 sq.; Cicero, *Parad*. 6:3; comp. <4612>1 Corinthians 3:12), and carving (Josephus, *Ant*. 8:5, 2; comp. Tavern. 1:168) since the splendor of Oriental houses was lavished

rather upon the interior than the exterior (Pococke, *East*, 1:49); the floor was laid sometimes with a coating of gypsum, at others with tesselated blocks of variegated marble (Tibull. 3:3, 16; Cicero, *Parad*. 6:3) or other kinds of stone (Harmer, 1:172 sq.; compare <17106>Esther 1:6). The doors (<5609>Deuteronomy 6:9), seldom high in private houses (<20179>Proverbs 17:19), sometimes of stone (Burckhardt, 1:122), swung (comp. Shaw, *Trav*. page 185) on morticed pivots (ryxæ, <20514>Proverbs 26:14; in sockets, t/tpo, <11050>1 Kings 7:50; comp. *cardo foenuria*, Vitruv. 9:6), and were commonly fastened with wooden bolts (l[;mæl[;mi), which were opened (<7025>Judges 3:25; <23222>Isaiah 22:22; comp. Harmer, 1:188) by means of a key (jitpe), but only from the inside (<22165>Song of Solomon 5:5; <42127>Luke 12:7; comp. Faber, page 427). In the better class of houses there was a door-keeper (Joseph. Ant. 17:5, 2) or female porter (<43816>John 18:16 sq.; <44123>Acts 12:13; comp. *Plant. Curcul*. 1:1, 76; Sept. <10406>2 Samuel 4:6), who, in case any one knocked outside (<42136>Luke 12:36; 13:25; <44123>Acts 12:13; compare <40707>Matthew 7:7; <66320>Revelation 3:20; Thilo, *Apocryph*. page 218; see Becker, *Charicles*, 1:230), and gave their name (<44214>Acts 12:14; <66320>Revelation 3:20; comp. Plutarch, *Genesis Soc*. page 31; Lucian, *bis. Accuso* page 29; *Apul. Asin*. 1, page 19 Bip.), opened the door to them (Acts, 12:13; comp. Athen. 14:614). (See Stuck, *Antiq. conviv*. page 249; Sagittar. *De januis vett*. Jen. 1694, chapter 16; also Elsner, *Observ*. 1:411 sq., in Graevii *Thesaur*. 6) Princes, however, had guards at the palace gates (<11427>1 Kings 14:27). The windows (^/Lj), on account of the street dust, generally face the court-yard (Schubert, 3:291), although anciently this rule does not appear to have so extensively prevailed (<7028>Judges 5:28; <20706>Proverbs 7:6); they were closed by a lattice (<7028>Judges 5:28). The most interior, or back rooms of all, were devoted to the special occupancy of the female members of the household, as is still universally the case in the East, under the name "harem," and no male dares intrude within their precincts (Chardin, 6:6 sq.; Hartmann, Hebr. 2:399 sq.; Hoffmann in the Hall. Encyclop. 2:1, page 396 sq.). The more distinguished Hebrews early had separate summer and winter residences (/yqhi tyBe and tyB ãr,jo, <30315>Amos 3:15; <24622>Jeremiah 36:22; comp. <7020>Judges 3:20; see Harmer, 1:200; *Prosp. Alp. Med. Egypt*. 1:6; Niebuhr, *Trav*. 2:394). The latter were warmed (of which they had the more need, as glass windows are unknown in the East) by means of a fire-pot (ja; <24622>Jeremiah 36:32), which is merely a vessel of burnt clay (Niebuhr, *Beschr*. page 56) placed in a round hole in the middle of the room, over which, when the fire is burnt down,

the inmates place a four-cornered frame, and next a carpet over this, and then gather around to enjoy the warmth (Tavernier, 1:276; Niebuhr, *Trav*. 1:154; 2:394). The furniture of the rooms (2 Kings 4:10) consisted of a sofa or couch (hFm,ae compare Ezekiel 23:41; v r,[, Amos 6:4; compare Josephus, *Ant*. 15:9, 3), which luxury was often adorned gorgeously (Amos 6:4; Song of Solomon 7:16), and furnished with pillows (Ezekiel 13:10); and besides this, only chairs (aSeKa) a table (^j;l]v), and lanterns or lamp-stands (2 Kings 4:10). See all the above parts and articles in their alphabetical order. Compare House.

The *house leprosy* described in Leviticus 14:33-57 was a corrosion of the saltpetre found in the lime used as mortar and the limestone used for building (see Michaelis, *Mos. Reckt*, 4:264 sq.; Mishna, *Negaim*, 12), and is still common in walls in Egypt (Volney, *Trav*. 1:55). *SEE LEPROSY*.

Dwight, Holden

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Thompson, Connecticut, August 28, 1810, was converted in 1828, studied in Dudley Academy, Massachussetts, in the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, and graduated in the Wesleyan University at Middletown in 1835. After this he taught in academies of the South and in Louisiana College, and was some time agent for Macon Female College, Georgia, until 1841, when he removed to Norwalk, O., and was principal of the seminary there, and of the Baldwin Institute at Berea till his death in 1847. Mr. Dwight was a man of strong mind and generous feeling, a thorough classical and general scholar, and an eminently successful teacher. As a preacher he was dignified, forcible, and convincing. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:159.

Dwight, Louis

a Congregational minister, was born at Stockbridge, Massachussetts, March 25, 1793, and graduated at Yale College in 1813. He studied theology at Andover, but, fearing that his feeble health would unfit him for the pastorate, he accepted in 1819 an agency of the American Tract Society. In 1823 he became agent of the American Education Society. In 1824, his health failing seriously, he undertook a long journey on horseback, and combined with this pursuit of health a mission of mercy in supplying Bibles to prisoners in the various jails. He visited for this purpose the prisons of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and as far

south as South Carolina. On his return to Boston in 1825, his reports of his mission gave rise to the American Prison Discipline Society, of which he was the first secretary, in which service he remained for thirty years. For years he preached the Gospel to the insane poor at South Boston. He died July 12, 1854; and the epitaph on his tomb sums up his labors in the phrases "a benefactor of man; a friend to the prisoner; a reformer of prisons; a preacher of the Gospel." — Sprague, *Ann.* 2:669.

Dwight, Sereno Edwards

DD, an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Greenfield, Connecticut, May 18, 1786. He graduated at Yale College in 1803, and in 1806 was chosen tutor, in which post he continued until 1810, when, having completed his law studies, he entered upon practice at the bar. He entered the ministry in October, 1816, and was elected chaplain of the United States Senate. On September 3, 1817, he was installed pastor of Park street Church, Boston, where he remained until his resignation, April 10, 1826. In 1833 he was elected to the presidency of Hamilton College, and entered upon the office in August, and resigned in 1835. In 1838 he moved to New York. He died in Philadelphia, November 30, 1850. Dr. Dwight published *Memoirs of David Brainerd* (1822). *An Address on the Greek Revolution* (1824): — *The Death of Christ: the Substance of several Sermons delivered at Park street Church* (1826): — *The Life of President Edwards, accompanying a new edition of Edwards's works* (1830): — *The Hebrew Wife* (1836); and a few occasional sermons. His discourses were published in a volume with memoir in 1851 by W. T. Dwight. — Sprague, *Annals,* 2:669.

Dwight, Timothy

DD, LL.D., grandson of Jonathan Edwards the elder, was born at Northampton, Massachussetts, May 14, 1752, and was graduated at Yale College at a very early age in 1769. Two years after his graduation he was elected a tutor in his college, and held the office during six years. Near the end of his tutorship he was licensed to preach, and soon joined the army of the Revolution as a chaplain to General Parsons's brigade. After a year spent in this service, he was called home by the news of his father's death in 1778, to take care of his mother and the family, being the eldest child of thirteen. Relinquishing his part of the family property, he taught school and preached for his own family's support. So highly was he thought of by his

fellow citizens that they called him into public life, solicited him to give himself permanently to politics, and promised to secure for him a place in the Continental Congress. But he preferred to preach the Gospel, and, after several flattering calls which he declined, accepted one from the parish of Greenfield, in Connecticut, to become their pastor. Here he spent twelve years, from November 1783, onward. As his salary was inadequate to the expenses which his family and his hospitality obliged him to incur, he established an academy, the oversight of which he took upon himself, which was distinguished for the advanced and thorough training of its scholars, and in which upwards of a thousand young persons of both sexes came under his instruction. His reputation as an instructor and as a preacher led the corporation of Yale College in 1795 to elect him to the presidency of that institution, which had lately become vacant by the death of President Stiles.

It was during his residence at Greenfield that his two poems, one on the "Conquest of Canaan" by Joshua, an epic in rhyme, the other entitled "Greenfield Hill," and describing the scenery and the events of the neighboring country, were given to the world. These poetical works, which are not without glow and fire, are now forgotten; but some of the versions of the Psalms which he inserted in a revision of Dr. Watts's Psalms, with hymns annexed, published by direction of the General Association of the state in 1800, have stood their ground, and probably will never go out of use; we refer especially to those whose first lines are, "I love thy kingdom, Lord" (Psalm 137), and "Shall man, O God of life and light" (Psalm 88).

The state of Yale College at his accession to the presidency was far from being satisfactory, but his vigor, ability, and wisdom ere long infused into it a new life. With great wisdom, he selected young men for the several professional chairs. He himself preached, and with very great acceptance, in the college chapel; he instructed in morals, mental philosophy, natural theology, and the evidences of revelation; and the religious interests of the students found in him a director and a guide. Soon after he came to Yale College he found that many students were tainted with infidelity. He was among the first, and one of the very ablest defenders of the Christian faith in this country, and by his preaching, as by his sermons on "The nature and danger of infidel philosophy" published at the time, he may be fairly said to have driven infidelity from the college. On the whole, his administration of the college was a very successful one. To him more than to any other man

Yale College is, indebted for its highly respectable position among the seats of learning in this country.

President Dwight died January 11, 1817, when not quite sixty-five, of a cancer in the neck of the bladder. He had a commanding person, a noble voice, great pathos, an ardent temper, an excellent judgment, and sincere piety. His conversational powers were of the highest order. His style in his extempore addresses and in his written discourses was fervid and eloquent, but somewhat too rhetorical. He entered with great interest into the politics of the day, as an adherent of the principles of Washington and of the Federal party. His theology was Calvinism as modified by the two Edwardses, his grandfather and uncle. In his youth he preached it with warmth, but as he advanced in years he laid little stress on any doctrines except those in which all evangelical Christians were agreed. His life was full of acts of hospitality and benevolence, and his sympathies were of the tenderest sort. During a great part of his life his eyes were too weak to be used, and his works were principally written by an amanuensis. His principal works published under his name, besides those which have been already mentioned, were Theology explained and defended (Middletown, Connecticut, 1818, 5 volumes; and in a multitude of editions afterwards in 4 volumes, both in the United States and in England): — *Travels in New England and New York* (New Haven, 1821, 4 volumes, which contained the record of journeys on horseback undertaken for his health during vacations), and *Sermons of an occasional character* (New Haven, 1828). See *Life* prefixed to his *Theology*, and Dr. Sprague's life of him in Sparks's *American Biography*, volume 14, or new series, volume 4.

Dwight, William T

DD, a Congregationalist minister, was a son of President Dwight, and was born at Greenfield Hill, Conn., in 1795. He graduated at Yale College in 1813, and was distinguished for his scholarship in a class of many able scholars. From 1817 to 1819 he was a tutor in the college, and then removed to Philadelphia, where he practiced law until 1831. In that year he was awakened under a lecture of Dr. Skinner, and, abandoning the law, he was licensed by the Third Presbytery of New York, and accepted a call to the Third Church in Portland, Maine. His ministry of above thirty years was eminently successful. He was an overseer of Bowdoin College and president of the Maine Missionary Society. In 1852 he was president of the Albany Convention of Congregational churches. "As a preacher he is

entitled to a foremost rank among American divines for sound and varied learning, clear and polished diction, graceful and effective delivery, and eminent success." He died at Andover October 22, 1865. He published a *Life of Sereno E. Dwight, with a Selection from his Discourses* (1851).

Dye

(μδα; *adam*, in the phrase "rams skins dyed red," Exodus 25, 26, 35, etc., to be "ruddy," <2507>Lamentations 4:7, or "red," <3403>Nahum 2:3; <2308>Isaiah 1:8; <2323>Proverbs 23:31; /mjy; *chamets*, brilliant in color as wine-stained garments, <2301>Isaiah 63:1). The art of dyeing is undoubtedly of great antiquity, and is, perhaps, nearly coeval with that of weaving. The Egyptians particularly excelled in the brilliancy of their dyed stuffs; and from them the Hebrews, while dwelling among them, learned the art of dyeing. This is evident from the curtains of the tabernacle and the sacerdotal robes which were manufactured in the desert (<0201>Exodus 26:1; 28:5-8). The skill of the Egyptian linen manufacturers in employing the metallic oxides and acids, or mordants, is placed beyond dispute by ocular proof. The various processes of dyeing and printing, or imparting the pattern, by blocks (the origin of calico printing), are exhibited in Rossellini's plates in all their minute details; and even the printing-blocks engraved with phonetic letters, and with the dye upon them, may be seen in the British Museum. Pliny's testimony is interesting as illustrating, though not wanted to corroborate the fact. "They dye cloth," he says, "in an extraordinary manner. It appears quite white before it is dipped; they then imbue it with drugs (mordants), which do not alter its appearance, but which absorb and retain a new and permanent color, varied according to the application of the drug."This is the modern process. Experimental investigation and chemical analysis have shown demonstratively that in the dyes which the linen and cotton manufacturers employed to produce certain results of which the relics are extant, they must have employed acetates of alum and of iron, and vegetable and mineral dyes, both substantive and adjective, as they are termed by the modern dyers. It is as easy as invidious to ascribe these applications to accident rather than to chemistry. Evidences drawn from all the other arts and trades prove that the Egyptians were good chemists. The long stripes of linen which the Hebrews worked in the desert for the tabernacle were separately blue, scarlet, and white (<0201>Exodus 26:1). The last was probably the effect of bleaching; but the whole of the colors and cloth so dyed have been found,

as well as the yellow, to evince chemical knowledge. It appears that the linen printers and dyers used the carthamnus tinctorius, which grows in Egypt, for red, woad for blue, and the reseda luteola, also a native of Egypt, for yellow. Now none of these operations could have been effected without a practical chemical knowledge. The system of bleaching now practiced in this country, but recently introduced, has been used from time immemorial in the East, and doubtless, therefore, in ancient Egypt, viz. by immersion in oxygenated muriate of lime, after subjection to the action of steam or boiling water. The three other colors, blue, red, and yellow, are adjective colors, i.e., fugitive without the use of mordants. They could not be fixed, as we find them fixed, without their proper mordants, namely, oxides of tin, arsenic, and iron. Occasionally the muslin, beautifully dyed and patterned, was interwoven with silver and gold thread, some specimens of which can be traced up to the early period of Thothmes I, and even of Osirtasen. Indeed, the richly painted walls and palaces, as well as the unmatched gilding, as fresh as when first laid on, show a perfect familiarity among the ancient Egyptians, not with mineral and vegetable colors only, but the perfect use of the metallic oxides in their composition.

The colors of the Egyptians were principally blue, red, green, black, yellow, and white. The red was an earthy bole; the yellow an iron ochre; the green was a mixture of a little ochre with a pulverulent glass, made by vitrefying the oxides of copper and iron with sand and soda; the blue was a glass of like composition with the ochreous addition; the black was bone or ivory black, and the white was a very pure chalk. They were mixed with water, and apparently a little gum, to render them tenacious and adhesive. With the Egyptians, the favorite combination of color was red, blue, and green; when black was introduced, yellow was added to harmonize with it; and in like manner they sought for every hue its congenial companion. They also guarded against the false effect of two colors in juxtaposition, as of red and blue, by placing between them a narrow line of white or yellow. They had few mixed colors, though purple, pink, orange, and brown are met with, and frequently on papyri. The blue, which is very brilliant, consists of fine particles of blue glass, and may be considered equivalent to our snialt; it seems to be the same that Vitruvius describes, which he supposes to have been first, made at Alexandria; and it also agrees with the artificial kyanus of Theophrastus, invented in Egypt, which he says was laid on thicker than the native (or lapis lazuli). The thickness of the blue on the ceilings in Belzoni's tomb confirms his remark. The green is also a glass in

powder, mixed with particles of colorless glass, to which it owes its brightness (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.*, abridgm., 2:292).

The following statements are more in detail. There are many kinds of hues, both natural alid artificial, mentioned in the Bible as fashionable or known among the Hebrews; besides white (ˆb;l) and black (rjø;or µDj), there were:

1, principally red (µdæa; brownish-red), crimson (ynæ;lymæ[;K), purple or violet red (ˆm§;rja), orange or vermilion (rviv);

2, next green (qry);

3, pale yellow (qriq]rY);

4, azure or hyacinthine (purplish) blue (tlk;ET);

5, brown or fox-colored (qrø;).

Many of these are no doubt properly, or at least originally, the designation of the coloring materials. *SEE CRIMISON*; *SEE VERMIILION*; *SEE PURPLE*. It is evident that each of these principal colors had a special significance among the Israelites, according to which it would be selected whenever there was an option; and it could not but be that some colors would be preferred to others, e.g. white garments as the clothing of the respectable (as among us black is the clerical color), but dignitaries were arrayed in purple (<070826>Judges 8:26; <170815>Esther 8:15; <270507>Daniel 5:7, 16, 29; comp. <270706>Song of Solomon 7:6), which hue was probably so appropriated on account of its costliness (comp. the purple sails of the Syrian ships, <262707>Ezekiel 27:7). *SEE APPAREL*. Bright, dazzling colors (/Wmj) further indicated, as might naturally be supposed, hilarity and joy (<100124>2 Samuel 1:24; comp. <240430>Jeremiah 4:30), while dark (black) and dull hues were expressive of grief and dejection (<300314>Malachi 3:14; <380602>Zechariah 6:2, 6; comp. Plutarch, *Pericl.* 38; Mishna, *Middith*, 5:3; Apulei *Metam.* 2, page 40 Bip.; see generally Gotze, *De vestium nigrar usu*, Helmst. 1726). Youth and age also constituted a distinction in this respect. White, moreover, was assumed as the color of whatever form came from heaven (as being that of the purest light); hence angels were clad in glittering white robes (<411605>Mark 16:5; <432012>John 20:12, etc.). 1. The symbolical use of colors is clearly exhibited in the prophetic visions. In <661202>Revelation 6:2 sq., the rider upon

the white horse is emblematical of one bringing prosperity like victorious champions, the red horse signifies bloodshed, the black denotes the distress of dearth and scarcity, the pale one (χλωρός) death. So when (<66603>Revelation 12:3) the great dragon (Satan) is depicted red, it appears altogether congruous with the character of the originator of death and of every ruin (<23118>Isaiah 1:18; comp. ver. 18; see Bihr, *Symbol*. 1:335 sq.; also <66703>Revelation 17:3). More difficult of interpretation are the colored steeds of <38108>Zechariah 1:8; 6:2 sq., which passages certainly served as a model to the revelator. In matters of worship (Krause, *De colore sancto,* Viterb. 1707), color symbols take a wider range (Creuzer, *Symbol*. 1:125 sq.). The priests in general wore white vestments, to indicate the purity of the divine Beinr whom they served. When idols were painted with vermillion (Wisd. 13:14; <26314>Ezekiel 23:14; see Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom*. 98), this color was not only selected for its brilliancy, but as that with which even the Romans, in early times, decorated their triumphant warriors (Plin. 33:36). Hence purple robes were used for robing the statues of the gods (<24109>Jeremiah 10:9; Creuzer, *Symbol*. 1:126; 2:358). In the Israelitish cultus the four principal colors occur: dark (or purplish) blue, purple-red, crimson, and white (the three essential colors, white, blue, and red, also occur in <66816>Revelation 18:16); they appear connectedly in the decorations (tapestry and veils) of the tabernacle (<02504>Exodus 25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 35:6 sq.; 36:8 sq.), and in the sacerdotal garments (<02805>Exodus 28:5 sq., 15; 39:1). Moreover, scarlet and deep blue cloths are prescribed for the transportation of the sacred furniture (Numbers 4), and scarlet wool for certain purificatory purposes (<03404>Leviticus 14:4, 6, 51 sq.; <04906>Numbers 19:6); and the tassels to the four corners of the covering, which had a religious significance, were to be made of dark blue materials (<04538>Numbers 15:38). Perhaps these four colors were selected not merely on account of their beafity and costliness (God demands the best that man has), but with reference to their special mystical import, which in the last instance (the ritual of purification) is more evident. Philo (*Opp*. 1:536; 2:148) and Josephus (*Ant*. 3:7, 7) too have already an explanation of the four sacred colors (comp. *Stud. u. Krit*. 1844, 2:315 sq.). See Friederich, *Symbol. d. mos. Stifftshutte* (Leipz. 1841). *SEE COLOR*.

Dyed Attire

stands in our version of <26315>Ezekiel 23:15, as a translation of µyl Wbe f] (*tebulim*, usually regarded as from l bif; to *dip*, and so to dye with colors;

but Gesenius prefers the derivation from an Ethiopic verb signifying to wind or wrap around, and so giving the sense of), head bands or tiaras. The Sept. and Vulg. combine both significations (τιάραι βαπταί, tiar). *SEE PAINT*.

Dysentery

SEE FLUX.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

Criticism, The Higher,

is a phrase or title which has lately come into use, or rather been assumed by a certain class of critics, to designate a peculiar form or theory in the treatment of the text of the Bible, especially with reference to the authorship of the several books composing the sacred volume. Under the article CRITICISM, BIBLICAL *SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL* , we have seen that it is the particular province of that science to ascertain what is the genuine original of the text itself by means of a recourse to the written or printed copies which are extant; while a determination of their value as religious authorities belongs to the title of CANON OF SCRIPTURES, and the settlement of their peculiarities of diction, dates, and writers is more properly treated under the head of INTRODUCTION or *Eisagogica*. It is rather a usurpation, therefore, in the promoters or adopters of this new term to claim for themselves the province par eminence of "higher critics," inasmuch as the topics which they discuss have always been recognised as legitimate to other departments of sacred literature, and have in fact been substantially treated there. Furthermore, they do not claim to have found any fresh sources of information, or to have discovered any really new facts or principles; there is nothing truly original even in their processes of investigation; they have merely followed up more closely certain hints and speculations of earlier disputants, and have evolved a more formidable system of conjectures and presumptions on the grounds already controverted. It is proper, therefore, at the outset to understand that this so-called science is not truly information, nor even a consistent and clearly defined classification of well-founded and generally admitted knowledge; but simply a dexterous manipulation of a few phenomena, long ago fully known and often considered, in accordance with the subjective opinions of individual minds, and therefore resulting in widely discrepant conclusions among themselves. In nothing do they actually agree except in a spirit of denial of views current among orthodox students hitherto, and in a wholesale scheme of dissection and redistribution of the contents of the books of Scripture which they have criticised, with a view to assign them in fragments to other unknown and even now nameless authors. In short it is but another phase of the rationalistic attack upon the genuineness,

authenticity, and integrity of the Bible as a total or in its parts, for the purpose of rendering a verdict against it as being; unhistorical, and therefore untrustworthy.

This assault upon the traditional authorship of the canonical books of Scripture began with the Pentateuch, which has still been the chief arena of contest; and may be said to have been inaugurated by the suggestion of Astruc, the French physician of the early part of the last century, concerning the Elohistic and the Jehovistic sections of Genesis (q.v.), which was afterwards taken up, especially by the destructive school of German scholars, headed by Eichhorn and others, and lately extended to other portions of the Bible; the most violent of the aspersions being by Colenso and his admirers, but the more keen and learned by Kuener, Wellhausen, and their associates, and at length largely adopted, with great variety in details, by the English latitudinarians, coming down to our own day in the persons specially of Profs. McCheyne, Driver, and Robertson Smith, with their followers in this country, the most noted and outspoken of whom is Dr. Briggs, of the Union Theological Seminary. We have room for a summary only of their different principles, purposes, and processes.

The object of these critics is not only a literary one beyond the scope of the ordinary "Introduction," questioning the authority of tradition, and seeking a more exact solution of difficulties, but it is also historical, applying the same rules as are usual with other documents. This would be perfectly fair, if a sufficient reverence were maintained for the sacred sources, themes, and conservators of revelation; but the standpoint of faith and spiritual experience is too much neglected, and thus a merely secular spirit is encouraged, which is not favorable to the apprehension and appreciation of divine truth. Even those who study from more religious motives do not ask, "How came the Bible here?" they forget that it is not simply a record of human experiences and beliefs like ordinary books, whereas it is the product of supernatural inspiration, and is therefore to be understood and interpreted accordingly. Especially is the history full of miraculous interventions and anomalies, which are not to be judged or accounted for on purely naturalistic and political principles. The Bible is not a mere human production, nor are its contents to be regarded as unaluthoritative.

In like manner the methods pursued by these critics are not only linguistic in the ordinary sense and application, but they are hypercritical and infected with the latent suspicion of a want of originality in the writings thus

scrutinized, which warps the judgment and forestalls the conclusion desired. Especially is this the case when a comparison is instituted between the chosen people and contemporary nations, where any apparent discrepancies are seized upon and magnified; to the prejudice of the sacred narrative. The anachronisms thus produced and displayed are really insignificant, and the tables have fairly been turned upon the objectors by the remarkable coincidences so recently brought to light by Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian explorations, strikingly confirming the minutest details of Scripture history. On the contrary these sceptical investigators seem to make an effort to array Biblical statements against each other, instead of pursuing the course of harmonizing usually adopted in reconciling profane historians with each other. The same perversity is especially exhibited in considering the origin and establishment of theological tenets and institutions, where the critics unwarrantably assume that these must have been the result instead of the cause of long years of culture and usage; thus reversing the normal and historical order of events. If any moral or religious sentiment of their own appears to be violated by what they discover in the record, the latter is forthwith repudiated as unworthy and therefore false, and is summarily rejected as a spurious interpolation from some extraneous source or age; a manifest petitio primncipii, which does not seem to occur to these critics as illogical.

In addition to these defects in the procedure of the critics in question, they fail to remember that the different books and chapters of the Bible are not isolated productions, each to be judged alone, but they form parts of a homogeneous and related unit, so that one portion or statement is to be interpreted and harmonized by others in order that the whole truth may be fairly and consistently elicited. Especially do they ignore the fact that the entire volume was not written from the modern standpoint of exact science, for then it would have been unintelligible to its first readers. In short a just system of exegesis is not applied to it, and confusion and misunderstanding of course result. On the contrary, the assumption being once made that even each book is the product of several authors, and that without concert or unity of plan a theory flatly opposed by the evident order and congruity of the whole when fairly expounded it is easy to find and multiply discrepancies, which would otherwise appear simply differences arising from the dislocation and partial exhibit of the passages out of their context and purpose. Besides this are the native repugnance to the preternatural, the asserted improbability of the miraculous, the

presumption against prophecy, and the innate rebellion of the heart at unwelcome doctrines, with its blindness of spiritual truths — in a word, the materialistic or naturalistic tendency to measure divine things by human, whether in objective statements or internal experience; and we have a sufficient explanation of the rationale or rather irrationale of "higher criticism."

The results of this criticism may be illustrated by the treatment of the Pentateuch (or as these writers usually prefer to call it, the Hexateuch, including the book of Joshua), of which the following is Strack's theory, but it is not altogether coincided in by Dillman, Wellhausen, Socin, and others. The four principal sources are supposed to have been as follows:

1. The *Priestly Code* (otherwise called the "First Elohist," the "Foundation Document," the "Book of Origins," or the "Annalistic Relator");

2. The *Second Elohist* (otherwise called the "Younger Elohist," the "North Israelitish Relator," the "Third Relator," or the "Theocratic Relator");

3. The *Jehovist* or "Jahvist" (otherwise called the "Additor," the "Fourth Relator," or the "Prophetic Relator'");

4. The *Deuteronomist*. These are substantially reckoned in that chronological order, although widely separated in point of time; and the books in question are distributed among them in a most intricate and minute manner, but with little agreement among the several critics as to the precise adjustment or authorship even of these fragments. All of them, however, in general agree that the very earliest sources, with but few unimportant exceptions, are the product of a comparatively late age; and they all deny the authorship of the Pentateuch as being of Moses. The scheme and detail, as wrought out by them, is too complicated and various to be reproduced intelligibly here. We can only exemplify it by a parody upon an unquestionably historical, authentic, and coherent passage from the New Testament, namely, the account of the restoration of Dorcas by Peter (<4036>Acts 9:36-43), which, for the purpose of a reductio ad absurdum, we treat in the same fashion.

In this specimen the reader will observe that the two imaginary sources or documents give each a connected and distinct account of an event, the former being the cure only, and the latter the revivification of the patient; the former exclusively giving the place of its occurrence and certain other

particulars (such as the messengers on the occasion, her sitting up of her own accord, etc.), and the latter her name (together with the apartment, spectators, Peter's help in arising, etc.). A few unimportant connecting words are omitted or supplied (in brackets or double brackets respectively) by that convenient personage the so-called "Redactor." In sober truth, the whole theory and process are simply ridiculous, for any veritable paragraph of undoubted history is capable of being travestied in a similar manner.

The literature of the subject is already considerable, although chiefly scattered in sporadic articles throughout periodicals or more extended works. A copious exhibit of the particulars both pro and con is given in the Hebraica for 1891-93, and the book of Genesis as thus dismembered has been printed in German indifferent sorts of type for the eye, by Kautsch and Socin (Freiburg, 1891, 8vo), reproduced in English in different colors by Bissell, with just comments (Hartford, 1892, 8vo). The latter author has admirably reviewed the whole scheme in his work on the Pentateuch (London. and N.Y., 1885, 8vo). Two excellent works on the subject are, *The Higher Criticism*, by Reverend C.W. Rishell (Cincinnati. 1893, 12mo), and *Anti-Higher Criticism*, edited by Reverend L.W. Munhall (N.Y. 1894, 8vo).

END OF VOLUME 2.